

## Phil Osterlind

---

**From:** Tom Modica [Tom\_Modica@longbeach.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 10, 2008 6:25 PM  
**To:** JEANNEMUEN@aol.com  
**Subject:** Clarification about the Scope of the Breakwater Study

Jeanne,

Thanks for your call and for giving me an opportunity to clarify some of the misconceptions about the Breakwater study that have been circulating recently.

First, we've heard that Moffatt & Nichol will only look at the benefits of a reconfiguration, and will not look at the costs. This is not the case. The City in our Scope of Work directed them to perform this study in the manner prescribed by the Army Corps of Engineers. Per the Army Corps rules, any Recon study **must** look at all the benefits and costs and perform an analysis to see if proposed project alternative has benefits that outweigh the costs. It is not possible for a study to only look at the benefits without a detailed analysis of costs.

Second, we have heard that coastal protection is not being considered in the study. This is also not the case. Coastal Protection is one of the main missions of the Army Corps. In this Reconnaissance Study, any degradation to the current level of coastal protection the Breakwater provides will be considered a negative cost, and must be factored into the analysis. In my personal pinion, it is very unlikely that any project that significantly increases risk of coastal flooding would be shown as feasible, as that cost would likely be very high and outweigh potential benefits. I've also provided below an excerpt from the City's scope of work for Moffatt & Nichol, which shows that the goal of the study is to continue to protect coastal areas.

Third, we've heard that Moffatt & Nichol has not incorporated the input of the Peninsula Beach Preservation Group. This is definitely not the case. I received your group's memo outlining your concerns on October 23 and promptly directed Moffatt & Nichol to include that input as part of their stakeholder input. Further, Moffatt & Nichol included those specific concerns into their Powerpoint Presentation, which they have been using in the three community workshops we have held. Below is a link to that presentation - if you look at page 8, we tried to graphically depict the concerns of your group so that the workshop attendees have an understanding of your concerns.

Again, we value the input from your group and it's 900 members. A number of your members, including Preston Smith, have attended our community meetings and have eloquently expressed your concerns on numerous occasions. We really do appreciate your group staying involved, as this is a study of all the issues, and we need to hear from all stakeholders.

As I mentioned on the phone, I am always available to answer questions, and would be willing to come out and speak to your group in person to help alleviate concerns and provide more information. Thanks again,

-Tom

### **Scope of Work from the City's Request for Proposals**

From the public and City Council debate on this issue, the primary Army Corps mission that this Reconnaissance study will address is ecosystem restoration through improved water quality, **while continuing to protect navigation, and coastal areas from storms**. Increased recreational and tourism benefits, although outside the Army Corps' core mission, are also important to Long Beach.

### **Link to Powerpoint Presentation showing Peninsula Beach Preservation Group Input**

<http://www.longbeach.gov/civica/filebank/blobload.asp?BlobID=20939>

Tom Modica  
Manager of Government Affairs  
City Manager's Office  
City of Long Beach  
(562) 570-5091  
(562) 570-6583 fax