

## Public Comment Matrix

| # | Name, Affiliation  | Comment (Summary for Public Distribution, includes spoken comments)  | Response (For Public Distribution)  |
|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | Eddy Bitton  | Has experienced flooding multiple times since 2021 at home near Cross Creek Bridge. Concerned about the removal of the dam and upstream barriers making the existing flood issue worse. Cross Creek Bridge is important to the neighborhood as a second point of entry for emergency vehicles. Consider bank restoration in the Cross Creek Bridge area as part of the project.  | Analysis of flooding in the vicinity of Cross Creek Bridge is a critical part of the current phase of the project. Currently, the dam and upstream barriers proposed for removal do not provide significant flood attenuation or retention of sediment. Due to the low slope of the stream near Cross Creek Bridge and lack of sediment retention at the dam, sediment will continue to aggrade near Cross Creek Bridge in the future with or without the dam removal. The previous study estimated that the channel bed elevation will rise up to 12 feet near Cross Creek Bridge in the future without dam removal. This estimate, and any effects of the dam removal alternatives on flooding, will be reevaluated during this current phase of the project and inform the dam removal design. Cross Creek Bridge is understood to be an important access point to the community and will factor into the design process as well as evaluating bank stabilization in this area.  |
| 2 | Serra Canyon Property Owner                                      | Speaking as a homeowner in the Serra community for 24 years. Cares about the nature and the environment. Concerned with sediment deposition affecting the Serra Retreat neighborhood. Suggested improving the existing flood risk, instead of just not making it any worse. Has had trouble with agency approvals for vegetation removal, maintenance, bank stabilization, or any work in the creek. Consider a long-term maintenance plan to allow dredging or other maintenance activities related to flooding affecting the Serra Retreat neighborhood  | Analysis of flooding in the vicinity of Cross Creek Bridge is a critical part of the current phase of the project. Currently, the dam and upstream barriers proposed for removal do not provide significant flood attenuation or retention of sediment. Due to the low slope of the stream near Cross Creek Bridge and lack of sediment retention at the dam, sediment will continue to aggrade near Cross Creek Bridge in the future with or without the dam removal. The previous study estimated that the channel bed elevation will rise up to 12 feet in the future near the bridge without dam removal. This estimate, and any effects of the dam removal alternatives on flooding, will be reevaluated during this current phase of the project and inform the dam removal design. Flood mitigation options, including flood walls, considered in the previous study will be reevaluated as part of the flood analysis for current/future conditions. More natural flood attenuation such as vegetated levees or berms may also be explored further with input from the Serra community. Linking permitting for a large project like the dam removal to other elements, like maintenance at the bridge, is feasible and will be considered in this current phase of the project. State Parks is not in favor of maintenance dredging of the channel due to significant environmental impacts that would be contrary to the project's goals.  |
| 3 | Conner Everts, Southern California Watershed Alliance            | Supportive of the dam removal. Has caught steelhead in Malibu Creek and would like to see the dam removed in his lifetime.   | Thank you for your support of the project and ecosystem restoration. Recovery of the steelhead population in the Malibu Creek watershed is a major objective of the project and includes removal of the dam and upstream barriers to increase access to spawning and rearing habitat. The consultant team's current scope is to provide a 90% design package by June 30, 2026. If funding and permitting are adequately in place, removal could begin within a few years of that milestone.   |
| 4 | Andy Lyon  | Speaking as a lifelong resident and steward for Surfrider Beach. Expressed concern with the impacts to the beach as part of past lagoon restoration projects and that this project will have similar issues. The lagoon is too wide and breaching of the lagoon was not part of those projects, which is important for beach replenishment. The beach has eroded. Beach replenishment and sediment studies need to be included. The area above the dam has a good forest and large sycamores that will be removed with the dam. Would like the dam to remain.  | Beneficial sediment re-use options will be evaluated including beach replenishment and nearshore placement. Sediment transport and fate studies will be a critical part of the current phase of the project and inform design of the dam removal. This will include evaluating effects of sediment deposition and future accretion at the beach as well as biodiversity in the lagoon and impacts to the surf break. Enhancing natural sediment transport processes as well as lagoon and river ecosystem function are objectives of the project. Impacts to vegetation and habitat as a result of the dam removal will also be considered. Malibu Lagoon is one of the few natural, bar-built estuary systems left in southern CA. The lagoon/estuary naturally closes in the dry season and opens during the wet season. This natural opening and closing is important for ecological function. Mechanical breaching of the lagoon/estuary would alter the natural opening/closing process and is not supported. Although there is native, riparian vegetation immediately above the dam, such as sycamores, removing the dam and it's sediment and opening up 15 additional miles of habitat for aquatic and terrestrial species outweigh loss of existing riparian vegetation as re-establishment and reconnection of the riparian stream zone will result. Post dam removal, the area above the dam will be restored to a natural stream channel with a native riparian vegetation zone. |
| 5 | Kelli Frye, Sierra Club Santa Monica Mountains Task Force        | Speaking in support of the removal of Rindge Dam. Opposes development in the Santa Monica Mountains.   | Thank you for your support of the project and ecosystem restoration.  |
| 6 | Melina Watts, Community Member & Watershed Coordinator Measure W | Involved during the previous study process and stated opposition to a proposal in that study to harden the creek below the dam. Encouraged ways to naturalize hydrology and avoid hardening. Downtown Malibu along the creek has an opportunity to integrate better with the creek, similar to a river walk.   | Enhancing natural ecosystem functions is an objective of the project and the proposed design will avoid "hardening" where feasible. The focus of the project in the vicinity of the shopping area along Malibu Creek will be impacts to aquatic species, and the river/tidal interaction including impacts such as flooding.  |
| 7 | Daniel K. Carr   | Speaking as a local lifelong surfer and fisher. Observed steelhead in the lagoon in 1993. Been present at the beach near the lagoon restoration area every day for the last seven years. The restoration resulted in loss of 100-year-old trees and sand from the beach. Keep the area natural and protect the surfers' point.   | The current phase of the project will evaluate effects of sediment beneficial re-use options including placement at the beach and nearshore zone, and related sediment transport, deposition and future accretion at the beach as well as biodiversity in the lagoon and impacts to the surf break.   |
| 8 | Reinard Knur   | Speaking as a resident of Serra Retreat and engineering geologist. Primary concern is with sedimentation and current conditions where the creek bed is rising in elevation, this needs to be looked at regardless of the dam removal. The previous study evaluated flood walls at Cross Creek Bridge and areas downstream, would not support that as an alternative as it is not a natural restoration. Additionally, next to the dam at the west abutment there is an ancient landslide. Consider whether removal of the dam and any erosion associated with the removal would potentially impact this landslide. | Analysis of flooding in the vicinity of Cross Creek Bridge is a critical part of the current phase of the project. Currently, the dam and upstream barriers proposed for removal do not provide significant flood attenuation or retention of sediment. Due to the low slope of the stream near Cross Creek Bridge and lack of sediment retention at the dam, sediment will continue to aggrade near Cross Creek Bridge in the future with or without the dam removal. The previous study estimated that the channel bed elevation will rise up to 12 feet near Cross Creek Bridge in the future without dam removal. This estimate, and any effects of the dam removal alternatives on flooding, will be reevaluated during this current phase of the project and inform the dam removal design. The project team is open to alternatives to flood walls, such as more natural vegetative levees or berms, and will work with the Serra community on flooding risks. The landslide deposit near the dam and other landslides within the canyon potentially buttressed by the sediment impounded by the dam will also be evaluated as part of the current phase of the project.   |

| #  | Name, Affiliation                               | Comment (Summary for Public Distribution, includes spoken comments)   | Response (For Public Distribution)   |
|----|---|---|--|
| 9  | Jefferson Wagner                                | Speaking as a former commissioner for the Planning Commission and long-time owner of Zuma Jay's Surf Shop, concessionaire at the Malibu Pier, and member of the Adamson House Board of Directors. Has been to the dam several times and prepared an alternative that represents the views of the residents, councilmembers, and meets the needs for fisheries in the watershed (Weephole Plan). Provided the MCER Project Team with a copy of the Weephole Plan for consideration. The proposal includes dismantling the dam in a gradual process using weepholes down the face of the dam for release of the impounded sediment. There are 230 railroad ties used in the dam construction and were tied with a metal higher in iron than the railroad ties themselves. The Malibu Creek watershed is large and includes many different communities all with an interest in the project. He mentioned that steelhead once migrated up to the tunnel in Malibu Canyon. | Thank you for providing additional background on the history of the dam and the Weephole Plan for dam removal. The current phase of the project will include evaluating dam removal options using the best information available and in consideration of the affected community's interests. The evaluation is based on determining if the alternatives meet the project goals. One of those goals is to provide conditions for volitional passage of steelhead upstream past the dam location to the tunnel and beyond within a short time period. Another project goal is to ensure continuity in sediment transport upstream and downstream of the dam. To that end, we would like to take a closer look at the Weephole Plan as a potential option.  |
| 10 | Ann Doneen, Malibu Township Council             | Homeowner in the area curious about the effect on area flora and fauna as well as involvement of indigenous groups in the planning process. Commented that water in the creek has increased recently as population increased, compared to past observations when the creek typically only had water during wet years. Commented that the lagoon restoration project has caused erosion due to the configuration of the lagoon.  | The project will have a long-term benefit to recovery of steelhead in the watershed by increasing the habitat they are able to access, as well as establishing connections through the creek for other wildlife. Impacts to species during and post-construction will be evaluated during the design phase as well. Tribal consultation and feedback occurred during the previous phase of the project and tribal communities will be reengaged during the current phase of the project. The current phase of the project will include an evaluation of the hydrologic and lagoon conditions.  |
| 11 | Aaron Ordowner, Deputy for Sup. Lindsey Horvath | Environmental Deputy for LA County Supervisor Lindsey Horvath (District 3, Malibu), expressing support for the project benefits to biodiversity, resiliency for the coastline, and health of the beaches.   | Thank you for your support of the project and ecosystem restoration.   |
| 12 | John Mazza, President Adamson House             | Speaking as President of the Adamson House Foundation. Currently working on a project to save the Adamson House from erosion, seeing impacts to the property. Have funding to study protection of the property including bank stabilization. Hopes the Malibu Creek Ecosystem Restoration Project will coordinate studies with the Adamson House stabilization project.   | The current phase of the project will evaluate effects of sediment beneficial re-use options and related sediment placement, transport, and ultimate fate at the beach, the nearshore zone, and along the lower Creek and lagoon, as well as biodiversity in the lagoon and impacts to the surf break. This can include any information available on likely future conditions as a result of the Adamson House stabilization project. State Parks is currently in the design phase of a project to bring more protection to the Adamson House from erosion and will incorporate that information and design into the project.  |
| 13 | Paul Grisanti, Malibu Councilmember             | The estimated number of truck trips to haul all the sediment will have significant environmental impacts and damage roadways. Costs for road repairs should be considered. What is the access to the creek bed (upstream or downstream of the dam site)? Studies have shown the ocean can accept materials of various grain sizes, not just sand, and sort or breakdown material through natural processes.   | Sediment removal, transport, and beneficial re-use options, and access road options considered in the previous study will be reevaluated to reduce trucking distance and the number of truck trips in this current phase. This will include looking at other options to mechanical removal of the sediment, such as natural sediment transport. The creek access outlined in the IFR is to use an old, existing access road just downstream of the tunnel on Malibu Canyon Road. We will also review whether more material of various grain sizes can be deposited in the nearshore environment than previously assumed.   |
| 14 | Patt Everett                                    | Is the project funded? If so, who has funded it? What will it cost?   | The project is currently funded through 90% Design by appropriations from the California State Legislature. The construction phase of the project is not currently funded. The previous study estimated construction to be \$280 million, but this construction cost estimate will be reevaluated and updated in the current design phase of the project.  |
| 15 | Anne Payne, Malibu Creek concerned resident     | Speaking as a resident of Serra Retreat and experienced multiple floods. Nutrients from Tapia Reclamation Facility has led to more vegetation growth than occurred historically in the creek. Debris from past arundo removal efforts became fuel source for fires and flood impacts. All the debris and vegetation in the creek should be cleared. For example, the sandbar developing downstream of Cross Creek Bridge. Would like to know what percentage of construction funds will be set aside for the downstream areas.  | Although the project will likely not influence discharge rates or discharge concentrations from Tapia Reclamation Facility, the project team will be looking at potential cumulative impacts from the project (i.e., whether a given project alternative will exacerbate existing water quality issues). We will also be taking a close look at potential impacts to the Cross Creek area, which will include consideration of flooding and any required modifications to existing conditions to eliminate flooding impacts attributable to the project.<br><br>After the project design has been advanced far enough along, we will be developing specifications and environmental commitments with the permitting agencies which will outline the demobilization requirements of the contractor, should construction activities take place near Serra Retreat (or elsewhere). These requirements will include the need to remove all loose construction debris before leaving the site.<br><br>The large sandbar downstream of Cross Creek Bridge is evident on aerial photos since at least the 1980's and is likely there because of the bridge. As water passes through the bridge constriction, it initially speeds up and then, after passing under the bridge and expanding out, generally slows down, depositing material.<br><br>Regarding construction funds, those monies have not yet been identified or allocated for the project. And although it is not uncommon for restoration project proponents to be required to monitor and maintain certain aspects of the constructed project (as conditions to receiving permits), those obligations typically have timelines in the range of 5 to 10 years, after which point the restoration project is considered complete and the owner's obligations are considered satisfied. |
| 16 | Gopal Sapparapu                                 | Supportive of the dam removal and asked about volunteer opportunities for the project.  | Thank you for your support of the project and the importance of dam removal to restoring healthy watersheds. Please email us at <a href="mailto:restoremalibucreek@parks.ca.gov">restoremalibucreek@parks.ca.gov</a> for volunteer opportunities. You can also find out about events related to this project and the Malibu Creek watershed by visiting <a href="https://restoremalibucreek.org/events">https://restoremalibucreek.org/events</a> . We will follow up with you at the email you provided with volunteer opportunities.   |
| 17 | Dennis Washburn                                 | Has been involved since the 1990 Malibu Creek Watershed Restoration Project. There is now a opportunity to address all the issues identified over the years and in multiple studies with this new phase of the project. Fortunate to have funding and support from the State to address the Malibu Creek watershed. There are several more watersheds in the Santa Monica Mountains that will need restoration as well. Recommend those involved remain critical but collaborative to   | Thank you for your continued leadership and support for the project and related Santa Monica Mountains watersheds and restoration work. We look forward to continuing to collaborate with you and others in the community to complete this and other related projects to reach conservation and community goals that protect our communities and natural resources.  |

| #  | Name, Affiliation                  | Comment (Summary for Public Distribution, includes spoken comments)   | Response (For Public Distribution)  |
|----|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 18 | Ross Somers                        | Asked about the status of a Malibu Lagoon Management Plan for the lagoon restoration project. There is concern about the areas downstream of the dam and lagoon management plan needs to be in effect before the dam removal.   | The project will incorporate preparation of monitoring and adaptive management plans for the creek, lagoon and beach in order to secure permits. Those plans will be comprehensive and address all areas to be affected by the project. Analyses of the fate of sediment placed in the creek, on the beach, and/or in the nearshore zone will be conducted with proven numerical models that will inform the future planning and maintenance of the beach and lagoon. There is currently no management plan that relates to the lagoon restoration project and the lagoon will be allowed to naturally open and close based on flows from Malibu Creek.   |
| 19 | Kraig Hill                         | Speaking as a Malibu Planning Commissioner, encourages the long-term view for this project where there will be development upstream, environmental changes, etc. over time that could affect the project and not just designing for conditions today. These should be considered in the analysis. For example, what will be any interactions w/ Tapia treatment plant, especially with additional effluent from 10-15,000 people/week from Pepperdine's coming "Mountain Arena" sports/entertainment complex? | Thank you for sharing the possibility of a future complex at Pepperdine. We are very interested in both cumulative impacts and consideration of a long time horizon. We see ecosystem restoration as tied to principles of sustainability, which requires planners to look far out into the future.<br><br>The Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, which operates the Tapia treatment plant jointly with the Triunfo Water & Sanitation District, has shared data with the project team and will continue to be consulted throughout the design process including projections for future operations. Information they provide will be incorporated into the hydrologic and environmental impacts studies.  |
| 20 | Greg Abe                           | How will the steelhead be repopulated? What year will a sustainable population of steelhead be established?   | As the commenter is likely aware, there are currently no steelhead in the Malibu Creek watershed. Dam removal and access to additional habitat will greatly advance their recovery in the watershed. This project will include a steelhead management plan to include measures to address impacts of dam removal on steelhead, and restoration of the creek following dam removal. The plan will be developed in collaboration with state and federal agencies and regional experts on steelhead, and will consider active reintroduction of steelhead following dam removal and restoration, or monitoring for potential passive recolonization. Either way, it is not known how long it will take for a natural sustainable population to be established, but monitoring and management will be conducted to advance that goal. |
| 21 | Louise Greene, lives on Cold Creek | 1) There is a barrier upstream from my property, which the Park Service proposed removing about 5 years ago, but the owner of the land on which it stood objected - so it wasn't removed. Is there any way to overcome this objection so the barrier can be removed?<br><br>2) Can any of the dam sediment be sold for construction purposes to mitigate costs?   | 1) We will reach out to determine which barrier this was specifically, but generally there are eight barriers upstream of Rindge Dam that will be evaluated for removal as part of this current phase of the project. Several are on Cold Creek. This will include working with any affected landowners.<br><br>2) Disposal sites for the sediment and associated costs will be reevaluated in the current phase of the project in case conditions have changed since the previous study was completed and new construction projects have developed that could accept the sediment. We are very interested in potential beneficial reuses of the impounded sediment behind Rindge Dam.  |