



CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH TIDELANDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA

Civic Center Community Room - 100 Civic Center Drive,
Newport Beach, CA 92660

September 17, 2014 - 4:00 PM

Tidelands Management Committee - Council Members:

Mike Henn - Chair Nancy Gardner Ed Selich

Citizens Advisory Panel:

Linda Beimfohr Paul Blank John Corrough
Jamshed Dastur John Keating Don Lawrenz

Staff Members:

Dave Kiff Michael Torres
Chris Miller Shannon Levin

-
- (1) **CALL MEETING TO ORDER - Welcome and Introductions**
 - (2) **ROLL CALL**
 - (3) **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Public comments are invited on agenda and non-agenda items generally considered to be within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. Speakers must limit comments to 3 minutes. Before speaking, we invite, but do not require, you to state your name for the record. The Finance Committee has the discretion to extend or shorten the speakers' time limit on agenda or non-agenda items, provided the time limit adjustment is applied equally to all speakers. As a courtesy, please turn cell phones off or set them in the silent mode.

- (4) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

July 17, 2014

- (5) **ON-GOING BUSINESS**

A. **Re-Cap of Harbor Commission Agenda Action Items during Previous Three Months**

Receive and file attached report. Provide comment as needed.

B. **Tidelands Capital Plan**

No changes since July 2014. Receive and file Plan. Provide comments as needed.

- (6) **CURRENT BUSINESS**

A. **Citizen's Advisory Panel – Appointment of New Member to Replace Former CAP Member Jeff Herdman**

The Committee will pick one member from the pool of applicants for the Citizen's Advisory Panel.

B. **Balboa Island Seawall Update**

Staff will discuss key design parameters for the Balboa Island seawall.

C. **Marina Park Update**

Staff will update the Committee on the status of the Marina Park project.

- (7) **ROUNDTABLE OR ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- (8) **COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS OR MATTERS WHICH MEMBERS WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION OR REPORT (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM)**

A. Balboa Island Bulkheads - Update

(9) DATE AND TIME FOR NEXT MEETING:

December 17, 2014 (Note: This is the first night of the Christmas Boat Parade)

(10) ADJOURNMENT

This Tidelands Management Committee is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act. Among other things, the Brown Act requires that the Tidelands Management Committee's agenda be posted at least seventy-two (72) hours in advance of each regular meeting and that the public be allowed to comment on agenda items before the Tidelands Management Committee and items not on the agenda but are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Tidelands Management Committee. The Tidelands Management Committee may limit public comments to a reasonable amount of time, generally three (3) minutes per person.

It is the intention of the City of Newport Beach to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") in all respects. If, as an attendee or a participant at this meeting, you will need special assistance beyond what is normally provided, the City of Newport Beach will attempt to accommodate you in every reasonable manner. If requested, this agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132), and the federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Please contact the City Clerk's Office at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting to inform us of your particular needs and to determine if accommodation is feasible at (949) 644-3005 or cityclerk@newportbeachca.gov.



NEWPORT BEACH

ITEM TITLE: July 17, 2014

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

[July 17, 2014 Meeting Minutes](#)



NEWPORT BEACH

ITEM TITLE: Re-Cap of Harbor Commission Agenda Action Items during Previous Three Months

ITEM SUMMARY: Receive and file attached report. Provide comment as needed.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

[Quarterly Review of Harbor Commission Action Items](#)



NEWPORT BEACH

ITEM TITLE: Tidelands Capital Plan

ITEM SUMMARY: No changes since July 2014. Receive and file Plan. Provide comments as needed.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

[Tidelands Capital Plan](#)



NEWPORT BEACH

ITEM TITLE: Citizen's Advisory Panel – Appointment of New Member to Replace Former CAP Member Jeff Herdman

ITEM SUMMARY: The Committee will pick one member from the pool of applicants for the Citizen's Advisory Panel.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

[CAP Applications](#)



NEWPORT BEACH

ITEM TITLE: Balboa Island Seawall Update

ITEM SUMMARY: Staff will discuss key design parameters for the Balboa Island seawall.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

[Email Communication](#)

Miller, Chris

From: Miller, Chris
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2014 4:58 PM
To: Miller, Chris
Subject: FW: Balboa Island Sea Walls

From: Jamshed Dastur
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2014 11:27 AM

Dear Tidelands Management Committee:

Ever since the news broke, almost 3 years ago, about a plan to possibly spend upwards of \$70,000,000 for new sea walls for Balboa Island, I have been trying to understand the need for and the details behind this evolving proposal. To the extent that I have knowledge of and experience in marine construction and engineering cost estimates, I have tried to put in my two cents worth. I am truly thankful to City Council members for having given me the opportunity to participate through my appointment to the Citizen's Advisory Panel to the Tidelands Management Committee.(TMC)

A lot of new, useful information has been provided by City staff during the last 3 meetings of TMC. I find it difficult to respond to facts and figures presented at the meeting without taking the time to understand and digest them over a period of time. My current understanding of the situation, along with my personal/professional opinion, for what it is worth, is as follows:

1. Balboa Island is protected from sea erosion and tidal flooding by a concrete wall, owned and maintained by the City. The total length of the wall is approximately 13,200 feet (+/-). The elevation of the top of the wall varies from a high of 9.1' to a low of 7.7'.
2. Of the 13,200 feet of wall, about 3,800 feet (along the Grand Canal and the West end of the big island) has deteriorated to the extent that it would be prudent to replace it within the next 5 to 7 years. There is no impending emergency to replace this section of the wall immediately, although planning, engineering and permitting needs to be addressed and is being addressed currently. The remaining 9,400 feet of wall has at least 20 to 25 years of useful life left, with normal routine maintenance. (This conclusion was supported by the City's consultant at one of the TMC meetings) With competing claims for scarce tax dollars, it would be a non-starter to consider any replacement of this section of the wall, any time soon.
3. There is general consensus that the sea level has risen in the past 20 years and is continuing to rise. The top elevation of 7.7' for a significant portion of the existing sea wall poses a present and imminent danger of swamping the island during a king tide combined with an ocean surge and a heavy rain storm. The probability of this happening may be small, but the consequences would be catastrophic. This issue needs to be addressed on an expedited basis.
4. The political football as to who should pay for any or all of the costs associated with these issues is finally being kicked around. The suggestion that Balboa Island property owners be required to pick up a substantial portion of the costs associated with sea walls, further muddies the already murky waters.

5. Current thinking and planning is for the City to put all issues - the entire 13,200 feet of the sea walls, ferry terminal & fuel dock, bridge retrofits, etc. - into one package for permitting and financing; this leads to the daunting \$72,000,000 number. It also forces a design decision for 75% of the wall that does not need to be made for the next 25 years.

Based on the above premises, I would like to put forth these ideas for your consideration.

A. As a first order of business, engineer and construct a cap addition to the 9,400 feet of wall that has a remaining life expectancy of 25 years, so that the top elevation is 9'. This can be accomplished along the lines of the cap addition done to the Little Island's South Bay Front. This would not entail any extraneous issues such as access to private docks and the beach, permitting for encroachment, ADA issues, home-owner views, etc. The total cost associated with this, per the City's estimate of \$250 - \$300 per foot would be \$2.4 to \$2.8 million. The cost for this should be borne by the City. Do not have this issue tied up with planning or permitting for a new wall.

The reason for opting for a height limit of elevation 9.0 is that this 9,400 feet long wall will be replaced at some date in the distant future. At that time, we will have a better understanding of how fast the sea is rising as well as what is being done holistically about rising sea level for the rest of the inner harbor.

B. Proceed cautiously with the planning, engineering and permitting of the 3,400 feet of new wall. The total cost associated with this, per the City's estimate of \$3,800 - \$4,000 per foot (I believe this number already has contingencies built into it and does not need additional contingency on top of that) would be \$14.4 to \$15.2 million. Since this is a new wall and expected to serve for the next 75 to 100 years, the preferred top elevation should be 10'. The City should be able to find the money, from the tidelands fund and supplemented by the General Fund, to get this done over the next 5 to 7 years.

C. Its is premature and counter-productive to reconfigure the entire ferry landing for future high tides. Re-grading the sidewalk and Agate street to provide protection up to elevation 9' can be accomplished at minimal cost out of the General Fund. The same applies to retrofitting of bridges.

The above course of action reduces the monumental \$72,000,000 problem to a more manageable \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 problem that addresses issues for the next 20 to 25 years while we continue to look for holistic solutions for the entire harbor, for the future beyond.

I am available to meet with anyone of you if you are so inclined, to discuss my views in detail.

Thank you for your indulgence in reading this presentation.

Jim Dastur

Miller, Chris

From: Miller, Chris
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2014 5:00 PM
To: Miller, Chris
Subject: Balboa Island Sea Walls

From: Jamshed Dastur
Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2014 12:03 PM
To: Stein, Robert

Robert:

Please bear with me while I run through some thoughts that have been bugging me.

I understand that the City, with the blessings of the Tidelands management Committee, is proceeding forward with a conceptual wall consisting of H piles and concrete planks as opposed to a steel sheet pile wall. This decision is based on the premise that the former is aesthetically superior and is possibly a little less expensive. However, this conclusion ignores two other parameters - functionality and constructability.

Functionality: The new sea wall, eventually will require a dewatering system to control the water table on the island. A sheet pile wall, where all of the sheets go deep into the soil, would provide a much better sub-soil water barrier than the concrete planks which do not go as deep. In fact, the main function of the concrete planks is to retain the soil and will provide little or no relief from water intrusion. This will necessitate a considerably bigger dewatering system for that option.

Constructability: Installation of the sheet pile wall is a single operation - drive sheet piles. This activity is done without disturbing the soil or having any construction activity under water. However, in order to install the concrete planks, underwater excavation will have to be done in front of the existing fragile wall. This will raise issues in the permitting process regarding control of turbidity and the handling/disposal of excavated material. Any excavation done below the existing wall could trigger a local failure of the wall, during construction, endangering the safety of adjoining homes. This system also requires multiple pieces of equipment for different activities - pile driving, hoisting concrete planks, excavation, disposal of excavated material - in a very congested area. Although, generically an H-pile/Concrete Plank wall may be a little less expensive than a steel sheet pile wall, I believe that in this special situation, it may not be the case.

I hope the above factors are given due consideration before it is too late.

Thank you for your indulgence.

JIM