



To enrich lives through effective and caring service



Santos H. Kreimann
Director

Kerry Silverstrom
Chief Deputy

Gary Jones
Deputy Director

February 21, 2013

TO: Beach Commission
FROM: *Carol Salas* Santos H. Kreimann, Director

SUBJECT: BEACH COMMISSION AGENDA – FEBRUARY 27, 2013

Enclosed is the agenda for your meeting of February 27, 2013, together with the minutes of your January 23, 2013 meeting. Also enclosed are reports related to Agenda Items 4A, 5A, 5B and 5D as well as the Beach Commission Attendance Report.

Please call me if you have any questions or need additional information.

SHK:CB:cm
Enclosures



County of Los Angeles Beach Commission

13837 Fiji Way, Marina del Rey, CA 90292
Phone: (310) 305-9546 Fax: (310) 822-0119
Web Page: <http://beaches.lacounty.gov>



AGENDA

Meeting of the Beach Commission
February 27, 2013
9:30 a.m.
Burton Chace Park
13650 Mindanao Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

1. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

(January 23, 2013)

3. OLD BUSINESS

A. Activation of Facilities and Design Subcommittee

(DISCUSSION/ACTION)

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Malibu Lagoon Restoration Project

(PRESENTATION)

5. STAFF REPORTS

A. Ongoing Activities Report

(DISCUSS REPORT)

▪ Board Actions on Items Relating to Beaches

B. Beach and Marina del Rey Special Events

(DISCUSS REPORT)

C. Facilities and Property Maintenance Division Report
Regarding Beach Maintenance

(VERBAL REPORT)

D. Capital Projects Status Report/Related Activities

(DISCUSS REPORT)

E. Lifeguard Report

(VERBAL REPORT)

Catherine McCurdy,
Chair
Ginny Kruger,
Vice-Chair

Clare Bronowski
Thomas Barnes
Rosi Dagit
Walt Dougher
Norman Dupont

Jeffrey Jennings
Kelly McDowell
Charles Milam
Wayne Powell
Norma Pratt

Don Rohrer
Jeffery Sallee
Scott Sachs
Andrew Stern
Gregory Woodell

6. COMMISSION COMMENTS

7. COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC

8. NEXT MEETING DATE & LOCATION – Wednesday, March 27, 2013, at 9:30 a.m. at Burton Chace Park Community Room.

9. ADJOURNMENT

PLEASE NOTE:

1. The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors adopted Chapter 2.160 of the Los Angeles Code (Ord. 93-0031 § 2 (part), 1993), relating to lobbyists. Any person who seeks support or endorsement from the Beach Commission on any official actions must certify that he/she is familiar with the requirements of this ordinance. A copy of the ordinance can be provided prior to the meeting and certification is to be made before or at the meeting.
2. The agenda will be posted on the Internet and displayed at the following locations at least 72 hours preceding the meeting date:

Department of Beaches and Harbors' Website Address: beaches.lacounty.gov or marinadelrey.lacounty.gov

Department of Beaches and Harbors
Administration Building
13837 Fiji Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Marina del Rey Information Center
4701 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Burton Chace Park Community Room
13650 Mindanao Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Lloyd Taber – Marina del Rey Library
4533 Admiralty Way
Marina del Rey, CA 90292

Si necesita asistencia para interpretar esta informacion llame al (310) 305-9546.

ADA ACCOMMODATIONS: If you require reasonable accommodations or auxiliary aids and services such as material in alternate format or a sign language interpreter, please contact the ADA (Americans with Disability Act) Coordinator at (310) 305-9590 (Voice) or (310) 821-1737 (TDD), with at least three business days notice.

DRAFT

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES BEACH COMMISSION
MINUTES OF JANUARY 23, 2013**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Clare Bronowski, Chair
Rosi Dagit
Walt Dougher
Ginny Kruger
Catherine McCurdy,
Vice-Chair
Kelly McDowell
Charles Milam
Don Rohrer
Jeffrey Sallee
Scott Sachs
Gregory Woodell

ABSENCES

Thomas Barnes
Norman Dupont
Jeffrey Jennings
Norma Pratt
Wayne Powell
Andrew Stern

STAFF PRESENT

Carol Baker, Division Chief, Community & Marketing
Services Division
Barry Nugent, Chief, Lifeguard Division, Los Angeles
County Fire Department
Kenneth Foreman, Division Chief, Facilities and
Property Maintenance Division
Catrina Love, Community & Marketing
Services Division
Betsy Barker, Information Technology Section

GUEST SPEAKERS

None

MEETING LOCATION

Burton W. Chace Park Community Room

1. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Bronowski called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. Chair Bronowski asked Vice-Chair McCurdy to lead the Pledge of Allegiance. The commissioners and staff stood and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chair Bronowski asked if there were changes to the minutes. Having no changes, **Commissioner Dagit motioned for the minutes to be approved, the minutes were approved unanimously.**

Commissioner Woodell stated that the agenda cover for October had the wrong date, October 25th instead of October 24th, and that's why he was not in attendance.

3. OLD BUSINESS

A. Ford Agreement for Lifeguard Vehicles

Ms. Baker told the commissioners that this sponsorship agreement was coming back to the commission, after approval from the Board of Supervisors because, after the commission first heard and approved the agreement, Ford determined it was unable to provide ownership of the vehicles as had been tentatively agreed to previously but instead would provide continued use without cost. Consequently, the agreement expired before an amendment could be executed. DBH did negotiate a new deal with Ford resulting in a new agreement. Ms. Baker introduced Catrina Love to give the commissioners an overview of the new agreement. Ms. Love stated that the new agreement was approved by the Board on December 4th. The new agreement would give Ford 10 special events instead of 20, they would not be able to sponsor the freestanding Rip Current Signs with name identification and the agreement now includes extensive insurance and indemnification language that was not included in the previous agreement. Ford would be granted the exclusive right to advertise themselves as the official vehicle sponsor for Los Angeles County Beaches as well as the official vehicle sponsor for Los Angeles County Beach Lifeguards. Because of the insurance and indemnification changes in this agreement, there was not time to bring the agreement before the commission for endorsement before going before the Board. Ms. Love asked the commissioners if they had any questions. Commissioner Dougher asked if the hybrid vehicles had any warning for the beach going public that a car is approaching. Chief Nugent answered affirmatively that the vehicles have a low tone as they are approaching and another tone when they back up, and the Lifeguards have had training in clearing the area, circle of safety, and how to go over berms and have the most visibility possible. Commissioner Milam asked if DBH would be working on a new agreement to take effect after the Ford contract's expiration. Ms. Love responded affirmatively that staff would be talking to other vehicle manufacturers about acquiring future beach patrol vehicles. Commissioner Milam was curious about Ford's reticence over another two-year contract and about what the active life of the vehicles that the Lifeguards use. Ms. Love answered that from what she hears from the Lifeguards the vehicles are holding up well, however she mentioned that the beach environment is hard on vehicles over time. Chief Nugent commented that their Department is in no position to purchase other vehicles at this time, so this is a great benefit to having the vehicles donated for the two-year period. Commissioner McDowell asked why Ford was refusing to cover manufacturing defects and if the transmission went out on day one would that be at the County's expense. Ms. Love said that they have had a lot of updates to their indemnification and insurance provisions over the last four-years. Ms. Love said in talking to Ford that if anything went wrong over the next two-years that the County has the vehicles Ford would cover any and everything that needs to be fixed. Commissioner McDowell stated that the agreement does not say that. Ms. Baker said general vehicle repair is different from a defect. Chair Bronowski commented the County would still have redress for defects. Ms. Baker thanked Ms. Love for her hard work on this negotiation.

4. NEW BUSINESS

B. Election of Officers

Chair Bronowski reported that the nominating committee met on November 9th, by telephone conference. The nominating committee consisted of The Chair, Commissioners Milam, McCurdy, Dagit and Ms. Baker. Chair Bronowski noted that the Vice Chair becomes the Chair, and a new Vice-Chair is selected, rotating from the Third or Fourth District according to the rules. Commissioner Ginny Kruger was nominated for Vice Chair. **The nomination was motioned for approval by Commissioner Dagit, seconded and approved unanimously.**

C. Venice Beach Sand Berms

Ms. Baker told the commissioners about a community meeting that was held in regards to a protest over the Washington Blvd. sand berm in Venice. Ms. Baker thanked Chief Nugent for hosting the meeting at Lifeguard Headquarters. Ms. Baker said there were two calls to DBH including one from a reporter, questioning the need for the berm. Around the holidays the Board of Supervisors offices began to receive calls and about 50 individuals began circulating a petition questioning the need for the berms and wanting more information about them. The Board of Supervisors requested a community meeting which was arranged by DBH with Ms. Baker, Chief Nugent, DBH Deputy Director John Kelly and Mr. Foreman. Commissioner Woodell also attended the community meeting. Mr. Kelly explained the dynamics of the berms and what they are used for. The berms had already been erected as high tides were expected that week. About 12 people showed up for the meeting with about six of them questioning the need for the berms and the other six were supportive of the berms. Mr. Foreman presented the sand berm community meeting PowerPoint to the commission, showing the damage that had been done in past storms without the berms in place. Commissioner Bronowski mentioned that the berm and the vehicle contract issue came up on short notice but highlighted the need for the commission to be more involved. Ms. Baker said she could start informing the commission at the meetings about the press inquiries she receives. Chair McCurdy asked if the berms were part of an emergency budget, Mr. Foreman said berms were a part of his standing budget each year and they know what areas need to be fortified so they build berms at Zuma, Venice, Dockweiler and Hermosa Beach, areas with facilities that are most likely to be hit in a bad storm. Commissioner Dougher asked if the bike path being cleaned on the weekend was overtime for his staff. Mr. Foreman said the bike path was generally the responsibility of L.A. City but that he has staff scheduled to work 365 days as part of a regular, non-overtime schedule. Commissioner Saltee asked about the Coastal Commission review process of the berms. Mr. Foreman said they have a 3-year permit that does not expire for another year and that the Coastal Commission reaches out to environmental groups like California Fish and Wildlife for any concerns, and if that agency has any concerns they impose restrictions on the DBH permit like requiring a biologist on site. Ms. Baker said at the community meeting it was clear that there was not unanimous support for the berm at Washington Blvd. and the Supervisors office said the permit for this issue would be revisited with the Coastal Commission and an update would be given at the next meeting.

5. STAFF REPORTS

A. Ongoing Activities Report

The report was received and filed.

B. Beach and Marina del Rey Special Events

The report was received and filed.

C. Facilities and Property Maintenance Division Report

Mr. Foreman stated that the RV Park was closed for the month of January due to the yearly maintenance activities. Mr. Foreman mentioned that the grass needed to be replaced. Commissioner Dagit asked what were they replacing the grass with and if it was drought resistant. Mr. Foreman said that is the intent. Ms. Dagit indicated she had some suggested grass options that she would forward to Mr. Foreman. Commissioner Woodell asked if that was part of his annual budget. Mr. Foreman said yes. Mr. Foreman added that the berms would be knocked down the week of February 4th, starting at Dockweiler and they all would be down by the middle of February. Commissioner Milam asked if that was too early, Mr. Foreman said berm dismantling had to be scheduled during a time that would not disturb the grunion run season.

D. Capital Projects Status Report

Ms. Baker said that there was no one present from the Capital projects staff because of a meeting with the Coastal Commission staff. Ms. Baker mentioned that Supervisor Yaroslavsky's office showcased the Coastline Drive project on their website and the County T.V. channel was doing a piece on it as well. The construction is scheduled to start in April 2013 and complete by the end of 2014. Ms. Baker also mentioned that DBH received a lot of feedback from Malibu regarding the Dan Blocker Beach improvement project and staff should be able to give an updated report next meeting. Commissioners Woodell, Dagit and Powell were interested in a Broad Beach renourishment project, DBH submitted a response which was given to the commission. Commissioner Woodell asked how does a commissioner bring a subject to the commission for discussion. Ms. Baker said basically meetings were left up to the discretion of the Chair. Commission Bronowski said policy states that there are ten meetings scheduled for the year with August and December being canceled and when there are meetings held with no new items, it makes commissioners not come to subsequent meetings. Commission Woodell said he would like a presentation on Broad Beach. Commissioner Kruger wants a presentation on how planned capital projects are budgeted and feedback on recent studies on climate change and rising sea levels. Commissioner Bronowski said that if we have a discussion on a subject one month to be sure there is a follow-up/conclusion at the next meeting and requested presentations on the Zuma underpass project and on grunion breeding season. Commissioner Dagit mentioned that the National Park Service report should be available sometime in

February or March on passage barriers and would like a presentation on that. Commissioner Woodell asked about the Facilities Design Subcommittee, a meeting held before the Beach Commission meeting, being reinstated. A discussion ensued about the subcommittee, and Ms. Baker asked that the matter be revisited at the next meeting, when staff handling those projects could be present to respond.

E. Lifeguard Report

Chief Nugent said for the first time in four years the Fire Department was holding a rookie school for new Lifeguards. The exam was held in October and there will be two classes held in March and April with 96 candidates that are going through background investigations now. The Department is also posting the Ocean Lifeguard Specialist exam, Beach Captain exam, Rescue Boat Captain exam, and an Assistant Chief Lifeguard exam. The Department will also be able to fill Section Chief positions. The Department is putting together a task book for new Ocean Lifeguards which will be an expectation of performance and development mastery in particular areas of performance. Commissioner Sallee wanted some follow-up on the smuggling issues Chief Frazer had previously mentioned. Chief Nugent said the Border Patrol and Coast Guard have put up a blockade in San Diego trying to stop that situation, however there have been more attempts to circumvent that, with pangas going hundreds of miles out of the way and traffickers, also using ultra light planes and GPS. Commissioner Dougher asked about the Director (Santos) attending the Beach Commission meetings. Ms. Baker said Santos still did not know his status as far as when/if he would come back to DBH, however Mr. Kelly, one of our Deputy Directors, regularly attends these meetings, and Deputy Director Gary Jones, who has been representing the Department at the Board of Supervisor's meetings and in other county government interactions has intentions of attending these meetings. Commissioner Woodell said agenda should have a section for comments for the commissioners called "Commissioners Comments". Chair McCurdy said the commissioners had a few items coming back like the climate change, the Broad Beach issue, the grunion and the sub-committee. Commissioner Sallee said he would be interested in information on the Healthy Living Commission and "blue zones".

6. COMMUNICATION FROM THE PUBLIC

There was no communication from the public.

NEXT MEETING DATE AND LOCATION

The next meeting is scheduled for February 27, 2013, 9:30 a.m. at Burton Chace Park.

The new Chair McCurdy adjourned the meeting at 11:15 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cheryl McGee
Commission Secretary



To enrich lives through effective and caring service



February 21, 2013

Santos H. Kreimann
Director

Kerry Silverstrom
Chief Deputy

Gary Jones
Deputy Director

To: Beach Commission
From: *Carol Bauer* for Santos H. Kreimann, Director

Subject: **AGENDA ITEM 4A – MALIBU LAGOON RESTORATION PROJECT PRESENTATION**

Item 4A pertains to Malibu Lagoon Restoration Project Presentation. Suzanne Goode, Senior Environmental Scientist with the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and Mark Abramson, will make a presentation to the Commission on the Malibu Lagoon Restoration Project.

Presenters' Background:

Suzanne Goode has worked in the Angeles District of the California Department of Parks and Recreation for twenty-three years. She supervises the resource management, planning and real property management functions for over 40,000 acres in the Santa Monica Mountains, the Santa Susana Mountains, the Verdugo Mountains and in urban Los Angeles. She has managed numerous habitat restoration projects throughout the Santa Monica Mountains.

Mark Abramson is the Senior Watershed Advisor for the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission. He has a Masters degree in Landscape Architecture from Cal Poly Pomona in ecosystem planning and design, specializing in stream and wetland restoration. Mark created a community volunteer monitoring program for the Malibu Creek Watershed and has created innovative partnerships with State and National Agencies to implement fish barrier removal projects and large-scale stream and riparian restoration projects in the Malibu Creek and Ballona Creek Watersheds. Mark designs and oversees rain garden and rain barrel installation programs in his ongoing work to make watersheds more permeable and create a greener more livable city.

SHK:cb



To enrich lives through effective and caring service



Santos H. Kreimann
Director

Kerry Silverstrom
Chief Deputy

Gary Jones
Deputy Director

February 21, 2013

TO: Beach Commission
FROM: *Carol Behr for*
Santos H. Kreimann, Director

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM 5A - ONGOING ACTIVITIES REPORT

BOARD ACTIONS ON ITEMS RELATING TO BEACHES

There were no Board action items related to the beaches since the last report to your Commission.

SHK:CB:cm



To enrich lives through effective and caring service

February 21, 2013



Santos H. Kreimann
Director

Kerry Silverstrom
Chief Deputy

Gary Jones
Deputy Director

TO: Beach Commission
FROM: *Carol Bauer for*
Santos H. Kreimann, Director

SUBJECT: **AGENDA ITEM 5B - BEACH AND MARINA DEL REY SPECIAL EVENTS**

BEACH EVENTS

BEACH NATURE WALK

Dockweiler Youth Center ♦ 12505 Vista del Mar ♦ Los Angeles ♦ 90245
Saturday, March 23
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

The Los Angeles County Department of Beaches and Harbors is teaming up with the Los Angeles Audubon Society to provide a free guided nature walk on Dockweiler Beach. In particular, you will look for the Western Snowy Plovers, a tiny bird that spends its life on the beach eating, sleeping, resting and laying its eggs right in the sand! You will be walking on the beach, so dress appropriately and bring plenty of water. **Space is limited so please call to pre-register at (310) 481-4037.** A parking pass is available for \$2 at the Dockweiler Youth Center office.

MARINA DEL REY

BIRDWATCHING 2013

Burton Chace Park ♦ Lobby
13650 Mindanao Way ♦ Marina del Rey, 90292

The Los Angeles County Department of Beaches and Harbors Outdoor Adventures are sponsoring a FREE two-hour excursion through the Ballona Wetlands, with visits to the nesting sites of the Great Blue Heron and Black Crowned Night Heron. You will also get to visit the shoreline habitat to observe Sandpipers, including Long-Billed Curlews, Willets, and Western Snowy Plovers. Don't miss this chance to get acquainted with the lives of our feathered friends who are part of our ecosystem! Please bring water, snacks, binoculars, comfortable clothes and shoes with traction. For morning sessions, also bring sunscreen and a hat. This activity is geared for adults, but may be attended by children who do not need a car seat or stroller, if accompanied by an adult. Space is limited, so please pre-register by calling (310) 322-6951.

A County van is available to pick up participants a half hour before the program start time at:

- Dockweiler Youth Center Lobby, 12505 Vista del Mar, Los Angeles, 90245
- Dockweiler RV Park Office, 12001 Vista del Mar, Playa del Rey, 90293

Walk Dates: February 28, April 25, June 27
9:00 a.m.

March 28, May 23
4:00 p.m.

For more information call: (310) 322-6951

FISHERMAN'S VILLAGE WEEKEND CONCERT SERIES

Sponsored by Pacific Ocean Management, LLC

All concerts from 1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Saturday, February 23

Jimbo Ross & The Bodacious Blues Band, playing Blues

Sunday, February 24

Jimi Nelson & The Drifting Cowboys, playing Country

Saturday, March 2

Kid & Nic, playing American Songbook

Sunday, March 3

Floyd & The Flyboys, playing R&B

Saturday, March 9

Blue Breeze, playing R&B

Sunday, March 10

Brazil Brasil, playing Bossa/Samba

Saturday, March 16

Friends, playing R&B

Sunday, March 17

Susie Hansen's Latin Jazz Band, playing Latin Jazz

Saturday, March 23

Carangoa, playing Cuban

Sunday, March 24

Jimi Nelson & The Drifting Cowboys, playing Country

Saturday, March 30

Jimbo Ross & The Bodacious Blues Band, playing Blues

Sunday, March 31

Upstream, playing Reggae

For more information call: Pacific Ocean Management at (310) 822-6866

HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE AND E-WASTE ROUNDUP

Saturday, February 23, 2013

9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. (approximately)

Dock 52 Parking Lot – 13483 Fiji Way

The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles are sponsoring the annual Household Hazardous Waste and E-Waste Roundup for the proper disposal of environmentally harmful household substances and electronic waste.

For more information call: Los Angeles County Sanitation District at (800) 238-0172 or visit their website at www.lacsd.org.

SHK:CB:cm



To enrich lives through effective and caring service

February 21, 2013



Santos H. Kreimann
Director

Kerry Silverstrom
Chief Deputy

Gary Jones
Deputy Director

TO: Beach Commission
FROM: *Carol Bahner for* Santos H. Kreimann, Director

SUBJECT: **AGENDA ITEM 5D – CAPITAL PROJECTS STATUS
REPORT/RELATED ACTIVITIES**

Item 5D on your agenda provides the Commission with a status report on the Department's four beach capital projects and other related projects.

CAPITAL PROJECTS

Supervisory District 3

(1)	Will Rogers SB - Coastline Drive Development	\$ 9,514,000
(2)	Dan Blocker-West Improvement Project	4,790,000
(3)	Beach Restroom Septic System Replacement Program	13,788,000
(4)	Surfrider Beach Tank Removal	<u>394,960</u>
TOTAL		\$28,486,960

(1) Will Rogers SB – Coastline Drive Development

The project includes: reconstruction of the parking lot; construction of an engineered seawall and slope; removal of the existing wooden pilings to below grade; construction of a view deck and ADA-compliant beach access ramp; and landscaping, irrigation and security lighting improvements.

Current Status: Construction bids were received on February 12, 2013. Granite Construction Company is the apparent low bidder with a bid of \$5,532,500, which is lower than the County's estimate of \$5,753,815. The Department of Public Works (DPW) is in the process of certifying the bid results.

There have been some delays in securing the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) permit. The staffer working on the review of the application is on extended leave. DPW has spoken to RWQCB management who indicated they will need several weeks before they can tell us when we can expect the permit. The Corps permit will be issued after the RWQCB permit.

Construction start is scheduled for April 2013 with substantial completion expected by end of October 2014.

(2) Dan Blocker Beach-West Improvement Project

The project involves the development of an unimproved westerly portion of this beach site, all of which will be ADA-complaint and includes a small paved parking lot; ramp to the beach; bluff top trail; benches and picnic facilities with protective railings; new perimeter fencing; and bluff top and slope native planting, with minimal irrigation for erosion control.

Current Status: At a meeting held on January 17 between the Department of Beaches and Harbors (DBH), DPW, and City of Malibu, it was recommended that the planned ADA access ramp be removed from the plans, and instead, repair an existing stairway and construct a new beach access ramp at the eastern segment of Dan Blocker Beach as a separate project. DPW will provide a summary of this option along with associated schedule and cost impacts within the next few weeks.

According to the City of Malibu, the proposed ADA beach access ramp at this location will be problematic with the Coastal Commission and some of the locals because it's a massive concrete structure on elevated piles that will have a negative aesthetic impact.

Construction start is scheduled for May 2013 with substantial completion expected by end of July 2014.

(3) Beach Restroom Septic System Replacement Program

This program consists of replacing septic systems and leach fields at 16 County operated beach locations in the Topanga and Malibu areas. Each project includes the removal of existing septic pumps and tanks and installation of an advanced treatment septic system, including pumps, tanks, telemetry monitoring system, filter pods, and leach field.

Current Status: Construction of the Zuma Maintenance Yard and Restroom No. 6 is expected to commence before the end of February and completed by mid-May 2013.

Replacement of the septic systems at Zuma restrooms Nos. 2, 7, 8 and 9 will begin after the summer season.

(4) Surfrider Beach Tank Removal

The abandoned saltwater concrete tank was uncovered during the storms of 2004-05. This project is to leave the tank in place on the beach. The tank will be filled with slurry to prevent collapse, sealed, and covered with beach sand.

Current Status: The California State Office of Historic Preservation (SOHP) is still reviewing the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and construction documents. Once SOHP provides their concurrence, DPW will use the revised documents to prepare and submit a Coastal Development Permit application to the City of Malibu.

A Board Letter to adopt the MND and approve the project will be drafted as soon as SOHP's comments are received.

RELATED ACTIVITIES

Broad Beach

On December 20, 2012, DBH submitted its comments (attached) to the Analysis of Impacts to Public Trust Resources and Values (APTR) for the Broad Beach Restoration Project. In January, California State Lands Commission (SLC) staff notified DBH that the project would go before the Commission in February 2013. We have received no indication that that such a hearing will be taking place and are awaiting confirmation from SLC staff.

Zuma Beach Underpass

DBH submitted a CDP application to the City of Malibu (City) in November 2012. The City has requested additional information regarding the design of the project. DPW is putting together a response.

In September 2012, DBH submitted the encroachment permit application to Caltrans. Since then, DPW and DBH have been working with Caltrans to address some of their concerns regarding design of the project. Caltrans has recently notified DPW and DBH that they won't issue the encroachment permit until the City of Malibu, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permits are obtained.

SHK:CM:ce

Attachment



To enrich lives through effective and caring service



Santos H. Kreimann
Director

Kerry Silverstrom
Chief Deputy

Gary Jones
Deputy Director

December 19, 2012

Jason Ramos, Environmental Scientist
California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 95825-8202

Dear Mr. Ramos:

**BROAD BEACH RESTORATION PROJECT
COMMENTS ON THE ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS
TO PUBLIC TRUST RESOURCES AND VALUES**

The County of Los Angeles Department of Beaches and Harbors (DBH) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Analysis of Impacts to Public Trust Resources and Values (APTR) for the Broad Beach Restoration project, and the extended time allowed to submit comments from November 16, 2012 to December 21, 2012.

DBH's intention is to provide the most comprehensive review of the APTR as possible at this time. Therefore, we retained Noble Consultants Inc., our Harbor Engineer Consultant, to review the APTR document as it relates to coastal engineering, coastal processes, regional sediment management, and construction related aspects of the proposed Broad Beach project. Noble's report (ATTACHMENT) is summarized for your convenience below. Please consider these comments to be part of DBH's formal response to the State Lands Commission.

1. The APTR summarizes the applicant's analysis and estimates about shoreline erosion causes and trends at Broad Beach. The applicant has done an adequate job of analyzing past, present, and future erosion scenarios. However, it is generally acknowledged and the APTR document concurs that the lack of data hinders one's ability to conclusively and confidently predict what Broad Beach's future will be. Based upon the historical erosion rates presented in Figure 3.1-7 of the document, a clear implication is made that the erosion will be ongoing. How fast Broad Beach will continue to erode is less known. Nevertheless, the coastal processes discussion and analysis suggests that the Broad Beach shoreline protection issue will be a long term problem. This concern raises questions about the corresponding long term consequences for Zuma Beach and Broad Beach's relation to those consequences.

2. Upon completion of the initial 600,000 cubic yard beach fill restoration, the applicant is proposing to renourish Broad Beach only one other time with an additional 450,000 cubic yards of sand. The longevity of each sand nourishment is not predicted with absolute confidence. Durations of each sand placement are indicated by the applicant to last anywhere from three to ten years. The APTR document indicates that additional sand nourishment, if necessary, may be performed only at the applicant's discretion. So it is not evident that the Trancas Property Owners Association (TPOA) would agree to maintain Broad Beach for any significant period of time. This issue is partly attributable to the relatively short project life proposed by the applicant.
3. The project life of the Broad Beach Restoration is implied to be only twenty years. The APTR's analysis of project impacts and shoreline scenarios is also limited to this short time span. We believe that this limited time span is a serious short coming of the impact analysis. The California Coastal Commission (CCC) typically uses 75 years and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer specifies 50 years for project life evaluation. We recommend that the applicant's project should minimally be reviewed over a 50 year life cycle as the potential impacts associated with sea level rise may become more significant.

The APTR document indicates that the emergency revetment is undersized and prone to damage should it be uncovered by future shoreline recession. The fortification of Broad Beach by the TPOA has significantly altered the natural shoreline setting of the reach. Since a primary objective of the beach restoration project is to cover the emergency revetment and restore the sand dune on top of it, we believe that the reluctance of the applicant to commit to a shoreline management plan longer than 20 years significantly detracts from the project intent and raises valid questions about the long term fate of the emergency revetment structure and its ultimate impact upon the littoral sub-cell including Zuma Beach.

4. The project is critically dependent upon the acquisition and utilization of suitable and sustainable sand sources to provide the volumes of beach and dune nourishment material needed to restore and maintain Broad Beach. The applicant's preferred choice for borrow material is the relic offshore sand deposits within Santa Monica Bay. Their preferred sand source includes the significant deposit offshore of Dockweiler Beach. This deposit has some of the highest quality sand available anywhere for beach nourishment and affords the applicant the opportunity to use more efficient and economical marine equipment to excavate and deliver the material in the large volumes that will be needed.

Prior studies have shown that the offshore sand deposits within Los Angeles County are a finite resource and one of the most valuable public trust resources available for regional sediment management use. Consequently, the resource

should be carefully allocated and utilized in the future. In recognition of their value, the draft Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (CRSMP) for Los Angeles County recommends that the Santa Monica Bay offshore sand sources be dedicated and set aside as a strategic offshore sand reserve to be available in the future to mitigate public beach erosion losses forecast as a result of sea level rise.

The APTR document indicates that the Dockweiler offshore sand deposit contains approximately three million cubic yards of good quality sand. The proposed Broad Beach restoration proposes to use about one-third of this public trust resource for only two nourishment cycles. This implies that the offshore deposit could be exhausted if additional sand is needed to maintain minimum beach widths at Broad Beach into the future. The APTR acknowledges the potential impact the project may have upon depletion of the offshore borrow site but then justifies its use for Broad Beach on the basis that no other competing uses for the offshore sand deposit have been identified. In light of the recommendation stated in the Los Angeles County draft CRSMP, we believe the APTR assessment is significantly in error and needs to be corrected.

5. The APTR document acknowledges that the Dume Submarine Canyon is a major sediment sink. Recent studies have indicated that up to ninety percent of the alongshore transport that emanates from beaches upcoast of Point Dume is lost to the canyon's abyss and deprived from nourishing downcoast beaches. This finding is significant as it implies that the majority of sand delivered to Broad Beach will not benefit beaches east of Point Dume. The Dume Submarine Canyon sediment sink further amplifies the consideration that should be made about importing sand from the limited Santa Monica Bay offshore sand deposits as up to ninety percent of those imported sediments will be lost to the submarine canyon and prevented from nourishing the most utilized public beaches in Los Angeles County.

Figure 1-2 of the APTR document does not illustrate the influence of the Dume Submarine Canyon on littoral transport within the Dume Sub Cells as discussed in the text. In our opinion, the movement of the alongshore transport diagram is overly simplistic and misleading in that it incorrectly implies that all littoral sand from natural or artificial sources west of Point Dume will ultimately nourish and benefit beaches within Santa Monica Bay. This inference is in direct conflict with the document's text. At a minimum, the figure should be corrected to show how the submarine canyon sink feature may intercept a significant volume of the alongshore sand transport from the upcoast thereby limiting sand movement past Point Dume to benefit beaches downcoast.

6. The dune reconstruction element of the project is proposed by the applicant to be a significant environmental restoration feature. However the APTR document

indicates that the dune component is currently very conceptual and deficient in detail. Questions and concerns about the dune's integrity are raised about the applicant's intent to construct over one hundred private pedestrian accessways over the dune's sensitive habitat.

7. The APTR document does not adequately discuss the project's relationship to Los Angeles County's Zuma Beach facility. Implications of project benefit are implied because of the potential for sand from the restored beach to nourish the downcoast shoreline. However, if the applicant is not committed to a long term beach maintenance effort, what will be the potential impact to Zuma Beach? If no additional sand nourishment is performed at Broad Beach and the revetment is re-exposed and allowed to remain in place forever, the natural sand supply to Zuma Beach will be significantly reduced.
8. At least half of the TPOA properties justify the current shoreline protection requirement based upon the need to protect their domestic sewage leach fields. Information on the extent and location of the privately maintained improvements in relation to the current shoreline position is not provided. The CCC generally does not allow construction of seawalls and revetments unless structures are in imminent threat of erosion damage. Removal of the leach fields would provide significant setback tolerance and allow consideration of shoreline protection relocation alternatives. Upgrading the area's existing sanitary sewer system and sewage treatment plant and adding the TPOA homes to it would provide a significant benefit to the shoreline reach by removing the potential environmental hazard from the coastal zone and allowing more beach restoration plans to be considered.

In addition to the summary above, DBH has the following concerns.

The Executive Summary and Section 2.2.3, Sand Sources, in the APTR document propose three primary sand sources for the Project; Central Trancas offshore Broad Beach, offshore Dockweiler, and Ventura Harbor. However, Appendix K, Sampling and Analysis Plan Addendum No. 2 Results Report, Introduction (Page 1), states that "the Ventura Harbor material is no longer under consideration as a source site and no further investigations will be conducted." No explanation is given as to why this site is not being considered, and according to current information available, we understand that the Ventura Harbor source is a viable source and is actively being negotiated by representatives of the Broad Beach Homeowners.

Also, on page 2 of the same section, it states that "the Venice Beach site has similarly been rejected as a source site due to an inability to secure authorization from the City who owns mineral rights to the area." Since the sand offshore Dockweiler is also owned by the City of Los Angeles, should it too be taken off the sources list?

In conclusion, we believe that the Broad Beach project as proposed in the APTR document primarily protects private property at the expense of public resources. The document lacks clarity in what the true source of the sand will be for current and future nourishment needs at Broad Beach. In addition, and equally important, long term solutions need to be developed that address beach maintenance, lifeguarding, and restroom facilities that are critical for any public beach with the extent and proximity of access proposed in the APTR.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input. Should you have any questions, you may contact me at (310) 574-6787 or by email at gjones@bh.lacounty.gov. Alternatively, you may contact John Kelly, Deputy Director, at (310) 305-9522 or by email at jkelly@bh.lacounty.gov.

Very truly yours,



Gary Jones, Deputy Director

GJ:JK:CE
ng

Attachment

c: John (Jack) Ainsworth, Senior Deputy Director
South Central and South Coast District Offices, California Coastal Commission
Daniel P. Swenson, D. Env.
Chief, L.A. and San Bernardino Counties Section U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
David M. Attaway, Environmental Supervisor II
City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks
Clare Bronowski, Chair
County of Los Angeles Beach Commission
Virginia "Ginny" Kruger, Beach Commissioner, 3rd District Appointee
County of Los Angeles Beach Commission

ATTACHMENT

NOBLE
CONSULTANTS, INC.

PROJECT MEMORANDUM

2201 DUPONT DRIVE, SUITE 620, IRVINE, CA 92612
FACSIMILE

(949) 752-1530
(949) 752-8381

Department of Beaches and Harbors, County of Los Angeles
Harbor Engineering Services

To: Cesar Espinosa
From: Jon Moore
Date: December 19, 2012
RE: Review of environmental assessment of the Broad Beach Restoration Project

In accordance with the Department of Beaches and Harbors' Requisition #13-00465 authorizing our October 29, 2012 task order proposal, this memorandum summarizes our findings and recommendations pertaining to the review of the environmental impact assessment document for the proposed Broad Beach Restoration Project.

Introduction

Significant beach erosion occurred along Broad Beach between 2004 and 2009 to the point where many homes installed temporary sandbag defenses in an effort to limit property losses. Erosion worsened during the winter storm season of 2009/2010. In response the Trancas Property Owners Association (TPOA) obtained an emergency coastal development permit from the City of Malibu and the California Coastal Commission (CCC) in January 2009 to construct 4,100 feet of stone revetment to protect 114 homes within the Association's 122 lots between 30760 and 31346 Broad Beach Road. As condition to granting of the emergency action, the CCC stipulated that the applicant must submit a permanent shoreline stabilization plan to the State for review and approval by January 2013 and implement it by 2015.

In fulfillment of the CCC's requirement for a permanent solution, the TPOA has conducted extensive technical studies to review alternative shoreline stabilization plans, search for suitable sediment borrow sources, formulate and design a preferred solution, and obtain the necessary regulatory entitlements. The preferred plan proposes to import and place approximately 600,000 cubic yards of sand obtained from several borrow sources to significantly widen the beach, cover the existing emergency revetment in place, and re-establish a sand dune feature. In order to implement any acceptable shoreline management plan, the TPOA formed a Geological Hazard Abatement District (GHAD) for its shoreline section to administer and fund the project's construction and maintenance.

The existing revetment and the Broad Beach sand fill involve significant encroachment upon public trust lands and resources. Therefore the California State Lands Commission (CSLC) is engaged in the permit approval process because of the necessity to obtain that agency's approval for the necessary land lease agreements. In order to facilitate review of the project, the CSLC agreed to be lead agency for the environmental documentation. The draft document entitled Analysis of Impacts to Public Trust Resources and Values (APTR) for the Broad Beach Restoration Project was completed by AMEC Environmental & Infrastructure, Inc. in October 2012. The document was recently released by the CSLC for public comment. We have reviewed the 712-page document and its technical appendices for issues that may be relevant to the

NOBLE CONSULTANTS

Cesar Espinosa

Review of Broad Beach Restoration Project APTR

December 19, 2012

Page 2 of 5

interests of Los Angeles County. Our focus has been confined mainly to the coastal engineering, sediment management, and shoreline management aspects of the project proposal. A summary of our review comments is provided in the following pages.

Review Comments

1. The APTR summarizes the applicant's analysis and estimates about shoreline erosion causes and trends at Broad Beach. The applicant has done an adequate job of analyzing past, present, and future erosion scenarios. However, it is generally acknowledged and the APTR document concurs that the lack of data hinders one's ability to conclusively and confidently predict what Broad Beach's future will be. Based upon the historical erosion rates presented in Figure 3.1-7 of the document, a clear implication is made that the erosion will be ongoing. How fast Broad Beach will continue to erode is less known. Nevertheless, the coastal processes discussion and analysis suggests that the Broad Beach shoreline protection issue will be a long term problem. This concern raises questions about the corresponding long term consequences for Zuma Beach and Broad Beach's relation to those consequences.
2. Upon completion of the initial 600,000 cubic yard beach fill restoration, the applicant is proposing to renourish Broad Beach only one other time with an additional 450,000 cubic yards of sand. The longevity of each sand nourishment is not predicted with absolute confidence. Durations of each sand placement are indicated by the applicant to last anywhere from three to ten years. The APTR document indicates that additional sand nourishment, if necessary, may be performed only at the applicant's discretion. So it is not evident that the TPOA would agree to maintain Broad Beach for any significant period of time. This issue is partly attributable to the relatively short project life proposed by the applicant.
3. The project life of the Broad Beach Restoration is implied to be only twenty years. The APTR's analysis of project impacts and shoreline scenarios is also limited to this short time span. We believe that this limited time span is a serious short coming of the impact analysis. The CCC typically uses 75 years and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer specifies 50 years for project life evaluation. We recommend that the applicant's project should minimally be reviewed over a 50 year life cycle as the potential impacts associated with sea level rise may become more significant.

The APTR document indicates that the emergency revetment is undersized and prone to damage should it be uncovered by future shoreline recession. The fortification of Broad Beach by the TPOA has significantly altered the natural shoreline setting of the reach. Since a primary objective of the beach restoration project is to cover the emergency revetment and restore the sand dune on top of it, we believe that the reluctance of the applicant to commit to a shoreline management plan longer than 20 years significantly

NOBLE CONSULTANTS

Cesar Espinosa

Review of Broad Beach Restoration Project APTR

December 19, 2012

Page 3 of 5

detracts from the project intent and raises valid questions about the long term fate of the emergency revetment structure and its ultimate impact upon the littoral sub-cell including Zuma Beach.

4. The project is critically dependent upon the acquisition and utilization of suitable and sustainable sand sources to provide the volumes of beach and dune nourishment material needed to restore and maintain Broad Beach. The applicant's preferred choice for borrow material is the relic offshore sand deposits within Santa Monica Bay. Their preferred sand source includes the significant deposit offshore of Dockweiler Beach. This deposit has some of the highest quality sand available anywhere for beach nourishment and affords the applicant the opportunity to use more efficient and economical marine equipment to excavate and deliver the material in the large volumes that will be needed.

Prior studies have shown that the offshore sand deposits within Los Angeles County are a finite resource and one of the most valuable public trust resources available for regional sediment management use. Consequently the resource should be carefully allocated and utilized in the future. In recognition of their value, the draft Coastal Regional Sediment Management Plan (CRSMP) for Los Angeles County recommends that the Santa Monica Bay offshore sand sources be dedicated and set aside as a strategic offshore sand reserve to be available in the future to mitigate public beach erosion losses forecast as a result of sea level rise.

The APTR document indicates that the Dockweiler offshore sand deposit contains approximately three million cubic yards of good quality sand. The proposed Broad Beach restoration proposes to use about one-third of this public trust resource for only two nourishment cycles. This implies that the offshore deposit could be exhausted if additional sand is needed to maintain minimum beach widths at Broad Beach into the future. The APTR acknowledges the potential impact the project may have upon depletion of the offshore borrow site but then justifies its use for Broad Beach on the basis that no other competing uses for the offshore sand deposit have been identified. In light of the recommendation stated in the Los Angeles County draft CRSMP, we believe the APTR assessment is significantly in error and needs to be corrected.

5. The APTR document acknowledges that the Dume Submarine Canyon is a major sediment sink. Recent studies have indicated that up to ninety percent of the alongshore transport that emanates from beaches upcoast of Point Dume is lost to the canyon's abyss and deprived from nourishing downcoast beaches. This finding is significant as it implies that the majority of sand delivered to Broad Beach will not benefit beaches east of Point Dume. The Dume Submarine Canyon sediment sink further amplifies the consideration that should be made about importing sand from the limited Santa Monica Bay offshore sand deposits as up to ninety percent of those imported sediments will be lost to the

NOBLE CONSULTANTS

Cesar Espinosa

Review of Broad Beach Restoration Project APTR

December 19, 2012

Page 4 of 5

submarine canyon and prevented from nourishing the most utilized public beaches in Los Angeles County.

Figure 1-2 of the APTR document does not illustrate the influence of the Dume Submarine Canyon on littoral transport within the Dume Sub Cells as discussed in the text. In our opinion, the movement of alongshore transport diagram is overly simplistic and misleading in that it incorrectly implies that all littoral sand from natural or artificial sources west of Point Dume will ultimately nourish and benefit beaches within Santa Monica Bay. This inference is in direct conflict with the document's text. At a minimum, the figure should be corrected to show how the submarine canyon sink feature may intercept a significant volume of the alongshore sand transport from the upcoast thereby limiting sand movement past Point Dume to benefit beaches downcoast.

6. The dune reconstruction element of the project is proposed by the applicant to be a significant environmental restoration feature. However the APTR document indicates that the dune component is currently very conceptual and deficient in detail. Questions and concerns about the dune's integrity are raised about the applicant's intent to construct over one hundred private pedestrian accessways over the dune's sensitive habitat.
7. The APTR document does not adequately discuss the project's relationship to Los Angeles County's Zuma Beach facility. Implications of project benefit are implied because of the potential for sand from the restored beach to nourish the downcoast shoreline. However, if the applicant is not committed to a long term beach maintenance effort what will be the potential impact to Zuma Beach? If no additional sand nourishment is performed at Broad Beach and the revetment is re-exposed and allowed to remain in place forever, the natural sand supply to Zuma Beach will be significantly reduced.
8. At least half of the TPOA properties justify the current shoreline protection requirement based upon the need to protect their domestic sewage leach fields. Information on the extent and location of the privately maintained improvements in relation to the current shoreline position is not provided. The CCC generally does not allow construction of seawalls and revetments unless structures are in imminent threat of erosion damage. Removal of the leach fields would provide significant setback tolerance and allow consideration of shoreline protection re-location alternatives. Upgrading the area's existing sanitary sewer system and sewage treatment plant and adding the TPOA homes to it would provide a significant benefit to the shoreline reach by removing the potential environmental hazard from the coastal zone and allowing more beach restoration plans to be considered.

NOBLE CONSULTANTS

Cesar Espinosa

Review of Broad Beach Restoration Project APTR

December 19, 2012

Page 5 of 5

Summary Comments

In our opinion, the Broad Beach Restoration Project presents a difficult planning dilemma with no immediate and clear long term solution. We believe that the project plan in its most basic terms may be honestly described and categorized as a proposal to use public trust lands and resources to protect private property. This raises significant policy questions about what is in the best public interest when it comes to use of State lands and allocation of the public's finite offshore sand resources.

The TPOA has significantly altered a portion of the West Malibu coast. The short term plan to mitigate and justify the revetment's presence is construction of a public beach and sensitive dune habitat area using public resources. However, the applicant has not committed to the project's maintenance beyond one re-nourishment or about ten to twenty years. So after that time who will be responsible for maintaining Broad Beach, and what are the long term impacts to Zuma Beach? Will there be requirements to provide lifeguard services on the restored beach, and if so will the County be responsible to provide them? Who will be required to maintain the public beach accessways?

We believe that the Broad Beach restoration plan in its current form provides only a short term solution to a potentially vexing long term problem. However, stipulation that the applicant commit to a long term beach nourishment plan is also problematic. Significant allocation of the County's limited sand sources will be required to maintain a widened Broad Beach shoreline in perpetuity. Estimates by Los Angeles County indicate that beach attendance at the public facilities between East Malibu and Torrance is over 50 million annually. Given the relatively low public use of Broad Beach in comparison to the heavily utilized Santa Monica Bay beaches, does the project warrant significant depletion of public trust resources that may be needed in the future to restore and maintain the most significant public beach facilities within Santa Monica Bay?

The Los Angeles County CRSMP recognizes the Broad Beach reach as a restoration zone. However the context for that designation is consideration and implementation of the most appropriate plan selected from the full spectrum of beach nourishment and managed retreat solutions commensurate with the West Malibu regional shoreline setting. Managed retreat is a controversial planning alternative that is currently being applied at several California beaches to relocate public development and infrastructure out of harm's way. In so doing the strategy is intended to defer implementation of more expensive and complex shoreline stabilization measures. The managed retreat alternative was not adequately considered or discussed in the APTR document.

This completes our review of the APTR document at this time.