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1.0 Introduction

On April 21, 2014, CenterCal Properties LLC (applicant) submitted an application for an Environmental Assessment to the City of Redondo Beach (City) for The Waterfront Project (proposed project). In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations) and the California Public Resources Code (Section 21000, et seq.), the City is the Lead Agency for the environmental review process and is preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project.

The City’s environmental review process, conducted in compliance with CEQA and the Redondo Beach Municipal Code (RBMC) Title 10, Chapter 3, provides for early input regarding the scope and content of the EIR, including alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant environmental issues. On June 19, 2014, the City began this public participation process (also known as “scoping”) by issuing a Notice of Preparation and Initial Study (NOP) for a draft EIR.

This report summarizes the scoping activities conducted for the proposed project during the 30-day scoping period. It includes written and email comments received from agencies and members of the public during the scoping period in response to the NOP.

2.0 Notice of Preparation

The City circulated a Notice regarding the availability of the NOP/Notice of Initial Study/Notice of Scoping Meeting (Attachment A) and/or NOP (Attachment B) for the proposed project on June 19, 2014, opening a 30-day comment period on the scope and content of the EIR and announcing a public scoping meeting/open house on July 9, 2014.

The NOP and/or Notice were distributed as follows:

Mail - The NOP was sent with the Initial Study via overnight mail to the State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2014061071), responsible and trustee agencies, and other federal, state, and local agencies. This included five federal agencies, nine state agencies and 12 local agencies.

---

1 Comments on the NOP were accepted over a 33-day period to avoid closing the comment period on a weekend.
2 The proposed project was received by the State Clearinghouse and posted on CEQAnet Database website on June 19, 2014 (Attachment C).
Additionally, the Notice was distributed by first class mail to 29 federal, state and local agencies, planning groups and organizations, over 175 business operators and lease holders within the harbor area, and over 1,300 individuals, including residential property owners and occupants within 300 feet of the project boundaries.

**Hand Delivery** – The Notice, NOP and Initial Study was delivered by hand to one local agency (Beach Cities Transit) and City officials (i.e., City Manager, City Council members and Mayor.)

**Email Blast** - The Notice was sent to 267 email addresses collected from sign-in sheets from eight community meetings held in 2013 to accept input on the proposed project. Of the 267 emails, 35 were returned as undeliverable.

**Newspaper Notice** - The following notice was posted in the Easy Reader on June 19, 2014.
Site Posting - The Notice was posted every 200 lineal feet along Harbor Drive south of Portofino Way and along the Torrance Boulevard Circle. Below are example photographs of the site posting.

City Website - The Notice, NOP and Initial Study were posted on the City’s website with a provided on the home page: http://www.redondo.org as shown below.

Local Access Cable Television – The following announcement regarding the availability of the NOP/Initial Study, the availability of the documents on the City’s website, email address for submitting comments, and scoping meeting information was posted on the local access cable television channel (Cable Crawl).
Scoping Meeting – Copies of the Notice were also available at the scoping meeting.

The Notice and NOP listed an address, telephone number and email address through which the public can contact the Project Planner and submit written and email comments on the proposed project. This information is as follows:

Katie Owston
Project Planner
Community Development Department
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Email: katie.owston@redondo.org
Phone: (310) 318-0637 x1-2895

The Notice included information on where a full copy of the NOP/Initial Study was available for review during the scoping period. The locations are as follows.

- City Hall Community Development Department, 415 Diamond Street (documents referenced are also available at this location)
- City Clerk, 415 Diamond Street
- The Redondo Beach Public Library Main Branch, 303 N Pacific Coast Hwy.
- The Redondo Beach Public Library North Branch, 2000 Artesia Blvd.
- http://www.redondo.org

The NOP/Initial Study will remain available to the public throughout the draft EIR preparation process on the City’s website and at the Community Development Department.
3.0 Scoping Meeting/Open House

A scoping meeting/open house was held from 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.\(^3\) on July 9, 2014 at the Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center, located at 1935 Manhattan Beach Boulevard, Redondo Beach, CA 90278.

Notice of the scoping meeting/open house was provided on the NOP (see Section 2.0 above for a description of the distribution and publication of the NOP). In addition to the distribution and publication of the NOP, information on the scoping meeting/open house was publicized on the local access cable channel (Cable Crawl), the marquee of the Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center, and the City Council meeting of July 1, 2014. Also, two electronic sign board trailers announcing the scoping meeting were placed on Artesia Boulevard near Aviation Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway near Diamond Street from July 4 to July 9, 2014.

The scoping meeting/open house was presented in an “open house” format to allow attendees to view presentation boards and speak to City staff and the City’s environmental consultant to provide input on the proposed project and ask questions. Given that a large number of attendees were anticipated to attend, the open house format was designed to maximize the opportunity for attendees to view the presentation boards and interact with staff. See below for a sketch showing the layout of the scoping meeting/open house.

---

\(^3\) Early arrivals were given the opportunity to review the presentation boards and speak with staff beginning at 5:30 p.m.
Two welcome tables were located at the entrance to the scoping meeting/open house. Attendees were encouraged to sign-in and provide mail and/or email addresses to be included on future EIR-related mailings for the proposed project. There were 216 names recorded on the sign-in sheets (Attachment D). Several meeting attendees declined to sign-in, and therefore, the actual number of attendees could be greater than indicated by the number of sign-ins.

At 6:15 p.m., an approximately 20 minute presentation with 19 slides was given by the City’s environmental consultant that provided an overview of the proposed project and the environmental review process (Attachment E). The presentation also addressed the purpose of the scoping process, the resource areas anticipated to be analyzed in the EIR, the anticipated EIR schedule, and the ways in which the public could provide comments. It was explained during the presentation that only comments provided in writing and by email and submitted at the scoping meeting/open house (either by submittal of comment form in comment box or via comment form at Computer Station) and/or by 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014, and those given orally to the reporter at the scoping meeting/open house (at the Reporter Station) would be included in the official record.

Materials provided at the scoping meeting/open house included the following handouts (Attachment F, except where noted):

- The Notice (Attachment A)
- The Waterfront Public Scoping Meeting/Open House Guide
- How do I Provide Input for the Waterfront EIR
- Comment Forms

Five identical Comment Stations were provided at the scoping meeting/open house. Each station was staffed by one representative from the City’s environmental consultant who was available to provide information on the proposed project and EIR process, as well as respond to questions on the proposed project. Each station had the following three presentation boards (Attachment G), which were also included in the presentation:

- EIR Process and Schedule
- Resource Areas Proposed To be Analyzed in the EIR
- Conceptual Site Plan

A Reporter Station staffed by a typist with a laptop computer was provided for meeting participants who wished to make oral statements for inclusion in the official record.

A Computer Station was provided with two laptop computers available for anyone who wished to provide electronic comments at the scoping meeting/open house for inclusion into the official record. A Microsoft Word comment form was provided on each laptop for entering comments. Staff was available at the Computer Station to provide assistance and ensure that typed comments were saved properly.

For those persons wishing to provide written comment at the scoping meeting/open house, seven enclosed comment boxes were provided throughout the meeting space.
The scoping meeting/open house also included two additional City staff representatives who were not assigned a station, but were available throughout the meeting space to provide information on the proposed project and EIR process, as well as respond to questions on the proposed project.

4.0 Comments Received

The 30-day comment period began on June 19, 2014, and ended on July 21, 2014. Approximately 260 comment letters (including emails, comment forms, and oral comments submitted at Reporter Station at the scoping meeting/open house) were received during the comment period. Eight letters were received after the close of the scoping period. Copies of the comment letters received, including those received after the close of the scoping period, are provided in Attachment H.

Of the letters received during the scoping period, eight were from state, regional and local agencies, and the remainders were from individuals and organizations.

Ninety-five comment letters were received in writing and orally at the scoping meeting and 165 comment letters were provided by email, mail, or hand-delivery to City Hall.

Comment letters received will be considered, as appropriate, in identifying in the scope and contents of the EIR.

---

4 Comments on the NOP were accepted over a 33-day period to avoid closing the comment period on a weekend.

5 Multiple emails in the same email chain are considered one comment letter, separate emails by same author are considered separate comment letters, identical emails received more than once are considered one comment letter, identical letters received by both email attachment and mail are considered as one comment letter.
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Notice of Preparation/Notice of Initial Study/Notice of Scoping Meeting

To: Interested Parties
From: City of Redondo Beach
Community Development Department
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Date: June 19, 2014


Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Redondo Beach, as the Lead Agency, will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for The Waterfront project (the proposed project). Your agency may need to use the EIR prepared by the City when considering permits or other approvals associated with the proposed project and your comments on the environmental scope of the EIR are requested. If you are not a public agency with any statutory/regulatory responsibility concerning this project, your comments on the environmental scope of the EIR are requested so that the EIR may be prepared in light of the concerns of the community and surrounding areas.

Project Description: The proposed project, located in the City of Redondo Beach’s Coastal Zone south of Portofino Way, North of Torrance Boulevard, and west of Harbor Drive/Catalina Avenue (see map below), would revitalize approximately 35.6 acres of land and water by redeveloping and expanding local and visitor serving commercial uses, enhancing public access and recreational opportunities and facilities, and improving the aging support infrastructure and parking facilities. The project also proposes substantial improvements in site connectivity, public access and public views to and along the waterfront. The proposed project is specifically designed as a new waterfront village to reconnect the Pier and Harbor area with resident and visitor serving uses. As such, the proposed project seeks to integrate the best of the public and private needs and interests in a revitalized village providing broad coastal access and enjoyment. The proposed project is designed to reconnect the public with the waterfront and to help resolve a long-standing separation of uses and disconnection from the community.

The main components include proposed demolition of approximately 221,347 square feet of existing structures, demolition/renovation of the existing pier parking structure, and construction/renovation of up to approximately 523,732 square feet (289,906 square feet net new development) to include retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, a market hall, and a boutique hotel. The proposed project includes public recreation enhancements such as a new boat launch ramp, improvements to Seaside Lagoon, new parking facilities, and pedestrian and bicycle pathways. Site connectivity would be improved by the establishment of a new pedestrian bridge across the Redondo Beach Marina Basin 3 entrance and the reconnection of Pacific Avenue.

Based on the findings of the Initial Study prepared in conjunction with the NOP, the City has identified potential significant impacts for the following topics: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic and Utilities/Service Systems. A copy of the Initial Study and NOP can be reviewed at: City Hall, Community Development Department, 415 Diamond Street; City Clerk, 415 Diamond Street; Redondo Beach Public Library Main Branch, 303 N Pacific Coast Highway and North Branch, 2000 Artesia Boulevard; and online at www.redondo.org (follow link to Waterfront on Home Page). The documents referenced may be obtained at City Hall, Community Development Department, 415 Diamond Street, Door “E”.

The NOP public review period is scheduled from June 19, 2014 to July 21, 2014 (5:30 p.m.). However, Responsible Agencies and Trustee Agencies may submit their responses no later than 30 days after receipt of the NOP. Please send your response to Katie Owston, Project Planner at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California 90277 or katie.owston@redondo.org. Please provide your name or the name of a contact person in your agency. If you have questions, please contact Ms. Owston at (310) 318-0637, x1-2895.

A public scoping meeting/open house will be held on July 9, 2014, 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm at the Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center, 1935 Manhattan Beach Boulevard, Redondo Beach, CA 90278.
Attachment B

Notice of Preparation/Initial Study
The Waterfront project (proposed project), located in the City of Redondo Beach’s Coastal Zone south of Portofino Way, North of Torrance Boulevard, and west of Harbor Drive/Catalina Avenue, would revitalize approximately 35.6 acres of land and water by redeveloping and expanding local and visitor serving commercial uses, enhancing public access and recreational opportunities and facilities, and improving the aging support infrastructure and parking facilities. The proposed project also proposes substantial improvements in site connectivity, public access and public views to and along the waterfront. The proposed project is specifically designed as a new waterfront village to reconnect the Pier and Harbor area with resident and visitor serving uses. As such, the proposed project seeks to integrate the best of the public and private needs and interests in a revitalized village providing broad coastal access and enjoyment. The proposed project is designed to reconnect the public with the waterfront and to help resolve a long-standing separation of uses and disconnection from the community.

The main components include proposed demolition of approximately 221,347 square feet of existing structures, demolition/renovation of the existing pier parking structure, and construction/renovation of up to approximately 523,732 square feet (289,906 square feet of net new development) to include retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, a market hall, and a boutique hotel. The proposed project also includes public recreation enhancements such as a new small craft boat launch ramp, improvements to Seaside Lagoon, new parking facilities, and pedestrian and bicycle pathways. Site connectivity would be improved by the establishment of a new pedestrian bridge across the Redondo Beach Marina Basin 3 entrance and the reconnection of Pacific Avenue.

This Notice of Preparation (NOP) is to inform responsible and trustee agencies, public agencies, and the public that the City of Redondo Beach will be preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed project.

Based on the findings of the Initial Study prepared in conjunction with the NOP, the City has identified potential significant impacts for the following topics: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic and Utilities/Service Systems. A copy of the NOP/Initial Study can be obtained at:

- City Hall Community Development Department, 415 Diamond Street (documents referenced are also available at this location)
- City Clerk, 415 Diamond Street
- The Redondo Beach Public Library Main Branch, 303 N Pacific Coast Hwy.
- The Redondo Beach Public Library North Branch, 2000 Artesia Blvd.
- http://www.redondo.org

A public scoping meeting will be held: July 9, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

The Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center
1935 Manhattan Beach Blvd, Redondo Beach, CA 90278

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Step 1: Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

- A NOP is the first step in the EIR process. It is a document stating that an EIR will be prepared for a particular Project.
- The NOP is released for review to solicit feedback. This feedback helps identify:
  - Scope and environmental impacts to be addressed in the EIR.
  - Alternatives and mitigation measures to be considered in the EIR process.

Step 2: Draft EIR

- The Draft EIR analyzes and discloses the environmental impacts of the proposed project, project alternatives, mitigation measures, and cumulative impacts.
- The Draft EIR will be released for review and comment, to obtain feedback on whether the project’s environmental impacts were adequately analyzed.

Step 3: Final EIR

- The Final EIR presents written responses to public comment on the Draft EIR and any changes to the Draft EIR as a result of the comments.
- The Final EIR is presented to the decision-makers for certification that it meets CEQA requirements.
SCOPING MEETING/OPEN HOUSE

The City of Redondo Beach (City) will conduct a public scoping meeting/open house to present information on The Waterfront project (proposed project) and the EIR process, and receive public and agency comments regarding the appropriate scope and content to be addressed in the preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed project. Participation in the meeting by federal, state, and local agencies and other interested organizations and persons is encouraged. The meeting time and location are as follows:

July 9, 2014
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
The Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center
1935 Manhattan Beach Blvd, Redondo Beach, CA 90278

See Attachment 1 for a map of the meeting location. The scoping process is intended to provide the City with information that agencies and the public believe necessary to establish the appropriate scope and content of environmental information for the Draft EIR. During the public scoping meeting/open house, comment cards will be provided for anyone wishing to comment on potential environmental effects, reasonable alternatives, suggested mitigation measures, or other pertinent information that may enable the City in the preparation of a comprehensive and meaningful EIR for the proposed project. Written comments may be submitted directly to the City at the public scoping meeting/open house, or may be submitted as described below.

Written Comments (Notice of Preparation, Initial Study, and Scoping):
Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, and interested parties may submit written comments related to the scope of environmental analysis, significant environmental issues, reasonable alternatives, and suggested mitigation measures, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082(b). Written and email comments to the City will be received until 5:30 pm (PDT) on July 21, 2014 (Responsible and Trustee Agencies have 30 days from receipt of the NOP to submit their comments).

Written Comments: Please send written comments to the address below:

Katie Owston
Project Planner
Community Development Department
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Email Comments: Please send email comments to the email address below:
katie.owston@redondo.org

Comment letters sent via email should include the title of the proposed project (“The Waterfront”) in the email subject line and the commenter’s physical mailing address in the body of the email.
Meeting Location
The Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center
1935 Manhattan Beach Blvd, Redondo Beach, CA 90278

Project Site

Sources: Esri, DeLorme, NAVTEQ, USGS, NRCAN, METI, iPC, TomTom

Basemap Source: ESRI, 2010 and PSOMAS, 2014
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1.0 Introduction

This Notice of Preparation (NOP) is to inform responsible and trustee agencies, public agencies, and the public that the City of Redondo Beach (City), as the Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), has independently determined that there are potential significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed Waterfront project (the proposed project) and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required. The City has prepared, as part of this NOP, an Environmental Checklist for the EIR determination in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations) and the California Public Resources Code (Section 21000, et seq.). The Environmental Checklist is attached to this NOP for agency and public review and comment.

Completion of the CEQA review process, including preparation and public circulation of the Draft EIR followed by preparation and certification of the Final EIR, must occur prior to any discretionary approvals of the project by state and local agencies. Additionally, implementation of the proposed project will require certain approvals and permits from federal agencies such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), which require environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Based on preliminary discussions with the USACE, as the federal Lead Agency involved in the federal approvals associated with the proposed project, it is anticipated that the NEPA analysis may be completed separate from the CEQA analysis.

2.0 Project Overview and Background

2.1 Project Overview

The proposed project is specifically designed as a new waterfront village which reconnects the waterfront with resident and visitor serving uses. As such, the project seeks to integrate the best of the public and private needs and interests in a revitalized village providing broad coastal access and enjoyment. The project is designed to reconnect the public with the waterfront and to help resolve a long-standing separation of uses and disconnection from the community.

The proposed project would revitalize approximately 35.6 acres of land and water by redeveloping and expanding local and visitor serving commercial uses, enhancing public access and recreational opportunities and facilities, and improving the aging support infrastructure and parking facilities. The project also proposes substantial improvements in site connectivity, public access and public views to and along the waterfront. As described in greater detail in Section 4, the main components of the proposed project include the proposed demolition of approximately 221,347 square feet of existing structures, demolition/renovation of the existing pier parking structure, and construction/renovation of up to approximately 523,732 square feet (289,906 square feet of net new development) to include retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, a market hall, and a boutique hotel. Enhancements to public recreation and
open space include a new small craft boat launch ramp, the opening of Seaside Lagoon to King Harbor as a protected beach (currently the lagoon is not directly connected to the ocean), new and expanded pedestrian and bicycle pathways, as well as new park and town green spaces. Site connectivity and coastal access would be increased by the establishment of a new pedestrian bridge across the Redondo Beach Marina Basin 3 entrance, a new pedestrian promenade along the water’s edge from the base of the pier to Seaside Lagoon, and the Pacific Avenue reconnection. Project elements also include water quality benefits, measures to accommodate sea level rise projections, and replacement or upgrades to aging infrastructure. The proposed uses and square footages are consistent with those allowed under the Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

The Draft EIR will evaluate the potential impacts of the demolition of some of the existing structures, and construction and operation of the aforementioned project, as described in greater detail in Section 4 below, as well as project alternatives, mitigation measures, and cumulative impacts.

2.2 Background

The City’s waterfront area is comprised of approximately 150 acres of City-owned or managed land and water developed with a variety of commercial and recreational uses, including marinas, hotels, retail, restaurants, beaches, and bike paths. The waterfront is a valuable amenity and attraction for residents and visitors, as well as a key economic engine for the City. The waterfront was the location of one of the first ports in Los Angeles County and it has been a focal point for the City since incorporation in 1892.

The last major revitalization of the pier and waterfront was in the 1970s. The characteristics (e.g., design, layout, and functionality) of many properties within the ocean-side area still reflect that time period of over 30 years ago. Although a number of buildings have since been constructed or modernized, many properties are aging and in need of renovation or reconstruction, including the Pier Parking Structure which likely has only five to ten years of service life remaining. In 1988, a major storm and subsequent fire on the Horseshoe Pier destroyed most of the original pier as well as more than 22,000 square feet of leasehold commercial improvements. The damaged portions of the Pier were subsequently reconstructed; however, patronage patterns to the Pier and waterfront were significantly interrupted and have yet to fully recover (City of Redondo Beach, 2010).

More recent projects in the area include a remodel of the Redondo Landing building at the southern entrance to the Pier, a new boutique hotel (the Shade Hotel) and renovations of existing hotels, approval of a master plan for Moonstone Park (Mole B) including a new Harbor Patrol Facility (Fire Station 3), the Harbor/Herondo Gateway Improvements including the Harbor Drive Cycle Track bicycle path improvements, adding visitor mooring slips, and public improvements such as new landscaping, benches and lighting.

Throughout the first half of 2013, eight community meetings were held to accept input on the proposed project. Residents were first asked what specific uses they would like to see in the waterfront. Subsequent meetings refined the range of possibilities and then focused on the physical location of each potential use, which resulted in a “conceptual site plan.” In July 2013, the Redondo Beach City Council gave direction for staff to initiate environmental review for the proposed project, based upon this conceptual site plan. In November 2013, the City Council approved the contract for preparation of the environmental analysis for the proposed project.
Input from the community meetings has and will continue to be considered in the proposed project.

**Measure G**

In approximately 2003 the City reinitiated planning for the Redondo Beach Harbor Area, including the project site. During this time the City proposed amendments to its Local Coastal Program (LCP); this included amendments to the City’s Coastal Land Use Plan and the City’s Coastal Zoning Ordinance (Redondo Beach Municipal Code (“RBMC”), Title 10, Chapter 5). This culminated in the approval of the LCP amendments by the City of Redondo Beach and certification of the LCP by the California Coastal Commission. In November 2010, these amendments to the City’s LCP were also approved by the voters of Redondo Beach (Measure G). The LCP sets development standards for the Harbor Area, including the project site.

### 3.0 Environmental Setting

#### 3.1 Regional Context

Redondo Beach is located in Los Angeles County along the Pacific Ocean, approximately 16 miles southwest of downtown Los Angeles (see Figure 1, Regional Location Map). Regional access is provided via the San Diego Freeway (I-405), the Harbor Freeway (I-105), State Route 1 (Pacific Coast Highway), and State Route 107 (Hawthorne Boulevard).

#### 3.2 Local Setting and Surrounding Land Uses

The project site is located in the City's Coastal Zone, and certain portions are located westward of the mean high tide line. The project is located along the waterfront, west of Catalina Avenue and high density residential development commonly referred to as “The Village” or “Sea Scape.” The project is located south of Portofino Way, and north of Torrance Boulevard. The Torrance Boulevard Traffic Circle is included in the project site. The northern portion of the project site is currently accessed from Harbor Drive including feeder arterials of Herondo Street and Pacific Avenue and the southern portion is accessed from Torrance Boulevard. See Figure 2, Local Vicinity and Existing Conditions Map.

The project site is an approximately 35.6-acre portion of the 150-acre waterfront area owned by the City. The project site is currently urbanized with approximately 233,826 square feet of existing development (not including the parking structures), including commercial, restaurant and office uses and an enclosed and contained public swimming and recreational facility known as the “Seaside Lagoon.” Other existing uses include two parking structures (the Pier Parking Structure and the Plaza Parking Structure which collectively provide approximately 1,300 parking spaces), surface parking lots, retail and restaurant uses and Basin 3 of King Harbor which provides recreational and visitor serving uses such as water craft rentals, sightseeing, and slip rentals. As shown on Figure 3, Proposed Project Boundary, and described further below, the project site is defined in terms of three geographic areas, the northern portion (approximately 19.5 acres), the southern portion (approximately 11.9 acres), and the water area (approximately 3.2 acres). The International Boardwalk, portions of which are included in both the northern and southern portion of the project site is approximately one acre.
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As shown on Figure 3, Proposed Project Boundary, the northern portion of the project site is located adjacent to the Turning Basin, south of the Port Royal and Portofino Marinas in Basin 2 and along the northern half of Basin 3. It includes large surface parking lots with several building pads consisting of primarily restaurants. A sport fishing pier (also known as “Polly’s Pier”), small boat launch (hand carried boats only), an existing Galveston break wall, two boat hoists, the northern portion of the International Boardwalk and elevated walkway above, and public areas west of the Plaza Parking Structure are included in the project area.

The southern portion of the project site encompasses the Horseshoe Pier and retail and restaurant buildings located on the pier, the Pier Parking Structure, and the two-level commercial and office development on the upper level (Pier Plaza). It also includes the southern portion of the International Boardwalk and elevated walkway above, situated east of, and adjacent to, Basin 3. The Torrance Circle south of Catalina Avenue is also included in the southern portion of the project site.

The third area, the water area, consists of Basin 3, which has vessel slips utilized by recreational, commercial, fishing, tourism, and excursion vessels that range in size from 20 to 68 feet.

The southern and northern portions of the site are currently connected by a paved access road (not currently accessible for public vehicle use) and upper level bicycle and pedestrian corridors located along the International Boardwalk and Basin 3. Access is provided for pedestrians, bicycles, delivery, service, and emergency vehicles. The current access road generally follows the historic route of the primary waterfront streets that once served to provide public access and connectivity along the coastline. In contrast to past conditions, where public streets connected the public to the waterfront via Pacific Avenue, El Paseo, Harbor Drive and various other streets, there currently exists no public vehicle access between the north and south areas of the project site. Instead, public patrons to the waterfront must now use Catalina Avenue from Harbor Drive to Torrance Boulevard to travel from one end of the site to the other.

To the north of the project site, the surrounding uses are Basin 2 (including Basin 2 improvements such as a hotel, yacht club, apartments, fueling facility, conference facility and restaurant), marinas, and surface parking lots. The AES Redondo Beach Power Plant is located approximately 0.09 mile to the northeast. East of the project site are a hotel, commercial uses, Czuleger Park, and high density multi-family residential development. South of the project site are Veterans Park, the Redondo Landing commercial development, and the Monstad Pier. West of the project site are the King Harbor (Outer) Breakwater and Santa Monica Bay.

### 3.3 Land Use Designation and Zoning District

The City’s General Plan provides two land use designations for the project site including “CC Coastal Commercial” and “P Public or Institutional.” The Coastal Commercial designation references the City’s Local Coastal Program (LCP). The Public or Institutional designation is intended to allow government facilities, schools, parks, hospitals, utility easements, public cultural facilities, public open space, complimentary commercial, and other public uses.

Development on the project site is also controlled by the City’s LCP, which contains two main components, (1) the Coastal Land Use Plan (CLUP), and (2) the Coastal Zoning Ordinance (RBMC Title 10, Chapter 5).
The project site is designated as “CR Commercial Recreation” in the City’s Coastal Land Use Plan (including portions of Sub-Areas 1, 2, and 3), with the exception of the Seaside Lagoon which is designated “P-PRO Parks, Recreation and Open Space” (a subset of the City’s “Public or Institutional” designation). The Commercial Recreation land use designation is intended to allow for a wide range of public and commercial recreational facilities, including hotels, restaurants, retail, and public open spaces, recreational uses, boating facilities, entertainment clubs and amusement facilities. The P-PRO designation is generally intended to allow for a broad range of institutional and public facilities such as parks, open space and recreational facilities and accessory uses, such as rest rooms storage sheds, concession stands, recreational, rentals, public buildings, community centers, etc.

The site includes properties zoned CC-1, CC-2, CC-3, and CC-4 (Coastal Commercial) and P-PRO (Parks, Recreation, and Open Space). The Coastal Commercial zones are generally designed to provide for the development of coastal-dependent land uses and uses designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation, including commercial retail and service facilities supporting recreational boating and fishing. Additional details regarding the Coastal Commercial zones are provided in RBMC, Title 10, Chapter 5, Article 2, Division 3. The P-PRO zone is generally designed to provide lands for park, recreation and open space areas, schools, civic center uses, cultural facilities, public safety facilities, accessory structures (e.g., including but not limited to recreation related facilities), and other public uses which are beneficial to the community and visitors to the coastal zone. Additional details regarding the P-PRO zone are provided in RBMC, Title 10, Chapter 5, Article 2, Division 6.

4.0 Description of the Proposed Project

4.1 Project Components

The proposed project involves redeveloping a portion of the waterfront area by expanding local and visitor serving commercial uses, enhancing public access and recreational opportunities, demolishing and replacing aging substandard facilities, and implementing water quality enhancements. This includes demolition of up to approximately 221,347 square feet of existing development, including restaurants, retail, and office development, demolition and reconstruction of the Pier Parking Structure, renovation of the Plaza Parking Structure, and construction/renovation of up to approximately 523,732 square feet of new development, resulting in approximately 289,906 square feet of net new development (the proposed project includes renovation of approximately 12,479 square feet of existing structures), to include retail, restaurant, and hotel uses, and construction/renovation of parking structures.

The components are described in greater detail below, although further refinement of the components may occur during the EIR preparation process. Figure 4 is a conceptual site plan of the proposed project.
Figure 4
Conceptual Site Plan
The Waterfront

Note: Plan depicts proposed uses and is for discussion purposes only. Actual development and placement details may vary.

Source: CenterCal, June 2014
Northern Portion of Project Site

- Proposed development would include restaurants, retail, office, cinema uses, and a market hall with fresh seafood and specialty merchants north of Basin 3. The building heights would vary from one to three stories, with a minimum of fifty percent of the buildings south of Seaside Lagoon being limited to one story.

- Replacement of existing surface parking with construction of a new approximately 919-stall parking structure at northeast corner of the site, approximately 68 surface parking stalls, and a parking lot for the proposed small craft boat launch ramp.

- Modifications to the Plaza Parking Structure to relocate the stairwell and elevator shaft within the parking structure to accommodate the Pacific Avenue reconnection. Bicycle and pedestrian paths would be enhanced to avoid navigation through parking structures.

- Opening of Seaside Lagoon to the waters of King Harbor in order to create a natural beach that is open year-round.

- Replacement of two boat hoists in Basin 3 with a small craft boat launch ramp and associated parking west of Seaside Lagoon (at the current site of Joe’s Crab Shack). A break wall would also be constructed to provide protection from wave action.

- Construction of an expansive pedestrian promenade along the water’s edge from the base of the pier to Seaside Lagoon.

Southern Portion of Project Site

- Proposed development includes replacement of some of the existing and former retail and restaurant buildings on the Horseshoe Pier and a new two-story boutique hotel with commercial uses on the ground floor. The building heights would vary from one to two stories, as measured from the top of the parking deck. The hotel would not exceed 30 feet from the grade at the current pier plaza office entry level.

- Demolition of the Pier Parking Structure, including the existing two level commercial and office Pier Plaza development, and replacement with a new approximately 1,012 stall parking structure.

- Should it be determined necessary, reinforcement of the Horseshoe Pier to support proposed development/redevelopment. Modifications to the Torrance Circle to facilitate the Pacific Avenue reconnection and access into the new parking structure.¹

¹ Construction activities in the vicinity of the Monstad Pier (e.g., demolition of the Pier Parking Structure, modifications to the Torrance Circle, and potential reinforcement of Horseshoe Pier) could result in limited modifications to portions of the Monstad Pier.
**Water Area**

- Improve public access between the northern and southern portions of the project site by providing a pedestrian bridge that spans the approximately 250-foot Basin 3 entrance. The bridge would allow small craft boat traffic to pass below; however, Basin 3 may no longer be accessible to larger sailboats.

- Retrofit of the existing Sportfishing Pier, including reconstruction of buildings.

- Replacement or refurbishment of the 53 existing boat slips in Basin 3.

**Additional Improvements**

- Demolition of the International Boardwalk and elevated walkway to accommodate the Pacific Avenue reconnection, which would provide vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic connectivity between the northern and southern portion of the project site.

- Introduction of new bicycle and pedestrian pathways throughout the project site, including a pedestrian promenade along the water’s edge on rock breakwater and marina bulkheads.

- Updates to aging infrastructure, including construction of a new stormwater drainage system that incorporates Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Low Impact Development (LID) BMPs in order to address stormwater quality requirements prior to discharging on-site stormwater from the project site to the receiving waters.

- The proposed topography of the project site will be generally similar to the existing condition, sloping towards the Pacific Ocean. The northern portion of the site may receive fill material ranging in depth of approximately one to six feet, and contours around the perimeter of the south portion of the site will remain relatively similar to the existing condition although some modifications to topography will be required to eliminate current flooding conditions and to accommodate anticipated sea level rise.

- Provide new high-quality public open space throughout the project area.
4.2 Project Phasing and Construction Scheduling

Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to commence in 2016 and last for approximately two to three years depending upon phasing. Although a phasing plan for the overall project is still being formulated, it is anticipated that construction of the northern portion of the project site would occur first.

Based on preliminary calculations, it is estimated that the proposed project would require approximately 150,000 cubic yards of fill material on the landside. Some of this fill material is anticipated to be imported from off-site and some may come from demolition of the existing Pier Parking Structure and Seaside Lagoon modifications. Exact quantities of import material needed would vary based on the amount of usable fill material obtained through demolition of the existing parking structure. The proposed project may also include the excavation and removal of soils from the project site on the landside.

Waterside construction would follow industry standard practices and would take place from both land and barges. Construction activities associated with project elements such as the boat launch ramp, Seaside Lagoon, and pedestrian bridge, may include dredging, filling, rock placement, in-water concrete placement, sheetpile installation, pile driving, shoreline protection and other above and below water activities. Detailed quantities of dredge/fill, piles, and overwater structural coverage have not yet been determined.

4.3 Project Approvals

The proposed project is expected to require the following approvals:

- Conditional Use Permit City of Redondo Beach
- Coastal Development Permit (non-tidelands) City of Redondo Beach
- Harbor Commission Design Review City of Redondo Beach
- Vesting Tentative Tract Map City of Redondo Beach
- Coastal Development Permit (tidelands) Coastal Commission
- Section 401 Water Quality Certification Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Section 404 Permit USACE
- Bridge Permit USCG
- Tidelands Exchange State Lands Commission
- Lease and related transactional documents City of Redondo Beach/State Lands Commission
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this proposed project (i.e., the proposed project would involve at least one impact that is a "potentially significant impact"), as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. The environmental factors utilized in the Initial Study below are used for determining whether a project may have a potential impact and whether an EIR should be prepared. If these environmental factors are carried forward for further analysis, they may be further refined in the EIR or combined when they address overlapping environmental issues.

| X | Aesthetics | Agriculture and Forest Resources | X | Air Quality |
| X | Biological Resources | Cultural Resources | X | Geology/Soils |
| X | Greenhouse Gas Emissions | Hazards and Hazardous Materials | X | Hydrology/Water Quality |
| Land Use/Planning | Mineral Resources | X | Noise |
| Population/Housing | Public Services | X | Recreation |
| X | Transportation/Traffic | Utilities/Service Systems | X | Mandatory Findings of Significance |

Determination:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the proposed project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

X I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have an impact on the environment that is "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Aaron Jones, Community Development Director  
Date 6/19/14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** There are no scenic vistas listed in the Redondo Beach General Plan; however, Czuleger Park, which is adjacent to the project site, is identified as a public view corridor in the General Plan, as it affords views of the Pacific Ocean and the Redondo Beach Harbor (King Harbor/Harbor). The Harbor is not designated as a highly scenic area in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation or by any local plan or ordinance (Department of Parks and Recreation, 1971). Nonetheless, the project site is located in a coastal setting with views of the Harbor (a portion of which is in the project site) and the Pacific Ocean. The project site is part of ocean and Harbor views available from a limited number of surrounding locations as well, including Veterans Park and Czuleger Park.

Therefore, the proposed project could have the potential to affect the public view corridor; as such, the potential effects on views are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

b. **Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

**No Impact.** The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is responsible for the official nomination and designation of eligible scenic highways. The proposed project is not near a designated state scenic highway or eligible state scenic highway as identified on the California Scenic Highway Mapping System (Caltrans, 2013a; 2013b). State Highway 2, from approximately three miles north of Interstate (I)-210 in La Cañada to the San Bernardino County
line, is the closest officially designated state scenic highway to the project site, approximately 29 miles to the north (Caltrans, 2013). A segment of Pacific Coast Highway (State Highway 1) from Venice Boulevard (State Route 187) to State Route 101, approximately 10 miles to the north of the project site, is identified as an eligible state scenic highway. Another segment of Pacific Coast Highway from Lakewood Boulevard (State Highway 19) in Long Beach to I-5 in San Juan Capistrano, approximately 14 miles southeast of the project site, is also identified as an eligible state scenic highway. The project site is not visible from these locations. The General Plan does not designate any local scenic highways. The project site does not include any trees or rock outcroppings of scenic significance (Impacts associated with historic buildings are addressed in Section V of this Initial Study). Therefore, the proposed project would not affect scenic resources from a designated or eligible state scenic highway and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

c. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the Harbor area and the existing uses are primarily recreational and commercial, including retail and restaurants, the Horseshoe Pier, Seaside Lagoon, marina, bicycle and pedestrian pathways, and supporting facilities such as public parking. Implementation of the proposed project would replace these existing structures and would include new visual elements, including new commercial development, hotel, parking structures, pedestrian bridge, small craft boat launch ramp, a public roadway extension and a new street providing greater access to the water’s edge, changes to Seaside Lagoon, and new and refigured bicycle and pedestrian paths. The new visual elements would be consistent with the existing commercial and recreational uses, and would incorporate elements such as a cohesive architectural design, public art, and enhanced landscaping, and are, thus, not expected to degrade the existing visual quality and character of the site and surroundings. While these changes are anticipated to be less than significant, the issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.

d. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would replace existing on site lighting with new lighting sources. These new lighting sources would be for safety and security and visual and aesthetic enhancement associated with proposed elements such as building exteriors, parking structures, walkways, Pacific Avenue reconnection, and boat launch ramp. The new lighting would make use of modern fixtures and light shields that would direct lighting on-site and prevent spillover. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would create a new source of substantial light that could adversely affect the quality of nighttime views. While lighting impacts are considered less than significant, they will be evaluated further in the EIR. The exterior surfaces associated with the new buildings could also cause glare depending on the types of materials used in building construction. In addition, glare can be caused from unshielded or misdirected lighting sources. However, as described above, the project would be replacing existing structures and existing light sources. While glare impacts are considered less than significant, they will be evaluated further in the EIR.
II. **AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in PRC Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

a. **Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

**No Impact.** The California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) develops maps and statistical data to be used for analyzing impacts on California’s agricultural resources. The FMMP identifies categories of agricultural resources that are significant (in terms of soil quality and irrigation status) and therefore require special consideration. The best quality land is identified as Prime Farmland. According to the FMMP, the project site is an area designated as Urban and Built-Up Land, which is described as land occupied by structures that has a variety of uses, including industrial, commercial, or railroad or other transportation yards (California Department of Conservation, 2013). There is no Prime or Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance or existing agricultural uses in the project site or vicinity (California Department of Conservation, 2010). Thus, no agricultural lands or uses would be converted to accommodate the proposed project. Therefore, no impact would occur and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

b. **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?**

**No Impact.** The Williamson Act applies to farmed or open space parcels consisting of at least 20 acres of Prime Farmland or at least 40 acres of land not designated as Prime Farmland. No land within the project site is eligible for a Williamson Act contract. The project site is zoned CC-1, CC-2, CC-3, and CC-4 (Coastal Commercial), which does not permit agricultural uses, and P-PRO (Parks, Recreation, and Open Space). P-PRO allows agricultural and horticultural uses with approval of a conditional use permit. However, the site classified as P-PRO is currently used for public recreation and accessory uses (Seaside Lagoon) and this use would not change under the proposed project. Therefore, no impact would occur and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).
c. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in PRC Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in PRC Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104 (g))?

No Impact. Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) identifies forest land as land that can support 10-percent native tree and cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. Public Resources Code Section 4526 identifies timberland as land which is available for and capable of growing a crop of trees of a commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products. Government Code Section 51105 (g) defines a Timberland production zone as an area that is devoted to and used for growing and harvesting timber, or for growing and harvesting timber and compatible uses.

The project site is developed as a public waterfront and zoned CC-1, CC-2, CC-3, and CC-4 (Coastal Commercial) and P-PRO (Parks, Recreation, and Open Space); it is not being managed or used for forest land. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland; hence, there would be no impact and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

d. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. The project site is consists of existing commercial and office development, recreational uses, and a marina. There is no forest land within the project site or surrounding area; thus, there would be no loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no impact and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

e. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could individually or cumulatively result in loss of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. As discussed under Items III(a-d) above, no farmland or forest land is located within the surrounding area or at the project site. The proposed project would not involve the changes in the existing environment that would result in the loss of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, there would be no impact and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).
### AIR QUALITY

When available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a non-attainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion:

**Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which consists of the urbanized areas of Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Orange Counties. Due to the combined air pollution sources from over 15 million people and meteorological and geographical effects that limit the dispersion of these pollutants, the SCAB can experience high air pollutant concentrations. As a result, the region currently does not attain the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for ozone (O3), lead (Pb), and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM2.5), and is designated as a maintenance area for particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM10), carbon...
monoxide (CO), and nitrogen dioxide (NO2). In addition, the SCAB does not attain the California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) for O3, Pb, PM2.5, and NO2.\(^2\)

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), in cooperation with the California Air Resource Board (CARB) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), have developed air quality plans that are designed to bring the Basin into attainment of the national and state ambient air quality standards. Periodically, the SCAQMD prepares an overall air quality management plan (AQMP) update to meet the federal requirements and/or to incorporate the latest technical planning information. Each iteration of the plan is an update of the previous plan. Once the AQMP is approved by both the CARB and USEPA, it becomes part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for attaining and maintaining the ambient air quality standards. Through this attainment planning process, the SCAQMD develops the SCAQMD Rules and Regulations to regulate stationary sources of air pollution in the SCAB. The NAAQS as defined in the Clean Air Act identify six common air pollutants and set standards for their maximum allowable concentration in the atmosphere. If the standards are exceeded in any given area, then the pollutants are in “nonattainment” and the area in which the standards are exceeded is called a “nonattainment” area.

The latest AQMP was adopted by the AQMD Governing Board on December 7, 2012 (SCAQMD, 2012). The 2012 AQMP proposes emission reduction measures that are designed to bring the Basin into attainment of the national and state ambient air quality standards. These attainment strategies include emission control measures and clean fuel programs that are enforced at the federal and state level on engine manufacturers and petroleum refiners and retailers. The SCAQMD staff is initiating an early development process for the subsequent AQMP, which will be a comprehensive and integrated plan primarily focused on addressing the ozone standards. The subsequent AQMP will incorporate the latest scientific and technical information and planning assumptions, including the latest applicable growth assumptions, Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, and updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories.

The proposed project is not expected to result in increased population, but it may result in construction and operational emissions; therefore, air quality impacts are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

---

\(^2\) In February 2014, the California Air Resources Board adopted regulations to redesignate Los Angeles County as an attainment area for the Pb CAAQS, and to redesignate the South Coast Air Basin as an attainment area for the NO2 CAAQS. The State has taken a final action on these regulations and they will take effect on July 1, 2014.
b. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project (e.g., site clearing, grading, other site preparation activities, and construction of new structures) could result in fugitive dust and equipment emissions. Construction workers commuting to and from the project site would also result in temporary emissions. Pollutant emissions would vary from day to day depending on the level of activity, the specific construction phasing operations, and the prevailing weather conditions. Associated air emissions could adversely affect the regional ambient air quality in the Basin and locally within Redondo Beach.

Operation of the proposed project may result in increased emissions of air pollutants from new stationary sources and from vehicle trips accessing the project site.

Therefore, air emissions from the construction and operation of the proposed project may violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. Consequently, this impact is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

c. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As indicated under Item III(b), construction and/or operation may generate emissions that could result in either a violation of an ambient air quality standard or contribute to an existing air quality violation. Due to the elevated concentrations of air pollutants that currently occur in the Basin, when combined with other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects in the area, the violations could result from a net increase of “criteria pollutants.” Criteria pollutants include O3, CO, PM2.5 and PM10, NOx, and Pb. The generation of these compounds during and after construction could exceed the national and state standards/limits for such emissions (including quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors). This impact is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

d. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Examples of land uses that can be classified as sensitive receptors include residences, schools, daycare centers, parks, recreational areas, medical facilities, rest homes, and convalescent care facilities. These types of uses, several of which can be found within or near the project site (i.e., multi-family residential uses immediately to the east), may be affected by air pollution in the form of dust and equipment emissions during construction and operation. Therefore, the potential exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.
e. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The SCAQMD Air Quality Handbook identifies the following uses as having a potential odor issues: wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, agricultural uses, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass moldings.

Short-term odors could be produced during the construction of the proposed project from paving (i.e., laying of asphalt) and temporary storage/stockpiling of dredged materials. Odors from these sources would be temporary, localized, and generally confined to the immediate area of construction activities. The potential for the proposed project to create objectionable odors associated with such activities during construction is less than significant, but the stockpiling of dredged materials will be evaluated in the EIR once additional details are known about the storage location.

Odors produced during operation of the proposed project are not expected to substantially change and are not expected to affect a substantial number of people as the project site would remain developed with commercial and recreational uses. These types of uses are not associated with the creation of odors. While the site currently includes the temporary storage and removal of solid waste, the City would continue to require compliance with regulations related to maintenance of trash areas (including RBMC Section 10-2.1536), to ensure that the operation of the project does not create any objectionable odors associated with solid waste. There is the potential that a limited amount of composting could occur on-site associated with the proposed market hall. Should this occur, it would be small-scale for organic (non-animal) wastes and limited to the market hall. If composting occurs, it would take place in a designated area and in a manner that would control odors (e.g., covered bins). The designated compost area would be regularly maintained and as such is not anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, odor impacts associated with operation of the proposed project are considered less than significant and will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

a. Would the project have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Several sensitive species may be present in the Redondo Beach coastal area. This includes the Palos Verdes blue butterfly (*Glaucopsyche lygdamus palosverdesensis*), a federally listed endangered species, and the sandy beach tiger beetle (*Cicindela hirticollis gravida*), a candidate species for listing as federally endangered or threatened, and South Coast Saltscale (*Atriplex pacifica*), listed on the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants. Although these species may be present within the coastal area, they are not expected to occur at the project site because there is no suitable habitat.

While the project site is not likely a roosting or feeding area for any species of special concern there is the potential for sensitive species, such as the California brown pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis californicus*), to forage in the Harbor. As the proposed project involves in-water activities (i.e., construction of the pedestrian bridge and boat launch ramp and the opening of Seaside Lagoon to the adjacent Harbor waters), the EIR will evaluate whether the proposed project would have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), including the potential to affect protected marine mammals. Impacts are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

b. Would the project have a substantial adverse impact on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is in an urbanized area that is highly disturbed. The landside is largely built-out with existing development and recreational facilities and no sensitive habitats, including riparian areas, or natural community is present. The waterside is a busy small craft marina with existing piers and breakwaters. However, there is the potential for sensitive marine habitat (i.e., eelgrass) or natural communities (i.e., essential fish habitat) to occur in the project area. An in-water survey will be conducted to determine if any marine sensitive natural community would be affected by the proposed project. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The regulations implementing Section 404 of the Clean Water Act define wetlands as those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs and similar areas. (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 230.3[t]). No known federally protected wetlands exist in the project area; however, a biological resources survey will be conducted to determine if sensitive habitat
Potentially Significant Impact. The project site is in an urban area and according to the CDFW BIOS Viewer, there are no essential connectivity areas (or, areas essential for ecological connectivity [i.e., wildlife corridors]) within or adjacent to the project site (CDFW, 2014). Thus, the proposed project is not expected to interfere substantially with movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. However, areas within the Harbor could serve as a foraging site or nursery site. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

e. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is within a highly urbanized setting and the landside is primarily developed with buildings, paving, and ornamental landscaping, including mature trees. Section 10-1.707 of the RBMC requires: 1) street trees be provided in all subdivisions, either within the street right-of-way or within a dedicated plating easement, and 2) maintenance and preservation of trees with a diameter of six inches or greater on private property unless the removal is proved to be necessary and removed trees are replaced. Section 10-5.1900 of the Coastal Land Use Plan Implementing Ordinance contains tree trimming and tree removal requirements for trees in the coastal zone. This includes prohibiting trimming or disturbance of trees that have been used for breeding and nesting by bird species listed pursuant to the Federal or California Endangered Species Acts, California bird species of special concern, and wading birds (herons or egrets) within the previous five years, as determined by a qualified biologist, unless a health and safety danger exists, and prohibiting tree trimming and removal during the breeding and nesting season (January through September) unless a tree is determined to be a danger to public health and safety. Any breeding or nesting tree that must be removed shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio. Any tree removal or trimming that would occur under the proposed project would occur in compliance with the Coastal Land Use Plan Implementing Ordinance. Therefore, it is anticipated that the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting trees, or other such biological resources. However, the policies and ordinances will be addressed further related to biological resources, and this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.

f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural communities conservation plan, or any other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. The proposed project is not located within an adopted Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) or Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The NCCP program, which began in 1991 under California’s Natural Community Conservation Planning Act, is administered by the CDFW and is a cooperative effort between resource agencies and developers that takes a broad-based ecosystem approach to planning for the protection and perpetuation of biological diversity. HCPs are administered by the USFWS and are designed to identify how impacts would be mitigated when a project would impact endangered species or designated critical habitat. There are no HCPs in place for the project site, nor other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, there would be no impact and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).
### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

a. **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project includes demolition of existing buildings within the project site. The project area could potentially contain buildings eligible for listing as a historical resource. A survey will be conducted for the EIR to determine if potentially historical resources would be affected by the proposed project. If historical resources are affected by the proposed project, significant impacts could result; therefore, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.

b. **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located in an urbanized area that has been previously disturbed by construction and redevelopment activities and coastal processes (i.e., wave action and winter storms). Given that the project site has been substantially disturbed, any archeological resources that may have existed at one time have likely been previously unearthed, collected, and/or destroyed or lost their stratigraphic and geologic context and would no longer be considered an archaeological resource. While unlikely, should native soils be disturbed construction activities may still impact archeological resources. A cultural resources technical report will be prepared as part of the EIR to determine if the proposed project could potentially cause an adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource; therefore, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.
c. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The majority of the City was originally developed on the El Segundo Sand Hills, in which geologic deposits consist of sand, silty sand, and silt from the late Pleistocene to Holocene age (200,000 to 10,000 years before present). The geologic formation within the project area consists of Quaternary older alluvium, playa, terrace deposits, which have the potential to carry paleontological remains due to the age of the deposits. However, the site is within an urbanized area and has been disturbed by previous development and redevelopment activity and thus paleontological resources may have been lost or destroyed. However, a cultural resources technical report will be prepared as part of the EIR to determine if the proposed project could potentially disturb paleontological resources; therefore, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed locations for development are not within any known historical or modern cemeteries. However, in the unlikely event project improvements and redevelopment disturb any unanticipated human remains, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that in the event of the discovery of human remains outside of a dedicated cemetery, all ground disturbances must cease and the county coroner must be notified. Section 7052 establishes a felony penalty for mutilating, disinterring, or otherwise disturbing human remains, except by relatives. Sections 5097.94 and 5907.98 of the Public Resources Code specify a protocol to be followed when the Native American Heritage Commission receives notification of a discovery of Native American human remains from a county coroner. If the Coroner determines that the remains are or appear to be of a Native American, he/she shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission for further investigations and proper recovery of such remains, if necessary in compliance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. With compliance with these regulations, impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).
### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.)</td>
<td>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.)</td>
<td>Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.)</td>
<td>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.)</td>
<td>Landslides?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b. | Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | X |

| c. | Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? | X |

| d. | Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | X |

| e. | Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | X |
Discussion:

a. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

(i.) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Less Than Significant Impact. Southern California is one of the most seismically active areas in the United States. Numerous active faults and fault zones are located within the general region, including the active Palos Verdes Fault within 1.3 miles south of the project site. Although the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, potential hazards exist due to seismic activities associated with the Palos Verdes Fault Zone and the presence of man-made engineered fill. The proposed facilities would be built in compliance with the most up-to-date building codes, which would minimize potential impacts to the greatest degree feasible and thus impacts are anticipated to be less than significant; however, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.

(ii.) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above, the proposed project is located in a region of known seismic activity. Although the nearest fault (the Palos Verdes Fault) has not generated any major earthquakes in historical time (i.e., the past 200 years), geological relationships suggest that it is active and has a relatively rapid rate of slip compared to other faults in the Los Angeles Basin region. The risk of seismic hazards such as ground shaking cannot be avoided. The fault may be capable of generating a 7.25-magnitude (Richter) earthquake and surface displacements of about 2.7 meters (8.8 feet) (Port of Los Angeles, 2006). Incorporation of emergency planning and compliance with current building and construction design codes would minimize damage resulting from a seismic event; thus impacts are anticipated to be less than significant; however, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.

(iii.) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Potentially Significant Impact. Liquefaction is a phenomenon that occurs when soil undergoes transformation from a solid state to a liquefied condition due to the effects of increased pore-water pressure. This typically occurs where susceptible soils (particularly the medium sand to silt range) are located over a high groundwater table. Affected soils lose all strength during liquefaction and foundation failure can occur. According to the California Geological Survey, the proposed project is within a liquefaction zone area, which is defined as an area where historic occurrences of liquefaction, or local geological, geotechnical, and groundwater conditions occur indicate a potential for permanent ground displacement such that mitigation would be required (California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, 1999). Liquefaction could lead to ground settlement and lateral spreading; therefore, this issue is considered a potentially significant impact and will be evaluated in the EIR.

(iv.) Landslides?

No Impact. The project site is located in an urbanized coastal area that is relatively flat with a small engineered slope to the east. According to the State Seismic Hazards Zones map (Redondo Beach 7.5 Minute Quadrangle), the project site is not located within or near an area of previous occurrence of landslide movement (California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, 1999). Further, construction work that occurs near the slope to the east
would conform with standard engineering requirements such as the California Building Code (CBC, Tile 24, California Code of Regulations), which has been adopted by the City of Redondo Beach (RBMC Sections 9-1.00 and 9-1.01) and recommendations, as applicable, in site-specific geotechnical engineering report(s), and would not result in slope instability. No significant risk of loss, injury, or death associated with landslides is anticipated. Therefore, no impact relative to landslides is anticipated to occur and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Potentially Significant Impact. Although the project site is currently developed, the proposed project has the potential to expose surficial soils to wind and water erosion during construction phases. Construction activities would be required to comply with the General Construction Activities Stormwater Permit (GCASP) approved by the State Water Resources Control Board by Water Quality Order 99-08-DWQ, relative to satisfying National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements (RBMC Section 5-7.216), as applicable to projects that disturb one-acre or more of surface area. Erosion and sediment controls would be incorporated into project construction plans, as delineated within a project-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) required in conjunction with the GCASP. The SWPPP would identify provisions and practices that include implementation of BMPs for the installation, monitoring, and maintenance of control measures. The SWPPP would be prepared and submitted prior to the start of construction, and the BMP control measures would be installed prior to the occurrence of relevant construction activities, as specified in the SWPPP.

Adherence to SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) would also help to minimize wind erosion through soil stabilization measures. Table 1 presented in SCAQMD Rule 403 provides measures for construction activities to reduce fugitive dust. This includes measures for the application of water or stabilizing agents to prevent generation of dust plumes, pre-watering materials prior to use, use of tarps to enclose haul trucks, stabilizing sloping surfaces using soil binders until vegetation or ground cover effectively stabilize slopes, hydroseed prior to rain, washing mud and soils from equipment at the conclusion of trenching activities (see SCAQMD Rule 403 Table 1 for additional details). Impacts are anticipated to be less than significant impacts with compliance with existing rules and regulations; however, this will be evaluated in the EIR as part of the geology and water quality analysis.

Operation of land uses under the proposed project would be similar to existing conditions and is not anticipated to result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil. However, the proposed project does include the opening of Seaside Lagoon to the adjacent Harbor waters, which could affect erosion during construction and operation of the lagoon. Thus, impacts associated with erosion and loss of topsoil are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

c. Is the project located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project is located within a liquefaction zone area. Liquefaction could lead to ground settlement and lateral spreading. Lateral spreading is the downslope movement of surface sediment due to liquefaction in a subsurface layer. The downslope movement is due to gravity and earthquake shaking combined. Such movement can occur on slope gradients of as little as one degree. Lateral spreading typically damages pipelines, utilities, bridges, and structures. Lateral spreading of the ground surface during a seismic activity usually occurs along the weak shear zones within a liquefiable soil layer and has
been observed to generally take place toward a free face (i.e., retaining wall, slope, or channel) and to lesser extent on ground surfaces with a very gentle slope. A geotechnical engineering report would determine if the potential for ground failure exists as a result of liquefaction and to identify any special soil or foundation design requirements. Impacts associated with geologic stability could be potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

d. Is the project located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Expansive soils generally result from specific clay minerals that expand when saturated and shrink in volume when dry. The project site has previously been developed and much of the existing on-site soils consist of artificial fill, with the exception of the area east of Basin 3 and the eastern portion of the existing Pier Plaza which consists of eolian and dune deposits (California Department of Conservation, Geological Survey, 2010). These geologic deposits within the project area and previously imported fill soils could be expansive. Impacts resulting from expansive soils would be controlled through incorporation of modern construction engineering and safety standards and compliance with current building regulations. Furthermore, soils would be sampled and analyzed in a project-specific geotechnical engineering report to determine site-specific conditions and determine if special design requirements are necessary. However, the potential presence of expansive soils is considered a potentially significant impact and will be evaluated in the EIR.

e. Would the project have soils that are incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, there would be no impact and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

---

3 The State of California provides minimum standards for building design through the California Building Code (CBC, Title 24, California Code of Regulations). The CBC has been adopted by the City of Redondo Beach (RBMC Sections 9-1.00 and 9-1.01). The CBC is based on the International Building Code (formerly known as the Uniform Building Code), established by the International Code Council (formerly known as the International Council of Building Officials), which is used widely throughout the U.S. (generally adopted on a state-by-state or agency-by-agency basis), and has been modified for conditions within California. Therefore, this Initial Study assumes compliance with the CBC.
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b.</th>
<th>Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion;

a. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

b. Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Potentially Significant Impact (a and b). Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. These emissions occur from natural processes and human activities. Human activities that produce GHGs are the burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil and natural gas for heating and electricity, gasoline and diesel for transportation); methane from landfill wastes and raising livestock, deforestation activities; and some agricultural practices. Accumulating scientific evidence indicates a correlation between the worldwide proliferation of GHG emissions by mankind over the past century and increasing global temperatures (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007; U.S. Global Change Research Program, 2009; and California Energy Commission, 2009). The climate change associated with this global warming is predicted to produce negative economic and social consequences across the globe.

The most common GHGs emitted into the atmosphere from natural processes and human activities include carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), and fluorinated gases (hydrofluorocarbons and perfluorocarbons). Each GHG is assigned a global warming potential (GWP), which is the ability of a gas or aerosol to trap heat in the atmosphere. The GWP rating system is standardized to CO2, which has a value of one. For example, CH4 has a GWP of 21, which means that it has a global warming effect 21 times greater than CO2 on an equal-mass basis. Total GHG emissions from a source are often reported as a CO2 equivalent (CO2e). The CO2e is calculated by multiplying the emission of each GHG by its GWP and adding the results together to produce a single, combined emission rate representing all GHGs.

Assembly Bill (AB) 32, signed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger in 2006, directs the State of California to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. In accordance with AB 32, CARB developed the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan), which outlines how the state will achieve the necessary GHG emission reductions to achieve this goal (CARB, 2008; 2013).
GHG emissions would be released from a variety of fossil fuel-powered sources associated with the proposed project during construction and operation. Construction activities are short-term and cease to emit GHGs upon completion. Operation emissions associated with the proposed project would include GHG emissions from mobile sources (transportation), energy, water use and treatment, and waste disposal. GHG emissions from electricity use are indirect GHG emissions from the energy (purchased energy) that is produced off-site. These sources would have the potential to generate GHGs and result in a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, impacts associated with GHG emissions are potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.
VIII. **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Potential short-term hazards include construction activities involving the transport of fuels, lubricating fluids, solvents, and other potentially hazardous material. However, construction would not involve the handling of significant amounts of these substances. Additionally, all storage, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials is regulated by the agencies such as the USEPA, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), the City fire department, and the County fire department. All hazardous material used during construction of the proposed project would be used and stored and transported in compliance with applicable requirements.

It is unlikely that construction activities would involve the use of substantial quantities of hazardous materials and the most likely source of these materials would be from vehicles at the site. There could be small amounts of hazardous materials, including fuels and solvents and lubricants used to maintain equipment, however, these materials would be confined and located at the project site. Federal and state regulations that govern the storage of hazardous materials in containers (i.e., the types of materials and the size of packages containing hazardous materials), secondary confinement requirements, and the separation of containers holding hazardous materials, would limit potential contamination to a relatively small area and avoid a significant hazard. In compliance with the GCASP for stormwater discharges associated with construction activity and a project-specific SWPPP, appropriate BMPs would be used during construction activities to minimize runoff of contaminants and clean-up any spills. Applicable BMPs include, but are not limited to: vehicle and equipment fueling and maintenance; material delivery, storage, and use; spill prevention and control; solid and hazardous waste management; and contaminated soil management. Therefore, implementation of such construction provisions would minimize the potential for an accidental release of hazardous materials during construction activities.

Construction of the project would involve demolition and renovation of the existing onsite structures, which, due to their age, may contain asbestos and lead-based paints and materials. The removal of any asbestos-containing materials (ACM) would be required to comply with all applicable existing rules and regulations, including SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Demolition and Renovation Activities). SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities) requires work practices that limit asbestos emissions from building demolition and renovation activities, including the removal and disturbance of ACM. This rule is designed to protect uses and persons adjacent to demolition or renovation activity.
from exposure to asbestos emissions. Rule 1403 requires surveys of any facility being demolished or renovated for the presence of all friable and Class I and Class II non-friable ACM. Rule 1403 also establishes notification procedures, removal procedures, handling operations, and warning label requirements, including High-efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filtration, the glovebag method, wetting, and some methods of dry removal that must be implemented when disturbing appreciable amounts of ACM (more than 100 square feet of surface area).

In addition, the proposed project would be required to comply with California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (CalOSHA) regulations regarding lead-based paints and materials. The California Code of Regulations, Section 1532.1, requires testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based paints and materials, such that exposure levels do not exceed CalOSHA standards. Compliance with applicable standards would ensure impacts related to hazardous materials are less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project is not anticipated to involve the transport, use, or disposal of substantial quantities of hazardous materials such as significant hazard to the public or environment would occur. Small quantities of hazardous materials may be used on-site and would generally include materials (i.e., commercial cleansers, lubricants, paints, etc.) associated with janitorial, maintenance, and repair activities. These materials are currently used on the project site under baseline conditions. Further, the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would occur in compliance with applicable regulations as required by USEPA, California DTSC, OSHA, CalOSHA, the City fire department, and the County fire department.

Currently chlorine is used to treat water used in Seaside Lagoon. The water is subsequently dechlorinated before it is released into the Harbor. The chlorine and dechlorinator are stored in tanks located on-site. Under the proposed project, Seaside Lagoon would be opened to the adjacent Harbor waters, which would eliminate the use of chlorine and dechlorinator being transported, used and stored at the project site, and, in turn, would result in removal of the existing storage tanks. Therefore, impacts associated with routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

b. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact. Some of the existing land uses that currently operate within and near the project site use or generate hazardous materials. According to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker data management system, two permitted underground storage tanks, one DTSC cleanup site, and two cases of leaking underground storage tanks (LUST) are found within the general vicinity of project site (SWRCB, 2013; DTSC, 2013). While there is no known soil or groundwater contamination, the project site may potentially contain unknown contamination related to existing and/or past uses on-site or surrounding properties. Therefore, there is the potential for soil or groundwater contamination associated with past or existing uses to be encountered during excavation which could create a hazard to the public or the environment and this will be evaluated in the EIR.

As discussed under Item VIII(a) above, construction activities would require the use and transport of hazardous materials such as asphalt, paints, and other solvents and the use of equipment that contains oil, gas, or hydraulic fluids that could be spilled during normal usage or during refueling. Quantities would be small and routine construction practices would include
measures to prevent/contain/clean-up spills and contamination from fuels, solvents, concrete wastes and other waste materials. In-water construction activities have a small potential for hazardous material releases into Harbor waters from accidents or upsets. Spill prevention and cleanup procedures for the proposed project would be addressed in a SWPPP that would be implemented by the construction contractor. The SWPPP would define actions to minimize potentials for spills (such as the proper storage of materials, perimeter control measures, and use of appropriate waste disposal practices, such as leak proof containment) and provide efficient responses to spill events (i.e., timely locate the release, prevent further releases, contain release, clean-up) to minimize the magnitude of the spill and extent of impacts. This would include compliance with California Water Code Section 13271 and 13272, which requires that the Office of Emergency Services (OES) be notified in the event of a discharge in or on any waters of the state. Implementation of such construction provisions would minimize the potential for an accidental release of hazardous materials during construction activities and ensure there would not be a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore impacts are considered less than significant associated with construction activities and will not be evaluated further in the EIR consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

As described under Item VIII(a) above, the potential exists for the existing buildings to contain lead-based paints/materials and/or ACM. Should such materials be found, abatement and disposal would occur in compliance with applicable regulations and thus the impact associated with lead-based paint/material and ACM would be less than significant and will not be discussed further in the EIR.

As discussed under Item VIII(a) above, small quantities of hazardous materials may be used or stored on-site during project operations. Similar storage occurs on-site under existing conditions. Furthermore, these materials would be handled in compliance with applicable rules and regulations and thus impacts would be less than significant and will not be discussed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

The potential for a significant hazard to the public or environment to occur through the reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of existing hazardous materials into the environment during excavation activities will be further evaluated in the EIR.

c. **Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**No Impact.** There are no schools located within one-quarter mile of the project site. The nearest schools to the project site include the South Bay Faith Academy and Redondo Beach High School located approximately 0.29-mile and 0.45-mile, respectively, east of the project site. As such, the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions within 0.25-mile of an existing school and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

d. **Is the project located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As described under Item VIII(b) above, the SWRCB GeoTracker data management system lists one DTSC cleanup site, and two closed LUST sites.
within the vicinity of the project site. This potential for a significant hazard to the public or the environment to occur will be evaluated in the EIR.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport. The closest airport is the Torrance Municipal Airport, which is approximately four miles southeast from the project site. The Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is approximately six miles from the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

f. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

**No Impact.** The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip or heliport. Therefore, there would be no impact and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

g. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Redondo Beach Fire Department currently provides emergency medical and fire protection support to the project site. The Redondo Beach Police Department is responsible for coordinating law enforcement and traffic control operations in emergency situations. The City of Redondo Beach has identified evacuation routes in case of earthquake, fire, flooding, landslides, hazardous spills, and tsunami. In the project vicinity, evacuation routes include Pacific Coast Highway, Herondo Street, Beryl Street (immediately to the northeast of the project site), and Torrance Boulevard north of the Torrance Boulevard and Catalina Avenue intersection (southeast of the project site) (City of Redondo Beach, 2011). No identified evacuation routes are within the project boundaries, although the Torrance Circle connects with the evacuation route that begins on Torrance Boulevard at the Catalina intersection.

There could be a temporary interference with local emergency response should lane or roadway closures be required on roads within the project site. However, any on-street construction activities or closures would conform to traffic work plan and access standards, including coordination with emergency service providers in accordance and the California Fire Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Section 9).

As part of the proposed project, a Pacific Avenue reconnection would be established. The Pacific Avenue reconnection would replace the existing fire lane and access road along the International Boardwalk. The Pacific Avenue reconnection would improve emergency access to the site and the immediately adjacent, high density residential area. However, this will be evaluated further in the EIR.

Per state fire and building codes, sufficient space would have to be provided around the new buildings for emergency personnel and equipment access and emergency evacuation. All project elements, including landscaping, would be sited with sufficient clearance from existing
and proposed structures so as not to interfere with emergency access to and evacuation from the project site.

Given compliance with fire code and other emergency access provisions, it is anticipated that no interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would occur during construction or operation. However, this will be evaluated further in the EIR.

h. Would the project expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

No Impact. There are no wildlands at or near the project site, as identified on the latest Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) maps (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, 2007). Therefore, there would be no impact and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX.</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-site or off-site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| X | |

j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| X | |

### Discussion:

**a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Construction of the waterside improvements (e.g., a small craft boat launch ramp, pedestrian bridge, and the opening of Seaside Lagoon to adjacent Harbor waters) may result in erosion and temporary water quality impacts such as turbidity and re-suspension of sediments in the adjacent Harbor waters. In addition, landside construction could result in erosion, sedimentation, and other potential sources of surface water pollutants. Erosion and sedimentation would be reduced through compliance with Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), which would also help to minimize wind erosion as discussed previously under Item VI(b); however, impacts associated with construction-related water quality are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

The proposed project would include a new on-site storm drain system, which would be similar to the existing drainage patterns and discharge locations. As part of the new on-site stormwater drainage system, LID BMPs would be incorporated in order to address water quality requirements prior to discharging to the receiving waters (RBMC Title 5, Chapter 7). Common post-construction BMPs include filtering stormwater through vegetated areas prior to discharge into the City’s storm drain system or retaining stormwater on-site to infiltrate into the ground. The proposed project would also have to comply with the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board MS4 Permit that discusses these BMPs in greater detail (Permit CAS004001) (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, 2007). It is anticipated that this will result in operational benefits to water quality. Additionally, the opening of the Seaside Lagoon to the King Harbor would eliminate the current need for chlorination of the lagoon water, which is also expected to benefit water quality. Uses under the proposed project would remain similar to existing uses; thus, a new source of waste discharge or water quality violation is not anticipated. However, the opening of Seaside Lagoon to the adjacent Harbor waters may result in erosion associated with operation. Therefore, further evaluation is required to determine if this could result in water quality impacts associated with turbidity and suspension of sediments. Operational impacts are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.
b. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site overlies the West Coast Basin but is within the saltwater intrusion area and thus no groundwater extraction occurs within or adjacent to the project site (Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 2007; and U.S. Geological Survey, 2014). The proposed project would receive its water supply from the California Water Service Company (CWSC). Part of CWSC’s water supply comes from groundwater, which comes from an adjudicated basin. The adjudicated basin limits groundwater pumping to safe yield amounts (safe yield based upon a calculation of rate of groundwater replenishment, see 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, Section 4.1, page 47). Furthermore, the project site is largely impervious under existing conditions with the exception of Seaside Lagoon and small areas of ornamental landscaping and thus does not make a substantial contribution to groundwater recharge. The amount of groundwater infiltration in the area would increase under the proposed project as a result of increased landscaped area and the implementation of LID BMPs (RBMC Title 5, Chapter 7), and the Los Angeles County NPDES Permit. As discussed under Item IX(a) above, common post-construction BMPs include filtering stormwater through vegetated areas prior to discharge into the City’s storm drain system or retaining stormwater on-site to infiltrate into the ground, which would help recharge the underlying groundwater. Therefore, no impact to groundwater recharge or groundwater supplies would occur. The impact would be less than significant and this issue will not be evaluated in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is currently developed and site runoff is captured and conveyed via a stormwater drainage system. There are no streams or rivers located on-site. However, the opening up of Seaside Lagoon to King Harbor has the potential to affect erosion or siltation.

The existing storm drain system would be replaced or upgraded under the proposed project to better to accommodate the runoff associated with the new site design. A site drainage plan, subject to review by the City Engineer, would minimize the potential for on- and off-site erosion or siltation to occur. The final grading and drainage plan would be approved by the City Engineer during plan check review.

There is the potential for erosion or siltation to occur during construction, particularly during demolition and grading activities; however construction would comply with the requirements in the NPDES Permit, which would minimize the amount of runoff from the site and potential for substantial erosion or siltation to occur. However, the potential for the existing drainage pattern of the site to be altered in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation to occur on-site or off-site will be evaluated in the EIR.
d. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-site or off-site?

Potentially Significant Impact. No streams or rivers traverse the project site; thus, the proposed project would not result in the alteration of the course of a stream or river. However, under the proposed project, Seaside Lagoon would be opened to King Harbor, which could affect surface runoff. The remainder of the project site is currently developed with primarily impervious surfaces, in which the site runoff is captured and conveyed via a stormwater drainage system. The amount of impervious surface area would decrease under the proposed project as a result of increased landscaped area and the implementation of LID BMPs and the rate or amount of surface runoff is not expected to increase.

The proposed project would include the upgrade or replacement of the on-site storm drain system to accommodate the runoff associated with the new site design. The new stormwater drainage system is expected to result in similar drainage patterns and discharge locations. The new storm drain system would also comply with drainage and runoff guidelines pursuant to RBMC Section 5-7.218, which requires the preparation of the local SWPPP that meets all requirements of the SWPPP as required by the GCASP. It is anticipated that the runoff from the project site would not increase compared to the existing conditions and that the new or upgraded storm drain system would minimize the potential for flooding to occur on-site or off-site. However, potential impacts associated with alterations of the drainage pattern of the site, including modifications to Seaside Lagoon, will be evaluated in the EIR as part of the water quality analysis.

e. Would the project create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would include a new or upgraded on-site storm drain system designed to accommodate the projected runoff associated with the proposed project. The modifications to the on-site storm drain system would comply with drainage and runoff guidelines pursuant to Redondo Beach Stormwater and Urban Runoff Pollution Control Regulations (RBMC Section 5-7.101 et seq.). Therefore, it is anticipated that adequate storm drain capacity would be provided; however this will be evaluated in the EIR.

Uses under the proposed project would remain similar to existing uses and thus a new source of polluted runoff is not anticipated. Additionally, the proposed project is required to comply with regulations regarding surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). These regulations include preparation of a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) to reduce potential post-construction water quality impacts. The proposed project is classified as a priority project per Los Angeles County SUSMP guidelines. A redevelopment project is classified as a priority project if it results in the creation, addition, or replacement of 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface area on an already developed site. As part of the SUSMP, the proposed project would comply with LID and hydro-modification requirements.

However, potential water quality impacts, including potential impacts associated with modifications to Seaside Lagoon will be evaluated in the EIR.
f. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** Waterside and in-water construction activities, including a small craft boat launch ramp, the opening of Seaside Lagoon, and pedestrian bridge could potentially affect the water quality of Harbor waters (i.e., turbidity and erosion). The EIR will evaluate if such impacts are significant. Operation of the proposed project is not expected to affect or otherwise degrade the water quality beyond the issues discussed in Item IX(a) above, and are considered less than significant. However, as described in Item IX(a) above, both construction and operation impacts on water quality will be further evaluated in the EIR.

g. Would the project place housing within a 100-year floodplain, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

**No Impact.** The proposed project does not include the construction of housing. No impacts would occur. Therefore, this issue will not be addressed in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

h. Would the project place within a 100-year floodplain structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map (DFIRM) Community Panel Number 06037C1907F and 06037C1909F and the National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) database, the project site is located within numerous flood zones (FEMA, 2008). The Horseshoe Pier is within Zone VE which is subject to one percent or greater annual chance of flooding in any given year (i.e., 100-year flood zone) with additional hazards associated with velocity wave action. Basin 3 is within Zone AE which is identified as Special Flood Hazard Area subject to inundation by the one percent annual chance flood, also known as the base flood, which has a one percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. The landside portion of the project site is outside the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain. The proposed project includes new development within flood zones and thus could involve construction of structures that may impede or redirect flows. Impacts are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

i. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is not within any potential dam or levee inundation area, but is located within the 100-year designated flood zone. New structures would be constructed above the flood plain and tidal elevation and thus are not expected to expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding; however, this will be evaluated in the EIR.

The paved corridor along the International Boardwalk that connects the northern and southern portion of the project site is currently subject to periodic ocean flooding during high tides and storm events. The proposed project would enhance bulkheads and raise the finished elevation at this location, which is expected to greatly reduce the potential for flooding to occur on-site. However, this will be evaluated further in the EIR.
j. Would the project contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** A mudflow (or debris flow) is rapidly moving slurry of water, mud, rock, vegetation and debris. However, the project site is in an urbanized area and is not located on a slope or in a naturalized area that could cause debris to flow from or over the site. No mudflow impacts would occur.

Tsunamis are gravity waves of long wavelengths generated by seismic activities that cause vertical motions of the earth’s crust. A vertical displacement of this nature leads to a corresponding displacement of the overlying water mass that can set off transoceanic waves of great lengths (up to hundreds of miles) containing large amounts of energy. Although such waves are usually hard to detect in relatively deep ocean waters, they amplify significantly as their lengths become shorter when propagating onto the continental shelf and toward the coast and can result in coastal inundation, damage of onshore structures/properties, loss of life disruption of natural and built environments, and Harbor surges.

The project site is located along the Pacific Ocean and is within a recommended evacuation area for its tsunami hazard risk, according to the California Geological Survey and the Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning (Redondo Beach Quadrangle) (California Emergency Management Agency, 2009). Impacts associated with tsunamis inundation is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

Seiches are seismically induced water waves that surge back and forth in an enclosed basin and could occur in Basin 3 as a result of earthquakes. Effects from a seiche would be expected to be less detrimental than those of a tsunami; potential impacts associated with tsunamis will be evaluated in the EIR as a worst-case scenario.

Models suggest that sea levels along the California coast could rise substantially over the next century as a result of climate change. Risks associated with rising sea levels include inundation of low lying areas along the coast, exposure of new areas to flood risk, an increase in the intensity and risk in areas already susceptible to flooding, and an increase in coastal erosion in erosion prone areas. Potential impacts associated with inundation from tsunamis and sea level rise are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. **Would the project physically divide an established community?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project involves revitalization of a site that is already developed and located at the western edge of the City, and thus the project would not physically divide the community. Currently, the northern and southern portions of the project site have limited vehicle and pedestrian connectivity. The proposed pedestrian bridge and promenade as well as the Pacific Avenue reconnection would improve the connectivity within the project site and Harbor area as a whole by providing a direct pedestrian and motor vehicle link between the northern and southern portions of the site. For public vehicles, it would eliminate the need to exit the Harbor area to Catalina Avenue for travel from one end of the Harbor to the other. The new pedestrian and vehicle connections would improve the connectivity of the waterfront and would not physically divide an established community. While implementation of the proposed project would remove physical divisions of the established community and would not physically divide an established community, the issue of pedestrian/bicycle/vehicle impacts will be further evaluated as part of the circulation analysis in the Transportation/Traffic Section in the EIR.

b. **Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site has a zoning classification of CC-1, CC-2, CC-3 and CC-4 (Coastal Commercial) and P-PRO (Parks, Recreation, and Open Space) and Coastal Land Use Plan designations of CR Commercial Recreation and P-PRO Parks, Recreation and Open Space. Additional details regarding the City’s land use regulations for this site are included in Section 3.3 above. The proposed project would retain many existing coastal commercial and recreational uses and the amount of net new development would increase by
approximately 289,906 square feet, which is within the limits of new development established under the applicable land use plans and zoning code. The proposed uses (described in greater detail in Section 4 above) would be consistent with the City’s LCP. As discussed in Redondo Beach Resolution No. 2011-09-HC-002 (Shade Hotel) there are approximately 371,638 remaining square feet of allowed development under the City's 400,000 square foot limit (RBMC Sections 10-5.813(a), 10-5.814(a), 100815(a), and 10-5.816(a)). Subsequent to the adoption of this resolution, there was an amendment to the Shade Hotel Project approval, which increased the square footage by 8,649 square feet (allowing for an additional 362,989 square feet under the City’s Limits). Since the proposed increase in square footage is within allowable limits, it is anticipated that no conflict with the land use designation and zoning classification would occur; therefore impacts would be less than significant. However, any inconsistencies with applicable plans will be evaluated further in the EIR.

c. Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?

No Impact. The proposed project site and surrounding areas are not part of any habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The closest significant ecological area (SEA) is the Madrona Marsh, approximately three miles east of the project site (County of Los Angeles, 2013). Therefore, there would be no impact and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact. The project site is located in an urbanized area. The Los Angeles County General Plan and Draft 2035 General Plan do not delineate any important mineral resources for Redondo Beach (County of Los Angeles, 1990 and 2014), and there are no mineral extraction or processing facilities on or near the site. However, the project site is within the Torrance oil field, where significant oil deposits and supplies are located (California Department of Conservation, 2001). The City has previously entered into long-term agreements whereby these petroleum deposits were safely extracted, transported, and used for commercial purposes. A number of small oil wells previously operated in the City and distributed petroleum within and outside the City through a series of underground pipelines. There are a number of abandoned wells located immediately to the north of the project site but no active wells are within the project site or immediate vicinity. The site is currently developed with commercial and recreational uses and not used for oil production and extraction. Likewise, the proposed project involves commercial and recreation uses with no oil production or extraction. Further, the proposed project would not change the accessibility of any mineral resources at or near the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any mineral resource areas. No impact would occur and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

b. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

No Impact. The project site is located in an urbanized area with primarily commercial and recreational uses. As discussed above, no mineral resources are known to exist within the vicinity with the exception of oil. There are no active oil extraction facilities located within the project site and given that the site is developed with commercial and recreational uses, they are not likely to be established. No impacts to mineral resources would occur and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exposure of persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?

b. Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

c. Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Potentially Significant Impact (a, c, and d). Construction could generate noise from construction equipment. Upon the completion of construction, the predominant source of noise in the project vicinity would be generated from traffic associated with vehicle trips to and from the project site and on-site activity within the project site. This may increase noise levels; therefore, a noise analysis will be prepared to determine if the proposed project would result in
significant impacts associated with noise. Noise impacts are considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

b. **Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The greatest groundborne vibration is generated during pile driving, rock blasting, soil compacting, jack hammering, and demolition-related activities such as materials recycling. Jack hammering would be required to demolish the existing parking structure and site clearing and grading would require the use of heavy equipment (e.g., bulldozers, large trucks, etc.), which may result in a ground vibration that could be felt by surrounding land uses. Pile driving or alternative soil improvement methods may be required to support new buildings and boardwalks and to provide additional pier support if necessary. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.

e. **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within two miles of a public airport. The closest airport, Torrance Municipal Airport, is located approximately four miles to the southeast of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The proposed project would not expose people residing or working at the project site to excessive noise related to a public airport. Therefore, there would be no impact and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

f. **For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project is not near a private airstrip or heliport. No impacts related to a private airstrip would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and business) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not establish new residential uses, require extension of roads or other infrastructure sufficient to induce substantial population growth (i.e. the project would not introduce new roads or infrastructure into previously uninhabited areas), or result in the relocation of substantial numbers of people from outside of the region. The proposed project would involve an increase in employment but given the proposed project’s location within a well-established urban community with a large population base and an existing housing stock, a large existing labor pool in the local area and region as a whole, and established infrastructure, it would not induce population growth in the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly which would result in significant environmental impacts. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. No existing housing would be removed as part of the proposed project. No replacement housing would be needed or required associated with the implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no impact and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

4 As of March 2014, the unemployment rate in Redondo Beach is 4.6 percent (2,100 workers) and 8.7 percent (435,000 workers) in the Los Angeles County (California Employment Development Department, 2014).
c. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. There is no housing within the project site that would be displaced as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in the displacement of any persons and the need for replacement housing. Therefore, there would be no impact and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fire protection?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion:

a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i.) Fire Protection

Less Than Significant Impact. The Redondo Beach Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency response services in the project site and surrounding area. Fire Stations #1 (401 South Broadway) and #3 (280 Marina Way) are the closest fire stations to the project site, each located within a half mile of the site.

The proposed project would be designed to meet modern fire safety codes, including access requirements and fire suppression and emergency response systems. In addition, the Redondo Beach Fire Department would check and review site design plans for compliance with appropriate safety codes prior to construction.

The proposed project is not expected to increase fire response times because it is located within the existing service area of the Fire Department and may actually decrease response times through improved connectivity and access. The proposed project is not expected to otherwise generate the need for new or expanded facilities; therefore impacts are considered less than
significant. However, the potential for a significant impact to occur relative to fire services will be evaluated in the EIR.

ii.) Police Protection

Potentially Significant Impact. The Redondo Beach Police Department provides police protection and emergency services in the project site and surrounding area. The Redondo Beach Police Main Station is located at 401 Diamond Street. The Pier Sub-Station is located within the project site (at 100 West Torrance Boulevard) and provides services to residents and businesses along the pier and adjacent areas. The substation may be replaced as part of the proposed project; however, the location has not yet been determined. Additional analysis is required to determine if the elimination of, or construction and operation of, the substation could have potentially significant impacts. Therefore, this impact is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated further in the EIR.

iii) Schools

No Impact. The demand for new schools is generally associated with increases in the school-aged population or decreases in the accessibility and availability of existing schools. The proposed project consists of coastal commercial and recreation uses, and would not include residential uses that could increase school-age population or modify school facilities in the area. The proposed project could result in an increase in the number of employees, but there is a large existing labor pool in the local area and region as a whole, thus, this is not expected to increase demand on schools beyond that which currently exists. While Redondo Beach Unified School District has a procedure under which a student residing outside of the district boundaries may apply to attend schools within the district, criteria to apply for an interdistrict permit does not include parental employment in Redondo Beach (Redondo Beach Unified School District, 2012). Thus, an increase in employment opportunities is not expected to increase school demand such that there is a need for new or physically altered school facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact schools, and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

iv) Parks

Potentially Significant Impact. The project would result in reconfiguration and enhancement of existing parkland at the Seaside Lagoon, and would provide substantial new public open space and recreational areas. While no new construction of parks to maintain acceptable service ratios is required, potential impacts associated with construction and operation of recreational facilities and public open space will be evaluated further in the EIR as detailed under Item XV(a and b) (see below).

v) Other Public Facilities

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not increase population growth; thus, it would not require expansion of any public services such as libraries or hospitals. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant and will not be addressed further in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).
XV. RECREATION. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion:**

a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

**Potentially Significant Impact (a and b).** The demand for parks is generally associated with the increase of housing or population into an area. The proposed project does not include residential uses; therefore, no increased demand for recreational facilities associated with population growth would occur. However, the Redondo Beach waterfront attracts tourists from outside the local area who use the existing recreational facilities (i.e., public beaches, bicycle path, marinas, Seaside Lagoon, and Veterans Park). It is anticipated that the proposed project would increase visitors to the waterfront, and therefore, the use of recreational facilities within and near the project site may increase. Additional analysis is required to determine if this increase in visitors to the waterfront would result in substantial physical deterioration of recreational facilities. During construction, temporary closures of recreational facilities (water and land) may be required. The EIR will evaluate if the temporary closures would increase use of other facilities such that physical deterioration would occur. Further, the pedestrian bridge may preclude sail boats from using Basin 3. Therefore, the potential impacts associated with the use of recreational facilities are potentially significant and will be further evaluated in the EIR.
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

a. Would the project exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project would generate new vehicle trips to the area during construction and operation. A traffic impact analysis will be conducted to determine if the proposed project would exceed the capacity of the street system. This impact is considered potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

b. Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Potentially Significant Impact. Automobile and truck trips generated during construction and operation of the proposed project could increase traffic on area roadways and project access points. Such traffic increases may cause an exceedance of level of service standards for Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP) intersections, such as along Pacific Coast Highway, I-405, and I-110. Therefore, traffic increases that would occur because of the proposed project would be potentially significant and will be evaluated in the EIR.

c. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No Impact. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan and does not include any structures that would change air traffic patterns or uses that would generate air traffic. Therefore, no impacts related to a change in air traffic patterns would occur and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

d. Would the project substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less Than Significant Impact. While new development would occur, the uses would remain consistent with the existing coastal commercial and recreation land use designations and thus no establishment of incompatible uses would occur. The proposed project would include the Pacific Avenue reconnection to connect with Torrance Boulevard, new and modified parking structures, and modifications to bicycle paths. The reconnection of Pacific Avenue would provide an alternative to motorists entering and exiting the northern portion of the project site to the 180 degree turn connecting Pacific Avenue and Harbor Drive. It is anticipated that the modified intersection will not result in a significant impact; nevertheless, this issue will be evaluated further in the EIR.
e. **Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** During construction, there could be a temporary interference with local emergency response should lane or roadway closures be required. Any on-street construction activities or closures would conform to traffic work plan and access standards, including coordination with emergency service providers in accordance with City temporary street closure requirements and the California Fire Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations, Section 9).

As part of the proposed project, a Pacific Avenue reconnection would be established. The new roadway would be designed to improve emergency access to the site. As with the Pacific Avenue reconnection, all new development would be required to comply with emergency access requirements, including the California Fire Code, which has been adopted by the City of Redondo Beach, and provisions in the City’s Fire Prevention Code pertaining specifically to the Harbor (RBMC Section 3-4.401). As part of the project approval process, the Redondo Beach Fire Department would review the design plans of the proposed project to ensure that emergency access to, from, and within the project site is adequate and complies with all applicable access requirements.

Given compliance with fire code and other emergency access provisions, it is anticipated that the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. However, the potential for project construction and operation of the proposed project to interfere with emergency access will be evaluated in the EIR.

f. **Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Public bus transit service in the project vicinity is currently provided by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and Beach Cities Transit bus lines. Metro operates one transit bus route between LAX and downtown Long Beach via Sepulveda Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway. Beach Cities Transit operates one bus line in the vicinity of the proposed project: the Red line runs north-south along Catalina Avenue (heading north from Redondo Beach, Catalina Avenue becomes Harbor Drive, Hermosa Avenue, Manhattan Avenue, and Highland Avenue) between the LAX City Bus Center and Palos Verdes Boulevard. The proposed project would not result in the elimination of existing bus access to the project site. Additionally, the new and improved pedestrian and bicycle paths would be designed to encourage the local community to bike or walk to and around the waterfront and would complete a portion of the California Coastal Trail. Therefore, it is anticipated that the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation and impacts would be less than significant; however, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR as part of the Transportation/Traffic Section.
### UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable regional water quality control board?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion:

a. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable regional water quality control board?

b. Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

e. Has the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Potentially Significant Impact (a, b, and e). The proposed project would be required to conform to all applicable wastewater standards set forth by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. During construction, water would be required primarily for dust suppression, but would also be used for concrete washout and soil compaction. This water percolates into the ground after use or evaporates, requiring no wastewater treatment.

The quality of wastewater generated by the proposed project would be similar to that generated by other uses currently existing at the site. However, the proposed project would also replace older existing inefficient fixtures with modern more water efficient fixtures (e.g., low flow toilets) as required for new development under the California Plumbing Code (Title 24, Cal. Code Regs., Part 5, Chapter 4). Similarly, existing and future cumulative projects will also be required to reduce their wastewater generation pursuant to Senate Bill 407 [2009] (Civil Code Section 1101.1 et seq.). All wastewater generated by the interior plumbing system of the proposed project would be discharged into the local sewer main and conveyed for treatment at the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts’ Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP), located in the City of Carson. The JWPCP has a capacity of treating 400 million gallons per day (mgd) and currently processes an average flow of 280 million gallons of wastewater per day (Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, 2014). The JWPCP is part of the Joint Outfall System, a regional interconnected system that provides wastewater conveyance and treatment, water reuse, and effluent disposal for residential, commercial, and industrial users within Los Angeles County. The Sanitation Districts conduct facilities planning efforts to ensure the ability to meet wastewater management needs associated with growing populations, changing regulatory requirements, and aging infrastructure. In November 2012, the Sanitation Districts prepared a Master Facilities Plan (MFP) that identifies near-term and long-term actions to ensure the continuation of a wastewater collection, treatment, and management services throughout Los Angeles County through the year 2050 (Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, 2014). As described in Section 4.7.2 of the MFP, wastewater flows to the JWPCP have decreased slightly over approximately the last 15 years. Given that there is existing capacity at JWPCP and planning efforts underway to ensure future capacity, it is anticipated that sufficient capacity exists at the JWPCP to process wastewater associated with the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the construction of new treatment facilities and impacts would be less than significant. However, the capacity of associated local wastewater infrastructure (i.e., sewer main line) to accommodate potentially increased wastewater generation will be evaluated in the EIR.
c. Would the project require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is currently served by an existing on-site storm drainage system. However, it is anticipated that upgrades to the existing system would be required to meet current standards and better accommodate stormwater runoff from the proposed project. Potentially significant impacts related to construction of new facilities or expansion of existing facilities will be evaluated in the EIR.

d. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The potable water supply for the proposed project would be delivered by the Hermosa-Redondo District of California Water Service Company (CWSC), which uses groundwater, imported surface water, and recycled supplies. Water demand in the Hermosa-Redondo District is anticipated to increase from 11,882 acre feet per year (AFY) to 14,838 AFY between 2010 and 2040. The projected water supply available is currently 12,516 AFY and is anticipated to be 15,311 AFY in 2040 (CWSC, Table 16, Hermosa-Redondo District Urban Water Management Plan). The Hermosa-Redondo District proactively maintains and upgrades its facilities to ensure a reliable, high-quality supply. Construction of the proposed project would use water for various purposes, such as dust suppression, mixing and pouring concrete, and other construction-related activities. Typically, the majority of water use during construction is associated with dust suppression during grading or trenching, which is generally performed by water trucks. Water usage during construction would be temporary and insubstantial and would not exceed the existing supply. However, operation of the proposed project would result in increased demand for water. A water supply assessment will be required to determine the level of increase in water demand and if sufficient supplies are available from existing entitlements and resources. This is a potentially significant impact and will be evaluated in the EIR.

f. Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

g. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

**Less Than Significant Impact (f and g).** The proposed project would generate construction debris from demolition and site clearing. This material would be recycled to the degree feasible which would reduce the amount of material requiring landfill disposal. Additionally, there is currently sufficient inert (i.e., construction debris) waste disposal capacity available in Los Angeles County (County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 2013) and, therefore, no significant impacts relative to construction waste are anticipated; nevertheless, this issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.

Operation of the proposed project would likely generate increased amounts of solid waste as compared to the existing development. This increase is not anticipated to generate solid waste in an amount that would exceed permitted landfill capacity. Further, as described below, the project would be required to comply with waste reduction and diversion requirements which would reduce the amount of waste requiring disposal in a landfill. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated; nevertheless, this issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.
The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable federal, state, County, and City statutes and regulations pertaining to solid waste disposal. This includes compliance with AB 939, the California Solid Waste Management Act, which requires each city in the state to divert at least 50 percent of their solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, and composting. AB 341 builds upon AB 939 and requires jurisdictions to implement mandatory commercial recycling with a statewide 75 percent diversion rate (from landfill disposal) by 2020. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant. However, the EIR will include a discussion of relevant solid waste regulations that the proposed project must comply with as part of the evaluation of potential solid waste impacts in the EIR.
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? 

   Potentially Significant Impact.

   As described in this Initial Study, the proposed project could potentially result in significant impacts on the quality of the environment with regard to several resource areas including biological resources and cultural resources. These potential impacts will be evaluated in the EIR.

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

   Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project, in conjunction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future related projects, has the potential to result in significant cumulative impacts when the independent impacts of the proposed project and the impacts of related projects combine to create impacts greater than those of the proposed project alone. 

   Discussion:

   a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

   Potentially Significant Impact.

   b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable?
list of the related projects or growth projections will be developed for the EIR. The potential for the proposed project in conjunction with the related projects and their cumulative contributions to environmental impacts will be evaluated in the EIR. The cumulative impacts addressed in the EIR will be the same as the individual resource areas to be evaluated in the EIR, which include topics in the following issue areas: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, noise, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, utilities and service systems.

The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerably contribution to the environmental factors which require no further analysis in the EIR. These factors were not carried forward for further analysis in the EIR (additional information is also provided in the analyses above):

**Aesthetics (Criterion b)**

The project site is not visible from any scenic highways, not does it have any trees or rock outcroppings of scenic significance. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to cumulatively considerable impact relative to scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

**Agriculture and Forest Resources (Criteria a, b, c, d, e)**

The project site is in an urbanized area with no agriculture and forest land or uses in the vicinity. The proposed project would not impact agricultural or forest resources and, thus, would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact relative to agriculture and forest resources.

**Biological Resources (Criterion f)**

The proposed project is not located within an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or any other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan habitat and conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The proposed project would have no impact and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact relative to an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or any other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan habitat and conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

**Cultural Resources (Criterion d)**

The proposed project is a developed site and not within any known historical or modern cemetery. In the unlikely event that human remains are disturbed, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable state laws. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects would also be required to comply with the same regulations. The proposed project would not result in significant impacts relative to disturbing human remains and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.
Geology/Soils (Criteria a(iv), e)

The proposed project is a relatively flat site that is not located within a landslide hazard area. The proposed project would have no impact relative to landslides, nor would it contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

Likewise, the proposed project does not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems, nor would it contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact relative to septic tanks and alternative wastewater disposal systems.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Criteria a, c, e, f, h)

All past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects that involve the handling of hazardous materials would be subject to the same regulations regarding waste handing, removal, transport, and storage as the proposed project. Implementation of these preventative measures would minimize the potential for risks associated with hazardous materials, including routine transport, use or disposal, such that no significant cumulative impacts would occur. The proposed project would not result in significant impacts relative to routine transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

The proposed project is not within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts relative to handing hazards or hazardous materials in the vicinity or school and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

Likewise, the proposed project is not in the vicinity of a public or private airport or airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts relative to being in proximity of an airport or airstrip and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

Hydrology and Water Quality (Criteria b, g)

No groundwater extraction occurs within or adjacent to the project site and no substantial change in impervious surface area would occur that could affect groundwater recharge. Thus, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact regarding groundwater recharge. The proposed project, as with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, receives part of the water supply from groundwater. The groundwater comes from an adjudicated basin which limits groundwater pumping to safe yield amounts. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact and would not contribute to a cumulative considerable impact relative to groundwater use.

Land Use and Planning (Criterion c)

The proposed project is not located within a habitat and conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The proposed project would have no impact and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact relative to a habitat and conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.
Mineral Resources (Criteria a, b)

The project site is within the Torrance oil field where significant oil deposits and supplies are located. The project site is developed with existing commercial and recreational uses and no mineral resources or mineral resource extraction occurs on site or in the immediate vicinity. The proposed project would not affect the availability or accessibility of mineral resources. Likewise, past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects would largely occur on previously disturbed land that is not appropriate or available for mineral extraction and thus no cumulative impacts would occur. The proposed project would not impact mineral resources or mineral resource extraction and would not contribute to a cumulative considerable impact relative to mineral resources.

Noise (Criteria e, f)

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of an airport or airstrip. The proposed project would have no impact and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact relative to an airport land use plan, or being located in the vicinity of an airport or airstrip.

Population and Housing (Criteria a, b, c)

The proposed project would not establish new residential uses, require extension of roads or other infrastructure, or result in the relocation of substantial numbers of people from outside of the region. The proposed project would increase employment opportunities, as could past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects. This growth in employment opportunities would occur within an existing urbanized area that has established infrastructure, well-developed transportation network, and existing public services. Given that the area is part of a well-established urban community connected by an existing transportation network and large labor pool and housing market, the combined related projects are not expected to significantly impact population growth, resulting in the need for new housing in the project vicinity or the region.

The proposed project would not remove housing or support new construction of housing. It would involve an increase in employment opportunities but given that it is located within a well-established urban community with an existing housing stock and established infrastructure, it would not result in the need for construction of new housing. The proposed project would not result in a significant impact and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact on population and housing.

Public Services (Criteria a(iii),(v))

The proposed project would not increase school-age population or modify school facilities in the area. The proposed project would not result in a significant impact and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact on schools.

The past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects are all located in an urbanized area within a well-developed network of existing public facilities, such as libraries and hospitals. The past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects could increase demand for public facilities. Service providers continuously evaluate levels of services and funding sources to meet demand, typically based on development and population growth projections. Service providers will continue to consider existing service requirements and reasonably...
foreseeable development in their long-range planning in order to ensure that adequate service would be provided to all existing and future project sites within their service area. Therefore, the combined related projects are not expected to significantly impact other public facilities such as libraries and hospitals. The proposed project would not result in a significant impact and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact on other public facilities.

Transportation/Traffic (Criterion c)

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of an airport or airstrip and would not affect air traffic patterns. The proposed project would have no impact and would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact relative to air traffic patterns.

Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with these resource areas will not be addressed further in the EIR consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3).

c. **Does the project have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could result in environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly; therefore, impacts from the proposed project will be evaluated in the EIR.
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Attachment C
CEQAnet Entry
The Waterfront

SCH Number: 2014061071
Document Type: NOP - Notice of Preparation
Project Lead Agency: Redondo Beach, City of

Project Description
The project would revitalize a portion of the Harbor by redeveloping and expanding commercial uses, enhancing public access and recreational facilities, and improving the aging infrastructure and parking while enhancing site connectivity, public access and public views. The main components are demolition of ~221,347 sf of existing structures; demolition of a parking structure; construction/renovation of up to ~523,732 sf (289,906 sf net new development) to include retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, and a boutique hotel; and new small boat launch ramp, improvements to Seaside Lagoon, and pedestrian and bicycle paths. Site connectivity elements include a new pedestrian bridge across the Redondo Beach Marina Basin 3 entrance and the reconnection of Pacific Ave.

Contact Information
Primary Contact:
Katie Owston
City of Redondo Beach
310 318-0637 x1-2895
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Project Location
County: Los Angeles
City: Redondo Beach
Region:
Cross Streets: Portofino Way, Torrance Boulevard, Harbor Drive/Pacific Avenue
Latitude/Longitude: 33° 50' 28.5" / 118° 23' 30.2" Map
Parcel No: Multiple
Township: 4S
Range: 14W
Section: 07
Base:
Other Location Info:

Proximity To
Highways: SR-1 (Pacific Coast Hwy)
Airports: No
Railways: No
Waterways: King Harbor and Pacific Ocean
Schools: Multiple
Land Use: CR Commercial Rec (subarea 1,2,3); P-PRO Parks, Rec & Open Space/CC Coastal Commercial; P Public or Institutional

Development Type
Office, Commercial, Recreational (bike/pedestrian trails, boat ramp, open space), Transportation: Other (Pacific Ave & Torrance Circle), Other (Overwater pedestrian bridge & marina/pier/seawall improvement)

Local Action
Use Permit, Local Coastal Permit
Project Issues


Reviewing Agencies (Agencies in Bold Type submitted comment letters to the State Clearinghouse)

Resources Agency; Department of Boating and Waterways; California Coastal Commission; Department of Conservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Resources, Recycling and Recovery; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 5; Native American Heritage Commission; State Lands Commission; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Air Resources Board; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 3

Date Received: 6/19/2014  Start of Review: 6/19/2014  End of Review: 7/18/2014
Attachment D

Scoping Meeting/
Open House
Sign-In Sheets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email/Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barry Solomon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barry.solomon@verizon.net">barry.solomon@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Solomon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Anderson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jna0271@gmail.com">jna0271@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanne Newton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dneustonpa@gmail.com">dneustonpa@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Singer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:trinity.x.rose@gmail.com">trinity.x.rose@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Giasso</td>
<td><a href="mailto:beegeotor@aol.com">beegeotor@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Goulet</td>
<td>1mnga@<a href="mailto:act@yahoo.com">act@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Bagland</td>
<td><a href="mailto:julesbythebay@aol.com">julesbythebay@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Martinez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lurla@aol.com">lurla@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleen Staal</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eileenstaal@verizon.net">eileenstaal@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Reed</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eeestaal@verizon.net">eeestaal@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James McCoo</td>
<td>619 VINCENT ST REDONDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Gilman</td>
<td>818 EL REDONDO AVE RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Ikena</td>
<td>P.O. Box 118 Redondo Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Hazelton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bmcremale@gmail.com">bmcremale@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Barker</td>
<td>310 Gamet janet@barkham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Cameron</td>
<td>You Have 1!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Treschick</td>
<td><a href="mailto:WawyJo2@Yahoo.com">WawyJo2@Yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Hughes</td>
<td>ram_hughes_f@AOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Howell</td>
<td>620 THE VILLAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Know</td>
<td>610 The Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Schiewin</td>
<td>520 Block S Beverly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Light</td>
<td>1K Light @ verizon.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olaf Coker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larisa Duke</td>
<td>larajs@yahoo RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Tody</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d.m.tody@cox.net">d.m.tody@cox.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Hartunian</td>
<td>310-540-7793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Epstein</td>
<td><a href="mailto:justbarb56@gmail.com">justbarb56@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email/Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lee Cora</td>
<td>635 E 8th Ave UT 109 RB 90277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Perl</td>
<td><a href="mailto:drewperl@comcast.net">drewperl@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Terris</td>
<td><a href="mailto:VIPPILA@AOL.COM">VIPPILA@AOL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Egger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:suzanne_egger@hotmail.com">suzanne_egger@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Zarembski</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LRORIZ@AOL.COM">LRORIZ@AOL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirk B. Yelinek DVM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dirk.yelinek@redondoarchitecture.com">dirk.yelinek@redondoarchitecture.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delia Vechi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:delia1978@yahoo.com">delia1978@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Herbert</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DHERBERT.JVH@GMAIL.COM">DHERBERT.JVH@GMAIL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Hegarty</td>
<td><a href="mailto:HEGARTYAMH@GMAIL.COM">HEGARTYAMH@GMAIL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Howard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CRAIG.HOWARD@ROADRUNNER.COM">CRAIG.HOWARD@ROADRUNNER.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherele Jones</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sherelejones@optonline.net">sherelejones@optonline.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Amman</td>
<td>727 S Broadway RR 901 Avenue E RR 901 Avenue E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol O'Fallon</td>
<td>501 Avenue E RR 901 Avenue E RR 901 Avenue E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Simms</td>
<td>857 Ave O, Jamaica Oceaneering M M M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Meloody</td>
<td>400 AVE E RR 901 Avenue E RR 901 Avenue E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devin Daly</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stevedd@pachelli.net">stevedd@pachelli.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Davis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Liz.Griggs@am.jill.com">Liz.Griggs@am.jill.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Griggs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mecalden@yahoo.com">mecalden@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Comer</td>
<td>monicaftdylken@com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Frey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:r.d.shea@gmail.com">r.d.shea@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Shea</td>
<td>(681) THE VILLAGE, RR 207-B N Lucia Ave RR 90277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tody Wilkinson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnm.hough@yahoo.com">johnm.hough@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hough</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marcieguillerms@mac.com">marcieguillerms@mac.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Ambrosi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TAREK@URBANESTATES.COM">TAREK@URBANESTATES.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah VGA &amp; mac.com</td>
<td>TAREK SHAER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcie Guillerms</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TAREK@URBANESTATES.COM">TAREK@URBANESTATES.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email/Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheik Anderson</td>
<td>already received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret McWilliams</td>
<td>MMCKW@<a href="mailto:redondo@AOL.COM">redondo@AOL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Lombard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SRL90277@yahoo.com">SRL90277@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF Emshee</td>
<td><a href="mailto:STUFF@EMSHEE.ORG">STUFF@EMSHEE.ORG</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAURA Emshee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Tseng</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JSTSENG@AOL.COM">JSTSENG@AOL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Pike</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JPATRB@YAHOO.COM">JPATRB@YAHOO.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURJIT S. Hora</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MORA1@VERIZON.NET">MORA1@VERIZON.NET</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Boyer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:boyer_rr_bch@verizon.net">boyer_rr_bch@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Mondragon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:julius_mondragon@verizon.net">julius_mondragon@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisa Vaien</td>
<td><a href="mailto:altccll@aol.com">altccll@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. T. SISNEROS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:NBR1BNR@AOL.COM">NBR1BNR@AOL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN DAVIS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eyendavis@aol.com">eyendavis@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Cahoon</td>
<td>cahoonahotmail.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Tuckerman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paula_tuckerman@hotmail.com">paula_tuckerman@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAIG CAWACAPAER</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CHAIR@SURFBEACH-SOUTHBAY.ORG">CHAIR@SURFBEACH-SOUTHBAY.ORG</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Garven</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agarten789@hotmail.com">agarten789@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TODD KEITHNER</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bmw13202x1479@gmail.com">bmw13202x1479@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Eflein</td>
<td>2360 THE VILLAGE RANCHO PALOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Galin</td>
<td>1306 Shawson Ln RB 90278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL PAUL</td>
<td>2804 VAIL AVE REDONDO BEACH 90278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Johnson</td>
<td>2806 VAIL AVE REDONDO BEACH 90278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane McDowall</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane_mcdowall@hotmail.com">jane_mcdowall@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Zaremski</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patty817@gmail.com">patty817@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Vaiia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vaidlydia.m@hotmail.com">vaidlydia.m@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Lesser, M.D.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:myamydog@gmail.com">myamydog@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malia Osterbauer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mosherbauer@hotmail.com">mosherbauer@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Delchany</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marydel1@prodigy.net">marydel1@prodigy.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email/Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Abela</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abela_connie@gmail.com">abela_connie@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Truax</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joan@JoanIrvineConsulting.com">joan@JoanIrvineConsulting.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Benton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:helenhoney@yahoo.com">helenhoney@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy Bryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Hannon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sim_hannon@hotmail.com">sim_hannon@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Hanson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marrigehair@yahoo.com">marrigehair@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Katz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Steele</td>
<td><a href="mailto:losots7@aol.com">losots7@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Kucosta</td>
<td><a href="mailto:merocestado@aol.com">merocestado@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Thorn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mallorygs85@gmail.com">mallorygs85@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara &amp; Ken Melcher</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmelch80704@aol.com">kmelch80704@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Haller</td>
<td>jimleyand <a href="mailto:sandy@gmail.com">sandy@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Maggio</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maggie_luke@gmail.com">maggie_luke@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Endres</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scc3ere@earthlink.net">scc3ere@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Agnelli</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gpalou4@aol.com">gpalou4@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Cohen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dalifanmel1@yahoo.com">dalifanmel1@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Leger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.ledger@sen.ca.gov">david.ledger@sen.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Rooney</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joycec_rooney@redondo.com">joycec_rooney@redondo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Nettel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALTER HOWELLS II</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wallyhow@aol.com">wallyhow@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Sandy Pringle</td>
<td><a href="mailto:family@kentridgeassociates.com">family@kentridgeassociates.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Tuck</td>
<td><a href="mailto:justinatuck@gmail.com">justinatuck@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Webb</td>
<td><a href="mailto:glennsod@sanetlink.com">glennsod@sanetlink.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Trevillian</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jstrevill@verizon.net">jstrevill@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIKA SNOOK ROBINSON</td>
<td><a href="mailto:redbandbeachartist@gmail.com">redbandbeachartist@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom D uy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Diana Mann</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmanni90277@hotmail.com">dmanni90277@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conyn Stanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email/Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Boswell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dougbo@red.com">dougbo@red.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Newman</td>
<td>redon <a href="mailto:databse@red.com">databse@red.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Sheehy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stevej@red.com">stevej@red.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike &amp; Alice Peabody</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mikep@earthlink.net">mikep@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco Spin-Weber</td>
<td>frances@<a href="mailto:weber@gmail.com">weber@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Lindberg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dalindberg@doc.com">dalindberg@doc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Stark</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barrystark@verizon.net">barrystark@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Collette</td>
<td><a href="mailto:deb@earthlink.net">deb@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Watkins</td>
<td><a href="mailto:watkinsml@verizon.net">watkinsml@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ewell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maryewell@verizon.net">maryewell@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Shepard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:destinationexcellence@gmail.com">destinationexcellence@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert &quot;Sally&quot; Sadler</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thesadlers@roadrunner.com">thesadlers@roadrunner.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoko Marashi</td>
<td>shokoufoe@<a href="mailto:marashi@iacity.org">marashi@iacity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine Atienza</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dr.or@msn.com">dr.or@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Criner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email/Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK WICKENS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRY BUCHWALD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAN CASEY</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SEAN90266@gmail.com">SEAN90266@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL WEBER</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mlenweber@aol.com">mlenweber@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARMEN CONTRERAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID LLOYD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DAVID.W.CLOYD@EARTHLINK.NET">DAVID.W.CLOYD@EARTHLINK.NET</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE &amp; DONNA SHUCKLEY</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dshuckley05@gmail.com">dshuckley05@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Telles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrícia Linnen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patricelimnetti@verizon.net">patricelimnetti@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Zak Landon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nina2ak-laddon@hotmail.com">nina2ak-laddon@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERRY O'CONNOR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gfoconnor@aol.com">gfoconnor@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Lisenwall</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lisenwall@gmail.com">lisenwall@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtu Waskow</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vhwang@hotmail.com">vhwang@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregoire Derrieux</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jianullas22@yahoo.com">jianullas22@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORANCE LENGER</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rockandheather@Verizon.net">Rockandheather@Verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email/Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Corradetti</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joycorra@opt.com">joycorra@opt.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Lopez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:martinlopez1@verizon.net">martinlopez1@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su Huang</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sukhwa@live.com">sukhwa@live.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumiko Noguchi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Cogen</td>
<td>hacogeneratt.net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Stoddard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stoddalind@gmail.com">stoddalind@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hansen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marklhansen@aol.com">marklhansen@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wilkinson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tommy.Wilkinson@gmail.com">Tommy.Wilkinson@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chevedden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Newman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeffnewman@msn.com">jeffnewman@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Torres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hank Folsom</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bankfolsom@gmail.com">bankfolsom@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Poland</td>
<td><a href="mailto:polands@centinela.k12.ca.us">polands@centinela.k12.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Reeder</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jreeder@tft.ucla.edu">jreeder@tft.ucla.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email/Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRED BRUNING</td>
<td><a href="mailto:FBRUNING@CONVERGECAL.COM">FBRUNING@CONVERGECAL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM ATKINS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TOMATKINS0065@GMAIL.COM">TOMATKINS0065@GMAIL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK KNIGHT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KNITIME@ME.COM">KNITIME@ME.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigi Frampton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GFRAMPTON@FOSS.COM">GFRAMPTON@FOSS.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Light</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JMLIGHT1@VERIZON.NET">JMLIGHT1@VERIZON.NET</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICK SHERBIN</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nsherbim@verizon.net">nsherbim@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Ressler</td>
<td>resslert@yahoocom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Lloyd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gclloyd2000@yahoo.com">gclloyd2000@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Barth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hinghamspa@AOL.COM">hinghamspa@AOL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Vosnow</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rossnizaus@yahoo.com">rossnizaus@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Speerst</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jayespeers65@yahoo.com">Jayespeers65@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Israel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ALANSEARCH@VERIZON.NET">ALANSEARCH@VERIZON.NET</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY MITCHELL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MARYMITCHELL@HOTMAIL.COM">MARYMITCHELL@HOTMAIL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOLD ZIMMERMAN</td>
<td><a href="mailto:AZIMMERMAN@HISSEARCH.COM">AZIMMERMAN@HISSEARCH.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE BARKS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BARKSTMIRACING@AOL.COM">BARKSTMIRACING@AOL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICH STAHLBERG</td>
<td><a href="mailto:WILDCARROT@IRONFLY.COM">WILDCARROT@IRONFLY.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Barberon (No Email)</td>
<td>123 S. CATHLINA # 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Vreba</td>
<td><a href="mailto:VERA.MM@GMAIL.COM">VERA.MM@GMAIL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Ellis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:AELLISCSSQ@AOL.COM">AELLISCSSQ@AOL.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damia Bacic</td>
<td><a href="mailto:damia99@yahoo.com">damia99@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Gudej</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ogudej@hermosabch.org">ogudej@hermosabch.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda Robs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agentiglenda@gmail.com">agentiglenda@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Robs</td>
<td><a href="mailto:STEVENCROBB@YAHOO.COM">STEVENCROBB@YAHOO.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Schmid</td>
<td>11661 S. IRVINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompeo Ragan</td>
<td>666 THE VILLAGE MYSTERION MOUND CIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAMIE GABNIA</td>
<td>911 C. OCEAN ST. GREENEVILLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email/Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Izent</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sizant@verizon.net">sizant@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Barkovsky</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cbarkovsky@yahoo.com">cbarkovsky@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken McNeeley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:korneth.s.mcneeley@boeing.com">korneth.s.mcneeley@boeing.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Greer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:greenes@metro.net">greenes@metro.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Campbell</td>
<td>hi@<a href="mailto:spence@gmail.com">spence@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickey Marriott</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mickey@markey.m.com">mickey@markey.m.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tye Burnett</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tye.burnett@gmail.com">tye.burnett@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Yee</td>
<td>milan2015@yahoocom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Pleatman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carole1234@verizon.net">carole1234@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Pleatman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stanpleatman@verizon.net">stanpleatman@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherie Stahlberg</td>
<td>cherieironfly.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Herrera</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carlahaerrera@verizon.net">carlahaerrera@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Rodriguez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodriguezdoug@gmail.com">rodriguezdoug@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Lowenstein</td>
<td><a href="mailto:loew4527@yahoo.com">loew4527@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Dziedzic</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ryan.dz5@gmail.com">ryan.dz5@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Goodrich</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Christensen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.freshburn@yahoo.com">doug.freshburn@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margie Christeehoson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:waynemargiee@aol.com">waynemargiee@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Johnson</td>
<td>janetjohnson535@yahoocom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbi Frolove</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dfrolove@msn.com">dfrolove@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Giebler</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dgiebler@specialletters.net">dgiebler@specialletters.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Cabalear</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bill_cabalar@ahm.honda.com">bill_cabalar@ahm.honda.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email/Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven B. Gheen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steven@cohencomm.net">steven@cohencomm.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Cohen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauth Are, NIEPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Schreider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora Rodriguez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LisnwKay328@yahoo.com">LisnwKay328@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Brakel</td>
<td>ingle <a href="mailto:sue@hotmail.com">sue@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Purpose of the Scoping Meeting

To present information on the proposed project and solicit comments on the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The presentation will include a description of the proposed project followed by a description of the purpose and process of preparing and certifying an EIR.
Project Location
Project Overview

The project proposes a waterfront village to:

• Redevelop and expand local and visitor serving commercial uses
• Enhance public access and recreational opportunities and facilities
• Improve aging support infrastructure and parking facilities
• Improve site connectivity, public access and public views to and along the waterfront
Project Boundaries
Project Description

The Northern Portion of the Project Site

• Restaurants, retail, office, cinema, and a market hall with fresh seafood and specialty merchants

• Replacement of existing parking with new parking structure, surface parking stalls and parking lot

• Modifications to the Plaza Parking Structure to accommodate the Pacific Avenue reconnection

• Enhancement of bicycle and pedestrian paths to avoid navigation through parking structures
Project Description (continued)

The Northern Portion of the Project Site (continued)

• Opening of Seaside Lagoon to the waters of King Harbor

• Replacement of two boat hoists in Basin 3 with a small craft boat launch ramp and break wall to provide protection from wave action

• Construction of an expansive pedestrian promenade along the water’s edge from the base of the pier to Seaside Lagoon
Project Description (continued)

The Southern Portion of the Project Site

- Replacement of some existing and former retail and restaurant buildings on the Horseshoe Pier
- Reinforcement of the Horseshoe Pier if necessary to support proposed development/redevelopment
- A new two-story boutique hotel with commercial uses on the ground floor
The Southern Portion of the Project Site (continued)

- Demolition of the Pier Parking Structure and Pier Plaza development, to be replaced with a new parking structure
- Modifications to the Torrance Circle to facilitate the Pacific Avenue reconnection and access into the new parking structure
- Some limited modifications to portions of the Monstad Pier may be necessary in association with adjacent construction
Project Description (continued)

The Water Area

- Improve public access by providing a pedestrian/bicycle bridge that spans the Basin 3 entrance
- Retrofit of the existing Sportfishing Pier, including reconstruction of buildings
- Replacement or refurbishment of existing boat slips in Basin 3
Project Description (continued)

Other Improvements

• Demolition of the International Boardwalk and elevated walkway to accommodate the Pacific Avenue reconnection

• Introduction of new bicycle and pedestrian pathways throughout the project site

• Essential updates to aging infrastructure

• Small modifications to topography to eliminate current flooding conditions and to accommodate anticipated sea level rise

• Provisions of new high-quality public open space

Reconnection of Pacific Ave.
Purpose of the NOP

• A Notice of Preparation (NOP) is the **first step** in the EIR process. It is a document stating that an EIR will be prepared for a particular project.

• The NOP is released for review **to solicit feedback** from public agencies and interested parties (i.e. we need your help).

• This feedback helps identify:
  
  • The range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed in depth in the EIR
  
  • Issues found not be significant and to be eliminated from detailed study
Purpose of the EIR

- An EIR is a document that evaluates and provides public disclosure of environmental consequences and considerations.

- An EIR provides identification of feasible mitigation measures and examination of potentially feasible alternatives to reduce or avoid significant impacts.

- An EIR is a planning tool to assist decision-makers in evaluating the environmental impacts of the proposed Project.
## EIR Process and Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Projected Completion Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Process</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EIR Distributed for Public Review &amp; Comment (45 days)</td>
<td>Winter 2014/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Draft EIR Public Review Period</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final EIR</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings/Final Certification</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Coastal Commission actions to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Areas Proposed To be Analyzed in the EIR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards/Hazardous Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/Service Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The EIR Will Also Address...

- Environmental Baseline: existing conditions at time of preparation

- Cumulative Impacts (project plus anticipated growth): evaluate individual project contribution to broader impacts

- Growth Inducing Impacts: evaluate potential to cause substantial growth

- Potentially feasible alternatives to the project including a No Project alternative: evaluate alternatives to the project to reduce or avoid significant impacts

- Irreversible Long-term Environmental Changes: evaluate long-term commitment of resources
Tonight’s Meeting Format

- Multiple Comment Stations
- Various ways to comment tonight:
  - Written comments
  - Electronic comments at Computer Station
  - Verbal comments at Reporter Station
Comments due:

• 5:30 p.m. July 21, 2014

Methods to Submit Comments:

• At Scoping Meeting/Open House (TONIGHT)
• Email: katie.owston@redondo.org
• Mail: Katie Owston, Project Planner
  City of Redondo Beach
  415 Diamond Street
  Redondo Beach, California 90277
• Questions? 310-318-0637, x1-2895
The NOP/Initial Study is available to review at:

- City Hall Community Development Department, 415 Diamond Street
- City Clerk, 415 Diamond Street
- The Redondo Beach Public Library Main Branch, 303 N Pacific Coast Highway
- The Redondo Beach Public Library North Branch, 2000 Artesia Boulevard
- http://www.redondo.org
Review Period

Comments due:

- 5:30 p.m. July 21, 2014

Methods to Submit Comments:

- At Scoping Meeting/Open House (TONIGHT)
- Email: katie.owston@redondo.org
- Mail: Katie Owston, Project Planner
  City of Redondo Beach
  415 Diamond Street
  Redondo Beach, California 90277
- Questions? 310-318-0637, x1-2895
Document Availability

The NOP/Initial Study is available to review at:

- City Hall Community Development Department, 415 Diamond Street
- City Clerk, 415 Diamond Street
- The Redondo Beach Public Library Main Branch, 303 N Pacific Coast Highway
- The Redondo Beach Public Library North Branch, 2000 Artesia Boulevard
- http://www.redondo.org
Attachment F
Scoping Meeting/
Open House
Handouts
Welcome!
The City of Redondo Beach welcomes you to this public scoping meeting/open house for The Waterfront EIR. Tonight you will hear a description of the proposed project and the purpose and process of preparing an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR"). You will also have the opportunity to submit written comments and provide verbal comments to a reporter regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, as well as speak to the City’s project team to learn more about the California Environmental Quality Act process.

Meeting Format
This workshop is designed in an “open house” format to allow participants to attend any time during the open house session and visit one of the Comment Stations to review the information presented and talk with City staff and the City’s EIR consultants. A brief presentation will be provided at approximately 6:15 p.m.

Stations
The following stations are available:

1. Welcome and Sign In Station – please visit this table to sign in.

2. Comment Stations – please visit one of the three identical comment stations to review the information, speak with staff, and provide written comments.

3. Reporter Station – if you would like to make verbal comments that will be included in the administrative record, please provide comments to the reporter at the Reporter Station.

4. Computer Station – if you would like to provide written comments electronically tonight, please visit the Computer Station to type in your comments on the electronic form provided. Staff is located at the station to provide assistance.

Only comments provided in writing and verbally to the reporter will be included in the administrative record for the proposed project. Written comments may also be submitted by 5:30 p.m., July 21, 2014 by mail (Katie Owston, Project Planner, 415 Diamond St., Redondo Beach, CA 90277) or email (katie.owston@redondo.org).

Thank you for your participation.
For additional information and updates, please visit the proposed project website at: www.redondo.org
(follow a link to the Waterfront on the City’s home page)
How Do I Provide Input for the Waterfront Project EIR?

1. **Provide comments tonight:**
   a. Write down your comments on the form provided and leave them in the comment box
   b. Type in comments in the electronic form at the Computer Station
   c. Provide verbal comments at the Reporter Station

2. **Send your written comments by 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014 to:**
   
   Katie Owston  
   Project Planner  
   Community Development Department  
   415 Diamond Street  
   Redondo Beach, CA 90277

3. **Email your written comments by 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014 to:**

   katie.owston@redondo.org

All comments received during the Scoping Period will be part of the Administrative Record

Comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: ____________________________________________________________

Organization (optional): ____________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________

Zip Code: __________________________________________________________

Phone (optional): ___________________________________________________

E-mail (optional): ___________________________________________________

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources* ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning ☐ Mineral Resources* ☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing* ☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic ☐ Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comment continued:
The Waterfront Scoping Summary
City of Redondo Beach

Attachment G

Scoping Meeting/
Open House
Presentation Boards
Conceptual Site Plan

Reconnection of Pacific Avenue

KEY
- GREEN: OPEN SPACE (PUBLIC)
- YELLOW: RETAIL / RESTAURANT / OFFICE
- TEAL: MARKET HALL
- LIGHT BLUE: HOTEL OVER RETAIL
- RED: PROJECT AREA
- ORANGE: BOAT RAMP
- GRAY: PARKING
- LIGHT GRAY: STRUCTURED PUBLIC PARKING
- WHITE: BIKE PATH
- GREEN: BOARDWALK

LA GOGON
## EIR Process and Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Projected Completion Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Process</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft EIR Distributed for Public Review &amp; Comment (45 days)</td>
<td>Winter 2014/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Draft EIR Public Review Period</td>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final EIR</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings/Final Certification</td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*California Coastal Commission actions to follow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following resource areas are proposed for further study in the EIR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Hydrology/Water Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Utilities/Service Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments Received at Scoping Meeting
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Sheila Anderson
Organization (optional):
Address: 140 N. Broadway #C
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 310-374-0551
E-mail (optional): sfbr27@gmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources*
- Noise
- Population/Housing*
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

The size of this project is overwhelming for the site available

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
The Waterfront Project  
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Damira Basic  
Organization (optional):  
Address:  
Zip Code:  
Phone (optional): 310 346-1810  
E-mail (optional): damira99@yahoo.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☑️ Aesthetics  ☑️ Agriculture and Forest Resources*  ☑️ Air Quality  
☑️ Biological Resources  ☑️ Cultural Resources  ☑️ Geology/Soils  
☑️ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☑️ Hazards and Hazardous Materials  ☑️ Hydrology/Water Quality  
☑️ Land Use/Planning  ☑️ Mineral Resources*  ☑️ Noise  
☐ Population/Housing*  ☑️ Public Services  ☑️ Recreation  
☐ Transportation/Traffic  ☑️ Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: This project is too big for the area. It will bring noise & pollution to the coastline. Please reconsider the size & impact of this enormous project!

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:  
Katie Owston, Project Planner  
City of Redondo Beach  
415 Diamond Street  
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.  
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Helen Barnes
Organization (optional):
Address:
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional): helenbarnes@yahoo.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources*
☐ Biological Resources  ☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☒ Land Use/Planning  ☐ Mineral Resources*
☐ Population/Housing*  ☐ Public Services
☐ Transportation/Traffic  ☐ Utilities/Service Systems
☐ Air Quality  ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☒ Noise
☒ Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

[Handwritten notes include:

Would like to know about:

Density
Height of project -- Limitations?

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Carol Barkovsky
Organization (optional): None
Address: 140 The Village #107 Redondo 90277
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 
E-mail (optional): charkovsky@yahoo.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

I am appalled at the scope of this project. We already have 2 huge malls near Redondo: The Galleria & Del amo. We do not need another mall that will be a tax burden on the people of Redondo when you have empty venues where initially we were promised that our views would be respected and they have not been. The heights and placements of buildings will block any view of the ocean by residents of the area and those using the park. Our views will be the rear of buildings and their trash bins and delivery tracks. Where are the open areas that

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
we've promised, what I see are a few small insignificant areas.

- The presentation tonight was pathetic. The presenters and those manning the stations could not answer the most important questions of the height of the proposed buildings.

- How can you do a viable EIR study if you do not know the heights of the buildings.

- The impact of this project as it stands now will have a devastating effect on all of the residents of the immediate area. We are already impacted every weekend of the summer with traffic noise.

- When are you going to listen to the public. You said from the start that you would work with residents, but it is evident that you have no interest in our quality of life or the financial health of our city. This monstrosity will haunt our community for decades to come!!!

- It is crucial that you add housing and population to the EIR study.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Doug Boswell
Organization (optional): 
Address: 2700 182nd St., Redondo Beach
Zip Code: 90278
Phone (optional): 310-921-2979
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [x] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: Land use/planning: Why so much emphasis on retail, which has always failed in this location? Why not more emphasis on business-office space for local entrepreneurs? Retail & restaurant development should be in line with the actual demand - which is low. More hotel space? Current number of rooms in the harbor area is already over-built.

Should be more recreational opportunities, traffic/roadway infrastructure to improve/decrease congestion, noise & pollution.

Over all, there is too much development for a location the has never attracted people from outside South Redondo.

The area needs revitalization, but this plan applies none of the lessons this community has learned from all the previously failed attempts to improve the harbor.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Ty Watson
Organization (optional):
Address: 1917 G Nelson Ave
Zip Code: 90278
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional): dwee, burnett@gmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics
☐ Biological Resources
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
☐ Land Use/Planning
☐ Population/Housing*
☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources*
☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Mineral Resources*
☐ Public Services
☐ Utilities/Service Systems
☐ Air Quality
☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Noise
☐ Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

I support the project and look forward to a speedy EIR process.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Spencer Campbell
Organization (optional): [Blank]
Address: 804 Picoma Ave
Zip Code: 90278
Phone (optional): [Blank]
E-mail (optional): [Blank]

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

I would like to maintain a high quality, safe bike path through the proposed area. Bike lanes on the street and sharrows are not acceptable.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Stacy Carpenter
Organization (optional): 
Address: 420 N Broadway #2
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 
E-mail (optional): stacy.ellen.carpenter@gmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

I think it's important to understand the impact of the project on the community.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: MARGIE CHRISTOPHERSEN

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic

These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: CONSIDER FAILURE OF PIER REDEVELOPMENT
TRAFFIC – already on/weekends
who will employees park – etc.
THIS MEETING VERY DISAPPOINTING – we feel your plan
PLANS WILL BLOCK OPENNESS OF VIEW
and expose in entire area
This area already attracts a large population of "beach" lovers.
WE ALREADY HAVE ENOUGH ATTRACTIONS –
4th of July carnivals runs, volleyball tournaments, etc.
OYSTER FEST etc etc BEACH BEACH BEACH

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
TRAFFIC - Reach a REDONDOD
residents already do not dare leave homes on weekends because of terrible traffic congestion.

BIKE TRAIL AS IS one of THE MOST wonderful gifts we have. THERE IS NOTHING TO COMPARE TO IT ANYWHERE.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: MARY LEE COEL
Organization (optional):
Address: 535 ESPLANADE UT/09 RB CA 90277
Zip Code:
Phone (optional): 310 216 6977
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [X] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [X] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

APPEARENTLY NOT IDENTIFIED ON THE MAP, THE MOVIE THEATER IS STILL IN THE PLANS!

NOT ONLY IS A MOVIE THEATER IN APPROPRIATE AT AN OUTDOOR NATURAL LOCATION PAID FOR BY PUBLIC MONEY

IT IS NOT GOING TO BE PROFITABLE (THEATERS HAVE RECENTLY CLOSED IN DEL AMO MALL AND NEWPORT BEACH ON PCH). NO VISUAL OR PRINTED MATERIAL IS AVAILABLE TO WHAT THE RETAIL CONCRETE STRUCTURES WILL LOOK LIKE.

BUT ASIDE FROM AESTHETICS THERE ARE TOO MANY, NOT ENOUGH OPEN SPACE WITH THE SEATING SPACE TO JUST ENJOY THE OCEAN. A DEVELOPER'S DREAM A REDONDO BEACH RESIDENT'S NIGHTMARE OVER"

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
As a homeowner on the beach with a beach view, I think it is unconscionable to put buildings or concrete structures in front of homeowners ocean views if they don't affect me. But if allowed, it could be a matter of time.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Melanie Cohen
Organization (optional): South Bay Parkland Conservancy
Address: 165 S. Guadalupe Ave H
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 310-474-4231
E-mail (optional): delfemme@yahoo.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

This plan is too big and there is no detail. You have not addressed anything I asked 3 other developers who told me that you should not be at EIR stage without an architectural plan. This is a sham.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Path Linnett & Debbie Collette
Organization (optional): DPM Mosiacs
Address: 1321 S Helbert Ave RB CA
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional): patricelinnett@verizon.net debofca@yahoo.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [x] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [x] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [x] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: We are the designers and creators of the "Ocean Steps" mosaic stairs. It is of great concern to us (and to over 50 volunteers who helped) that these stairs remain untouched and not destroyed. This was the first project that the R.B. Public Arts Commission approved and it is a very significant part of the beginning of the revitalization of Redondo Beach as a desired destination.

We are in great support of Centercal and the Waterfront project. We have already met with Jean Paul Wardy and an engineer from Centercal and we are hoping that this is something that is being taken under consideration.

Thank you!

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: 
Organization (optional): 
Address: 108 International Boulevard
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 310-778-8889
E-mail (optional): byCorra@aol.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

As this project moves forward, Redondo Beach Waterfront positions to be a glittering jewel in harmony with nature! I totally support this revitalization as the concepts and plans are visionary. The legacy of the waterfront will benefit future generations with beauty, commerce, artistic enhancements and aesthetics. I truly wish the development would begin tomorrow as the deterioration of our current pier and boardwalk is in need of polishing and repurposing.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: KATHLEEN DAVIS

Organization (optional):  
Address: 354 Camino Delas Colinas

Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 310-328-1501
E-mail (optional):  

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [x] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [x] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [x] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [x] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [x] Mineral Resources*
- [x] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [x] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic*
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: I feel this project is way to over developed for the area, and it's Redondo Beach Pier, not Manhattan! Hey! New York Beach! I would think you could try to remove some of the existing structures that are already there. PLAVE PARADISE and Put up a Parking LOT!
I RE THINK WHAT you think is good for the residents of Redondo Beach.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: STEVE DAVIS
Organization (optional):
Address: PORTOFINO MARINA - D-5
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 213-925-7895
E-mail (optional): stevedd@pachell.net

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

This project is too big. We like the pier & harbor as it is. If anything, something would be fine. you should make small incremental improvements. We do not need a mall at the harbor.

Please kill this conceptual design!

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Regarding what **environmental issues** you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [x] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [x] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [x] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

**Comments:**

I agree, improvement is needed, but we must retain the character of the pier.

My concerns: Keeping the unique characteristics of the RB Pier like the "mom & pop" shops, we shouldn't be shutting down these businesses and bringing in high-end chain stores, restaurants. Let's keep it small like the MBS & HB piers, yet make it nice enough to generate revenue for the city. It must be a nicely laid-out design, connecting the sprawling pier so it flows better, but this can be done through landscape & landscape improvements. It's not necessary to have high-end restaurants & shops which this project is increasingly looking like it will be. Do not run out the kite shop, Tony's or any of our city officials. Remove the "too ring shops."

Shops like this are what we find at a pier. For high-end shops - go to the multiple options for malls all over the urban cities. Let the fishermen fish and keep height-building restrictions strict. Please don't let money dictate an ugly transformation of our pier. Do it right & ethically.

Clean it up, make it flow well, and listen to the public wants!

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:

Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.

All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
The format of this meeting is completely ridiculous. To have a sensing meeting/open house which should allow for public comment and then not offer seating to a predominantly elderly crowd is wrong. It is not assumed. We are in a Performing Arts Center with a theater with seating and you choose to have this put in the lobby. Seems by design—underhanded and deceitful. For city council people to be afraid of extended public commentary is the equivalent of turning off the mic before it’s even turned on.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Suzanne Eger
Organization (optional): SBF
Address: 408 N. Broadway St. C, Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Zip Code: 310-729-5315
Phone (optional): Suzanne_eger@hotmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [x] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [x] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic

- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:
The parking structures should be partially subterranean (if feasible) and should not be taller than 3 stories.

Additionally, the City of Redondo Beach should receive economic benefit beyond the stated "income once central earns a 10% profit - after 30 years."

Impact to wildlife (land, air, & ocean) should be considered and prioritized.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Barbara & Jack Epstein
Organization (optional):
Address: 230 The Village, #305
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional): justbarb56@gmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [x] Aesthetics
- [ ] Views
- [x] Biological Resources
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [x] Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [x] Public Services
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: This meeting was cleverly designed to limit shared public comment, resulting in the "divide and conquer" strategy. Older participants had a great deal of difficulty standing, seeing the charts, and hearing.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Barbara Epstein, Redondo Beach

There are many unacceptable environmental impacts from this CenterCal Waterfront project:

Opening a public street directly in front of, and in close proximity to, hundreds of human dwellings will have severe impacts on resident's health, producing dangerous, toxic vehicle exhaust, including particulates, blowing into the homes from prevailing winds.

The new through-traffic road will create a new safety hazard to all the residents of the nearby neighborhoods who are trying to access the waterfront by foot or bicycle that is not present there at this time. This road will block free, safe, and open access that all enjoy now.

The noise generated by this new road will destroy the quality of life for nearby residents, adding stress and ruining human quality of life in this presently quiet area. We suggested foot traffic only during the planning meetings.

Demolition and construction related to this project, including the new road, could undermine the geology of the area and compromise the residential structures immediately above the project.

Demolition and construction will certainly be harmful to nearby residents in terms of stress and pollution.

Overall traffic in the general area during construction and in the future will certainly be a burden to area residents and visitors alike.

The enormity of the general inappropriate commercial overbuilding designed into the project violates the spirit, and possibly letter, of the Coastal Act and must be challenged as very poor land use for this area. For this reason it should not be permitted by the State Of California. There is very little public open space, small walkways and plazas, too many commercial buildings.

The scope of this meeting goes far beyond ordinary EIR considerations. What we need to address here are also the moral crimes against the public being perpetrated by the City and the developer, CenterCal.

The developer and the City have engaged in endless deception surrounding this project:

1) The City claimed there was no other recourse than to hand the waterfront over to this developer. In reality, there are several other, better options, such as to contact organizations like the Trust For Public Land. Such organizations contribute funds for public improvements to provide beautiful recreational and open space projects.
We could have help in retrofitting the structures and making something appropriate and amazing that the public could help design. I will volunteer to help.

2) The public was invited to help plan the project. Many of us spent countless hours participating in the so-called public planning meetings held last year. We gave this project an enormous amount of thought, submitted photos, and shared ideas for an improved waterfront, including better alternatives to turning our public land over to CenterCal to build a mall.

Our input was almost entirely ignored, the first, almost acceptable drawing suddenly changed without further discussion, and the city entered into this agreement against the public will.

3) The City has gifted our prime public waterfront to a private, commercial corporation to do with as it pleases. We are not willing to accept this outcome. We are philosophically opposed to governments gifting public land to private business. It is immoral.

This project needs to be cancelled before it goes any farther.

We did not move to the waterfront to shop, or go to the movies, or watch our visitors pay enormous prices for parking and other fees.

We moved to the Waterfront to walk to the pier and harbor, watch the fishermen, look for seals, see the sky, look a pelican in the eye.
I support "sensible" building & renovation of Pier, Boardwalk & Harbor Area.

I am against building a movie theater as you will be competing against existing theaters that provide free parking. Many local theaters offer senior & student discount days which would be impossible for a harbor theater.

Call me & I will be glad to state this & more at whatever venue comes along.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: KAYE GAGNON
Organization (optional):
Address: 170 OPAL ST.
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional): greenervoice@gmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources*
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Land Use/Planning ☐ Mineral Resources*
☐ Population/Housing* ☐ Public Services
☐ Transportation/Traffic ☐ Utilities/Service Systems

* These issue areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

I NEED TO MAKE THE HARBOR A DRAW FOR BOATERS.
I WOULD LIKE INFORMATION ON THE TRAFFIC PLANS, SPECIFICALLY A COPY WHEN RELEASED.

THE THEATER IS SOMETHING RESIDENTS CONSISTENTLY VOICE THEY DID NOT WANT OVER THE PAST YEAR. I WOULD SUPPORT A THEATER THE SIZE OF HB COMMUNITY CENTER OR 75% OF HB PERFORM ARTS CENTER.

I SUPPORT THE BOUTIQUE HOTEL IN ADDITION TO SHOPS.
I SUPPORT OPEN SPACE - IT WILL DRAW BUSINESS.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.

I DO NOT SUPPORT THE PARKING STRUCTURE AS PROPOSED
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Joanne Galin
Organization (optional):
Address: 
Zip Code: 
Phone (optional): 
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources*
☐ Biological Resources  ☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Land Use/Planning  ☐ Mineral Resources*
☐ Population/Housing*  ☐ Public Services
☐ Transportation/Traffic  ☐ Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

I am excited for this project to get started. It will be a big improvement from what we have now. It will be financially beneficial for our great city.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Jim Goodrich

Organization (optional):
Address: 670 The Village
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: Reconnection of Pacific Ave will add too much pollution (Noise & Air) to approx 800 condo apartments right adjacent to it.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Barbara Graasso
Organization (optional): 
Address: 123 S. Catalina #304 Rd
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 310 429-2540
E-mail (optional): beegestor@aol.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources
- [x] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [x] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [x] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [ ] Public Services
- [x] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: It seems we are not keeping with major trends across the country that are opting for smaller, boutique, outdoor cafe environments in place of large malls. We need places to rest, recreation in other words A Little Soul Food

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Name: Scott Greene
Organization (optional): LA County Metro
Address: One Gateway Plaza, LA 90012
Phone (optional): 213 922-1322
E-mail (optional): greenes@metro.net

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [X] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [X] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [X] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [X] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

More bus service to attract riders.
Provide off-street layover facility for buses.
Need operator restrooms (male/female) - not public.
Lighting, safety, pedestrian friendly design.
Reduce parking so people will ride the bus.

Metro Lines 130 and 232 can provide service in addition to Torrance Transit and BCT.

Also fix the bike path so we don't have to ride through the parking garage or dismount at King Harbor.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Surtit S. Horan
Organization (optional):
Address: 230 The Village Unit #203
Redondo Beach CA 90277
Zip Code:
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional): Horan123@verizon.net

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: I LIKE TO SEE VIEW HEIGHTS HOW IT IS GOING TO EFFECT MY VIEW TO HARBOUR FROM 230 THE VILLAGE. WHAT WILL BE HEIGHT OF STRUCTURE ON NORTH SIDE NEAR CAPTAIN KID RESTAURANT

7/9/14

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: John Hough
Organization (optional): Resident
Address: 1922 Condon Ave
Zip Code: 90276
Phone (optional): 310 922-2700
E-mail (optional): johnmhough@yahoo.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: Let's start the project now

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name:  MARK IRVING

Organization (optional):  

Address:  731 SAPPHIRE ST. 

Zip Code:  90277 

Phone (optional):  

E-mail (optional):  

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

I COMPLETELY REJECT THIS PROJECT FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

A. WILL INCREASE TRAFFIC EXPONENTIALY
B. WILL REDUCE OCEAN VIEWS FROM CURRENTLY ACCESSIBLE AREAS
C. WILL HAVE AN UNKNOWN IMPACT ON CITY REVENUES AND EXPENSES, POSSIBLY INCREASING COSTS TO THE CITY AND THUS ITS TAXPAYERS
D. WILL CHANGE THE HISTORIC CHARACTER OF THE WATERFRONT AREA
E. MAY NEGATIVELY AFFECT SMALL BOAT LAUNCHING

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Todd Kalmer
Organization (optional):
Address: 418A, North G Street
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources*
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Land Use/Planning ☐ Mineral Resources*
☐ Population/Housing* ☐ Public Services
☐ Transportation/Traffic ☐ Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: What about the element of gang bangers (i.e., M13, South Side etc) as of late myself and neighbors are concerned with these elements, which are on the increase. Gang bangers: what is the security threat? How to address this growing threat?

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: JAILA LAND

Organization (optional):

Address: 1532 STEWART AVE

Zip Code: 90278

Phone (optional):

E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [X] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [X] Population/Housing*
- [X] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

1. Will the height of the parking garage change?

2. How much will the cost of parking change?

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Michael Landon
Organization (optional): 
Address: 420 S. Guadalupe 
Zip Code: 90277 
Phone (optional): 
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: We should consider the use of native plants for the green area. Save water.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:

Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Michael Landon
Organization (optional):
Address: 420 S. Guadalupe Ave
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [X] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [X] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [X] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [X] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

Having fallen in recently, the water in the harbor tastes like gasoline from the boats. By opening up Seaside Lagoon to the harbor, you will have children playing in that water. Seaside’s water is already disgusting (from childhood memory) so perhaps there is still another alternative.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Name: Dottie Lee
Organization (optional): 
Address: 535 Esplanade 302, Redondo Beach
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

[ ] Aesthetics  [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
[ ] Biological Resources  [ ] Cultural Resources
[ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions  [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
[ ] Land Use/Planning  [ ] Mineral Resources*
[ ] Population/Housing*  [ ] Public Services
[ ] Transportation/Traffic  [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

Aesthetics - too many buildings, not enough views of the ocean, not enough open spaces. The theater is inappropriate for the area and a bunch of restaurants inside a blog is inappropriate. People want to see the ocean (like at Tony's) and fishing boats, birds, fishermen (like at Polly's at the pier). The latest picture looks like Tony's is gone. So many locals like that restaurant. Too much of a commercial flavor, just like the art fesivals are getting more and more commercial vendors.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:

Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.

All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comment continued:

Public Services

3. Be sure fire trucks can get to pier so the new one won't burn down.

4. Don't opening the lagoon mean that oil from harbor boats under power at the low speed area go into the open lagoon, collecting sand & swimmers?

5. I hate the children's families to lose their venue at Seaside Lagoon.

6. cont. In the lowered dock area off the pier: Will there be still a boat loft?

chard: Will the pedestrian walk because of height eliminate types of boats used using the area? Will commercial fishing boats still be able to get under the ped walkway? Will sail boats long get in? E hoot see Joe's Grub Shack will views be replaced by a parking lot with the approach studies & fences hold up wells around is there a need for a the hotel? Will the

b) I'm glad the pier will be reinforced that storm, flooding, & earthquake will be addressed...

chard: Will there be problems of ocean being drifted as well as addressed by storm drains better?

A) How many foot or the pier already?
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Lillian Light
Organization (optional): Environmental Priorities Network
Address: 2807 Pine Ave
Zip Code: Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
Phone (optional): 310-545-1384
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: I do not approve of putting a mall with so much overdevelopment at a beach. I like visiting Redondo Beach as it is now with beach views and access to the ocean.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: **Luke Massey**

Organization (optional):

Address: 620 The Village Unit #301 Redondo Beach

Zip Code: 90277

Phone (optional): (310) 416-4227

E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [x] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [x] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [x] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [x] Transportation/Traffic

- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [x] Cultural Resources
- [x] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [x] Mineral Resources*
- [x] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

All of these aspects need to be thoroughly inspected. Also, views from the condominium/apartment complexes need to be taken into account (aesthetic). Ocean views add tremendous value to property and can also be the reason one would buy such property, as I did. There should be projected heights and view structures flagged off so residents will see how they’ll be affected.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

**Comments:**

- Objection to the road. Increased traffic will create pollution, congestion, noise, dangerous conditions for pedestrians.
- Objection to Market Hall structure: a large, basically useless building, located next to the Shore Dr., should be a parkland recreation area.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:

Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Diana Mann

Organization (optional):

Address: 230 The Village #302, Redondo Beach

Zip Code:

Phone (optional): 424-257-8542

E-mail (optional): dmann_90277@hotmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

Objection: View impacts. The 37 ft. height limitation is too high. It will severely impact ocean and harbor views from Cenacle Park. Who wants to sit in the park and look at a parking structure and building. Now you can see sailboats. Then you will see a little ocean & sky. No more boats 😞. No more paddleboads 😞.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: JOHN MANN
Organization (optional):
Address: 230 THE VILLAGE # 302
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 424-257-8542
E-mail (optional): jm_mann@fattomail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [x] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

Without the 3D Nighttime models, Fred Broming promised many times in the last 12 months to public meetings, we cannot assess the impacts on views. Where are the promised models?

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process
Name: Mickey Marruffo
Organization (optional): Resident
Address: 1917 Nelson Ave
Zip Code: 90278
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional): mickey@mickeym ciné

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: I support the project and look forward to improving the waterfront. Thank you for being thorough.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Aesthetics - I'm in favor of revitalization, but current concept seems way overdeveloped. I prefer balanced development. With this much development then comes the need to increase infrastructure to support it. Infrastructure impact should be included in study! While the external roads that lead to this area are stagnant, the traffic impact & pollution are also a major area of concern.

This revitalization could be better if quaint & purposeful rules the day. Please approach the study with thoughtful consideration for this fine beach community. This is a project for many lifetimes. Thank you.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Patricia McKinsey
Organization (optional): Leonardo/BC Urban
Address: W Torrance Blvd
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional): p.mckinsey@bcurban.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

*These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: Pier needs upgrading. Market place could have farmers market everyday. Lots of shops for people on vacation. Encourage visitors to stay in Redondo as their base while they are work other parks, etc. Hopefully enough one of them to use beach facilities.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: JAMES MCLEOD
Organization (optional): FRIENDS OF "VINCENT PARK"
Address: 619 VINCENT ST
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 310 3342245
E-mail (optional): JAMES.ALEXANDER.MCLEOD@GMAIL.COM

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: THIS PROJECT IS WAY OVERRUN WE DO NOT NEED "OVERDEVELOPMENT IN OUR HARBOR". WE MUST RETAIN THE VIEW CORRIDOR (SINGLE STORY ONLY), WHY DO WE NEED TO COMPLETE OR "BRING" DOLLARS FROM ADJOINING CITIES WE SHOULD NOT BE COMPETING. THIS IS A CHANCE TO HAVE POSSIBLY A DOWNTOWN REDONDO WHICH WE DO NOT HAVE. RETAIL IS DOWN LOOK WHAT HAPPENED TO THE AREA ABOVE THE PIER. All MALLS AND THATS WHAT THIS WILL BE GROW OLD AND AGE AND THEN WHEN MR. BRUNET IS LONG GONE WE AS RESIDENTS ARE STUCK WITH A DINOSAUR

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Ken & Barbara Melcher
Organization (optional): Resident
Address: 200 No. Catalina Ave, Unit F, RB
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources* ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning ☐ Mineral Resources* ☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing* ☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic ☐ Utilities/Service Systems

* These issue areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

Proposed project is entirely too large for the area. Infrastructure (roads), fire, insufficient today for ingress/egress to & from the area. Added structures will only increase traffic problems more. The market hall will block many residents' views, including ours.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: 

Organization (optional): 

Address: 

Zip Code: 

Phone (optional): 

E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems

These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: Please consider that most of us see the list that you are considering and I have written comments. Looking forward to the results.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:

Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Linda Neal
Organization (optional): 
Address: 1110 4th Ave
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 310 316 9931
E-mail (optional): lindaneal@gmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: I am all for updating the waterfront, and I want it to reflect the beach attitude and ambiance. It feels much too much – too big, grandiose and not conducive to small-town businesses and friendly a waterfront. We need to think about refurbishing the underground garage, not build a three-story garage. I do not want this to be a "lifestyle center" which to me is just a fancy name for mall. We need waterfront access and usability for many. Not a monorail...

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments

The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Deanne Newton
Organization (optional):
Address: 1617 S. Broadway #5 Redondo Beach
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [x] Agriculture and Forest Resources
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [x] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [x] Minerals Resources
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

Aesthetics: do not want large parking structure affecting view.

Traffic: do not want more traffic in area which will cause poor air quality & congestion & inability for residents like myself to get home.

I would like basic improvements to pier so it is more functional for residents – better restaurants & bars & less touristy shops. We do not need a parking structure & retail shops. Just remodel existing buildings.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Fumiko Noguchi

Organization (optional):

Address: 672 The Village, Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Zip Code: 310-373-4797

Phone (optional):

E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [x] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [x] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: The new pacific Ave will add too much pollution for near by residents.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Jonathan Wood

Organization (optional):
Address: 610 The Village 302
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 3108974862
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: Additional roadways pose safety issues

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
No matter what CenterCal calls the proposed Waterfront Project (*Life Style Center*) -- it is a MALL -- with a big, old, ugly Parking Structure -- and with all the mostly empty (especially during the week) Movie theaters at DelAmo, South Bay Galleria, Palisades Plaza, Peninsular Center -- why do we need a Movie Theater on our Waterfront!!?? -- and

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:

Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.

All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
what about the traffic 77
--- assuming people come
to walk around ---
the additional pollution at
our waterfront will be

Buy on the other hand, gosh,
are these oh so unique
retail stores really going to
bring in shoppers who will
purchase enough to make
these shops financially
feasible? Think again.

Del Amo Mall is enlarging by
leaps and bounds
The South Bay Galleria is
often pretty empty
Peninsula Center is a Ghost Town.

and on and on.

Oh and why do we need a Fountain
to look at instead of our
fantastic God-given Ocean

By the way, who is Katie Quston? 77
Who hired her? Who is paying
her salary? What are her
qualifications? The Citizens & Taxpayers
of Redondo Peninsula
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Ronald "Sandy" Pringle
Organization (optional):
Address: 402 South Broadway
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): Sandy@PringleAssociates.com
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and
describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [x] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Noise
- [x] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [x] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently projected to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: This presentation was very difficult to see.
The preparation for the presentation was ridiculously inappropriate. The screen was way way too small. It couldn't be seen by the vast majority of the room.

That being said - this is a ridiculous overbuild poor use of an excellent site - Public USE

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Very hard to approve on even like that which seems to overcome, and overwhelm our Public use area and its poor use of newly developed possibilities.

MORE PARK
MORE RECREATION FACILITIES

I believe the traffic impact including exhaust gases and solids will be extremely detrimental.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) - Scoping Process

Name:  
Organization (optional):  
Address:  
Redondo  
Zip Code:  
90277  
Phone (optional):  
E-mail (optional):  

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

I AM CURRENTLY AGAINST

THIS PROJECT.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Curt Reimer
Organization (optional):
Address: 404 Rainbow Rd, RB, 90277
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: totally against the Waterfront Project.
Big sham

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: ERIKA SNOW ROBINSON
Organization (optional): RBAG (R.B. ART GROUP)
Address: 315 S. MARIA AVE, RB
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): redondoobeachartist@gmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: YAY! WE CAN BE A TEAM! WE BE A TEAM! To furthering R.B’s CULTURAL ART PRESENCE!

Please please please find a way to keep Naja’s – and keep Naja’s as Naja’s – not as some high-falutin “gastro pub” or bistro!

Please keep Tony’s! As is! Or just safety updates if necessary!

AND LAST Please Please Please –

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Please think of paddle boarders & S.U.P. ers & make sure we have a place to launch safely and also can you find a way to have the paddle board storage like they do in Hawaii - where they have "SUP" racks - just like bike racks - lining the piers or the walkways where we can pay to store our S.U.P. boards.
I would like to have Seaside Lagoon be converted into an outdoor Olympic size pool for year round use. 50 yds x 100 meters.

Torrance Plung is the only one in our community. Let's make better use of the lagoon space year round.

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issue areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: A Center Cal representative declined to give the building heights for any of the structures in the project and claimed that the structure heights "are not available." That cannot possibly be true. No developer even plans a building project without planning for and knowing the height of each structure, so his statement is simply put, a lie. Do you wonder why we as RB residents don't trust Center Cal? It's easy to see why residents believe that the City is railroadng this project.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Mary Sanders
Organization (optional):
Address: Redondo Beach
Zip Code: 90272
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [x] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [x] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [x] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [x] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: I look forward to seeing a revitalization of the RBs waterfront as there is a great need. However, I am very concerned of the economic viability of the project & fear that the over commercialization & overdevelopment will deter future consumers as the traffic would make it less desirable for a customer to visit a store at the waterfront when they can go elsewhere with significantly less traffic. I worry that this project if overdeveloped will lead to the bankruptcy of the city & vacant stores on our waterfront. Please evaluate the financial impact of this project.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Please also evaluate if it would be in the City's best interest (environmentally, traffic, noise, pollution, economically) to spread the current dense planned development plans & distribute it between the waterfront land & the AE6 site. Would moving what Mayor Aspel called "The World's largest parking lot by the beach" (on July 30, 2013) to more inland to the AE6 site or even decrease the size & distributing it to the AE6 site be more feasible? Perhaps moving "the World's largest parking lot by the beach" to the AE6 site & having a trolley to transport the people would provide a better solution.

Thank you for your time & consideration to help develop guide the building of a beautiful, successful, and financially sound waterfront project.
Comments

The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Frank Schmidt

Organization (optional): 

Address: 1964 S. Junipero St. R.B.

Zip Code: 90277

Phone (optional): 

E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: Bike path should not be in the street

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:

Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Pam Schreider
Organization (optional):
Address:
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what **environmental issues** you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [x] Aesthetics
- [x] Biological Resources
- [x] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [x] Population/Housing*
- [x] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [x] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [x] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

**WE NEED RENOVATION OF OUR WATERFRONT, not this over-development!**

The small-town feel of Redondo is why we live here - we do not need another mall or chain stores. The long construction, traffic, noise and loss of views I feel will be detrimental, in addition to the environmental impact.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Deborah Shepard
Organization (optional): associated with Tourism Com./RSCVB
Address: 2146 Eucalyptus Ave., Long Beach
Zip Code: 90815
Phone (optional): 
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics / Views
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources*
- Noise
- Population/Housing*
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

While all issues are important, the most vital concern is to move forward with revitalization. Addressing concerns is different from getting too involved with NIMBY caterers.

Residents & visitors, family, friends, travelers deserve to enjoy the well thought-out plan brought to us by the City and Centerline.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Regarding what **environmental issues** you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

**Comments:**

- **HIGH ON MY LIST:**
  - *ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC, NOISE BIG ISSUE*
  - *LAND USE*
  - *HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, WATER QUALITY*

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:

Katie Owston, Project Planner  
City of Redondo Beach  
415 Diamond Street  
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.  
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Steve Sheehan
Organization (optional): LESSOR
Address: 140 the Village
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 310 874 9982
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

[ ] Aesthetics
[ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
[ ] Air Quality
[ ] Biological Resources
[ ] Cultural Resources
[ ] Geology/Soils
[ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
[ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
[ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
[ ] Land Use/Planning
[ ] Mineral Resources*
[ ] Noise
[ ] Population/Housing*
[ ] Public Services
[ ] Recreation
[ ] Transportation/Traffic
[ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

ATTACHED

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
A very important issue is the removal of the Seaside Lagoon.

Proposition G was specific to keeping the Seaside Lagoon. In fact the initiative would probably not have passed if it were not for "Save the Seaside Lagoon".

By definition: **AN INLET IS NOT A LAGOON.**

There will be no separate clean safe area for families with children to play and swim. The area will be part of the dirty harbor and no one swims in the harbor now. How can the city possibly think that little children will swim and be safe next to a boat ramp?

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Center Cal told me in the beginning they would buy me or build around me. But, no one has made me an offer.

The plans show me gone, not built around.

I have a long term lease. So, how can the EIR or the development include my property?

*Footnotes*
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Barry Solomon & Anita Solomon

Address: 2219 Bataan Rd. Unit 13

Zip Code: 90278-1404

Phone (optional): 310-591-2040

E-mail (optional): Barry@SolomonEVerizon.Net

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [x] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [x] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [x] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [x] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

We are concerned about the possibility that this project may cost residents’ money. This should make money for the city due to the rent the stores will pay but we do not know this for sure.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:

Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Janet Speens
Organization (optional):
Address: 140 The Village, Redondo Beach
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics
☐ Biological Resources
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
☐ Land Use/Planning
☐ Population/Housing*
☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources*
☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Mineral Resources*
☐ Public Services
☐ Utilities/Service Systems

☐ Air Quality
☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Noise
☐ Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

The proposed Contracted project is way over what the limited space can hold and still remain a nice open space harbor view location. Roads are limited for coming to the harbor/pier area, so added traffic is a poor choice. Not to mention the higher noise level of more businesses, pollution of air from their buildings, and increased vehicle noise if the road planned to cut through is done.

This is a project that few actual residents want. Just the city council due to there poor planning to look after what we already have at the pier/harbor. They want... (Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
"bailed out", things do need to be repaired/replaced but not magnified out of control.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Eileen Stael

Organization (optional):

Address: 2211 Earle Ct

Zip Code: 90278

Phone (optional): 310-374-7678

E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources*
☐ Biological Resources  ☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Land Use/Planning  ☐ Mineral Resources*
☐ Population/Housing*  ☐ Public Services
☒ Transportation/Traffic  ☐ Utilities/Service Systems
☐ Air Quality  ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality  ☐ Noise
☐ Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: We are very concerned. In the 1970’s redevelopment came in and basically ruined our city. We no longer have a downtown. Our view of the Ocean is very limited already. Please we already have a bordsrugs at Seaport Village. What is next?

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Bradley Tellison
Organization (optional): Torrance Transit
Address: 20500 Madrona Ave, Torrance, CA
Zip Code: 90501
Phone (optional): (310) 618-3030
E-mail (optional): B.Tellison@TorranceCA.gov

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources* ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning ☐ Mineral Resources* ☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing* ☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation
☒ Transportation/Traffic ☐ Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: Impacts to transit service and infrastructure are not clear. If the north side of the property is to become the hub of the site, Torrance Transit will not work as a transit terminal for Torrance Transit. Torrance Transit requires at least 240 ft. (60 ft.*4) of curb space for layovers and space for turnarounds. We also require nearby restrooms to reduce the time spent laying over (usually 10 minutes or more). The less time we have to spend...

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comment continued:

turning around the more service it is possible to provide.

A) If service must be shifted to
north side, a site in the middle of
the project must be identified to
accommodate transit vehicles (Metro,
LADOT, BCT, Torrance Transit).

B) If service to the north side
is not appropriate, current facilities
at Torrance Circle should be maintained
at a minimum.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Jim Tseng
Organization (optional):
Address: 1104 Yasbel St.
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): (310) 951-7334
E-mail (optional): JSTSENG@AOL.COM

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:
1. EIR should be considered with economic feasibility.
2. How to attract customers during weekdays & winter time?
3. How to compete with other public spaces in the neighborhood cities?
4. Why after 10% return from the developer, the city of R.B. can get income?

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Justin Tuck
Organization (optional):
Address: 1916 Rigby Ave RB CA 90278
Zip Code: 90278
Phone (optional): (310) 577-1507
E-mail (optional): Justinatuck@gmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [x] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [x] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Noise
- [x] Population/Housing*
- [x] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

Bike path on the East side of Pacific Ave?
It should be on the west side. Why isn't the bike path along the ocean next to the walking path?

Like the bridge.

Don't like the opening of seaside lagoon.
What is the environmental impact of that?

Like the boat ramp.

Don't like where the market place is located.

Why isn't there a model of the project?

It looks like the south parking lot is for the hotel.

Why is the hotel in arc prime location?

It doesn't feel like it's doing anything for the community.

Like the connection of Pacific Ave

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:

Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.

All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
I'm concerned with parking structures being built on waterfront property—no multi-levels—take away from beauty of ocean.

The traffic will increase bringing more waste and pollution to the area.!!
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: DON VANGELUFF
Organization (optional):
Address:
Zip Code:
Phone (optional): DON.VANGELUFF@MIDAMERICA.COM
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

I made verbal comments to link about the logistics of this meeting. (No changes? Pretty weak. Amateur hour, especially when throwing stones and rioting.)

I had good discussion w/ Mike W. and then w/ Pete Carmichael on city retaining more ownership over select portions of this project. Please check w/ him if you have more questions.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
What dates are Draft C1a (Spring)
Final C1a (Summer)
It is a rather angry crowd here tonight. We drove a long way from City Hall to meet in a theater lobby with poor acoustics, poor visibility and nowhere to sit. And the lobby would have been worse if not for James Blackman. "I think a lot of people were concerned about the height of the development, and when asked, the presenter replied he had no information about that. A very disappointing evening. Hopefully there is more info on the website?"
Also, I have some concerns about opening up seaside lagoon to the ocean. I asked one of the consultants what would be the advantage to this and she said something about kayakers & other small craft but admitted she didn't really know.

Who does know? This is a big change to a lagoon where many families enjoy spending time because it is closed off from the ocean.

I am not against all development, but given the past history of RB elected officials not being willing aware of public opinion and residents' wishes, I will continue to watch developments on this project very closely.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Thomas Wilkinson
Organization (optional):
Address: 681 Tl'c V'llage
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional): Tommy.Wilkinson@gmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources* ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning ☐ Mineral Resources* ☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing* ☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic ☐ Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: I feel the conceptual plan provided by Centrco is unrealistic for the use of the pier area. The reconstruction of Pacific Ave. could have a significant impact on local traffic, noise & smog pollution, as well as pose a hazard to guests on the pier that was not present before. The sheer number of new retail also seems high. Very few types of shops seem to thrive in a pier environment. Theaters and clothing shops do not seem like something that would do well though I like the idea of both. They also pose a possible interruption of the ocean view, I go to the pier to enjoy the ocean, not see movies & buildings.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comment continued:

blocking the view, I think this development could be a good thing, but the imagined scale I have seen frightens me.
REDONDO BEACH PIER doesn’t need a Billion Dollar makeover. Redondo Beach is a charming seaside town with a rich history. We enjoy our beach and pier. “CenterCAL” specializes in creating malls - our beautiful location has a unique personality - it is NOT a mall. We don’t need to go into debt to “CenterCAL” for the next 30 years. We are among the earliest seaside cities in Southern California. Our city logo pictures the fishing pier, a boat and the date 1892, when we incorporated as a city. Keep our pier a place where we can all celebrate the ocean and unique pier.

Jianulla and Arnie Zimmerman
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: ____________________________________________
Organization (optional): ____________________________
Address: __________________________________________
Zip Code: __________________________________________
Phone (optional): ____________________________________
E-mail (optional): ____________________________________

Regarding what **environmental issues** you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:


(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural and Forest Resources*
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources*
- Noise
- Population/Housing*
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

No sealing - no way to hear other comments I have a dialog start the project Unbelievable

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agricultural and Forest Resources*
- [x] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

Please also evaluate the project's impact comparing with and without the reconstruction of Pacific Avenue on traffic, noise, pollution, etc.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Existing streets cannot support the flow of traffic going in and around the proposed retail/office space near Golds Gym. Are we just going to ignore this landlock traffic issue?

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: ____________________________________________________________
Organization (optional): ____________________________________________
Address: __________________________________________________________
Zip Code: __________________________________________________________
Phone (optional): __________________________________________________
E-mail (optional): __________________________________________________

Regarding what **environmental issues** you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics **and** describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:

Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 6:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: 
Organization (optional): 
Address: 
Zip Code: 
Phone (optional): 
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: We have the Galleria Mall in RB, the remodeled Del Amo Mall in Torrance, the El Segundo Mall. We do not need another mall in the area, especially one the size that is being proposed. People do not come to the beach to shop or watch movies. On weekends the streets are already very congested which makes it difficult for residents to get around. People paid money to purchase homes with a view.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.

and now those views will be blocked.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name:
Organization (optional):
Address:
Zip Code:
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing *
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources *
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources *
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

What an insult! How dare you put on this charade.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: 
Organization (optional): 
Address: 
Zip Code: 
Phone (optional): 
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [X] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [X] Land Use/Planning
- [X] Population/Housing*
- [X] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [X] Air Quality
- [X] Geology/Soils
- [X] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [X] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Oral Comments Received at Reporter Station
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process
Scoping Meeting/Open House July 9, 2014

Nick Sherbin – concerned that any cost from an oversight will be borne by the City, and thereby the residents of the City; does not appear to be any viable way to be mitigated; study on the impact of the cost and the feasibility that the development can generate money

Barbara Grasso – cannot rush the process; there’s enough shopping don’t need more; concerned about air quality; wants smaller scale retail no big box development; preserve and enhance existing beachfront environment

Anonymous (two people) - Feel CenterCal has lied and hasn’t disclosed the details of the development; CenterCal has not incorporated the residents’ feedback from previous meetings; the size is too huge; more family activities, not shopping; place for local artists; more of a Laguna Beach atmosphere; concerned of how the businesses will receive deliveries.

Anonymous - Public meeting 2 hours, nowhere to sit, seems like the City wants people to get out quick, should have used the auditorium portion

Alan Israel – should have had seating; should have handed out copies of the schematic to take home; schematic should show the building heights of each section

Todd Kelner – family of 4; concerned about growing element of gang members that frequent the Seaside Lagoon on the weekends, feels unsafe; not enough of a police presence in the area; address public safety

Sheila Lamb – 1532 Steinhart Ave. – concerned about water quality in the Harbor area once the lagoon opened up; what will be the cost to have quality water and who monitors; is project economically viable, any income generation; if there is an increase in customer base is will increase traffic in the vicinity and PCH and costs related to traffic mitigation and costs to the adjacent cities.

Lydia Vaia – 406 Mirmar Dr. – too large scale, loss of view; doesn’t like the market mall and what kind of retailers are planned to occupy; no multi-level parking lot - no need

Jim Tseng – 1104 Ysabel St. - how do they address the issue of attracting people during weekdays and winter; and where is there any closed/covered public space; why is the City waiting until developer profits 10% before we receive revenue because the developer can say they’re losing money, who will account for the income; how can the development compete with the malls in El Segundo or Manhattan Beach, or Torrance

Anonymous – lives off Diamond and Catalina – pollution factor, what are they using for liquefaction, construction and demo; air quality and pollution who monitors and how does the city report; how will they mitigate dust from construction; would like to see incremental development; who will support the infrastructure City or CenterCal

Deborah Vaia – 424 Camino Real – against the entire development; pollution, parking, traffic, noise; don’t need another strip mall; who will monitor the future development
Name: Anne Balderas
Organization (optional): Resident of Casa de Los Amigos
Address: 123 S. Catalina Avenue Apt. 335
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [X] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

Thanking you for the information this night. I am privileged to live at Casa de Los Amigos along with many others. Casa is a low-income senior facility. A plaque on my own door reads “Seaside Sanctuary,” please do not take this away from us!!!!!
Comments Received at Computer Station
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Ryan Dziedzic

Organization (optional): Resident

Address: 232 S. Helberta Ave

Zip Code: 90277

Phone (optional): 

E-mail (optional): Ryan.dz5@gmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [X] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [X] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [X] Noise
- [X] Population/Housing*
- [X] Public Services
- [X] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

The number one priority for any project in this valuable and cherished waterfront area of our city is does it help improve the lives of the majority of our citizens. Adding generic retail and movie theaters and chain restaurants that are already available nearby (Del Amo Mall, El Segundo Plaza) does not add value to our area and only adds congestion. Notice that the cities of Manhattan Beach, Hermosa Beach, and Palos Verdes do not have large generic retail spaces anywhere near the waterfront. The only type of development that should be permitted is something unique that enhances our waterfront and provides something not already available just a few miles away. Generic retail space may bring in many people in the short term but will not add value in the long term. The questions I want you to answer for the EIR, as it relates to Land Use, Planning, and Aesthetics are the following: “How does this development improve the lives of our citizens? What does the development provide that is not already available only a few miles away? What is unique and special enough about this development that it should be located on our valuable and very limited waterfront area? How will this development remain relevant over the next 10/20/50 years?”
Comments Received at Computer Station
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Jeff Emdee
Organization (optional):
Address: 2910 Perkins Lane
Zip Code: 90278
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: All of the areas should be addressed but I would be interested in seeing the study look at public safety impacts of the bike lane and suggest any improvements.
Comments Received at Computer Station
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Su Hwang
Organization (optional): Resident
Address: 232 S. Helberta Ave, Unit A
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): E-mail (optional): sukhwang@hotmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [X] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [X] Land Use/Planning
- [X] Population/Housing*
- [X] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [X] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [X] Noise
- [X] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

It is evident that the residents of RB are not in favor of the proposed development. It does not add to the quality of life of the residents. It will block waterfront views, add retail that is not desired, increase traffic/noise to an extremely residential area along Torrance Blvd and Catalina Ave. The proposed development does not add meaningful recreation, cultural resources, or public services. This is a mall. A mall that residents do not want. Residents moved to Redondo for waterfront features not additional retail & parking structures for non-residents.

The set-up of the public hearing was inadequate and downright disrespectful. No seating was provided, presentation was not able to be seen, fellow resident comments could not be heard, and meaningful discourse not possible.
Comments Received at Computer Station
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Vinita Waskow

Address: 2000 Graham Avenue

Zip Code: 90278

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources* [X]
- [X] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources [X]
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [X] Hazards and Hazardous Materials [X]
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources* [X]
- [ ] Noise [X]
- [ ] Population/Housing* [X]
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation [X]
- [X] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

In regards to bike planning, why does the bike lane cross over to the north side of the street along the project boundary? If there are going to be a lot of cyclists, it may be a safety issue for cyclists to stop and cross the street. Also, if you are riding your bike and you want to enter the project area in the middle, one will have to cross the street again, which does not seem functional and will create another potential safety area. Also, are there any considerations for connecting the bike path east-west to the surrounding Redondo beach neighborhood. There is a good north-south connection but if you live in the neighborhood and are trying to get down to the Beach, it is very scary on a bike right when you go one street east. If the project is trying to reduce car trips and mitigate air quality, I would consider better connections for cyclists and pedestrians from the local neighborhood down to the waterfront. Planning within the project boundary is not always the best way since we lose sight of what is outside that boundary line. Make sure there are better connections for cyclists and peds to reduce trips.

The site also has a lot of history that unfortunately has been lost. It would be nice to somehow incorporate some of the waterfront's history into the new development. RB used to have the sister hotel to the Del in Coronado, which is still a gem. The design team may want to consider incorporating historic pieces into the marketplace and the hotel.

With all the new development, water quality will also be very important since the project is right on the waterfront. Please consider capturing stormwater on-site or filtering prior to entering the ocean. The more pervious pavement the better.

The Waterfront Scoping Meeting Comments
Agency Comment Letters
July 21, 2014

Ms. Katie Owston  
City of Redondo Beach  
415 Diamond Street  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Re: The Waterfront  
Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR  
SCH #2014061071, IGR No. 140646FL  
Vic. SR-1/PM 19.5

Dear Ms. Owston:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above-referenced project. Based on the Initial Study (IS), the proposed project is to revitalize approximately 35.6 acres of land and water: mainly proposed demolition of approximately 221,347 square feet of existing structures, demolition/renovation of the existing parking structure, and construction/renovation of up to approximately 523,732 square feet for retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, a market hall, and a boutique hotel.

As mentioned in the IS, the proposed project would generate new vehicle trips and traffic increases would occur; therefore, to assist Caltrans in our effort to evaluate the impacts of this project on State Transportation Facilities, please forward a copy of the environmental document once it’s prepared. Currently, Caltrans has the following comments:

Please evaluate potential transportation impacts to State Route 1 (Pacific Coast Highway), SR-405, and SR-110, associated with this project and from future growth in the surrounding area in a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA). Please refer traffic engineers to follow the Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impacts Studies, it is accessible online at:  

Listed below are elements of what Caltrans generally expects in a traffic impact study:

- Presentations of assumptions and methods used to develop trip generation, trip distribution, trip assignments, and choice of travel mode. Travel modeling should be consistent with other regional and local modeling forecasts and with travel data.

- Inclusion of all appropriate traffic volumes. Analysis should include a) traffic from the project under consideration, b) cumulative traffic from all specific approved developments in the area, c) cumulative traffic from likely not-yet-approved developments in the area, and d) traffic growth other than from the project and developments. Scenarios involving different assumptions on development and growth should be considered.
• Analysis of AM, and PM peak-hour volumes for both existing and future conditions in the affected area.

• Discussion of mitigation measures appropriate to alleviate anticipated traffic impacts, including a description of transportation infrastructure improvements, financial costs, funding sources and financing, sequence and scheduling considerations, implementation responsibilities, controls and monitoring.

• A plan of realistic mitigation measures under the control of the lead agency or project sponsors or specification percent shares of the costs for various mitigation actions undertaken by other agencies. Any traffic mitigation fees may be assessed proportionally with the additional traffic generated by the project. (See Caltrans’ Traffic Impact Study Guide for a suggested formula).

Although the lead agency is required to comply with Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP) standards and thresholds of significance, Caltrans does not consider the Los Angeles County’s CMP criteria alone to be adequate for the analysis of transportation impacts pursuant to a CEQA review. The CMP does not adequately address cumulative transportation impacts and does not analyze for safety, weaving problems, or delay. Caltrans’ Guide directs preparers of traffic impact analysis to consult with the local District as early as possible to determine the appropriate requirements and criteria of significance to be used in the traffic impact analysis.

Generally, when traffic is added to already deficient highway conditions (LOS “F”), it is considered a cumulatively significant impact, as it may contribute to the extension of the congestion period and deterioration of safety.

As a reminder, various permits may be needed for this project, such as but not limit to – oversize vehicle permits, transportation permits (any wide loads or unusual loads), encroachment permits (any work performed within the State Right-of-Way), etc. – For information on the Permit process, please contact Caltrans District 7 Office of Permit at (213) 897-3631.

Storm water run-off is a sensitive issue for Los Angeles and Ventura counties. Please be mindful of the project’s need to discharge clean run-off water and it is not permitted to discharge onto State highway facilities.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (213) 897 – 9140 or project coordinator Frances Lee at (213) 897 – 0673 or electronically at frances.lee@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

DIANNA WATSON
IGR/CEQA Branch Chief
Caltrans District 7

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
July 18, 2014

Katie Owston
Project Planner
Community Development Department
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Subject: Notice of Preparation (NOP) for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Redondo Beach Waterfront Project, Los Angeles County

Dear Ms. Owston:

The California State Lands Commission (CSLC) staff has reviewed the subject NOP for an EIR for the Redondo Beach Waterfront Project (Project), which is being prepared by the City of Redondo Beach (City). The City, as the public agency proposing to carry out the Project, is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.). The CSLC is a trustee agency for projects that could directly or indirectly affect sovereign lands, and their accompanying Public Trust resources or uses. In addition, the CSLC may act as a responsible agency.

CSLC Jurisdiction and Public Trust Lands

The CSLC has jurisdiction and management authority over all ungranted tidelands, submerged lands, and the beds of navigable lakes and waterways. The CSLC also has certain residual and review authority for tidelands and submerged lands legislatively granted in trust to local jurisdictions (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 6301, 6306). All tidelands and submerged lands, granted or ungranted, as well as navigable lakes and waterways, are subject to the protections of the Common Law Public Trust.

As general background, the State of California acquired sovereign ownership of all tidelands and submerged lands and beds of navigable lakes and waterways upon its admission to the United States in 1850. The State holds these lands for the benefit of all people of the State for statewide Public Trust purposes, which include but are not limited to waterborne commerce, navigation, fisheries, water-related recreation, habitat preservation, and open space. On tidal waterways, the State's sovereign fee ownership extends landward to the mean high tide line, except for areas of fill or artificial accretion or where the boundary has been fixed by agreement or a court. On navigable non-tidal
waterways, including lakes, the State holds fee ownership of the bed of the waterway landward to the ordinary low water mark and a Public Trust easement landward to the ordinary high water mark, except where the boundary has been fixed by agreement or a court. Such boundaries may not be readily apparent from present day site inspections.

A portion of the proposed Project will involve lands that have been legislatively granted to the City, pursuant to Chapter 57, Statutes of 1915 and as amended by Chapter 1555, Statutes of 1971. The City, as trustee of these sovereign lands, must ensure that the specific uses proposed on lands impressed with the public trust are consistent with the provisions of the relevant granting statutes and the common law Public Trust Doctrine. Future approvals from the Commission may be necessary as the project proceeds. Please contact Reid Boggiano, Public Land Management Specialist (see contact information below) for more information.

**Project Description**

The proposed Project, located in the City’s Coastal Zone south of Portofino Way, North of Torrance Boulevard, and west of Harbor Drive/Catalina Avenue, would revitalize approximately 35.6 acres of land and water by redeveloping and expanding local and visitor serving commercial uses, enhancing public access and recreational opportunities and facilities, and improving the aging support infrastructure and parking facilities. The main components include proposed demolition of approximately 221,347 square feet of existing structures, demolition/renovation of the existing pier parking structure, and construction/renovation of up to approximately 523,732 square feet (289,906 square feet net new development) to include retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, a market hall, and a boutique hotel. The Project includes public recreation enhancements such as a new boat launch ramp, improvements to Seaside Lagoon, new parking facilities, and pedestrian and bicycle pathways. In addition, a new pedestrian bridge would be constructed that spans the approximately 250-foot Basin 3 entrance.

**Environmental Review**

CSLC staff requests that the following potential impacts be analyzed in the EIR.

**General Comments**

1. **Project Description**: Page 12 of the NOP states that “Construction activities associated with project elements such as the boat launch ramp, Seaside Lagoon, and pedestrian bridge, may include dredging, filling, rock placement, in-water concrete placement, sheet pile installation, pile driving, shoreline protection and other above and below water activities.” A thorough and complete Project Description should be included in the EIR in order to facilitate meaningful environmental review of potential impacts, mitigation measures, and alternatives. The Project Description should be as precise as possible in describing the details of all allowable activities (e.g., types of equipment or methods that may be used, maximum area of impact or volume of sediment removed or deposited, seasonal work windows, locations for
material disposal, etc.), as well as the details of the timing and length of activities. Thorough descriptions of all Project phases will make for a more robust analysis of the work that may be performed, and minimize the potential for subsequent environmental analysis to be required.

Biological Resources

2. **Consultation**: The EIR should include a discussion of consultation with the Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), including any recommended mitigation measures and potentially required permits identified by these agencies for any special-status plant or wildlife species that may occur in the Project area.

3. **Construction Noise**: The EIR should also evaluate noise and vibration impacts on fish and birds from construction, flood control activities in the water, on the levees, and for land-side supporting structures. Mitigation measures could include species-specific work windows as defined by CDFW, USFWS, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Again, staff recommends early consultation with these agencies to minimize the impacts of the Project on sensitive species.

Cultural Resources

4. **Submerged Resources**: The EIR should evaluate potential impacts to submerged cultural resources in the Project area. The CSLC maintains a shipwrecks database that can assist with this analysis. CSLC staff requests that the City contact Assistant Chief Counsel Pam Griggs (see contact information below) to obtain shipwrecks data from the database and CSLC records for the Project site. The database includes known and potential vessels located on the State’s tide and submerged lands; however, the locations of many shipwrecks remain unknown. Please note that any submerged archaeological site or submerged historic resource that has remained in State waters for more than 50 years is presumed to be significant.

5. **Title to Resources**: The City should also mention that the title to all abandoned shipwrecks, archaeological sites, and historic or cultural resources on or in the tide and submerged lands of California is vested in the State and under the jurisdiction of the CSLC. CSLC staff requests that the City consult with Assistant Chief Counsel Pam Griggs (see contact information below), should any cultural resources on state lands be discovered during construction of the proposed Project.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NOP for the Project. As a trustee and potential responsible agency, we request that you consider our comments prior to certification of the EIR. Please send copies of future Project-related documents, including electronic copies of the Final EIR, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), Notice of Determination (NOD), CEQA Findings and, if applicable, Statement of Overriding Considerations when they become available, and refer questions concerning environmental review to Cynthia Herzog, Senior Environmental
Scientist, at (916) 574-1310 or via e-mail at Cynthia.Hertzog@slc.ca.gov. For questions concerning archaeological or historic resources under CSLC jurisdiction, please contact Assistant Chief Counsel Pam Griggs at (916) 574-1854 or via email at Pamela.Griggs@slc.ca.gov. For questions concerning CSLC jurisdiction, please contact Reid Boggiano, in the Granted Public Trust Lands Program, at (916) 574-0450, or via email at Reid.Boggiano@slc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Cy R. Oggins, Chief
Division of Environmental Planning and Management

cc: Office of Planning and Research
Reid Boggiano, Granted Lands, CSLC
Cynthia Herzog, DEPM, CSLC
Kathryn Colson, Legal, CSLC
July 17, 2014

Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277
(katie.owston@redondo.org)

Subject: Response to Notice of Preparation of an EIR for Waterfront Project

Dear Ms. Owston:

We have reviewed the NOP for the Waterfront Project and request the following potential impacts as related to all phases of the proposed Project be addressed in the EIR:

1. Potential effects on the harbor, breakwater, shoreline, or seafloor with the potential to affect accretion or erosion relating to the coastline or beach, wave action, or water quality.
2. Potential effects on the types, mix, square footage, time of use, circulation, parking and other land use components of the project and nearby areas catalyzed by the project.
3. Potential displacement and relocation of various populations currently using the harbor area and pier to other locales including Hermosa Beach.
4. Potential impacts to Hermosa Beach's commercial/tourism sectors, particularly in the downtown area, including effects on vacancy rates, local and regional land use, tourism or visitation patterns, etc., which may lead to deteriorated or blighted conditions.
5. Potential alterations or increases in traffic and use of fossil-fuels during construction or operation that increase greenhouse gases.
6. Effects on views from public viewpoints in Hermosa Beach.
7. Effects on recreational resources in Hermosa Beach, such as The Strand, beach, Plaza and coast generally.
8. Effects relating to traffic, congestion or circulation patterns affecting streets, roads, bikeways or circulation within and proximate to Hermosa Beach.
9. Impacts on the ability to provide the mutual fire, police and ambulance aid at the current levels.
10. The relationship and consistency of the above with coastal goals and policies in the City of Hermosa Beach Coastal Land Use Plan (title Local Coastal Plan).
11. Cumulative impacts relating to the above issue areas.

Based on our understanding of the project at this time, we agree that the City of Hermosa Beach is not a responsible agency.
The project contact will be Pamela Townsend, Senior Planner, City of Hermosa Beach, 1315 Valley Drive, Hermosa Beach, CA 90254 (ptownsend@hermosabch.org).

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ken Robertson
Community Development
Ms. Katie Owston, Project Planner  
Community Development Department  
City of Redondo Beach  
415 Diamond Street  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Dear Ms. Owston:

The Waterfront Project

The County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Districts) received a Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the subject project on June 19, 2014. The proposed development is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the South Bay Cities Sanitation District. We offer the following comments regarding sewerage service:

1. The wastewater flow originating from the proposed project will discharge to a local sewer line, which is not maintained by the Districts, for conveyance to the Districts’ Herondo Trunk Sewer Section 1, located in Herondo Street west of Francisca Avenue. This 14.06-inch diameter lined trunk sewer has a design capacity of 2.1 million gallons per day (mgd) and conveyed a peak flow of 1.0 mgd when last measured in 2010.

2. The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant located in the City of Carson, which has a design capacity of 400 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 263.7 mgd.

3. The expected increase in average wastewater flow from the project site is 22,282 gallons per day. For a copy of the Districts’ average wastewater generation factors, go to www.lacsd.org, Wastewater & Sewer Systems, click on Will Serve Program, and click on the Table 1, Loadings for Each Class of Land Use link.

4. The Districts are empowered by the California Health and Safety Code to charge a fee for the privilege of connecting (directly or indirectly) to the Districts’ Sewerage System for increasing the strength or quantity of wastewater attributable to a particular parcel or operation already connected. This connection fee is a capital facilities fee that is imposed in an amount sufficient to construct an incremental expansion of the Sewerage System to accommodate the proposed project. Payment of a connection fee will be required before a permit to connect to the sewer is issued. For more information and a copy of the Connection Fee Information Sheet, go to www.lacsd.org, Wastewater & Sewer Systems, click on Will Serve Program, and search for the
appropriate link. For more specific information regarding the connection fee application procedure and fees, please contact the Connection Fee Counter at extension 2727.

5. In order for the Districts to conform to the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA), the design capacities of the Districts' wastewater treatment facilities are based on the regional growth forecast adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Specific policies included in the development of the SCAG regional growth forecast are incorporated into clean air plans, which are prepared by the South Coast and Antelope Valley Air Quality Management Districts in order to improve air quality in the South Coast and Mojave Desert Air Basins as mandated by the CCA. All expansions of Districts' facilities must be sized and service phased in a manner that will be consistent with the SCAG regional growth forecast for the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial. The available capacity of the Districts' treatment facilities will, therefore, be limited to levels associated with the approved growth identified by SCAG. As such, this letter does not constitute a guarantee of wastewater service, but is to advise you that the Districts intend to provide this service up to the levels that are legally permitted and to inform you of the currently existing capacity and any proposed expansion of the Districts' facilities.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (562) 908-4288, extension 2717.

Very truly yours,

Grace Robinson Hyde

Adriana Raza
Customer Service Specialist
Facilities Planning Department

cc: M. Tremblay
J. Ganz
July 16, 2014

Katie Owston
Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

RE: Redondo Beach Waterfront Revitalization Project

Dear Ms. Owston,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Redondo Beach Waterfront Revitalization Project. This letter conveys recommendations from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) concerning issues that are germane to our agency's statutory responsibility in relation to our facilities and services that may be affected by the proposed project.

Metro bus line 130 operates on North Catalina Avenue, proximate to the proposed project. Although the project is not expected to result in any long-term impacts on transit, the developer should be aware of the bus services that are present. Metro Bus Operations Control Special Events Coordinator should be contacted at 213-922-4632 regarding construction activities that may impact Metro bus lines. (For closures that last more than six months, Metro's Stops and Zones Department will also need to be notified at 213-922-5188). Other municipal bus may also be impacted and should be included in construction outreach efforts.

Beyond impacts to Metro facilities and operations, LACMTA must also notify the applicant of state requirements. A Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA), with roadway and transit components, is required under the State of California Congestion Management Program (CMP) statute. The CMP TIA Guidelines are published in the "2010 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County", Appendix D (attached). The geographic area examined in the TIA must include the following, at a minimum:

1. All CMP arterial monitoring intersections, including monitored freeway on/off-ramp intersections, where the proposed project will add 50 or more trips during either the a.m. or p.m. weekday peak hour (of adjacent street traffic).

2. If CMP arterial segments are being analyzed rather than intersections, the study area must include all segments where the proposed project will add 50 or more peak hour trips (total of both directions). Within the study area, the TIA must analyze at least one segment between monitored CMP intersections.

3. Mainline freeway-monitoring locations where the project will add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the a.m. or p.m. weekday peak hour.

4. Caltrans must also be consulted through the NOP process to identify other specific locations to be analyzed on the state highway system. Please note that the nearby Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) is a State Highway, SR 1.
The CMP TIA requirement also contains two separate impact studies covering roadways and transit, as outlined in Sections D.8.1 – D.9.4. If the TIA identifies no facilities for study based on the criteria above, no further traffic analysis is required. However, projects must still consider transit impacts. For all CMP TIA requirements please see the attached guidelines.

If you have any questions regarding this response, please contact Marie Sullivan at 213-922-5667 or by email at SullivanMa@metro.net. LACMTA looks forward to reviewing the Draft EIR. Please send it to the following address:

LACMTA Development Review
One Gateway Plaza MS 99-23-4
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

Sincerely,

Marie Sullivan
Development Review Coordinator, Countywide Planning

Attachment: CMP Appendix D: Guidelines for CMP Transportation Impact Analysis
D.1 OBJECTIVE OF GUIDELINES

The following guidelines are intended to assist local agencies in evaluating impacts of land use decisions on the Congestion Management Program (CMP) system, through preparation of a regional transportation impact analysis (TIA). The following are the basic objectives of these guidelines:

- Promote consistency in the studies conducted by different jurisdictions, while maintaining flexibility for the variety of project types which could be affected by these guidelines.

- Establish procedures which can be implemented within existing project review processes and without ongoing review by MTA.

- Provide guidelines which can be implemented immediately, with the full intention of subsequent review and possible revision.

These guidelines are based on specific requirements of the Congestion Management Program, and travel data sources available specifically for Los Angeles County. References are listed in Section D.10 which provide additional information on possible methodologies and available resources for conducting TIAs.

D.2 GENERAL PROVISIONS

Exhibit D-7 provides the model resolution that local jurisdictions adopted containing CMP TIA procedures in 1993. TIA requirements should be fulfilled within the existing environmental review process, extending local traffic impact studies to include impacts to the regional system. In order to monitor activities affected by these requirements, Notices of Preparation (NOPs) must be submitted to MTA as a responsible agency. Formal MTA approval of individual TIAs is not required.

The following sections describe CMP TIA requirements in detail. In general, the competing objectives of consistency & flexibility have been addressed by specifying standard, or minimum, requirements and requiring documentation when a TIA varies from these standards.
D.3 PROJECTS SUBJECT TO ANALYSIS

In general a CMP TIA is required for all projects required to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) based on local determination. A TIA is not required if the lead agency for the EIR finds that traffic is not a significant issue, and does not require local or regional traffic impact analysis in the EIR. Please refer to Chapter 5 for more detailed information.

CMP TIA guidelines, particularly intersection analyses, are largely geared toward analysis of projects where land use types and design details are known. Where likely land uses are not defined (such as where project descriptions are limited to zoning designation and parcel size with no information on access location), the level of detail in the TIA may be adjusted accordingly. This may apply, for example, to some redevelopment areas and citywide general plans, or community level specific plans. In such cases, where project definition is insufficient for meaningful intersection level of service analysis, CMP arterial segment analysis may substitute for intersection analysis.

D.4 STUDY AREA

The geographic area examined in the TIA must include the following, at a minimum:

- All CMP arterial monitoring intersections, including monitored freeway on- or off-ramp intersections, where the proposed project will add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours (of adjacent street traffic).
- If CMP arterial segments are being analyzed rather than intersections (see Section D.3), the study area must include all segments where the proposed project will add 50 or more peak hour trips (total of both directions). Within the study area, the TIA must analyze at least one segment between monitored CMP intersections.
- Mainline freeway monitoring locations where the project will add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours.
- Caltrans must also be consulted through the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process to identify other specific locations to be analyzed on the state highway system.

If the TIA identifies no facilities for study based on these criteria, no further traffic analysis is required. However, projects must still consider transit impacts (Section D.8.4).

D.5 BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

The following sections describe the procedures for documenting and estimating background, or non-project related traffic conditions. Note that for the purpose of a TIA, these background estimates must include traffic from all sources without regard to the exemptions specified in CMP statute (e.g., traffic generated by the provision of low and very low income housing, or trips originating outside Los Angeles County. Refer to Chapter 5, Section 5.2.3 for a complete list of exempted projects).

D.5.1 Existing Traffic Conditions. Existing traffic volumes and levels of service (LOS) on the CMP highway system within the study area must be documented. Traffic counts must
be less than one year old at the time the study is initiated, and collected in accordance with CMP highway monitoring requirements (see Appendix A). Section D.8.1 describes TIA LOS calculation requirements in greater detail. Freeway traffic volume and LOS data provided by Caltrans is also provided in Appendix A.

D.5.2 Selection of Horizon Year and Background Traffic Growth. Horizon year(s) selection is left to the lead agency, based on individual characteristics of the project being analyzed. In general, the horizon year should reflect a realistic estimate of the project completion date. For large developments phased over several years, review of intermediate milestones prior to buildout should also be considered.

At a minimum, horizon year background traffic growth estimates must use the generalized growth factors shown in Exhibit D-1. These growth factors are based on regional modeling efforts, and estimate the general effect of cumulative development and other socioeconomic changes on traffic throughout the region. Beyond this minimum, selection among the various methodologies available to estimate horizon year background traffic in greater detail is left to the lead agency. Suggested approaches include consultation with the jurisdiction in which the intersection under study is located, in order to obtain more detailed traffic estimates based on ongoing development in the vicinity.

D.6 PROPOSED PROJECT TRAFFIC GENERATION

Traffic generation estimates must conform to the procedures of the current edition of Trip Generation, by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). If an alternative methodology is used, the basis for this methodology must be fully documented.

Increases in site traffic generation may be reduced for existing land uses to be removed, if the existing use was operating during the year the traffic counts were collected. Current traffic generation should be substantiated by actual driveway counts; however, if infeasible, traffic may be estimated based on a methodology consistent with that used for the proposed use.

Regional transportation impact analysis also requires consideration of trip lengths. Total site traffic generation must therefore be divided into work and non-work-related trip purposes in order to reflect observed trip length differences. Exhibit D-2 provides factors which indicate trip purpose breakdowns for various land use types.

For lead agencies who also participate in CMP highway monitoring, it is recommended that any traffic counts on CMP facilities needed to prepare the TIA should be done in the manner outlined in Chapter 2 and Appendix A. If the TIA traffic counts are taken within one year of the deadline for submittal of CMP highway monitoring data, the local jurisdiction would save the cost of having to conduct the traffic counts twice.

D.7 TRIP DISTRIBUTION

For trip distribution by direct/manual assignment, generalized trip distribution factors are provided in Exhibit D-3, based on regional modeling efforts. These factors indicate Regional Statistical Area (RSA)-level tripmaking for work and non-work trip purposes.
(These RSAs are illustrated in Exhibit D-4.) For locations where it is difficult to determine the project site RSA, census tract/RSA correspondence tables are available from MTA.

Exhibit D-5 describes a general approach to applying the preceding factors. Project trip distribution must be consistent with these trip distribution and purpose factors; the basis for variation must be documented.

Local agency travel demand models disaggregated from the SCAG regional model are presumed to conform to this requirement, as long as the trip distribution functions are consistent with the regional distribution patterns. For retail commercial developments, alternative trip distribution factors may be appropriate based on the market area for the specific planned use. Such market area analysis must clearly identify the basis for the trip distribution pattern expected.

D.8 IMPACT ANALYSIS

CMP Transportation Impact Analyses contain two separate impact studies covering roadways and transit. Section Nos. D.8.1-D.8.3 cover required roadway analysis while Section No. D.8.4 covers the required transit impact analysis. Section Nos. D.9.1-D.9.4 define the requirement for discussion and evaluation of alternative mitigation measures.

D.8.1 Intersection Level of Service Analysis. The LA County CMP recognizes that individual jurisdictions have wide ranging experience with LOS analysis, reflecting the variety of community characteristics, traffic controls and street standards throughout the county. As a result, the CMP acknowledges the possibility that no single set of assumptions should be mandated for all TIAs within the county.

However, in order to promote consistency in the TIAs prepared by different jurisdictions, CMP TIAs must conduct intersection LOS calculations using either of the following methods:

- The Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) method as specified for CMP highway monitoring (see Appendix A); or
- The Critical Movement Analysis (CMA) / Circular 212 method.

Variation from the standard assumptions under either of these methods for circumstances at particular intersections must be fully documented.

TIAs using the 1985 or 1994 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) operational analysis must provide converted volume-to-capacity based LOS values, as specified for CMP highway monitoring in Appendix A.

D.8.2 Arterial Segment Analysis. For TIAs involving arterial segment analysis, volume-to-capacity ratios must be calculated for each segment and LOS values assigned using the V/C-LOS equivalency specified for arterial intersections. A capacity of 800 vehicles per hour per through traffic lane must be used, unless localized conditions necessitate alternative values to approximate current intersection congestion levels.

2010 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County
D.8.3 Freeway Segment (Mainline) Analysis. For the purpose of CMP TIAs, a simplified analysis of freeway impacts is required. This analysis consists of a demand-to-capacity calculation for the affected segments, and is indicated in Exhibit D-6.

D.8.4 Transit Impact Review. CMP transit analysis requirements are met by completing and incorporating into an EIR the following transit impact analysis:

- Evidence that affected transit operators received the Notice of Preparation.
- A summary of existing transit services in the project area. Include local fixed-route services within a ¼ mile radius of the project; express bus routes within a 2 mile radius of the project, and; rail service within a 2 mile radius of the project.
- Information on trip generation and mode assignment for both AM and PM peak hour periods as well as for daily periods. Trips assigned to transit will also need to be calculated for the same peak hour and daily periods. Peak hours are defined as 7:30-8:30 AM and 4:30-5:30 PM. Both “peak hour” and “daily” refer to average weekdays, unless special seasonal variations are expected. If expected, seasonal variations should be described.
- Documentation of the assumption and analyses that were used to determine the number and percent of trips assigned to transit. Trips assigned to transit may be calculated along the following guidelines:
  - Multiply the total trips generated by 1.4 to convert vehicle trips to person trips;
  - For each time period, multiply the result by one of the following factors:
    - 3.5% of Total Person Trips Generated for most cases, except:
      - 10% primarily Residential within ¼ mile of a CMP transit center
      - 15% primarily Commercial within ¼ mile of a CMP transit center
      - 7% primarily Residential within ¼ mile of a CMP multi-modal transportation center
      - 9% primarily Commercial within ¼ mile of a CMP multi-modal transportation center
      - 5% primarily Residential within ¼ mile of a CMP transit corridor
      - 7% primarily Commercial within ¼ mile of a CMP transit corridor
      - 0% if no fixed route transit services operate within one mile of the project

To determine whether a project is primarily residential or commercial in nature, please refer to the CMP land use categories listed and defined in Appendix E, Guidelines for New Development Activity Tracking and Self Certification. For projects that are only partially within the above one-quarter mile radius, the base rate (3.5% of total trips generated) should be applied to all of the project buildings that touch the radius perimeter.

- Information on facilities and/or programs that will be incorporated in the development plan that will encourage public transit use. Include not only the jurisdiction’s TDM Ordinance measures, but other project specific measures.
Analysis of expected project impacts on current and future transit services and proposed project mitigation measures, and;

Selection of final mitigation measures remains at the discretion of the local jurisdiction/lead agency. Once a mitigation program is selected, the jurisdiction self-monitors implementation through the existing mitigation monitoring requirements of CEQA.

D.9 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF MITIGATION

D.9.1 Criteria for Determining a Significant Impact. For purposes of the CMP, a significant impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2% of capacity ($\frac{V}{C} \geq 0.02$), causing LOS F ($\frac{V}{C} > 1.00$); if the facility is already at LOS F, a significant impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2% of capacity ($\frac{V}{C} \geq 0.02$). The lead agency may apply a more stringent criteria if desired.

D.9.2 Identification of Mitigation. Once the project has been determined to cause a significant impact, the lead agency must investigate measures which will mitigate the impact of the project. Mitigation measures proposed must clearly indicate the following:

- Cost estimates, indicating the fair share costs to mitigate the impact of the proposed project. If the improvement from a proposed mitigation measure will exceed the impact of the project, the TIA must indicate the proportion of total mitigation costs which is attributable to the project. This fulfills the statutory requirement to exclude the costs of mitigating inter-regional trips.

- Implementation responsibilities. Where the agency responsible for implementing mitigation is not the lead agency, the TIA must document consultation with the implementing agency regarding project impacts, mitigation feasibility and responsibility.

Final selection of mitigation measures remains at the discretion of the lead agency. The TIA must, however, provide a summary of impacts and mitigation measures. Once a mitigation program is selected, the jurisdiction self-monitors implementation through the mitigation monitoring requirements contained in CEQA.

D.9.3 Project Contribution to Planned Regional Improvements. If the TIA concludes that project impacts will be mitigated by anticipated regional transportation improvements, such as rail transit or high occupancy vehicle facilities, the TIA must document:

- Any project contribution to the improvement, and
- The means by which trips generated at the site will access the regional facility.

D.9.4 Transportation Demand Management (TDM). If the TIA concludes or assumes that project impacts will be reduced through the implementation of TDM measures, the TIA must document specific actions to be implemented by the project which substantiate these conclusions.
D.10 REFERENCES


3. Travel Forecast Summary: 1987 Base Model - Los Angeles Regional Transportation Study (LARTS), California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans), February 1990.


5. Traffic/Access Guidelines, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.


Katie Owston, Project Planner  
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH  
415 Diamond Beach  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

RE: SCH#2014061071 CEQA Notice of Completion; draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the "The Waterfront" located in the City of Redondo Beach; Los Angeles County, California

Dear Ms. Owston:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has reviewed the above-referenced environmental document.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) states that any project which includes archeological resources, is a significant effect requiring the preparation of an EIR (CEQA guidelines 15064.5(b)). To adequately comply with this provision and mitigate project-related impacts on archaeological resources, the Commission recommends the following actions be required:

Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5(f). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities. Also, California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 require documentation and analysis of archaeological items that meet the standard in Section 15064.5 (a)(b)(f). This area is known to local Tribes to be culturally sensitive.

We suggest that this (additional archaeological activity) be coordinated with the NAHC, if possible. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. Any information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure pursuant
to California Government Code Section 6254.10.

A list of appropriate Native American Contacts for consultation concerning the project site has been provided and is attached to this letter to determine if the proposed activity might impinge on any cultural resources.

California Government Code Section 65040.12(e) defines “environmental justice” to provide “fair treatment of People...with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies.” (The California Code is consistent with the Federal Executive Order 12898 regarding ‘environmental justice.’) Also, applicable to state agencies is Executive Order B-10-11 requires consultation with Native American tribes their elected officials and other representatives of tribal governments to provide meaningful input into the development of legislation, regulations, rules, and policies on matters that may affect tribal communities.

Lead agencies should consider first, avoidance for sacred and/or historical sites, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15370(a). Then if the project goes ahead, lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring plan provisions for the analysis and disposition of recovered artifacts, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.

Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains in their mitigation plan. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, CEQA §15064.5(e), and Public Resources Code §5097.98 mandates the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Gayle Totton
Program Analyst

CC: State Clearinghouse

Attachment: Native American Contacts list
Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
July 7, 2014

Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation
John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Admin.
tauntlaw@gmail.com
(310) 570-6567

Gabrieleno-Tongva Tribe
Bernie Acuna, Co-Chairperson
P.O. Box 180
Bonsall, CA 92003
bacuna1@gabrielinotribe.org
(619) 294-6660 Office
(310) 428-5690 Cell
(760) 636-0854 Fax

Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
P.O. Box 693
San Gabriel, CA 91778
GTTrbalcouncil@aol.com
(626) 483-3564 Cell
(626) 286-1262 Fax

Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians
Andrew Salas, Chairperson
P.O. Box 393
Covina, CA 91723
gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com
(626) 925-4131

Gabrieleno /Tongva Nation
Sandonne Goad, Chairperson
P.O. Box 86908
Los Angeles, CA 90086
sgoad@gabrielinotongva.com
(951) 845-0443

Gabrieleno Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
Robert F. Dorame, Tribal Chair/Cultural Resources
P.O. Box 490
Bellflower, CA 90707
gtongva@verizon.net
(562) 761-6417 Voice/Fax

Gabrieleno Tongva Tribe
Conrad Acuna
P.O. Box 180
Bonsall, CA 92003
(760) 636-0854 Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting locative Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed The Waterfront Project; located in the City of Redondo Beach; Los Angeles County, California for which a Sacred Lands CEQA search and Native American Contacts list were requested.
Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
July 7, 2014

Gabrielino / Tongva Nation
Sam Dunlap, Cultural Resources Director
P.O. Box 86908Gabrielino Tongva
Los Angeles, CA 90086
samdunlap@earthlink.net
(909) 262-9351

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting locative Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed The Waterfront Project; located in the City of Redondo Beach; Los Angeles County, California for which a Sacred Lands file search and Native American Contacts list were requested.
Notice of Preparation of a CEQA Document for the
The Waterfront Project

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The SCAQMD staff’s comments are recommendations regarding the analysis of potential air quality impacts from the proposed project that should be included in the draft CEQA document. Please send the SCAQMD a copy of the Draft EIR upon its completion. Note that copies of the Draft EIR that are submitted to the State Clearinghouse are not forwarded to the SCAQMD. Please forward a copy of the Draft EIR directly to SCAQMD at the address in our letterhead. In addition, please send with the draft EIR all appendices or technical documents related to the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses and electronic versions of all air quality modeling and health risk assessment files. These include original emission calculation spreadsheets and modeling files (not Adobe PDF files). Without all files and supporting air quality documentation, the SCAQMD will be unable to complete its review of the air quality analysis in a timely manner. Any delays in providing all supporting air quality documentation will require additional time for review beyond the end of the comment period.

Air Quality Analysis
The SCAQMD adopted its California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook in 1993 to assist other public agencies with the preparation of air quality analyses. The SCAQMD recommends that the Lead Agency use this Handbook as guidance when preparing its air quality analysis. Copies of the Handbook are available from the SCAQMD’s Subscription Services Department by calling (909) 396-3720. More recent guidance developed since this Handbook was published is also available on SCAQMD’s website here: www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/hdbk.html. SCAQMD staff also recommends that the lead agency use the CalEEMod land use emissions software. This software has recently been updated to incorporate up-to-date state and locally approved emission factors and methodologies for estimating pollutant emissions from typical land use development. CalEEMod is the only software model maintained by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and replaces the now outdated URBEMIS. This model is available free of charge at: www.caleemod.com.

The Lead Agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the project and all air pollutant sources related to the project. Air quality impacts from both construction (including demolition, if any) and operations should be calculated. Construction-related air quality impacts typically include, but are not limited to, emissions from the use of heavy-duty equipment from grading, earth-loading/unloading, paving, architectural coatings, off-road mobile sources (e.g., heavy-duty construction equipment) and on-road mobile sources (e.g., construction worker vehicle trips, material transport trips). Operation-related air quality impacts may include, but are not limited to, emissions from stationary sources (e.g., boilers), area sources (e.g., solvents and coatings), and vehicular trips (e.g., on- and off-road tailpipe emissions and entrained dust). Air quality impacts from indirect sources, that is, sources that generate or attract vehicular trips should be included in the analysis.

The SCAQMD has also developed both regional and localized significance thresholds. The SCAQMD staff requests that the lead agency quantify criteria pollutant emissions and compare the results to the recommended regional significance thresholds found here: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/signithres.pdf. In addition to analyzing regional air quality impacts, the SCAQMD staff recommends calculating localized air quality impacts and comparing the results to localized significance thresholds (LSTs). LST’s can be used in addition to the recommended regional significance thresholds as a second indication of air quality impacts when preparing a CEQA document. Therefore,
when preparing the air quality analysis for the proposed project, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a localized analysis by either using the LSTs developed by the SCAQMD or performing dispersion modeling as necessary. Guidance for performing a localized air quality analysis can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/LST/LST.html.

In the event that the proposed project generates or attracts vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a mobile source health risk assessment. Guidance for performing a mobile source health risk assessment ("Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risk from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis") can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mobile_toxic/mobile_toxic.html. An analysis of all toxic air contaminant impacts due to the use of equipment potentially generating such air pollutants should also be included.

In addition, guidance on siting incompatible land uses (such as placing homes near freeways) can be found in the California Air Resources Board’s Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Perspective, which can be found at the following internet address: http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf. CARB’s Land Use Handbook is a general reference guide for evaluating and reducing air pollution impacts associated with new projects that go through the land use decision-making process.

Mitigation Measures
In the event that the project generates significant adverse air quality impacts, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation measures that go beyond what is required by law be utilized during project construction and operation to minimize or eliminate these impacts. Pursuant to state CEQA Guidelines §15126.4 (a)(1)(D), any impacts resulting from mitigation measures must also be discussed. Several resources are available to assist the Lead Agency with identifying possible mitigation measures for the project, including:

- Chapter 11 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook
- SCAQMD’s CEQA web pages at: www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mitigation/MM_intro.html
- SCAQMD’s Rule 403 -- Fugitive Dust, and the Implementation Handbook for controlling construction-related emissions
- Other measures to reduce air quality impacts from land use projects can be found in the SCAQMD’s Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning. This document can be found at the following internet address: http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/aqguide/aqguide.html.

Data Sources
SCAQMD rules and relevant air quality reports and data are available by calling the SCAQMD’s Public Information Center at (909) 396-2039. Much of the information available through the Public Information Center is also available via the SCAQMD’s webpage (http://www.aqmd.gov).

The SCAQMD staff is available to work with the Lead Agency to ensure that project emissions are accurately evaluated and mitigated where feasible. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at imacmillan@aqmd.gov or call me at (909) 396-3244.

Sincerely,

Ed Eckerle
Program Supervisor
Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources

LAC140620-02
Control Number
July 1, 2014

Ms. Katie Owston, Project Planner
Community Development Department
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277
Telephone: (310) 318-0637, Ext. x1-2895
E-mail: katie.owston@redondo.org

RE: SCAG Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Waterfront Project [SCAG NO. IGR8089]

Dear Ms. Owston,

Thank you for submitting the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Waterfront Project ("proposed project") to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for review and comment. SCAG is the authorized regional agency for Inter-Governmental Review (IGR) of programs proposed for federal financial assistance and direct development activities, pursuant to Presidential Executive Order 12372. Additionally, SCAG reviews the Environmental Impact Reports of projects of regional significance for consistency with regional plans pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.

SCAG is also the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency under state law, and is responsible for preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) including its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) component pursuant to SB 375. As the clearinghouse for regionally significant projects per Executive Order 12372, SCAG reviews the consistency of local plans, projects, and programs with regional plans. Guidance provided by these reviews is intended to assist local agencies and project sponsors to take actions that contribute to the attainment of the regional goals and policies in the RTP/SCS.

SCAG staff has reviewed the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Waterfront Project. The proposed project would include the construction and renovation of up to approximately 523,732 square feet (289,906 square feet of net new development) to include retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, a market hall, and a boutique hotel in the City of Redondo Beach's Coastal Zone, Los Angeles County, California.

When available, please send environmental documentation to SCAG’s office in Los Angeles or by email to sunl@scag.ca.gov providing, at a minimum, the full public comment period for review. If you have any questions regarding the attached comments, please contact Lijin Sun at (213) 236-1882 or sunl@scag.ca.gov. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Nadler,
Manager, Compliance and Performance Assessment

---

1 SB 375 amends CEQA to add Chapter 4.2 Implementation of the Sustainable Communities Strategy, which allows for certain CEQA streamlining for projects consistent with the RTP/SCS. Lead agencies (including local jurisdictions) maintain the discretion and will be solely responsible for determining "consistency" of any future project with the SCS. Any "consistency" finding by SCAG pursuant to the IGR process should not be construed as a finding of consistency under SB 375 for purposes of CEQA streamlining.

The Regional Council consists of 86 elected officials representing 191 cities, six counties, six County Transportation Commissions, one representative from the Transportation Corridor Agencies, one Tribal Government representative and one representative for the Air Districts within Southern California.
COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE WATERFRONT PROJECT [SCAG NO. IGR8089]

CONSISTENCY WITH RTP/SCS

SCAG reviews environmental documents for regionally significant projects for their consistency with the adopted RTP/SCS.

2012 RTP/SCS Goals

The SCAG Regional Council adopted the 2012 RTP/SCS in April 2012. The 2012 RTP/SCS links the goal of sustaining mobility with the goals of fostering economic development, enhancing the environment, reducing energy consumption, promoting transportation-friendly development patterns, and encouraging fair and equitable access to residents affected by socio-economic, geographic and commercial limitations (see http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov). The goals included in the 2012 RTP/SCS may be pertinent to the proposed project. These goals are meant to provide guidance for considering the proposed project within the context of regional goals and policies. Among the relevant goals of the 2012 RTP/SCS are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCAG 2012 RTP/SCS GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTP/SCS G1:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTP/SCS G2:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTP/SCS G3:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTP/SCS G4:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTP/SCS G5:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTP/SCS G6:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTP/SCS G7:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTP/SCS G8:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTP/SCS G9:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For ease of review, we encourage the use of a side-by-side comparison of SCAG goals with discussions of the consistency, non-consistency or non-applicability of the policy and supportive analysis in a table format. Suggested format is as follows:
SCAG 2012 RTP/SCS Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTP/SCS G1: Align the plan investments and policies with improving regional economic development and competitiveness.</td>
<td>Consistent: Statement as to why Not-Consistent: Statement as to why or Not Applicable: Statement as to why DEIR page number reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP/SCS G2: Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.</td>
<td>Consistent: Statement as to why Not-Consistent: Statement as to why or Not Applicable: Statement as to why DEIR page number reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RTP/SCS Strategies

To achieve the goals of the 2012 RTP/SCS, a wide range of strategies are included in SCS Chapter (starting on page 152) of the RTP/SCS focusing on four key areas: 1) Land Use Actions and Strategies; 2) Transportation Network Actions and Strategies; 3) Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Actions and Strategies and; 4) Transportation System Management (TSM) Actions and Strategies. If applicable to the proposed project, please refer to these strategies as guidance for considering the proposed project within the context of regional goals and policies. To access a listing of the strategies, please visit http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Documents/2012/final/f2012RTPSCS.pdf (Tables 4.3 – 4.7, beginning on page 152).

Regional Growth Forecasts

The Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed project should reflect the most recently adopted SCAG forecasts. At the time of this letter, the most recently adopted SCAG forecasts consists of the 2020 and 2035 RTP/SCS population, household and employment forecasts. To view them, please visit http://scag.ca.gov/Documents/2012AdoptedGrowthForecastPDF.pdf. The forecasts for the region and applicable jurisdictions are below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Adopted SCAG Region Wide Forecasts</th>
<th>Adopted City of Redondo Beach Forecasts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2020</td>
<td>Year 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>19,663,000</td>
<td>22,091,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>6,458,000</td>
<td>7,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>8,414,000</td>
<td>9,441,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MITIGATION

SCAG staff recommends that you review the SCAG 2012 RTP/SCS Final Program EIR Mitigation Measures for guidance, as appropriate. See Chapter 6 (beginning on page 143) at: http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Documents/peir/2012/final/Final2012PEIR.pdf

As referenced in Chapter 6, a comprehensive list of example mitigation measures that may be considered as appropriate is included in Appendix G: Examples of Measures that Could Reduce Impacts from Planning, Development and Transportation Projects. Appendix G can be accessed at: http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Documents/peir/2012/final/2012FPEIRAppendixG_ExampleMeasures.pdf
Notice of Preparation

June 19, 2014

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: The Waterfront
SCH# 2014061071

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the The Waterfront draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Katie Owston
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency
**Document Details Report**  
**State Clearinghouse Data Base**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCH#</th>
<th>2014061071</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>The Waterfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>City of Redondo Beach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type**  

Notice of Preparation

**Description**

The project would revitalize a portion of the Harbor by redeveloping and expanding commercial uses, enhancing public access and recreational facilities, and improving the aging infrastructure and parking while enhancing site connectivity, public access and public views. The main components are demolition of ~221,347 sf of existing structures; demolition of a parking structure; construction/renovation of up to ~523,732 sf (289,906 sf net new development) to include retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, and a boutique hotel; and new small boat launch ramp, improvements to Seaside Lagoon, and pedestrian and bicycle paths. Site connectivity elements include a new pedestrian bridge across the Redondo Beach Marina Basin 3 entrance and the reconnection of Pacific Ave.

**Lead Agency Contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Katie Owston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>City of Redondo Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>310 318-0637 x1-2896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>415 Diamond Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>90277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Streets</td>
<td>Portofino Way, Torrance Boulevard, Harbor Drive/Pacific Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat / Long</td>
<td>33° 50' 28.5&quot; N / 118° 23' 30.2&quot; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel No.</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>4S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>14W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proximity to:**

- **Highways**: SR-1 (Pacific Coast Hwy)
- **Airports**: No
- **Railways**: No
- **Waterways**: King Harbor and Pacific Ocean
- **Schools**: Multiple
- **Land Use**: CR Commercial Rec (subarea 1,2,3); P-PRO Parks, Rec & Open Space/CC Coastal Commercial; P Public or Institutional

**Project Issues**

Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Coastal Zone; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Sismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects; Other Issues; Traffic/Circulation

**Reviewing Agencies**

Resources Agency; Department of Boating and Waterways; California Coastal Commission; Department of Conservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Resources, Recycling and Recovery; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 5; Native American Heritage Commission; State Lands Commission; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Air Resources Board; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 3

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
Resources Agency
- Fish & Wildlife Region 1E
  - Laurie Harnsberger
- Fish & Wildlife Region 2
  - Dept. of Boating & Waterways
- Fish & Wildlife Region 3
  - Charles Armbrister
- Fish & Wildlife Region 4
  - Julie Vance
- Fish & Wildlife Region 5
  - Leslie Newton-Reed Habitat Conservation Program
- Fish & Wildlife Region 6
  - Gabrila Gatchel Habitat Conservation Program
- Fish & Wildlife Region 6 I/M
  - Heidi Sickler Inyo/Mono, Habitat Conservation Program
- Dept. of Fish & Wildlife M
  - George Isaac Marine Region

Other Departments
- Food & Agriculture
  - Sandra Schubert Dept. of Food and Agriculture
- Dept. of General Services
  - Public School Construction
- Dept. of General Services
  - Anna Garbeff Environmental Services Section
- Dept. of Public Health
  - Jeffrey Worth Dept. of Health/Drinking Water
- Delta Stewardship Council
  - Kevan Samsam
- Independent Commissions, Boards
  - Delta Protection Commission
  - Michael Machado
  - Cal EMA (Emergency Management Agency)
  - Dennis Castroillo
- Native American Heritage Comm.
  - Debbie Treadway Public Utilities Commission
  - Leo Wong
- Santa Monica Bay Restoration
  - Guanyang Wang
- State Lands Commission
  - Jennifer De Leon
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)
  - Cherry Jacques

Business, Trans & Housing
- Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics
  - Philip Crimmins
- Caltrans - Planning
  - Terri Pencovic
- California Highway Patrol
  - Suzanne Ikeuchi Office of Special Projects
- Housing & Community Development
  - CEQA Coordinator Housing Policy Division

Dept. of Transportation
- Caltrans, District 1
  - Rex Jackman
- Caltrans, District 2
  - Marcelino Gonzalez
- Caltrans, District 3
  - Eric Fredericks - South
  - Susan Zanchi - North
- Caltrans, District 4
  - Erik Aim
- Caltrans, District 5
  - David Murray
- Caltrans, District 6
  - Michael Navarro
- Caltrans, District 7
  - Dianna Watson

Cal EPA
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - Cathleen Hudson North Coast Region (1)
- Environmental Document Coordinator
  - San Francisco Bay Region (2)
- Central Coast Region (3)
- Teresa Rodgers Los Angeles Region (4)
- Central Valley Region (5)
- Central Valley Region (6)
- Fresno Branch Office
- Central Valley Region (5)
- Redding Branch Office
- Lahontan Region (6)
- Lahontan Region (6)
- Victorville Branch Office
- Colorado River Basin Region (7)
- Santa Ana Region (8)
- San Diego Region (9)

Other

Last Updated 5/5/2014
Individual and Organization Comment Letters
Dear Katie,

I own property at Seascape II and I am very concerned about the impact of the planned development for Redondo and the impact that it will have on so many levels as follows:

1) The level of noise from traffic along Pacific is already very bad on weekends. The police are doing a better job of controlling it now than in the past; however, there will undoubtedly be more traffic generated not just through the construction period but also after the new road is put in place. Also, how is Redondo expected to cover the extra expense for policing the road during and after the construction especially since the developer will not be required to provide any financial contribution that could mitigate this expense?

2) Traffic congestion not only along Pacific is concerning, but traffic congestion is already a problem along PCH and will undoubtedly become worse during and after construction bringing employees and visitors to the area. It doesn’t seem to be possible or even considered to widen PCH for this project. Will the traffic congestion on PCH be evaluated?

3) I am very concerned about the aesthetics of the area from the density of the buildings being planned destroying the view not only from my property but also along the waterfront area. The plan looks like there will be a loss of views from the new bike path on Harbor Drive because an ugly three story parking garage will block the view for the public.

4) There are already certain buildings and businesses that are vacant. I fear that there will be more of a ghost town with vacant buildings doing nothing but taking up space destroying views and possibly bringing in vagrancy. In the end the residents of the city will be ultimately financially responsible to hold them and determine what to do with them.

5) I am very concerned about having enough police protection. We will not only require additional police force to patrol the area for our safety but also for the complex that I live in will also need to pay for additional security to maintain safety from unwanted visitors to our complex. How will the city pay for additional police protection and how will my complex be expected to pay for additional security?

6) I am concerned about the impact of the air quality impact on my health from additional vehicles, trucks, construction that this project will generate.

7) The Draft of the Environmental Impact Report on the Redondo website identifies that there could be a potentially significant impact for Seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction. This is very worrisome and I would be very interested in fully understanding this risk. This one concern if proved to be a possibility should be enough to halt this project because if even one life is lost or hurt due to this would be too high of a price to pay.

8) The development will prevent or impede access to Coastal Dependent waterfront recreational and commercial uses because elimination of parking facility or severely limited usable parking will make traffic gridlock that prevents access, making people walk through a high density retail/commercial with equipment or boats to get to the waterfront, having to park across an active street to get to Seaside Lagoon or boat slips in Redondo Marina.

9) The impact to public safety, exposure to hazardous pollution, excessive fresh water consumption, hazards to people; in particular exposure to children from pollution and garbage in opened Seaside Lagoon with untreated water.

10) Last but not least of all, I am concerned that the developer would not be required to pay any rent for 30 years or until they make a profit of more than 10%. Even though this is not a direct environmental impact, I
consider it to impact Redondo’s environment in an indirect way. How will Redondo be expected to pay for the additional resources of police and fire protection, water, utilities, etc. if we do not have a source of substantial income for 30 years? Or if we have vacant buildings, how will we financially look after them if we need to tear them down or look after them? Why would the Mayor and City Council approve such a plan? Where and how was 10% devised? How will the 10% be determined – based on Gross Revenue or Net Assets? How can we be sure that the developer will be fiscally responsible to earn a 10% plus profit? Will the developer employ City employees on their board to review that they are being fiscally responsible?

These are some but not all of my concerns about the development of this mall. I appreciate that you will review and include them in your evaluation of the Environment Impact Report in an objective manner.

Thank you for your consideration.

Connie
Connie Abela
cennieabela@adelphia.net

__________ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10136 (20140722)
__________

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.
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Comments re: CenterCal EIR

Eric Pendergraft [eric.pendergraft@aes.com]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 4:54 PM
To: Katie Owston
Attachments: CenterCal EIR Comments - A~1.pdf (83 KB)

Katie,

Please see the attached letter from AES Southland.

Regards,

Eric

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com
VIA EMAIL

July 21, 2014

Katie Owston
Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
katie.owston@redondo.org

Re: Notice of Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Waterfront Project

Dear Ms. Owston,

AES appreciates the opportunity to respond to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Waterfront Project. We are supportive of the City’s plans to revitalize the Redondo Beach waterfront and pier area.

We wanted to let you know that a new land use plan is being considered to revitalize the 50-acre Redondo Beach Generating Plant property. In a broad sense, the plan would enable the elimination of the existing Redondo Beach Generating Plant and allow for new mixed-use development on the western portion of the property and single-family residences on the eastern portion of the property. The mixed-use development along Harbor Drive will include retail and visitor-serving uses, restaurants, art and cultural facilities, offices, and similar uses serving residents and visitors, together with residential uses above the ground floor and a new hotel. Twenty percent (20%) of the property will be dedicated to open space. Under the plan, overall development of the property would be limited to 600 new residences, 85,000 square feet of commercial uses (of which no greater than 25,000 square feet can be restaurants), and 250 new hotel rooms. We can provide you with additional details if that would be helpful.
Pursuant to Section 15130(b)(1)(A) of the state California Environmental Quality Act guidelines, this land use plan should be considered as a probable future project and included in the list of related projects studied in the Waterfront Project EIR.

Sincerely,

Eric Pendergraft
AES Southland
The EIR for this mall in Redondo Beach is unacceptable. It is a poor use of waterfront property and not best for the community or the environment. This massive development which will include movie theaters and more retail space is not conducive to enjoying the waterfront: boating, swimming, strolling, bike riding and views are not adequately protected. In addition the amount of traffic and pollution from his project will harm residents and other visitors. Finally, the financial structure of the deal means that the city and the public are at risk for bearing the cost of a failed project since there will be no tax revenue from the project for 30 years unless there is a net income. This EIR must not be approved.

The public meeting to solicit feedback on the EIR was a metaphor for the lack of public input into the process of planning this development. Start over.

Thank you.

Jane Affonso
1919 Belmont Lane
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
Dear Ms. Owston:

Please find attached my response to the Notice of Preparation of an EIR for the Waterfront project.

Thank you,
Linda Akyüz
July 17, 2014

Dear City of Redondo Beach Mayor Aspell and Members of the City Council; Planning Commission; and Harbor Commission:

Re: Comments on Notice of Preparation of Environmental Impact Report for the Waterfront Revitalization Project

Background

I am submitting this letter to provide my comments regarding the Cultural Resources portion of the City of Redondo Beach Notice of Preparation (NOP) of Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Waterfront Revitalization Project (the Project). I am a Cultural Resources Principal Investigator and meet Secretary of the Interior (SOI) Professional Standards for Archaeologist, Architectural Historian, and Historian. I have been a historian for 26 years and have been surveying, recording, reporting, and evaluating cultural resources (archaeological sites and buildings/structures) for California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility and listing for 13 years. I am also a qualified paleontological technician, according to Society for Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) standards. I served on the City of Redondo Beach Preservation Commission and have offered to update the City’s “historic landmark” survey pro bono.

I attended the public planning meetings regarding the above-named Project, and my input concerning the preservation of CRHR-eligible structures/archaeological sensitivity of the waterfront and my suggestions to alter the project to preserve cultural resources was elided and not documented.

My greatest concerns are the loss of Tony’s, impacts to archaeological resources, and notification of Native American representatives and other stakeholders. I want to make sure that Native American representatives listed by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) are contacted as stakeholders in this process and that their comments and concerns are honored by the City. My comments regarding the Cultural Resources Initial Study checklist in Figure 1 follow the figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Waterfront Revitalization Project cultural resources initial study checklists
Entry V.a. Impact on Historical Resources

Analysis: I agree with the Initial Study that the Project may be found to have a Potentially Significant Impact on historical resources. A cultural resource inventory and evaluation has not been conducted yet and will be done as part of the EIR process. This study will find several elements of the built environment to be historical resources that will qualify for listing in the CRHR. One of these is Tony’s (Status Code 3S). It may also be determined that the “snack bars” and the Starboard Attitude structure north of Tony’s are eligible for listing, as well as Luna Park.

Much of the Pier and Seaside Lagoon has been altered, and structures and objects that would have been eligible are no longer eligible because they have lost integrity. The portion of the Pier that was lost to storms was lost to forces of nature. However, the cultural landscape of family fishing can be retained at the waterfront. Character-defining features of Seaside Lagoon were lost when water structures were removed and when bathrooms were altered in 2010. This change was considered a categorical exemption to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); I disagreed with this analysis by the City at the time, but the City Council did not agree with my evaluation. I understand that power plants can no longer use the ocean as cooling systems any longer, but Seaside Lagoon has become another part of our cultural landscape, and some version of this attraction should be retained, without the power plant association.

Recommendations:
- Project Alternative Element: Alter the project to retain Tony’s as-is; the loss of this National- and California-Register-eligible structure is inmitigable.
- Project Alternative: Alter the project to retain the Pier as-is from the Barney’s Beanery area until the turn west (near the fish-cleaning area)
- Project Alternative: Alter the project to retain the rest of the “new” pier (sails area) for fishing.
- Project Alternative: Alter the project to retain Luna Park, International Seafood and the associated dock area
- Project Alternative: Alter the project to retain Seaside Lagoon
- Mitigation Measures: Mitigation-level recordation of built environment that qualifies for CRHR; report by SOI-qualified architectural historian; Mitigation to include integration of history of structures in waterfront museum

Entry V.b. Impact on Archaeological Resources

Analysis: I do not agree with the Initial Study that the Project is not likely to have a Potentially Significant Impact on archaeological resources. This area is highly sensitive for archaeological resources. It appears that extensive groundbreaking will be occurring. California’s procedures call for preservation-in-place of archaeological resources whenever possible. Subsurface testing for presence of archaeological resources is not recommended, as this may adversely impact archaeological resources.

Recommendations:
- Project Alternative: Alter the project to feature minimal groundbreaking (top 6 inches), in order to preserve archaeological resources in place.
- If the above recommendation is not followed, methodical sub-surface testing for “significance” of archaeological found present via a records search at the Southern Central Coastal Information Center; this is likely to be a recommendation of the EIR cultural resources survey
- Mitigation Measure: Monitoring of any groundbreaking activities by an SOI-qualified archaeologist and Native American cultural resources monitor

Linda Akyuz Response to Waterfront NOP
• Mitigation Measure: Recovery and full recordation of archaeological resources of any groundbreaking activities by a SOI-qualified archaeologist; full archaeological monitoring report by an SOI-qualified archaeologist.

Entry V.c. Impact on Paleontological and Geological Resources
Analysis: I agree with the Initial Study that the Project may be found to have a Potentially Significant Impact on Paleontological and Geological resources. This area is sensitive for paleontological and geological resources. A records search at the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles will assist in this analysis. It appears that extensive groundbreaking will be occurring. SVP guidelines call for monitoring by a qualified paleontological resources monitor and quantified collections of sensitive deposits for recovery and analysis of fossil remains.

Recommendations:
• Project Alternative: Alter the project to feature minimal groundbreaking (top 6 inches), in order to preserve paleontological and geological resources in place.
• If the above recommendation is not followed, the Mitigation Measure would be: monitoring of any groundbreaking activities by a qualified paleontological monitor under the supervision of an SVP QualifiedPaleontologist
• Mitigation Measure: Full analysis of paleontological resources
• Mitigation Measure: recordation and reporting of paleontological resources

Entry V.d. Impact on Human Remains
Analysis: The Project may have a Potentially Significant Impact on human remains.

Recommendations:
• Project Alternative: Alter the project to feature minimal groundbreaking (top 6 inches), in order to preserve human remains in place.
• Mitigation Measure: Monitoring of any groundbreaking activities by an SOI-qualified archaeologist and Native American cultural resources monitor
• Mitigation Measure: Follow California procedures for the discovery of human remains: stop all groundbreaking activities; contact County Coroner; contact NAHC if for Most Likely Descendent; deference to Most Likely Descendent for disposition of human remains.

Thank you for considering my comments and recommendations.

Sincerely,

Linda Akyuz
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: MARINA ALTAMUDA
Organization (optional): 
Address: 428 Esplanade CA 90277
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 310-543-2283
E-mail (optional): mza@tlpbox.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and
describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources*
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Land Use/Planning ☐ Mineral Resources*
☐ Population/Housing* ☐ Public Services
☐ Transportation/Traffic ☐ Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: Don't change afluing!

NO Hotel 0
NO HIGH RISE 0
NO TALL BLDGS

Don't make us a Manhattan Beach #25.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Development at Redondo King Harbor
Mimi Andersen [antandbee@verizon.net]
Sent:Wednesday, July 09, 2014 8:55 PM
To: Katie Owston
Cc: Bill Brand [bbrand@earthlink.net]

re: Letter for the record to Oppose the 2014 King Harbor City Approved Development

To Whom It May Concern:

We strongly oppose the City approved development project being proffered for Redondo's King Harbor area just north of the pier parking structure.

It is clear by the size, height and number of storefronts and restaurants spaces that the CalCtr developer has proposed for this small area right at the water's edge, that the City wants as much commercial density as the law allows and the developer must provide this or lose the bid.

The ocean, the harbor, civic space and view corridors be damned. The City wants a dense mall and hired a mall developer to build one and lease it out quickly.

Looking at it objectively, we currently have a huge pier parking structure that was terribly expensive and is really badly designed and ugly - and it has dominated the new pier (I say new cause I grew up here) which itself was poorly designed and remains unable to be the premiere location it should be for Redondo for many reasons.

Now we will have more ugly huge parking structures and an unneeded mall right on the waterfront to match the pier.

Why would we use waterfront space for yet another ugly parking structure? I thought that the pier parking structure is never at capacity? It never is when I look out at all the empty levels!

Moreover, I think any Redondo resident who has ever walked around it trying to get to the pier or had the awful experience of cycling on the bike path there trying to get to the pier realizes what a huge mistake this poorly designed project was.

Moreover, the empty shops and unused parking at the top of this boondoggle remains a problem after decades with no solution in sight.

My point is how bad decisions and bad design leave a legacy of ugly, wasted and unprofitable space. Think about it. You make a rushed cheap and poorly designed plan to let's say fill up a parking lot or rebuild a pier.

The new structure you rushed and paid cheaply for is now a permanent eye-sore and instead of what was a benign parking lot or a small pier you now have cursed the city with more 'development blight'.

So when we think of the mistakes made with the pier and apply lessons learned to the project before us now - what can we take away?

My gut reaction in seeing the new harbor plans was indescribable. I just felt ill. There is no wisdom applied here. I am not an architect but I felt that upon closer look, is it even worse than I first thought.
Never in my wildest dreams did I think the current City Leadership would allow this level of development or approve the heights.

Most normal people just can not envision that any coastal zoning in the South Bay would allow it either but then I remembered the heights of the Apartment buildings and the Spectrum Club and the loss of Measure G - so I realize the zoning is legal.

Too bad. What a disaster for this small wedge area - not only does the new Vegas style development height hide the beautiful ocean and boats it does nothing - I repeat - it really does nothing to resolve the trouble issues which are there now as I described above.

This is something I really hoped for but this design seems just plopped down like a ton of bricks fell from the sky.

Furthermore, from the perspective of many Redondo residents who share my view, this project seems to be built on promises that cannot be kept.

The developer themselves instead of designing a plan they can be proud of and stand behind which will new attract businesses are obviously terrified that this mall will fail and so they boldly asked if the City of Redondo, the real owners, would take that financial burden for them 'just in case' - to which the City said "Sure!". What?

Why is it only Councilman Brand (District 2) who has not bitten this poison apple and is aware and willing to tell the residents what is going on?

Truly Councilman Brand and the developer understand more than the rest of Redondo's City officials that this level of density and this style of mall on the waterfront is not a recipe for success.

Why else would the developer be asking for deals like the latest: guaranteed locked in discounts from the city which would take effect if the percentage of committed commercial leases goes too low for them to make a profit. They are more than concerned.

The developers should be lining up the happy, anxious and willing corporate tenants and promoting the project 24/7 but instead they are forming contingencies and offering deals - anything to insure the city will bail them out when they cannot make their lease payments.

A quick spin around the block on Catalina within spitting distance is the empty Tech Center, another overdeveloped wasteful building the same City leaders still in power really 'needed'. No wonder the developers are concerned.

Just adjacent and north to the tech center is the stylish new car wash with a bunch of empty storefronts gathering months of dust already, hopefully not the toxic dust that site is supposedly built on.

As an aside, I have watched for over 10 years as the location that now houses the underground style car wash site moved dirt around. They seemed to take some away, put some in railroad containers, move some back- it was an interesting endeavor.

Why would a development site next to the AES power plant, and the tech center be moving dirt around for 10 years?
It is public knowledge (google) that the AES power plant has numerous buried and epa regulated waste materials it has inherited from previous industrial owners. One wonders if there is a connection? I have no idea.

I do know that I was told by a previous employee that the reason they have not built until now and spent years moving soil around was because it was extremely hazardous and polluted soil! I cannot verify this.

In the Harbor development project presently occurring, Redondo residents have been told by the city for years that the heights would be low or only high in a small part -- and view corridors would be respected. That promise is broken.

Adjacent residents who have repeatedly asked for relief from loud drunk partiers and bright lights as well as begging the city that no new buildings will block their views will also be disappointed.

Another promise broken was that the City would work with developers who would in turn listen and work with the residents. That has been impossible as Cal Development have now publicly characterized any residents who dislike their design as not worth their time.

Their recent quotes in the local papers were condescending, rude and openly hostile to residents who want an open and fair dialogue with them.

They are clearly doing their job well as instructed by the City - 1. designing a mall with the most allowed square footage and tallest legal heights and the maximum bulk allowed in the Harbor zone, and 2. treating any residents who question them with contempt.

It furthers the notion that instead of an intelligently and carefully designed Harbor waterfront development which will help integrate the pier, new businesses and feature the ocean, we will get more of the same type of thinking which brought us the Crown Plaza and the Tech Center. It is just simply a bad idea.

Have the city no designers on staff or consultants that will tell them the honest truth that this development stinks?!

It seems that all they have is a mall developer who has done a nice big mall in Utah.

Now I think this developer DID do some nice huge malls HERE in California, but the Council agreed with the developer that a trip to Utah was warranted. So they all went to see the Utah mall.

The Utah Mall is this developer's exact example of the type of mall he is proposing and has in fact proposed for the Redondo Harbor.

The photos I saw of the Utah mall well, it clearly was a mall or movie theaters and it had a corporate feel to it. It was lit up and a pretty photo to be sure.

However, I didn't see the expected modern and clean design one would expect in a mall built in 2014, where the most successful malls have relied on strong lines and a clean look with large outdoor walking spaces and room to breath while you shop.

From it looking like a huge glass bank, to it looking like a huge Orange County Mall, to it looking like a mish mash of an incredibly horrible design whose goal is to pack as many sq feet in the space as possible — it did not excite.
It clearly was just a mall and not one that would be featuring the ocean, adding any considerable amount of Public or Civic space or adding artistic or modern design to the space. It could be the Galleria with more glass? jmo

Don't we understand people do not come to Redondo Beach Harbor to shop at the Gap, Banana Republic, Victorias Secret, Anthropologie or any of the other corporate mall leasees we will expect who can afford the developers preposterous rental fees?

Do we expect that the languishing Redondo Beach funded Galleria will improve from yet another corporate mall?

Do we realize there is the Manhattan Beach Mall a few miles away with huge parking areas that has struggled from day one and more now that the humungus El Segundo Mall hit town just a few blocks over?

It boggles the mind. I hate to ask but in my heart I think, "Are they greedy or just plain dumb at City Hall. What reasoning can they he using"?

But maybe it is our fault for voting for Aspel and the rest of the Council when it was clear from their record, especially Aspel's, that this type of development is their idea of beauty.

It must be their vision -- sadly so, because from a profitability standpoint the deals they are making are not going to make Redondo Beach richer.

Are they forgetting that we are not just Redondo we are Redondo Beach? Why are we continuing to build in this unsustainable, unprofitable and over developed way which makes our waterfront ugly and unpleasant for visitors and residents alike?

Like the Vegas style Crown Plaza building which should be torn down and rebuilt to integrate the pier and foster business as well as improve the Marina and boating facilities in this long ignored harbor area, the new development proposed makes all the same mistakes and is even worse.

As a life long resident of Redondo, I am often asked by visitors why Redondo has allowed such over development to ruin our coastline from the border of Hermosa to beyond the esplanade.

Didn't the Redondo City leaders want to feature the biggest asset the city has which is the ocean? Why isn't there a lovely walking and biking strand in Redondo linking it to it's neighbors to the South?

How could they allow the skyscraping vegas style building that is the Crown Plaza to be built right there?

It is not like we needed a behemoth pillar to rise from any ashes nor did we need the revenue. It's presence is disconcerting and it's lack of visitors obvious and troubling. Personally, I would want a Crown plaza in Redondo but not a Vegas Crown plaza.

Why indeed. Who knows?
Redondo already has tall buildings on the map south of the pier - maybe the City planners thought this new tall building will set the stage for how future planning will be determined in the area - development will be large and tall, cater to visitors and businesses but not residents.

Kinda like Marina del Rey or Santa Monica??

The next big thing I personally saw built next door was a huge commercial building curiously called the tech center. Built right up against the power plant, it is a warren of confusing concrete floors and what the designers must of thought would house small storefronts.

Inside I saw that many of the so-called shops - all empty- which face to the east away from the ocean - as all the shops do, have doors that roll up so during open hours each floor would resemble a mini-strip mall.

BTW- There are no windows to the lovely ocean view for any of the patrons- just shops or actually empty shops, to stare at.

Behind the scenes in back of each stall through a small door is a room big enough to be some type of an office but not large enough to hold store inventory.

Finally the very back wall was, if I remember correctly a glass door that looked out over the power plant into some large oil wells.

Walking out the back door each stall exits onto the same outdoor apartment- or hotel style concrete walkway leading to stairs as an optional path to the buildings odd central elevators.

What more can we say about the tech center? It is an interesting piece of architecture without a real use other than a few rented spaces and people who seem to rent these large odd corner spaces at the top which are all glass and look like gorgeous north facing residential apartments. I always wonder who lives there.

It was also continually cracking but maybe that issue is fixed.

Another boondoggle.

As a landscape designer, I often hear from clients that their backyard is just not right. Seating areas are not clear. Areas are cold and or uninviting. The outdoor experience is now enjoyed only from inside through a window.

It is interesting that many of the same complaints as listed above are heard from Redondo residents and visitors alike when they visit King Harbor.

One could surmise that the legacy of overdevelopment is bad design that makes the environment humans live, work and play in to be un hospitable, confusing feeling, cold, unwelcoming, crowded, noisy, polluted, traffic jammed, unsafe, and a huge mistake when it all combines to ruin the oceanfront experience.

Bad design makes people avoid an area and NO amount of new development that does not address ongoing issues has much of a chance succeed.

When I ride my bike on Harbor Dr. to the strand in Hermosa Beach, just a step over the Redondo Beach border, I can finally see the beach and I remember that the shining beacon of water and light in the South Bay is not a development it's called the ocean. It ought to be the prime focus of any future waterfront development.
Mimi Andersen
Andrew Andersen
625 N Guadalupe Av
Redondo Beach CA 90277
John A. Apoian

Comments:

I believe the EIR is just adding evidence to cancel this project.

There is no benefit to Redondo Beach.

These are all outside companies that are raping the city of its natural resources.

More pollution!!! Why!!!

Growth is not a good thing.

Planning does not make logic.

Community is needed!!!

Please stop this.

We don't need this growth in our city.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
I attended the scoping meeting last Wednesday and I offer the following comments:
- The meeting was professional, well run and offered every attendee the opportunity to comment in depth on all aspects of the project.
- I think the proposed project is excellent, especially the Market Hall and Hotel components, and I like the design and landscaping.
- The proposed project is exactly what is needed to revitalize the tired, out-of-date current facilities.
- The proposed project will increase tax revenue for the City, as well as encourage local City residents to visit the waterfront regularly again, many by walking and biking.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Grieg Asher, AICP
Hi Katie,

I will not be attending the public meeting on July 9, but I would like to weigh in with my opinion on the subject of the Redondo Waterfront Redevelopment.

I am in complete support of the plan that was put forth by CenterCal, and can find no fault with it.

I moved to Redondo in 2010, and have always found myself amazed at the beauty of the area and the waste of space that is Redondo Pier. To me, this area of Redondo has the most pristine views on the Santa Monica Bay, and those views are being grossly underutilized. There is ENORMOUS potential for development of this area, or at least re-arranging. For instance, the parking garage as you first enter the pier area is the first thing you see, and takes up an inordinate amount of space. The parking garage should be in the background somewhere, and all beach-front areas should be utilized for any purpose other than parking. But I could go on forever about the misuse of real estate.

The point of this email is to simply tell you that I am in FULL support of the CenterCal proposal. The area desperately needs a facelift befitting the natural beauty around it. This should be an area in which people are drawn to, much as they are drawn to Brentwood or Santa Monica.

And I know about the very vocal minority of people who are trying to block the development. I hope the project is able to overcome them.

Thank you.

Boyd Baker
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Peter Barth
Organization (optional):
Address: 250 The Village #301 Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Zip Code:
Phone (optional): E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [x] Aesthetics
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [x] Public Services
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

The Road: Putting a road at the bottom of Culegar Park and in front of all the Village condos & apartments is preposterous. It will impact approximately 6000 owners & renters with pollution, noise & safety. It will impact the public walking & biking to the waterfront. Children & the public will be at risk. It makes absolutely no sense.

The Bridge: Will impact beautiful views of the ocean. No more sailboats allowed in the "dock" area. America has an obesity problem... let people walk.

The hotel at the South end: Mr. Bruning talked about walking out of the lobby, out to a beautiful beach. This beach is

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comment continued:

shorter than a football field & has a glorious view of the pilings holding up the pier.

Seaside Laguna: A few years ago the city spent lots of money improving the filtering system. Now they want to open it to the ocean & put a boat ramp right in front of it. You think that's a "safety" idea?

Boat ramp: The beach goers will get no airs, gas, or refreshment from all the craft entering & exiting the sea. The Crab shack will have to be torn down to make way for the ramp & a parking lot. Irony isn't it? A parking lot closer to the ocean. This whole mess started years ago because the council didn't like parking lots which, of course, allow the public to see the ocean from almost everywhere. With the proposal we're going to have "view corridors"...like looking down an alley to the sea.

Market Hall - Movie Theater - Parking structure - White elephant

In his presentations Mr. Browning has mentioned Victoria's Quay Market, Vancouver's Granville Island, Seattle and San Francisco. All major cities, not beach towns.

The public view from the top of Carbonel Park is all ocean, rocks & trees with the exception of the top of the blue & white lighthouse building. One of the prettiest views in Boston.

Composite pictures from the same viewpoint show that the proposed buildings look like the back of a house & block the public view of the channel & boats entering & exiting the waterway.

I have documents from the coastal commission stating "the scenic & visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered & protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: 
Organization (optional): 
Address: 
Zip Code: 
Phone (optional): 
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources*  ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources  ☐ Cultural Resources  ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials  ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning  ☐ Mineral Resources*  ☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing*  ☐ Public Services  ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic  ☐ Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: shall be cited & designed to protect views to and along the ocean & scenic coastal areas... new development shall not obstruct views from Crenshaw Park to the ocean...
The city council & the developer should read this...


(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Hi Katie,

I personally don't support the huge mall planned at the Redondo Pier. Rather I prefer something classy, cute and scaled down. No need to cram so much into that space.

I do appreciate all the work being done to upgrade the pier, but getting carried away will affect traffic and the quality of life in the surrounding area for many years to come.

Thank you,

Tom Bauer
413 Avenue D
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Light, Jim [jim.light@linquest.com]

Sent: Friday, July 18, 2014 11:11 AM
To: Katie Owston; Eleanor Manzano; Steve Aspel; Jeff Ginsburg; Bill Brand; Pat Aust; Stephen Sammarco; Matt Kilroy
Attachments: The CenterCal Mall IES questions comments and concerns BBR R3.pdf

For the public record, BBR inputs on the CenterCal Mall IES. This one is more complete and up to date and replaces the previous versions of this documents submitted by BBR.

VR,

Jim Light
District 1 Redondo Beach
President of Building a Better Redondo
310-989-3332

http://www.eset.com
The CenterCal Mall project represents a substantial intensification of uses of our harbor area / waterfront that are not coastal dependent uses. The impacts of this level of intensification would be substantial under normal circumstances. In this case, the project site configuration, location and infrastructure exacerbate the impacts of this magnitude of intensification. The impacts require close scrutiny as the project appears it will have significant adverse impacts on coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses of the harbor and waterfront by uses that are not coastal dependent. The harbor was built by public funds for recreational boating and other coastal dependent uses. The non-coastal dependent development should not have significant negative impact upon the public’s ability or desirability to fully use and enjoy these existing coastal dependent uses of our harbor and waterfront. In fact, that would be a violation of Redondo’s Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act. Furthermore, the advertised high end nature of the shops, restaurants, hotel and movie theater would impact the ability of a large number of visitors from being able to enjoy and utilize this area of the waterfront. The IES assessment and project description lead to a number of questions, concerns, and comments which are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

Questions:

The project description is too vague in many places to make substantive comments or fully develop concerns. Since this is specific development project, not zoning or a master/specific plan, the project description should be far more definitive. The answers to questions below would allow a better development of concerns. Without these details, the public is preventing from making a complete response to the IES as it exists.

a. The IES does not describe parking adequately. What is the current number of parking spaces and how many total are included in the current project? What are the number of space, square footage, and dimensions of the proposed new parking structure and the changes to the number of pier parking spaces, pier parking total square footage, and dimensions under the proposed configuration? What are the parking spaces allocated to boaters using the boat ramp, boaters/SUP’ers who hand launch small craft, and boaters with slips in Redondo Marina?

b. The project description is unclear. Some city documents say 15 acres the IES states that the land and water combined are more than 38 acres. How many acres of land/pier are included in the project? The description describes new bicycle and pedestrian walkways, but other than the pedestrian esplanade, there is no further description. “High quality public open space” is undefined.

c. The project description says there will be a new small boat launch but it does not appear anywhere in the site drawing or project description. The following details are needed to fully assess the impacts of the proposed project. Where is it? How big is it? How is
CenterCal Mall Project IES Comments and Questions
Submitted by Jim Light and Building A Better Redondo
16 July 14

it accessed by small boat users?

d. Will all boat slips be maintained in the Redondo marina? What is the height of the proposed pedestrian bridge above the high tide line? Will the commercial boats fit under the bridge?

e. Has there been an analysis of the quality of water in the small boat launch area to determine if the lagoon would be safe for children to swim in? Will this stagnant water area be able to support swimming, wading, and play while maintaining acceptable water quality? The small boat launch area is only inches deep at low tide. It shoals after a few years. Will the Seaside Lagoon be dredged regularly – is that included in any fiscal analysis? What will keep the dramatically sloped beach in place? What is the final size of the water area compared to current and what is the size of the public open space/usable beach/grass area compared to current conditions?

f. The current drawings show a very narrow road for the new road connecting Harbor Dr and Torrance Blvd. What is the configuration of the bike and pedestrian paths through this same area? Are the bike and pedestrian paths protected? How do they link up with the bike and pedestrian paths at Harbor Dr?

g. The project plan is vague on public open space. What is considered public open space and what is its size and uses? Much of the area looks like it would tables for eating restaurant food from the mall vendors... is this considered public open space? How much is truly public, city controlled space and how much is controlled by the developer/leaseholder? Will access and uses to this public open space be controlled or limited? If so, what will be allowed and prohibited in these areas? How is the 10% public open space requirement met in each zoning area?

h. The boat ramp as depicted in the IES does not have a breakwater. Other city documents show a new breakwater. Configuration of the boat ramp is critical to assess the hazards associated with the reconfiguration. The location of the dinghy dock is not show either. The impact of surge, which is great in this area of the harbor; the mixing of small human powered craft with just launched or returning power boats and dinghies; the flow of gas/oil from the boat ramp area and dinghy dock into the opened Seaside lagoon; the mixing of newly launched and returning power boats into the turn basin where sailboats drop their sails and many human powered craft traverse and congregate; and the ability to navigate safely into and out of the boat ramp are all concerns that cannot be adequately assessed without more detail. What is the proposed configuration of the new public boat ramp and the missing dinghy dock? How is the Public Esplanade
requirement met in the northern end of the project with the break in the Seaside Lagoon and what is the connectivity with the California Coastal Trail?

i. What is the calculation of total new square footage based on the cumulative development including the new Shade hotel?

j. The building heights have not been included in the IES information provided publicly, yet CenterCal presentations to the Council have shown this detail. Why has the public not been provided the detailed drawings in planview and elevation and more detailed descriptions so that we might be able to comment more effectively?

Comments/Concerns:

a. **Aesthetics:** An analysis of views from Harbor Drive based on the CenterCal Mall plan drawings reveals approximately an 80% reduction in views of the harbor, ocean, cliffs of Palos Verdes, and Catalina Island from the roadway, bike path and pedestrian sidewalks along Harbor Blvd. Figure 1 shows the limited views left after development assuming no obstacles are placed in the open corridors.

![Figure 1: View analysis along Harbor Drive shows 80% loss of harbor/ocean views. The orange areas are where views of the harbor/ocean are possible.](image-url)
This actual view impact could be far worse depending on use of landscaping, umbrellas, fountains, pergola, and other amenities in the two narrow slivers of view that remain. Even those views would be dominated by the development. This would be a significant impact on public scenic resources and could substantially degrade both the visual character and quality of the site. The Local Coastal Plan calls for preserving and enhancing public views from Harbor Drive. Any reasonable assessment would conclude that requirement is not being met.

The following photographs demonstrate a sampling of views today:

View of Dedication Park from northeast corner of Beryl and Harbor. The Centercal Mall plan replaces Dedication Park with a three story parking structure. Today this is the main entrance to the harbor as evidenced by the signage on either side of the park.
View of Harbor from Dedication Park. This park and its view are eliminated in the Centercal Mall plan by the parking structure.

Harbor View from Harbor Drive through Seaside Lagoon. This view would be blocked by the three story parking structure and two story movie theater.
Harbor Mouth View from Harbor Drive. This view would be blocked by the Market Hall and other development.

The three story parking structure on the corner of Portofino Way and Beryl would create a devastating aesthetic impact from both Harbor Drive as well as from the Seaside Lagoon. The parking structure and attached retail/restaurant uses encroach on the Seaside Lagoon area and will create the effect of a huge three story structure looming over and dominating the views from the much smaller Seaside Lagoon “beach” area and the water. This would impact the attractiveness of the Seaside Lagoon to the public.

b. **Hazards and hazardous materials:** The plan as described may have significant impact on the ability to evacuate the area in the event of an earthquake, tidal surge, tsunami, fire, or other natural or man-made events. Also disturbance of the current fill and demolition of existing structures could expose the harbor waters to toxic substances.

The water quality of the proposed opening of the Seaside Lagoon has not been assessed or considered in the IES. The small boat launch area today is a collecting point for harbor trash. Opening Seaside lagoon will create a large area of stagnant water and a large collector area for harbor trash. The lack of water exchange, the direction of the prevailing winds, and the use of this stagnant water by people, especially children, may make the water quality unsafe in and of itself. This would be exacerbated by the location of the new public boat ramp as the seaside lagoon may become a collecting area for oil and gas from the boat ramp area. The whole Seaside Lagoon may be rendered unusable for swimming/wading and play. Even if the water quality is not an issue, the presence of trash will be a deterrence to use.
There are numerous safety hazards that also need to be analyzed as part of the EIR. The location of the Seaside Lagoon and proximity to the access road for the mall and parking structure creates a hazard that is not there today because the current fence that separates Seaside Lagoon from the current parking lot is eliminated. Young children could easily run into the new roadway servicing the parking garage and restaurant/retail uses. The flow of pedestrian traffic to and from the area, the reconfiguration of the bike path and increased bike use, combined with the change and increase in traffic flow create hazards and safety concerns between vehicular traffic and pedestrians and bicycles. For example, users of Seaside Lagoon would now have to transport their gear and children through a parking structure and across the new internal street that separates the parking from the Seaside Lagoon area. Today, there is no roadway separating the surface level parking from Seaside Lagoon.

And as discussed elsewhere, the new boat ramp, reconfiguration of the Seaside Lagoon, the addition of new moorings, and the location of the dinghy dock and small hand launched boat launch change boating traffic patterns and will increase and concentrate human powered, sailing, and motor craft activities, which will increase the potential for navigation hazards in the harbor. This is especially true in that many trailer boaters and stand up paddle boarders are novices with little or no training on their vessel or on the boating “rules of the road”. The proposed location of the boat ramp is far more impactful and potentially hazardous than the current location of the boat hoists, which are isolated from the turn basin and small boat launch/dinghy dock. And the need for an additional breakwater to quell the surge at the boat ramp location creates very tight maneuvering space and would task saturate even experienced boaters to where they may be unaware of all the movements of multiple human powered craft, especially those operated by neophyte users.

c. **Hydrology:** The water usage of this site will increase dramatically and will significantly increase demand for water despite a multi-year drought and increasing water shortages.

d. **Land Use and Planning:** The project plan shows a wall of development that will effectively separate the community from and limit access to waterfront coastal dependent recreational uses. This is in conflict with the General Plan and the approved Local Coastal Plan. The degradation of access, especially when traffic is taken into consideration will be significant.

In the deliberations of the AES power plant project, CEC staff deemed that certain areas of the AES site fall under the definition of protected wetlands. The impact of construction and increased traffic on these areas should be evaluated.
In general, the proximity, density, and impacts of the commercial development and parking structure represent uses incompatible with existing coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses. And the development as proposed violates the zoning requirements that the new development “be consistent and harmonious with the scale of existing development.” This development is clearly not consistent with the scale of existing development.

e. **Public services:** The proposed project could have substantial impact on police and fire access and response times well beyond the project boundaries due to substantial increases in traffic and associated delays at intersections and driveways. The increased crime associated with commercial intensification will put additional burden on our police department. This burden will increase if the mall is unsuccessful. Increased use of the area and the increased interaction of vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists will likely lead to more calls for medical emergency support from the fire department. And the reconfiguration and concentration of boating uses and traffic patterns at the proposed boat ramp area will increase demands on the Harbor Patrol.

There will be a substantial impact on the public lands and waters of and around the harbor. The project as proposed eliminates Dedication Park and shrinks the publicly usable portion of the Seaside Lagoon beach/grass lawn area by about 1/3. What is left of the beach area has commercial development added to it, further decreasing the availability, usability, and desirability of the public parkland. Additionally, because the Seaside Lagoon must be dredged much deeper to open it up to the tidal waters of the harbor, the smaller beach will have to slope more, which may impact usability and erosion. The impact of the slope on beach sustainability and usability should be evaluated in the EIR.

Currently, the plan does not show any relocation of the small boat hand launch/dinghy dock which was recently expanded using state funds to accommodate boaters using the new mooring field in the harbor. If this dock is not replaced, the ability of visitors using the new moorings to come to shore is negatively impacted. And depending on placement safety may be impacted. It appears the swimming/wading area of the Seaside Lagoon is on the order of two thirds smaller than the current water area and will be further negatively impacted if this smaller area is to be shared now by Stand Up Paddleboarders and other small craft users. The City has also discussed the possibility of moving the outrigger canoe club to this site. The storage of outrigger canoes and equipment on the site and the navigation of the waters of the lagoon would create a significant impact to current family uses of the park. As stated before, the poor water quality of an opened Seaside Lagoon may preclude its use by swimmers, waders, etc.

The highly touted public waterfront “esplanade” is not a substantive improvement as a
waterfront walkway exists today. In fact the opening of Seaside Lagoon will interrupt the existing walkway and force people to walk through the mall area beside the street added beside the Seaside Lagoon. In fact the new esplanade negatively impacts the other recreational uses in the Seaside Lagoon. The new esplanade encroaches on and dramatically reduces the usable beach area of the park and it really configured to support the five commercial lease spaces added to the Seaside Lagoon park area.

Reconfiguration of the bike path and pedestrian walkways through the CenterCal development combined with the density of the development, the addition of streets internal to the development, and the elimination of the International Boardwalk may have significant impact on the safety and desirability of these uses in the harbor and pier area. Especially moving from Torrance Blvd to Harbor Drive.

f. **Recreation:** Recreational impacts of the project exceed those defined in the IES.

**Substantial Reduction in Usable Recreational Open Space/Parkland** - Redondo Beach has actually reduced its parkland to resident ratio through the years. The Recreation and Parks element of the General Plan cites a goal of 3 acres/1000 residents, which Redondo has never achieved. In looking for areas to expand, the Recreation and Parks element specifically calls out for the exploration of the use of the old octagonal building site for public recreational uses. Indeed today, the City/Pier Business Association uses this site for projecting public movies in the summer. The project as depicted does not contemplate a public recreational use for this site – instead it shows commercial development on this site. Similar to the trend across the city, the CenterCal Mall plan further depletes public parkland. The Seaside Lagoon Park is considerably smaller and Dedication Park is eliminated in the proposed plan.

Figure 2 overlays the current footprint of Seaside Lagoon and its water area over the CenterCal Mall Plan – demonstrating the loss of public parkland to CenterCal Mall development. A total of nine commercial retail/restaurant lease spaces, a road, the pedestrian esplanade and a portion of the parking garage encroach on the current Seaside Lagoon parkland.
The figure also demonstrates the loss of about two thirds of the water area in the current park. The smaller Seaside Lagoon tightly surrounded by mall development and the three story parking structure will be less desirable to the public and will likely decrease utilization. How many people park in a parking structure and navigate their kids and all their beach gear through the parking structure, across a street, through a retail/restaurant area, across a pedestrian esplanade to enjoy a much smaller Seaside Lagoon with shopping/restaurant uses and a three story parking structure dominating the view, and ambiance of the dinky beach area? Today the commercial areas of the pier and International Boardwalk are well separated from Seaside Lagoon and the fencing with landscaping provides further separation. The shrinking of the park area combined with the encroachment of incompatible uses represents a significant impact to recreation in the harbor area and a violation of the City’s zoning and Local Coastal Plan. Conversion of public open space and parkland to other uses requires a vote of the People under City Charter Article XXVII. The recreational capacity of the Seaside Lagoon should be expanded, not contracted.

Water quality of the opened lagoon is not addressed nor is periodic requirements for dredging. This area of the harbor already collects garbage and the open lagoon would
create a large stagnant area. The location of the new boat ramp and dinghy dock also may cause gas and oil to collect in the open lagoon. All these combined may make the open lagoon waters unfit/unusable and or undesirable for swimming and wading.

**Substantial Reduction in Parking and Inconvenience of Parking for Recreational Uses:** The project plan substantially reduces parking for trailer boaters, fishermen, small craft boaters, and Stand Up Paddleboarders, and those intending to swim at the Seaside Lagoon.

The proposed parking lot for the boat ramp is insufficient for the trailer boaters. According to a study completed by the city\(^1\), the boat ramp parking lot would only hold about 40 trailer/tow vehicles (Figure 3). This is reduced from the 50 trailer parking spots that exist today (Figure 4). Redondo’s current zoning ordinance\(^2\) requires 67 double length spaces for trailers boaters. The California Department of Boating and Waterways\(^3\) design handbooks calls for parking spaces within 600’ of the boat ramp, a MINIMUM of 20 to 30 car/trailer spaces per lane, plus additional car only parking spaces. The current plan represents a decrease in parking spaces and is the minimum of the minimum specified in the design handbook. Furthermore, the design handbook calls for pull through parking. The configuration of planned boat ramp only achieves the minimum of the minimum by utilizing parallel parking spots, which will prove difficult to use due to the tight maneuvering space.

A King Harbor boat ramp would service a major portion of the Los Angeles area trailer boater population as the only boat ramp between Marina Del Rey and San Pedro and due to its proximity to excellent fishing and scuba diving spots off of Redondo Beach and Palos Verdes. The Coastal Commission’s stated intent in requiring a boat ramp was to increase accessibility and use. The Coastal Commission believes the current boat hoists stifle the use of King Harbor by trailer boaters due to the time, complexity and cost of using the boat hoist. The extremely limited parking is at odds with the whole goal of installing a new boat ramp as it would artificially reduce the use of the new boat ramp.

\(^1\) “Redondo Beach Boat Launch Ramp Facility Feasibility Report”, Moffatt & Nichol, 13 Mar 14
\(^2\) Redondo Beach Zoning Ordinance 10-2.1706 Commercial, industrial, and other nonresidential parking standards
\(^3\) “Layout, Design and Construction Handbook for Small Craft Boat Launching Facilities”; California Department of Boating and Waterways; March 1991
Figure 3: Graphic from Boat Ramp Study\textsuperscript{4} showing parking configuration for new boat ramp site. Note Outrigger canoes depicted in graphic.

Figure 4: Current trailer boater parking

The boat ramp study and other city discussions have indicated a desire to use the boat ramp parking to service hand launched human powered craft. Figure 3, for example, shows outrigger canoes launching from the opened Seaside Lagoon. If the City expects the boat

\textsuperscript{4} “Redondo Beach Boat Launch Ramp Facility Feasibility Report”, Moffatt & Nichol, 13 Mar 14
ramp parking to cover hand launched boater parking, the City study only allocates 21 parking spaces for hand launch boaters and trailer boater guests, which is far too few. The outrigger canoe club regularly launches four 8 person outriggers for workouts usually along with sever single person canoes for weekday and weekend workouts. That alone would overwhelm the available parking. When they have a competition, that demand would be multiplied by two at least. Stand-up paddleboarding (SUP) and kayak fishing are growing uses of King Harbor. Currently, commercial stand up paddleboard rentals are available at the hand launched boat dock (Figure 5).

Figure 5: Current Hand Launch Boat Dock vehicular and pedestrian access and parking.

Personally owned small craft are launched from the same hand launched boat dock. Today both commercial vendors and private owners can drive up to the hand launched boat dock to drop off their boats/SUP’s. The CenterCal Mall project is not configured for convenient, close proximity drop off. Stopping on any of the nearby roads would clog access. And the parking at the boat ramp would not address the demand especially when combined with trailer boater parking.

Should the City decide that the boat ramp parking should not be used for hand launched human powered craft, the only alternative would be parking in the new three story parking structure at Portofino Way and Harbor Drive. The parking structure parking is not adequate for these users due to the distance their boat or SUP and all their equipment must be transported to the use area, and the difficulty in transporting the water craft and equipment through the parking structure, across the internal street to the west of the parking
structure, across the pedestrian esplanade, and through the commercial retail and restaurant uses. Additionally, the height of the parking structure floors may prevent kayakers and Stand Up Paddleboarders from being able to use the parking structure due to the combined height of their vehicle and the watercraft transported on the roof.

Today commercial and recreational boaters berthed in Redondo Marina use the surface level parking shown in Figure 6. Redondo’s zoning ordinance requires three fourths of a parking space for each slip. The CenterCal Mall plan eliminates this parking area as shown in Figure 7.

---

5 Redondo Beach Zoning Ordinance 10-2.1706 Commercial, industrial, and other nonresidential parking standards
CenterCal Mall Project IES Comments and Questions
Submitted by Jim Light and Building A Better Redondo
16 July 14

The elimination of surface parking for boaters with slips in Redondo Marina provides these boaters no reasonable parking solution for access and transfer of equipment to and from their vessels. Parking and access for the commercial boaters is not addressed at all and looks to be severely impacted. Parking in the parking structure across the new street would be an unreasonable burden on those with boats in the Redondo Marina and would decrease desirability of those slips. It would also be a hazard to transport boating/fishing/family gear to and from this parking structure and across an active roadway and bike path.

Colocation of boating uses creates navigation hazard: In addition to poor parking solution for trailer boaters and those using human powered craft, the configuration as cited in the plan creates hazards to navigation. While the hand launch boat/dinghy dock is called out in the text of the project description, its location is not shown on project drawings. The hand launched boat/dinghy dock is not shown on this plan though it is called out in the description. This hand launched boat/ dinghy dock is well used today and the new mooring field being installed now should increase its use. Location and size are critical to usability and could impact public safety as well depending on proximity to power boats launching at the boat ramp.

First if the City’s final solution is for hand launch boaters to use the new trailer boat ramp, mixing trailer boats with human powered craft in the ramp area would be hazardous. Second if the city intends for the hand launch boaters to launch in the smaller water area of the Seaside lagoon as depicted in the City’s boat ramp study, mixing children playing the water with human powered craft is hazardous as well and would impact families using the Seaside Lagoon for swimming, wading, playing, etc. And the Seaside lagoon exit is in close proximity to the ingress and egress to the trailer boat ramp, again creating a hazard to navigation. Both these uses then dump into the turn basin which is used by returning sailboats to head into the wind and drop sail in the harbor. Add to this increased dinghy dock traffic and the concentration of boating traffic patterns in this area exacerbates the hazards.

Increased traffic and concentrated multi-mode traffic patterns impedes access to recreational uses: In addition to the shrinking of recreational resources and lack of parking and infrastructure to support these existing uses, the increased traffic of the intensified retail and restaurant development and boat ramp could have a substantial impact on the accessibility and desirability to use the harbor for coastal dependent recreational and commercial due to the traffic density and increased time to get to the resources. This is especially true at Portofino Way, and its intersection with Harbor Drive, which will now concentrate parking structure traffic, trailer boater traffic, hand launch boat traffic, valet parking from the Shade Hotel, Portofino Marina boaters, Seaside Lagoon users and
Portofino Inn guests, diners, and employees. This traffic problem is further exacerbated by the new two way bike path on the west side of Harbor Drive, the addition of “sharrows” in both directions of Harbor Drive, and the exit of the pedestrian esplanade onto Portofino Way. The Harbor Drive/Portofino Way/Beryl Street intersection will become gridlocked. And that gridlock will be further exacerbated by the short block on Beryl between Catalina Avenue and Harbor Drive. While this is specifically a traffic problem, the gridlock will act as a barrier to access and turn potential waterfront recreation users away.

**Pedestrian bridge severely impacts use of navigable waters and current marina:** Finally, the pedestrian bridge supporting the commercial development would eliminate use of the Redondo marina for sailboats and for the larger commercial boats. This violates the Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act.

**Proposed “open space” does not replace loss of recreational uses:** The project states there will be public open space within the commercial retail/restaurant area but it does not define them. The drawings supplied show these open spaces as amenities to the commercial development and expand seating areas for restaurants rather than expansion of /replacement for usable recreational space. This will not replace public parkland impacted by the development. These open spaces should not be considered replacement for coastal dependent recreational resources. Likewise, the project description touts the pedestrian waterfront Esplanade as though it were a new amenity in the harbor. While in some places the esplanade may be wider, a public waterfront walkway exists today throughout the harbor and pier area. Today this path also allows kayakers and stand up paddleboarders to drop off their vessels and equipment at the hand launch boat dock. The CenterCal plan eliminates this access.

**g. Traffic:** Today during the summer weekends and weekday evenings, the limited circulation infrastructure and the area geometry regularly create gridlock conditions in the harbor and pier immediate vicinity and in the main access routes. Currently the turn into the Decron lease parking lot often has long turn queues that back up through traffic in either direction and create hazardous interactions with the bicycles and pedestrians on the west side of Harbor Drive. Torrance Boulevard is especially challenged due to the short block between Catalina Ave and PCH, which is exacerbated by the stop sign controlled Broadway intersection in the middle. The pedestrian crosswalks from Broadway are hazardous as they are not signaled and new visitors do not notice people in the cross walk. Turn queues often overflow at the intersections of Torrance Boulevard and PCH and Torrance Boulevard and Catalina Avenue blocking through traffic. Longer lights associated with pedestrian signals exacerbate this problem today. The intersections of Torrance Blvd and PCH and 190th and PCH already perform below City standards specified in the General Plan Circulation Element.
With double the commercial development and the addition of a boat ramp, traffic will increase dramatically thus exacerbating the already gridlocked situations that exist today and likely creating new ones on Beryl, Harbor Dr., Portofino Way, Yacht Club Way and Pacific Ave. Adding to the this dilemma the reconfiguration of the bike path to the west side of Harbor Drive and the increased use of the bike path by more bicyclists will increase the frequency and magnitude of overflowing turn queues into and out of Harbor Drive’s unsignaled driveways. These overflowing turn queues will also impede through traffic and increase the hazard of bicycle car accidents. The most recent plan showed at the City IES meeting shows the bike path on the new Pacific Avenue crossing both lanes of traffic twice, once at each end of the new road segment. This adds both hazard and delay. Likewise increased pedestrian traffic will only make the situation worse.

The addition of “sharrows” in both directions of Harbor Drive combined with other traffic calming methods employed by the recently approved bike plan project for the harbor area will substantially reduce lane capacity and increase gridlock. This will effectively impact access to coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses.

The new roadways internal to the mall area and immediately adjacent to the Seaside Lagoon combined with the elimination of fencing for the Seaside Lagoon increases the potential of vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian accidents in these areas. Forcing recreational users of the waterfront to traverse the parking structure and commercial areas with their families and gear also increases this hazard. The EIR should evaluate this internal traffic, the hazards and what mitigations should be employed.

As stated before the increase in vehicular traffic and reduction of level of service of the circulation system will impede public safety response times and impact access for coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses.

It does not appear that the EIR contract requires any analysis of the Pacific/Catalina stop signed intersection. This intersection must be analyzed from and LOS and safety perspective. The short roadway segments between traffic light controlled and partially stop sign controlled side street intersections on Harbor, Herondo, and Beryl Street also need special attention in analysis. Standard city traffic evaluation techniques do not account for overflowing queue conditions, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, and the potential hazards associated with them. The Highway Capacity Manual specifically cites that the intersection models typically used by the City are invalid in turn queue overflow conditions and when upstream traffic impedes flow through the intersection being analyzed. Thus, currently reported intersection LOS for many of the City’s intersections do not reflect the real conditions. In order for the EIR to accurately project the impact of the development, the
appropriate methods must be used and bicycles and pedestrians must be considered. Additionally, the increase in trailer boaters will have an impact on intersection and lane capacity. If the City proposes increased mass transit, the analysis needs to reflect the increased mass transit traffic, the location of the stops and its impact on lane capacity and lane changing behaviors. Several intersections are already adversely impacted when a bus stops to load and unload passengers. Again, the City’s current analyses do not take these impacts into account.

h. **Cumulative impacts:** The IES does not assess known and predictable projects in the immediate vicinity. The new Shade Hotel construction and guest, employee and delivery traffic combined with the valet parking to and from the Triton oil site will substantially impact traffic flow on Harbor Drive and Portofino Way. The new bike path project will impact the ability of vehicles to exit and return to harbor Drive in the project area using both roads and driveways. And the street modifications associated with the bike path project will decrease lane capacity, especially the addition of “sharrows” in each direction of travel on Harbor Drive and the reduction of lanes in both directions on Herondo Street. The Green Street development has been built but is not yet populated with tenants, which will impact traffic flows in the project area. The AES property will be undergoing extensive construction activities regardless of whether a new powerplant is constructed or not and will result, either way, in an increased intensity of land use...especially in light of current elected official statements about their opposition to parkland. Thus construction and post construction traffic should be included in any analysis. Likewise, the “dirt farm” property was recently sold. And it is likely that the new owner will repurpose the site. The traffic impacts of this repurposing should be considered as well. Additionally, continued infill development will increase traffic on major circulation roads in the project vicinity. These cumulative impacts should be assessed.

In the harbor, the cumulative impacts of changing where power boats are launched, where the dinghy dock is located, where small craft will be launched, the increasing popularity of stand-up paddleboarding, and the location of new moorings may create a hazardous change to use and traffic patterns in the harbor. The turn basin is designed to let incoming sailboats safely drop sail. Now it appears we are collocating more uses which could become a hazardous navigation area due to the cumulative impacts of all these changes.

i. **Visitor Serving Commercial uses:** Advertising and public discussion about the proposed mall speaks to the high end, boutique nature of the shops, restaurants, movie theater and hotel. The high end nature of these establishments would impact the ability of many visitors and residents from frequenting the harbor waterfront. This is exacerbated by the negative impacts on the mall project on existing recreational uses both in size, intensification of recreational use, parking usability and availability, and decreased vehicular...
access around and within the project. Likewise, scenic vistas from Harbor Drive enjoyed today by passing bicyclists, runners and pedestrians are severely impacted.

Applicable Coastal Act Sections

The following sections of the Coastal Act may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

30211 – Development shall not interfere with access
30212 – Public access in new development projects
30212.5 – Public facilities distribution
30220 – Protection of certain water-oriented activities
30223 – Upland areas support of coastal recreational uses
30224 – Recreational boating use, encouragement, facilities
30234 – Commercial fishing and recreational boating facilities
30234.5 – Economic, commercial, and recreational importance of fishing
30250 – Location; existing developed area
30251 – Scenic and visual qualities
30253 – Maintenance and enhancement of public access
30255 – Priority of coastal-dependent developments

This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The following sections of the CEQA may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

15124 – Project Description
15125 - Environmental Setting

This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

Applicable City of Redondo Beach Code

The following sections of Redondo code may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

Coastal Land Use Plan

Exhibit H
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 1
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 2
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 6
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 15
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 17
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 18
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 20

Title 10 Chapter 5 Coastal Land Use Plan Implementing Ordinance
Article 1 General Provisions
10-5.102

Article 2 Zoning Districts Division 3
10-5.800
10-5.811
10-5.812
10-5.813
10-5.814

Article 5 Parking Regulations
10-2.1706

Redondo Beach City Charter
Article XXVII

Redondo Beach General Plan
2.1.4 Objective 1.7
2.1.4 Policy 1.7.1
2.1.4 Policy 1.7.2
2.1.4 Objective 1.9
2.1.4 Goal 1J
2.14 Objective 1.44
2.14 Objective 1.45
Parks and Recreation Element
3.4.5 Objective 8.2a
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.2
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.4
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.8
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.10
3.4.5 Objective 8.2b
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.3
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.4
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.5
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.8
3.4.5 Objective 8.2c
3.4.5 Policy 8.2c.2
3.4.6 Implementation Programs

Circulation Element
Summary and Conclusion

The project description is overly vague in many areas for a specific development project. This vagueness leads to the inability of the public to adequately assess potentially significant impacts. The IES as submitted to the public is cursory and does not adequately represent the impacts of the proposed development. These concerns and questions represent significant impacts to the harbor area that are not assessed by the IES today.

The harbor was built for public coastal dependent recreation and commercial activities. State and City policies and code prioritize and protect coastal dependent recreational and commercial activities and resources over non-coastal dependent uses. The current project represents a significant degradation in the ability of the public to enjoy and utilize these coastal dependent recreational and commercial opportunities and assets. The impacts are driven by the amount of development of commercial retail, entertainment, and restaurant uses, none of which are coastal dependent. The project should not sacrifice coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses for non-coastal dependent commercial uses. The public deserves a thorough analysis of all the impacts and concerns noted in this submission. Because of the severity and cumulative nature of these impacts, the project will likely represent a violation of the City’s Local Coastal Plan and General Plan as well as the Coastal Act.

BBR strongly urges the City take action to adjust the project now, prior to investing the time and money on an EIR. If the City decides to alter the plan post EIR and those alterations are not adequately and specifically assessed as an alternative or mitigation in the EIR, the City would have to do another EIR assessment to consider the specific impacts of the proposed plan alterations. With the outcome of an EIR already very clear, it would be far more efficient and effective to develop a more balanced project now, than waste the time and money on the project as proposed.
For the public record and for consideration in subsequent activities, attached are BBR’s comments to the CenterCal Mall IES. Please contact me if you have any questions.

VR,

Jim Light
310-989-3332

http://www.eset.com
The CenterCal Mall project represents a substantial intensification of uses of our harbor area / waterfront that are not coastal dependent uses. The impacts of this level of intensification would be substantial under normal circumstances. In this case, the project site configuration, location and infrastructure exacerbate the impacts of this magnitude of intensification. **The impacts require close scrutiny as the project appears it will have significant adverse impacts on coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses of the harbor and waterfront by uses that are not coastal dependent.** The harbor was built by public funds for recreational boating and other coastal dependent uses. **The non-coastal dependent development should not have significant negative impact upon the public’s ability or desirability to fully use and enjoy these existing coastal dependent uses of our harbor and waterfront.** In fact, that would be a violation of Redondo’s Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act. Furthermore, the advertised high end nature of the shops, restaurants, hotel and movie theater would impact the ability of a large number of visitors from being able to enjoy and utilize this area of the waterfront. The IES assessment and project description lead to a number of questions, concerns, and comments which are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

1. **Questions – the project description is too vague** in many places to make substantive comments or fully develop concerns. The answers to questions below would allow a better development of concerns. **Without these details, the public is preventing from making a complete response to the IES as it exists.**

   a. The IES does not describe parking adequately. What is the current number of parking spaces and how many total are included in the current project? What are the number of space, square footage, and dimensions of the proposed new parking structure and the changes to the number of pier parking spaces, pier parking total square footage, and dimensions under the proposed configuration? What are the parking spaces allocated to boaters using the boat ramp, boaters/SUP’ers who hand launch small craft, and boaters with slips in Redondo Marina?

   b. The project description is unclear. Some city documents say 15 acres the IES states that the land and water combined are more than 15 acres. How many acres of land/pier are included in the project? The description describes new bicycle and pedestrian walkways, but other than and pedestrian esplanade, there is no further description. “High quality public open space” is undefined.

   c. The project description says there will be a new small boat launch but it does not appear anywhere in the site drawing or project description. The following details are needed to fully assess the impacts of the proposed project. Where is it? How big is it? How is it accessed by small boat users?

   d. Will all boat slips be maintained in the Redondo marina? What is the height of the proposed pedestrian bridge above the high high tide line? Will the commercial boats fit
under the bridge?

e. Has there been an analysis of the quality of water in the small boat launch area to determine if the lagoon would be safe for children to swim in? Will this stagnant water area be able to support swimming, wading, and play while maintaining acceptable water quality? The small boat launch area is only inches deep at low tide. It shoals after a few years. Will the opened Seaside Lagoon be dredged regularly – is that included in any fiscal analysis? What will keep the dramatically sloped beach in place? What is the final size of the water area compared to current and what is the size of the public open space/usable beach/grass area compared to current conditions?

f. The current drawings show a very narrow road for the new road connecting Harbor Dr and Torrance Blvd. What is the configuration of the bike and pedestrian paths through this same area? Are the bike and pedestrian paths protected? How do they link up with the bike and pedestrian paths at Harbor Dr?

g. The project plan is vague on public open space. What is considered public open space and what is its size and uses? Much of the area looks like it would tables for eating restaurant food from the mall vendors... is this considered public open space? How much is truly public, city controlled space and how much is controlled by the developer/leaseholder? Will access and uses to this public open space be controlled or limited? If so, what will be allowed and prohibited in these areas? How is the 10% public open space requirement met in each zoning area?

h. The boat ramp as depicted in the IES does not have a breakwater. Other city documents show a new breakwater. Configuration of the boat ramp is critical to assess the hazards associated with the reconfiguration. The location of the dinghy dock is not show either. The impact of surge, which is great in this area of the harbor; the mixing of small human powered craft with just launched or returning power boats and dinghies; the flow of gas/oil from the boat ramp area and dinghy dock into the opened Seaside lagoon; the mixing of newly launched and returning power boats into the turn basin where sailboats drop their sails and many human powered craft traverse and congregate; and the ability to navigate safely into and out of the boat ramp are all concerns that cannot be adequately assessed without more detail. What is the proposed configuration of the new public boat ramp and the missing dinghy dock? How is the public espalade requirement met in the northern end of the project with the break in the SeaSide Lagoon and what is the connectivity with the California Coastal Trail?

i. What is the calculation of total new square footage based on the cumulative development including the new Shade hotel?
2. Comments/Concerns:

a. **Aesthetics:** A top level analysis of views from Harbor Drives reveals approximately an 80% reduction in views of the harbor, ocean, cliffs of Palos Verdes, and Catalina Island from the roadway, bike path and pedestrian sidewalks along Harbor Blvd. This analysis could be far worse depending on use of landscaping, umbrellas, fountains, pergola, and other amenities in the two narrow corridors that remain. This would be a significant impact on scenic resources and could substantially degrade both the visual character and quality of the site.

The three story parking structure on the corner of Portofino Way and Beryl would create a huge aesthetic impact from both Harbor Drive as well as from the Seaside Lagoon. The parking structure and attached retail/restaurant uses are pushed right to the edge of the now smaller Seaside Lagoon area and will create the effect of a huge three story structure looming over and dominating the views from the much smaller Seaside Lagoon “beach” area and the water. This would impact the attractiveness of the Seaside Lagoon to the public.

b. **Hazards and hazardous materials:** The plan as described may have significant impact on the ability to evacuate the area in the event of an earthquake, tidal surge, tsunami, fire, or other natural or man-made events. Also disturbance of the current fill and demolition of existing structures could expose the harbor to toxic substances.

The water quality of the proposed opening of the Seaside Lagoon has not been assessed or considered in the IES. The small boat launch area today is a collecting point for harbor trash. Opening Seaside lagoon will likely create a large area of stagnant water and a large collector area for harbor trash. The lack of water exchange and the use of this stagnant water by people, especially children, may make the water quality unsafe in and of itself. This would be exacerbated by the location of the new public boat ramp as the seaside lagoon may become a collecting area for oil and gas from the boat ramp area. The whole Seaside Lagoon may be rendered unusable.

There are numerous safety hazards that also need to be analyzed as part of the EIR. The location of the Seaside Lagoon and proximity to the access road for the mall and parking structure creates a hazard that is not there today because of the fence that separates Seaside lagoon from the current parking lot. The flow of pedestrian traffic to and from the area, the reconfiguration of the bike path and increased bike use, combined with the change and increase in traffic flow create hazards and safety concerns between vehicular traffic and pedestrians and bicycles.
And as discussed elsewhere, the new boat launch, reconfiguration of the Seaside lagoon, the addition of new moorings, and the location of the dinghy dock and small boat launch change boat traffic patterns and increase and concentration of use that will likely create increased navigation hazards in the harbor. The proposed location of the boat ramp is far more impactful and potentially hazardous than the current location of the boat hoists, which are isolated from the turn basin and small boat launch/dinghy dock.

c. **Hydrology:** The water usage of this site will increase dramatically and could significantly increase demand for water despite a multi-year drought and increasing water shortages.

d. **Land Use and Planning:** The project plan shows a wall of development that will separate the community from waterfront water dependent recreational uses. This is in conflict with the General Plan and the approved Local Coastal Plan. The impacts could be significant. Also in the deliberations of the AES power plant project, it was deemed by CEC staff that certain areas of the AES site fall under the definition of protected wetlands. The impact of construction and increased traffic on these areas should be evaluated. The proximity, density, and impacts of the commercial development and parking structure represent uses incompatible with existing coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses.

e. **Public services:** The proposed project could have substantial impact on police and fire access and response times well beyond the project boundaries due to substantial increases in traffic and associated delays at intersections and driveways. The increased crime associated with commercial intensification will put additional burden on our police department. Increased use of the area will likely lead to more calls for medical support and other support from the fire department. And the reconfiguration and concentration of boating uses and traffic patterns at the proposed boat ramp will increase demands on the Harbor Patrol.

There will be a substantial impact on the public lands and waters of and around the harbor. The project as proposed eliminates Dedication Park and shrinks the publicly usable portion of the Seaside Lagoon beach/grass lawn area. Likewise the plan does not currently show any relocation of the small boat launch/dinghy dock which was recently expanded using state funds and meant to accommodate boaters using the new mooring field in process in the harbor. It appears the swimming/wading area of the Seaside Lagoon is significantly smaller and will be negatively impacted if this smaller area is to be shared now by SUP’ers and other small craft users. The increase in the public waterfront walkway is not substantive as a waterfront walkway exists today. In fact the
opening of Seaside Lagoon will interrupt the existing walkway and force people to walk through the mall area.

Pedestrian crossings interior to and external to the project (leading to the project area) represent a hazard and the increase in both pedestrian and vehicular traffic would compound these hazards.

f. **Recreation:** Recreational impacts of the project exceed those defined in the IES.

The Seaside Lagoon park is considerably smaller and Dedication Park is eliminated from the proposed plan. It appears the internal roadway west of the Seaside Lagoon encroaches on the Seaside Lagoon park contributing to the reduction “beach” area in the park. Also, the plan shows multiple commercial buildings in the park that will further detract from and encroach upon space available for recreation. The smaller Seaside Lagoon tightly surrounded by mall development and the three story parking structure will be less desirable to the public and will likely decrease utilization. Potential users will be reticent to be exposed in their bathing suits and bring their kids to a comparatively small recreational feature so exposed to shoppers and restaurant goers. How many people would show up to a mall in their bathing suits? Today the commercial areas of the pier and International Boardwalk are well separated from Seaside Lagoon and the fencing with shading material provides further separation. The shrinking of the park area combined with the encroachment of incompatible uses represents a significant impact to recreation in the harbor area.

The project plan substantially reduces parking for trailer boaters, fishermen, small craft boaters, and SUP’ers, and those intending to swim at the Seaside Lagoon. Parking structure parking is not adequate for these users due to the equipment that must transported to the use area. The proposed parking lot for the boat ramp is insufficient for the trailer boaters much less the small craft boaters and SUP’ers. While the addition of a boat ramp is intended to increase utilization by trailer boaters, the number of parking spaces apparent in the project drawing is greatly reduced from current parking regulation minimum for the existing boat hoists. This situation is further exacerbated if the outrigger canoe club is collocated at the Seaside Lagoon as has been proposed.

The small boat launch and dinghy dock are not shown on this plan though they are called out in the description. This dinghy dock is well used today and the new mooring field will increase use. Location and size is critical to usability.

Water quality of the opened lagoon is not addressed nor is periodic requirements for dredging. This area of the harbor already collects garbage and the open lagoon would
create a large stagnant area. The location of the new boat ramp and dinghy dock also may cause gas and oil to collect in the open lagoon. All these combined may make the open lagoon waters unfit for swimming and wading.

The elimination of surface parking for boaters with slips in Redondo Marina provides these boaters no reasonable parking solution for access and transfer of equipment to and from their vessels. Access to the commercial boaters is not addressed at all and looks to be severely impacted.

In addition to the shrinking of recreational resources and lack of parking and infrastructure to support these existing uses, the increased traffic of the increased development and boat ramp could have a substantial impact on desirability to use the harbor for coastal dependent recreational and commercial due to the traffic density and increased time to get to the resources.

City policy specifically cites exploring the use of the old octagonal building site for public recreational uses. The project description does not contemplate a public recreational use for this site. The City should explain why this site is not appropriate for public recreational use.

Finally, the pedestrian bridge would have a significant impact on use of the Redondo marina for sailboats and for the larger commercial boats. This violates the Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act.

g. **Traffic:** The increased traffic and changed traffic patterns combined with the relocation of the bike path to the west side of Harbor Drive could have a substantial impact on hazards related to mixed pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular traffic including an increase in trailered boats. The lack of controlled driveway and parking structure entrances exacerbates this hazard. The new roadways internal to the mall area and immediately adjacent to the Seaside Lagoon combined with the elimination of fencing for the Seaside Lagoon increases the hazard of vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic in these areas. Forcing recreational users to traverse the parking structure and commercial areas also increases this hazard. As stated before the increase in vehicular traffic will impede public safety response times and impact access for coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses. It does not appear that any analysis is required of the Pacific/Catalina stop signed intersection. This intersection must be analyzed. The short roadway segments between traffic light controlled and partially stop sign controlled side street intersections on Harbor, Herondo, and Beryl Street also need special attention in analysis. With current development these intersections and turn queues are saturated during busy periods severely impacting traffic flow. Heavy pedestrian traffic combined
with their extended traffic light and uncontrolled pedestrian crossings further exacerbate is situation. For example the pedestrian crossing at Broadway and Torrance is already hazardous. Standard city traffic evaluation techniques do not account for these overflow conditions, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, and the potential hazards associated with them.

h. **Cumulative impacts:** The IES does not assess known and predictable projects in the immediate vicinity. The new Shade Hotel with valet parking at the Triton oil site will substantially impact traffic flow on Harbor Drive and likely Portofino Way. The new bike path project will impact the ability of vehicles to exit and return to harbor Drive in the project area using both roads and driveways. The Green Street development has been built but is not yet populated with tenants, which will impact traffic flows in the project area. The AES property will be undergoing extensive construction activities regardless of whether a new powerplant is constructed or not and will result, either way, in an increased intensity of land use...especially in light of current elected official statements about their opposition to parkland. Thus construction and post construction traffic should be included in any analysis. Likewise, the “dirt farm” property was sold. And it is likely that the new owner will repurpose the site. The traffic impacts of this repurposing should be considered as well. Additionally, continued infill development will increase traffic on major circulation roads in the project vicinity. These cumulative impacts should be assessed. In the harbor, the cumulative impacts of changing where power boats are launched, where the dinghy dock is located, where small craft will be launched, the increase in human powered craft use, and the location of new moorings may create a hazardous change to use and traffic patterns in the harbor. The turn basin is designed to let incoming sailboats safely drop sail. Now it appears we are collocating more uses which could become a hazardous navigation area due to the cumulative impacts of all these changes.

i. **Visitor Serving Commercial uses:** Advertising and public discussion about the proposed mall speaks to the high end, boutique nature of the shops, restaurants, movie theater and hotel. The high end nature of these establishments would impact the ability of many visitors from enjoying the harbor waterfront. This is exacerbated by the negative impacts on the mall project on existing recreational uses both in size, intensification of recreational use, parking usability and availability, and decreased vehicular access around and within the project. Likewise, scenic vistas from Harbor Drive enjoyed today by passing bicyclists, runners and pedestrians are severely impacted.

3. **Applicable Coastal Act Sections**

The following sections of the Coastal Act may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:
30211 – Development shall not interfere with access
30212 – Public access in new development projects
30212.5 – Public facilities distribution
30220 – Protection of certain water-oriented activities
30223 - Upland areas support of coastal recreational uses
30224 – Recreational boating use, encouragement, facilities
30234 – Commercial fishing and recreational boating facilities
30234.5 – Economic, commercial, and recreational importance of fishing
30250 – Location; existing developed area
30251 – Scenic and visual qualities
30253 – Maintenance and enhancement of public access
30255 – Priority of coastal-dependent developments

This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

4. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The following sections of the CEQA may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

15124 – Project Description
15125 - Environmental Setting

This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

5. Applicable City of Redondo Beach Code

The following sections of Redondo code may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

Coastal Land Use Plan

Exhibit H
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 1
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 2
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 6
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 15
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 17
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 18
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 20

Title 10 Chapter 5 Coastal Land Use Plan Implementing Ordinance
Article 1 General Provisions
10-5.102
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Article 2 Zoning Districts Division 3
10-5.800
10-5.811
10-5.812
10-5.813
10-5.814

Article 5 Parking Regulations
10-2.1706

Redondo Beach General Plan
2.1.4 Objective 1.7
2.1.4 Policy 1.7.1
2.1.4 Policy 1.7.2
2.1.4 Objective 1.9
2.1.4 Goal 1J
2.14 Objective 1.44
2.14 Objective 1.45

Parks and Recreation Element
3.4.5 Objective 8.2a
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.2
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.4
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.8
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.10
3.4.5 Objective 8.2b
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.3
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.4
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.5
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.8
3.4.5 Objective 8.2c
3.4.5 Policy 8.2c.2
3.4.6 Implementation Programs

Circulation Element
Goal 2
Goal 6
Policy 9
Goal 11
Policy 12
Policy 25

Redondo Beach Municipal Code
Article 2, Chapter 5, Title 10
10-5.800
10-5.811
10-5.812
This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

6. Summary and Conclusion

The project description is overly vague in many areas for a specific development project. This vagueness leads to the inability of the public to adequately assess potentially significant impacts. The IES as submitted to the public is cursory and does not adequately represent the impacts of the proposed development. These concerns and questions represent significant impacts to the harbor area that are not assessed by the IES today.

The harbor was built for public coastal dependent recreation and commercial activities. State and City policies and code prioritize and protect coastal dependent recreational and commercial activities and resources over non-coastal dependent uses. The current project represents a significant degradation in the ability of the public to enjoy and utilize these coastal dependent recreational and commercial opportunities and assets. The impacts are driven by the amount of development of commercial retail, entertainment, and restaurant uses, none of which are coastal dependent. The project should not sacrifice coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses for non-coastal dependent commercial uses. The public deserves a thorough analysis of all the impacts and concerns noted in this submission. Because of the severity and cumulative nature of these impacts, the project will likely represent a violation of the City’s Local Coastal Plan and General Plan as well as the Coastal Act.

BBR strongly urges the City take action to adjust the project now, prior to investing the time and money on an EIR. If the City decides to alter the plan post EIR and those alterations are not adequately and specifically assessed as an alternative or mitigation in the EIR, the City would have to do another EIR assessment to consider the specific impacts of the proposed plan alterations. With the outcome of an EIR already very clear, it would be far more efficient and effective to develop a more balanced project now, than waste the time and money on the project as proposed.
On behalf of BBR and the people of Redondo Beach, I am submitting an update of our questions and comments on the CenterCal Mall project IES for the public record. For a development project, the description is overly vague so the public cannot adequately assess all our potential concerns. The briefing to the public last night was even more vague.

In case you have not received any feedback on last night’s IES meeting, residents were, in the vast majority, appalled. The projected briefing was too small. We could not hear the speaker. The speaker was not well versed on the project, residents knew more. There were no seats and there was no public comment allowed by the residents who took time out of their schedule to attend. To add insult to injury, consultants wore badges that said “City of Redondo Beach” as though they were City Staff. Ironically, City staff wore no identification. One City staffer stated they did not have to have this event at all. The question from the audience was then why waste our time by not doing it right. This was a very poorly run event and only served to galvanize the dissatisfaction with, mistrust of, and opposition to the City’s actions on this project. Residents felt ignored and railroaded by CenterCal during their highly overrated and, in the end, fruitless public sessions. CenterCal simply did not listen. And the final development as described in the IES, is more dense and has less of the amenities that appealed to the public in CenterCal’s first concepts. And now they feel cheated and deceived by the City.

Summarizing the attached document, it is quite clear the impacts of this development will have a significant negative impact on long established coastal dependent waterfront recreational and commercial uses. These impacts as well as elements of the project as described in the IES represent a violation of the City’s Local Coastal Plan, the General Plan, and the California Coastal Act. The City Council would best serve their constituents and the City by stopping this process and working with the people to define a more balanced solution now. Bulldozing ahead in the face of the snowballing public opposition, which has started much, much earlier than the Heart of the City opposition, will only force residents to take action and unnecessarily delay any real progress on Harbor revitalization, which is what we all want to see in the end.
The CenterCal Mall project represents a substantial intensification of uses of our harbor area / waterfront that are not coastal dependent uses. The impacts of this level of intensification would be substantial under normal circumstances. In this case, the project site configuration, location and infrastructure exacerbate the impacts of this magnitude of intensification. **The impacts require close scrutiny as the project appears it will have significant adverse impacts on coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses of the harbor and waterfront by uses that are not coastal dependent.** The harbor was built by public funds for recreational boating and other coastal dependent uses. **The non-coastal dependent development should not have significant negative impact upon the public’s ability or desirability to fully use and enjoy these existing coastal dependent uses of our harbor and waterfront.** In fact, that would be a violation of Redondo’s Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act. Furthermore, the advertised high end nature of the shops, restaurants, hotel and movie theater would impact the ability of a large number of visitors from being able to enjoy and utilize this area of the waterfront. The IES assessment and project description lead to a number of questions, concerns, and comments which are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

1. **Questions – the project description is too vague** in many places to make substantive comments or fully develop concerns. The answers to questions below would allow a better development of concerns. **Without these details, the public is preventing from making a complete response to the IES as it exists.**

   a. The IES does not describe parking adequately. What is the current number of parking spaces and how many total are included in the current project? What are the number of space, square footage, and dimensions of the proposed new parking structure and the changes to the number of pier parking spaces, pier parking total square footage, and dimensions under the proposed configuration? What are the parking spaces allocated to boaters using the boat ramp, boaters/SUP’ers who hand launch small craft, and boaters with slips in Redondo Marina?

   b. The project description is unclear. Some city documents say 15 acres the IES states that the land and water combined are more than 15 acres. How many acres of land/pier are included in the project? The description describes new bicycle and pedestrian walkways, but other than the pedestrian esplanade, there is no further description. “High quality public open space” is undefined.

   c. The project description says there will be a new small boat launch but it does not appear anywhere in the site drawing or project description. The following details are needed to fully assess the impacts of the proposed project. Where is it? How big is it? How is it accessed by small boat users?

   d. Will all boat slips be maintained in the Redondo marina? What is the height of the proposed pedestrian bridge above the high high tide line? Will the commercial boats fit
under the bridge?

e. Has there been an analysis of the quality of water in the small boat launch area to
determine if the lagoon would be safe for children to swim in? Will this stagnant water
area be able to support swimming, wading, and play while maintaining acceptable water
quality? The small boat launch area is only inches deep at low tide. It shoals after a few
years. Will the opened Seaside Lagoon be dredged regularly – is that included in any
fiscal analysis? What will keep the dramatically sloped beach in place? What is the final
size of the water area compared to current and what is the size of the public open
space/usable beach/grass area compared to current conditions?

f. The current drawings show a very narrow road for the new road connecting Harbor Dr
and Torrance Blvd. What is the configuration of the bike and pedestrian paths through
this same area? Are the bike and pedestrian paths protected? How do they link up with
the bike and pedestrian paths at Harbor Dr?

g. The project plan is vague on public open space. What is considered public open space
and what is its size and uses? Much of the area looks like it would tables for eating
restaurant food from the mall vendors... is this considered public open space? How
much is truly public, city controlled space and how much is controlled by the
developer/leaseholder? Will access and uses to this public open space be controlled or
limited? If so, what will be allowed and prohibited in these areas? How is the 10%
public open space requirement met in each zoning area?

h. The boat ramp as depicted in the IES does not have a breakwater. Other city documents
show a new breakwater. Configuration of the boat ramp is critical to assess the hazards
associated with the reconfiguration. The location of the dinghy dock is not show either.
The impact of surge, which is great in this area of the harbor; the mixing of small human
powered craft with just launched or returning power boats and dinghies; the flow of
gas/oil from the boat ramp area and dinghy dock into the opened Seaside lagoon; the
mixing of newly launched and returning power boats into the turn basin where sailboats
drop their sails and many human powered craft traverse and congregate; and the
ability to navigate safely into and out of the boat ramp are all concerns that cannot be
adequately assessed without more detail. What is the proposed configuration of the
new public boat ramp and the missing dinghy dock? How is the Public Esplanade
requirement met in the northern end of the project with the break in the Seaside
Lagoon and what is the connectivity with the California Coastal Trail?

i. What is the calculation of total new square footage based on the cumulative
development including the new Shade hotel?
j. The building heights have not been included in the IES information provided publicly, yet CenterCal presentations to the Council have shown this detail. Why has the public not been provided the detailed drawings in planview and elevation and more detailed descriptions so that we might be able to comment more effectively?

2. Comments/Concerns:

a. **Aesthetics:** A top level analysis of views from Harbor Drive reveals approximately an 80% reduction in views of the harbor, ocean, cliffs of Palos Verdes, and Catalina Island from the roadway, bike path and pedestrian sidewalks along Harbor Blvd. This actual view impact could be far worse depending on use of landscaping, umbrellas, fountains, pergola, and other amenities in the two narrow corridors that remain. This would be a significant impact on scenic resources and could substantially degrade both the visual character and quality of the site.

The three story parking structure on the corner of Portofino Way and Beryl would create a huge aesthetic impact from both Harbor Drive as well as from the Seaside Lagoon. The parking structure and attached retail/restaurant uses are pushed right to the edge of the now smaller Seaside Lagoon area and will create the effect of a huge three story structure looming over and dominating the views from the much smaller Seaside Lagoon “beach” area and the water. This would impact the attractiveness of the Seaside Lagoon to the public.

b. **Hazards and hazardous materials:** The plan as described may have significant impact on the ability to evacuate the area in the event of an earthquake, tidal surge, tsunami, fire, or other natural or man-made events. Also disturbance of the current fill and demolition of existing structures could expose the harbor to toxic substances.

The water quality of the proposed opening of the Seaside Lagoon has not been assessed or considered in the IES. The small boat launch area today is a collecting point for harbor trash. Opening Seaside lagoon will likely create a large area of stagnant water and a large collector area for harbor trash. The lack of water exchange, the direction of the prevailing winds, and the use of this stagnant water by people, especially children, may make the water quality unsafe in and of itself. This would be exacerbated by the location of the new public boat ramp as the seaside lagoon may become a collecting area for oil and gas from the boat ramp area. The whole Seaside Lagoon may be rendered unusable.
There are numerous safety hazards that also need to be analyzed as part of the EIR. The location of the Seaside Lagoon and proximity to the access road for the mall and parking structure creates a hazard that is not there today because of the fence that separates Seaside Lagoon from the current parking lot. The flow of pedestrian traffic to and from the area, the reconfiguration of the bike path and increased bike use, combined with the change and increase in traffic flow create hazards and safety concerns between vehicular traffic and pedestrians and bicycles.

And as discussed elsewhere, the new boat ramp, reconfiguration of the Seaside Lagoon, the addition of new moorings, and the location of the dinghy dock and small hand launched boat launch change boating traffic patterns and will increase and concentrate human powered, sailing, and motor craft activities, which will increase the potential for navigation hazards in the harbor. This is especially true in that many trailer boaters and stand up paddle boarders are novices with little or no training on their vessel or on the boating “rules of the road”. The proposed location of the boat ramp is far more impactful and potentially hazardous than the current location of the boat hoists, which are isolated from the turn basin and small boat launch/dinghy dock.

c. **Hydrology:** The water usage of this site will increase dramatically and could significantly increase demand for water despite a multi-year drought and increasing water shortages.

d. **Land Use and Planning:** The project plan shows a wall of development that will separate the community from and limit access to waterfront coastal dependent recreational uses. This is in conflict with the General Plan and the approved Local Coastal Plan. The access impacts could be significant.

In the deliberations of the AES power plant project, CEC staff deemed that certain areas of the AES site fall under the definition of protected wetlands. The impact of construction and increased traffic on these areas should be evaluated.

In general, the proximity, density, and impacts of the commercial development and parking structure represent uses incompatible with existing coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses.

e. **Public services:** The proposed project could have substantial impact on police and fire access and response times well beyond the project boundaries due to substantial increases in traffic and associated delays at intersections and driveways. The increased crime associated with commercial intensification will put additional burden on our police department. This burden will increase if the mall is unsuccessful. Increased use of the area and the increased interaction of vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists will likely
lead to more calls for medical emergency support from the fire department. And the reconfiguration and concentration of boating uses and traffic patterns at the proposed boat ramp area will increase demands on the Harbor Patrol.

There will be a substantial impact on the public lands and waters of and around the harbor. The project as proposed eliminates Dedication Park and shrinks the publicly usable portion of the Seaside Lagoon beach/grass lawn area. What is left of the beach area has commercial development added to it, further decreasing the availability, usability, and desirability of the public parkland. Additionally, because the Seaside Lagoon must be dredged much deeper to open it up to the tidal waters of the harbor, the smaller beach will have to slope more, which may impact usability and erosion.

Currently, the plan does not show any relocation of the small boat hand launch/dinghy dock which was recently expanded using state funds to accommodate boaters using the new mooring field in the harbor. If this dock is not replaced, the ability of mooring guests to come to shore is negatively impacted. And depending on placement safety may be impacted. It appears the swimming/wading area of the Seaside Lagoon is significantly smaller and will be even further negatively impacted if this smaller area is to be shared now by SUP’ers and other small craft users. As stated before, the poor water quality of an opened Seaside Lagoon may preclude its use by swimmers, waders, etc.

The highly touted public waterfront “esplanade” is not substantive as a waterfront walkway exists today. In fact the opening of Seaside Lagoon will interrupt the existing walkway and force people to walk through the mall area beside the street added beside the Seaside Lagoon.

Reconfiguration of the bike path and pedestrian walkways through the CenterCal development combined with the density of the development, the addition of streets internal to the development, and the elimination of the International Boardwalk may have significant impact on the safety and desirability of these uses in the harbor and pier area. Especially moving from Torrance Blvd to Harbor Drive.

f. **Recreation:** Recreational impacts of the project exceed those defined in the IES.

The Seaside Lagoon park is considerably smaller and Dedication Park is eliminated from the proposed plan. It appears the internal roadway west of the Seaside Lagoon encroaches on the Seaside Lagoon park contributing to the reduction “beach” area in the park. Also, the plan shows multiple commercial buildings in the park that will further detract from and encroach upon public parkland space available for recreation.
The smaller Seaside Lagoon tightly surrounded by mall development and the three story parking structure will be less desirable to the public and will likely decrease utilization. Potential users will be reticent to be exposed in their bathing suits and bring their kids to a comparatively small recreational feature so exposed to shoppers and restaurant goers. How many people would show up to a mall in their bathing suits? Today the commercial areas of the pier and International Boardwalk are well separated from Seaside Lagoon and the fencing with shading material provides further separation. The shrinking of the park area combined with the encroachment of incompatible uses represents a significant impact to recreation in the harbor area.

Water quality of the opened lagoon is not addressed nor is periodic requirements for dredging. This area of the harbor already collects garbage and the open lagoon would create a large stagnant area. The location of the new boat ramp and dinghy dock also may cause gas and oil to collect in the open lagoon. All these combined may make the open lagoon waters unfit/unusable and or undesirable for swimming and wading.

The project plan substantially reduces parking for trailer boaters, fishermen, small craft boaters, and SUP’ers, and those intending to swim at the Seaside Lagoon. Parking structure parking is not adequate for these users due to the equipment that must transported to the use area. Additionally, the height of the parking structure floors may prevent kayakers and Stand Up Paddleboarders from being able to use the parking structure due to the combined height of their vehicle and the watercraft transported on the roof.

The proposed parking lot for the boat ramp is insufficient for the trailer boaters. According to other studies completed by the city, the ramp parking lot would only hold about 28 trailer/tow vehicles. This is greatly reduced from the number of parking spots required for the current boat hoists by city zoning ordinance. The Coastal Commission’s stated intent in requiring a boat ramp was to increase accessibility and use. The limited parking would have the opposite effect.

Discussion about the boat ramp also indicated that the City may consider the boat ramp parking lot to be the parking for those who hand launch boats in the harbor. First if the final intent is for hand launch boaters to use the new boat ramp, mixing trailer boats with human powered craft in the ramp area would be hazardous. Second if the city intends for the hand launch boaters to launch in the smaller water area of the Seaside lagoon, mixing children playing the water with human powered craft is hazardous as well and would impact families using the Seaside Lagoon for swimming, wading, playing, etc. In either case, the use of the boat ramp parking for hand launched watercraft only exacerbates the parking problem. Limited ramp parking artificially limits the use of
harbor for boating activities.

The hand launched boat/dinghy dock is not shown on this plan though they are called out in the description. This hand launched boat/ dinghy dock is well used today and the new mooring field will increase use. Location and size are critical to usability and could impact public safety as well depending on proximity to power boats launching at the boat ramp.

The elimination of surface parking for boaters with slips in Redondo Marina provides these boaters no reasonable parking solution for access and transfer of equipment to and from their vessels. Parking and access for the commercial boaters is not addressed at all and looks to be severely impacted. Parking in the parking structure across the new street would be an unreasonable burden on those with boats in the Redondo Marina and would decrease desirability of those slips. It would also be a hazard to transport boating/fishing/family gear to and from this parking structure and across an active roadway and bike path.

In addition to the shrinking of recreational resources and lack of parking and infrastructure to support these existing uses, the increased traffic of the intensified retail and restaurant development and boat ramp could have a substantial impact on the accessibility and desirability to use the harbor for coastal dependent recreational and commercial due to the traffic density and increased time to get to the resources. This is especially true at Portofino Way, and its intersection with Harbor Drive, which will now concentrate parking structure traffic, trailer boater traffic, hand launch boat traffic, valet parking from the Shade Hotel, Portofino Marina boaters, Seaside Lagoon users and Portofino Inn guests, diners, and employees. This traffic problem is further exacerbated by the new two bike path on the west side of Harbor Drive and the exit of the pedestrian esplanade onto Portofino Way. The Harbor Drive/Portofino Way/Beryl Street intersection will become gridlocked. And that gridlock will be further exacerbated by the short block on Beryl between Catalina Avenue and Harbor Drive. While this is specifically a traffic problem, the gridlock will act as a barrier to access and turn potential waterfront recreation users away.

Redondo Beach has actually reduced its parkland to resident ratio through the years. The Recreation and Parks element of the General Plan cites a goal of 3 acres/1000 residents, which Redondo has never achieved. In looking for areas to expand, the Recreation and Parks element specifically calls out for the exploration of the use of the old octagonal building site for public recreational uses. Indeed today, the City/Pier Business Association uses this site for projecting public movies in the summer. The
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project as depicted does not contemplate a public recreational use for this site – instead it shows commercial development on this site.

Finally, the pedestrian bridge supporting the commercial development would eliminate use of the Redondo marina for sailboats and for the larger commercial boats. This violates the Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act.

The project states there will be public open space within the commercial retail/restaurant area but it does not define them. This will not replace public parkland impacted by the development. These open spaces should not be considered replacement for coastal dependent recreational resources. Likewise, the project description touts the pedestrian waterfront Esplanade as though it were a new amenity in the harbor. While in some places the esplanade may be wider, a public waterfront walkway exists today throughout the harbor and pier area. Today this path also allows kayakers and stand up paddleboarders to drop off their vessels and equipment at the hand launch boat dock. The CenterCal plan eliminates this access.

g. Traffic: Today during the summer weekends and weekday evenings, the limited circulation infrastructure and the area geometry regularly create gridlock conditions. Currently the turn into the Decron lease parking lot often has long turn queues that back up through traffic in either direction and create hazardous interactions with the bicycles and pedestrians on the west side of Harbor Drive. Torrance Boulevard is especially challenged due to the short block between Catalina Ave and PCH, which is exacerbated by the stop sign controlled Broadway intersection in the middle. The pedestrian crosswalks from Broadway are hazardous as they are not signaled and new visitors do not notice people in the cross walk. Turn queues often overflow at the intersections of Torrance Boulevard and PCH and Torrance Boulevard blocking through traffic. Longer lights associated with pedestrian signals exacerbate this problem today. The intersections of Torrance Blvd and PCH and 190th and PCH already perform below City standards specified in the General Plan Circulation Element.

With double the commercial development and the addition of a boat ramp, traffic will increase dramatically thus exacerbating the already gridlocked situations that exist today and likely creating new ones on Beryl, Harbor Dr., Portofino Way, Yacht Club Way and Pacific Ave. Adding to the this dilemma the reconfiguration of the bike path to the west side of Harbor Drive and the increased use of the bike path by more bicyclists will increase the frequency and magnitude of overflowing turn queues into and out of Harbor Drive’s unsignaled driveways. These overflowing turn queues will also impede through traffic and increase the hazard of bicycle car accidents. Likewise increased pedestrian traffic will only make the situation worse.
The new roadways internal to the mall area and immediately adjacent to the Seaside Lagoon combined with the elimination of fencing for the Seaside Lagoon increases the potential of vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian accidents in these areas. Forcing recreational users of the waterfront to traverse the parking structure and commercial areas with their families and gear also increases this hazard.

As stated before the increase in vehicular traffic and reduction of level of service of the circulation system will impede public safety response times and impact access for coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses.

It does not appear that the EIR contract requires any analysis of the Pacific/Catalina stop signed intersection. This intersection must be analyzed from and LOS and safety perspective. The short roadway segments between traffic light controlled and partially stop sign controlled side street intersections on Harbor, Herondo, and Beryl Street also need special attention in analysis. Standard city traffic evaluation techniques do not account for overflowing queue conditions, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, and the potential hazards associated with them. The Highway Capacity Manual specifically cites that the intersection models typically used by the City are invalid in turn queue overflow conditions and when upstream traffic impedes flow through the intersection being analyzed. Thus, currently reported intersection LOS for many of the City’s intersections do not reflect the real conditions. In order for the EIR to accurately project the impact of the development, the appropriate methods must be used and bicycles and pedestrians must be considered. Additionally, the increase in trailer boaters will have an impact on intersection and lane capacity. If the City proposes increased mass transit, the analysis needs to reflect the increased mass transit traffic, the location of the stops and its impact on lane capacity and lane changing behaviors. Several intersections are already adversely impacted when a bus stops to load and unload passengers. Again, the City’s current analyses do not take these impacts into account.

h. Cumulative impacts: The IES does not assess known and predictable projects in the immediate vicinity. The new Shade Hotel guest, employee and delivery traffic combined with the valet parking to and from the Triton oil site will substantially impact traffic flow on Harbor Drive and Portofino Way. The new bike path project will impact the ability of vehicles to exit and return to harbor Drive in the project area using both roads and driveways. The Green Street development has been built but is not yet populated with tenants, which will impact traffic flows in the project area. The AES property will be undergoing extensive construction activities regardless of whether a new powerplant is constructed or not and will result, either way, in an increased intensity of land use…especially in light of current elected official statements about their opposition to
parkland. Thus construction and post construction traffic should be included in any analysis. Likewise, the “dirt farm” property was recently sold. And it is likely that the new owner will repurpose the site. The traffic impacts of this repurposing should be considered as well. Additionally, continued infill development will increase traffic on major circulation roads in the project vicinity. These cumulative impacts should be assessed.

In the harbor, the cumulative impacts of changing where power boats are launched, where the dinghy dock is located, where small craft will be launched, the increasing popularity of stand-up paddleboarding, and the location of new moorings may create a hazardous change to use and traffic patterns in the harbor. The turn basin is designed to let incoming sailboats safely drop sail. Now it appears we are collocating more uses which could become a hazardous navigation area due to the cumulative impacts of all these changes.

i. **Visitor Serving Commercial uses:** Advertising and public discussion about the proposed mall speaks to the high end, boutique nature of the shops, restaurants, movie theater and hotel. The high end nature of these establishments would impact the ability of many visitors and residents from frequenting the harbor waterfront. This is exacerbated by the negative impacts on the mall project on existing recreational uses both in size, intensification of recreational use, parking usability and availability, and decreased vehicular access around and within the project. Likewise, scenic vistas from Harbor Drive enjoyed today by passing bicyclists, runners and pedestrians are severely impacted.

### 3. Applicable Coastal Act Sections

The following sections of the Coastal Act may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

30211 – Development shall not interfere with access
30212 – Public access in new development projects
30212.5 – Public facilities distribution
30220 – Protection of certain water-oriented activities
30223- Upland areas support of coastal recreational uses
30224 – Recreational boating use, encouragement, facilities
30234 – Commercial fishing and recreational boating facilities
30234.5 – Economic, commercial, and recreational importance of fishing
30250 – Location; existing developed area
30251 – Scenic and visual qualities
30253 – Maintenance and enhancement of public access
30255 – Priority of coastal-dependent developments
This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

4. **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**

The following sections of the CEQA may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

15124 – Project Description
15125 - Environmental Setting

This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

5. **Applicable City of Redondo Beach Code**

The following sections of Redondo code may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

**Coastal Land Use Plan**

Exhibit H
- Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 1
- Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 2
- Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 6
- Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 15
- Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 17
- Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 18
- Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 20

**Title 10 Chapter 5 Coastal Land Use Plan Implementing Ordinance**

**Article 1 General Provisions**

10-5.102

**Article 2 Zoning Districts Division 3**

10-5.800
10-5.811
10-5.812
10-5.813
10-5.814

**Article 5 Parking Regulations**

10-2.1706

**Redondo Beach General Plan**
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2.1.4 Objective 1.7
2.1.4 Policy 1.7.1
2.1.4 Policy 1.7.2
2.1.4 Objective 1.9
2.1.4 Goal 1J
2.14 Objective 1.44
2.14 Objective 1.45

Parks and Recreation Element
3.4.5 Objective 8.2a
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.2
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.4
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.8
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.10
3.4.5 Objective 8.2b
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.3
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.4
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.5
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.8
3.4.5 Objective 8.2c
3.4.5 Policy 8.2c.2
3.4.6 Implementation Programs

Circulation Element
Goal 2
Goal 6
Policy 9
Goal 11
Policy 12
Policy 25

Redondo Beach Municipal Code
Article 2, Chapter 5, Title 10
10-5.800
10-5.811
10-5.812
10-5.813
10-5.814

This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

6. Summary and Conclusion

The project description is overly vague in many areas for a specific development project. This vagueness leads to the inability of the public to adequately assess potentially significant impacts. The IES as submitted to the public is cursory and does not adequately represent the impacts of the
proposed development. These concerns and questions represent significant impacts to the harbor area that are not assessed by the IES today.

The harbor was built for public coastal dependent recreation and commercial activities. State and City policies and code prioritize and protect coastal dependent recreational and commercial activities and resources over non-coastal dependent uses. The current project represents a significant degradation in the ability of the public to enjoy and utilize these coastal dependent recreational and commercial opportunities and assets. The impacts are driven by the amount of development of commercial retail, entertainment, and restaurant uses, none of which are coastal dependent. The project should not sacrifice coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses for non-coastal dependent commercial uses. The public deserves a thorough analysis of all the impacts and concerns noted in this submission. Because of the severity and cumulative nature of these impacts, the project will likely represent a violation of the City’s Local Coastal Plan and General Plan as well as the Coastal Act.

BBR strongly urges the City take action to adjust the project now, prior to investing the time and money on an EIR. If the City decides to alter the plan post EIR and those alterations are not adequately and specifically assessed as an alternative or mitigation in the EIR, the City would have to do another EIR assessment to consider the specific impacts of the proposed plan alterations. With the outcome of an EIR already very clear, it would be far more efficient and effective to develop a more balanced project now, than waste the time and money on the project as proposed.
Attached find an updated version of BBR’s submission that corrects some typos and adds minor content.

VR,

Jim Light
310-989-3332
The CenterCal Mall project represents a substantial intensification of uses of our harbor area / waterfront that are not coastal dependent uses. The impacts of this level of intensification would be substantial under normal circumstances. In this case, the project site configuration, location and infrastructure exacerbate the impacts of this magnitude of intensification. **The impacts require close scrutiny as the project appears it will have significant adverse impacts on coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses of the harbor and waterfront by uses that are not coastal dependent.** The harbor was built by public funds for recreational boating and other coastal dependent uses. **The non-coastal dependent development should not have significant negative impact upon the public’s ability or desirability to fully use and enjoy these existing coastal dependent uses of our harbor and waterfront.** In fact, that would be a violation of Redondo’s Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act. Furthermore, the advertised high end nature of the shops, restaurants, hotel and movie theater would impact the ability of a large number of visitors from being able to enjoy and utilize this area of the waterfront. The IES assessment and project description lead to a number of questions, concerns, and comments which are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

1. **Questions – the project description is too vague** in many places to make substantive comments or fully develop concerns. Since this is specific development project, not zoning or a master/specific plan, the project description should be far more definitive. The answers to questions below would allow a better development of concerns. **Without these details, the public is preventing from making a complete response to the IES as it exists.**

   a. The IES does not describe parking adequately. What is the current number of parking spaces and how many total are included in the current project? What are the number of space, square footage, and dimensions of the proposed new parking structure and the changes to the number of pier parking spaces, pier parking total square footage, and dimensions under the proposed configuration? What are the parking spaces allocated to boaters using the boat ramp, boaters/SUP’ers who hand launch small craft, and boaters with slips in Redondo Marina?

   b. The project description is unclear. Some city documents say 15 acres the IES states that the land and water combined are more than 38 acres. How many acres of land/pier are included in the project? The description describes new bicycle and pedestrian walkways, but other than the pedestrian esplanade, there is no further description. “High quality public open space” is undefined.

   c. The project description says there will be a new small boat launch but it does not appear anywhere in the site drawing or project description. The following details are needed to fully assess the impacts of the proposed project. Where is it? How big is it? How is it accessed by small boat users?
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d. Will all boat slips be maintained in the Redondo marina? What is the height of the proposed pedestrian bridge above the high high tide line? Will the commercial boats fit under the bridge?

e. Has there been an analysis of the quality of water in the small boat launch area to determine if the lagoon would be safe for children to swim in? Will this stagnant water area be able to support swimming, wading, and play while maintaining acceptable water quality? The small boat launch area is only inches deep at low tide. It shoals after a few years. Will the opened Seaside Lagoon be dredged regularly – is that included in any fiscal analysis? Will the dramatically sloped beach in place? What is the final size of the water area compared to current and what is the size of the public open space/usable beach/grass area compared to current conditions?

f. The current drawings show a very narrow road for the new road connecting Harbor Dr and Torrance Blvd. What is the configuration of the bike and pedestrian paths through this same area? Are the bike and pedestrian paths protected? How do they link up with the bike and pedestrian paths at Harbor Dr?

g. The project plan is vague on public open space. What is considered public open space and what is its size and uses? Much of the area looks like it would tables for eating restaurant food from the mall vendors... is this considered public open space? How much is truly public, city controlled space and how much is controlled by the developer/leaseholder? Will access and uses to this public open space be controlled or limited? If so, what will be allowed and prohibited in these areas? How is the 10% public open space requirement met in each zoning area?

h. The boat ramp as depicted in the IES does not have a breakwater. Other city documents show a new breakwater. Configuration of the boat ramp is critical to assess the hazards associated with the reconfiguration. The location of the dinghy dock is not show either. The impact of surge, which is great in this area of the harbor; the mixing of small human powered craft with just launched or returning power boats and dinghies; the flow of gas/oil from the boat ramp area and dinghy dock into the opened Seaside lagoon; the mixing of newly launched and returning power boats into the turn basin where sailboats drop their sails and many human powered craft traverse and congregate; and the ability to navigate safely into and out of the boat ramp are all concerns that cannot be adequately assessed without more detail. What is the proposed configuration of the new public boat ramp and the missing dinghy dock? How is the Public Esplanade requirement met in the northern end of the project with the break in the Seaside Lagoon and what is the connectivity with the California Coastal Trail?
i. What is the calculation of total new square footage based on the cumulative development including the new Shade hotel?

j. The building heights have not been included in the IES information provided publicly, yet CenterCal presentations to the Council have shown this detail. Why has the public not been provided the detailed drawings in planview and elevation and more detailed descriptions so that we might be able to comment more effectively?

2. Comments/Concerns:

a. **Aesthetics:** A top level analysis of views from Harbor Drive reveals approximately an 80% reduction in views of the harbor, ocean, cliffs of Palos Verdes, and Catalina Island from the roadway, bike path and pedestrian sidewalks along Harbor Blvd. This actual view impact could be far worse depending on use of landscaping, umbrellas, fountains, pergola, and other amenities in the two narrow corridors that remain. This would be a significant impact on scenic resources and could substantially degrade both the visual character and quality of the site.

The three story parking structure on the corner of Portofino Way and Beryl would create a huge aesthetic impact from both Harbor Drive as well as from the Seaside Lagoon. The parking structure and attached retail/restaurant uses are pushed right to the edge of the now smaller Seaside Lagoon area and will create the effect of a huge three story structure looming over and dominating the views from the much smaller Seaside Lagoon “beach” area and the water. This would impact the attractiveness of the Seaside Lagoon to the public.

b. **Hazards and hazardous materials:** The plan as described may have significant impact on the ability to evacuate the area in the event of an earthquake, tidal surge, tsunami, fire, or other natural or man-made events. Also disturbance of the current fill and demolition of existing structures could expose the harbor to toxic substances.

The water quality of the proposed opening of the Seaside Lagoon has not been assessed or considered in the IES. The small boat launch area today is a collecting point for harbor trash. Opening Seaside lagoon will likely create a large area of stagnant water and a large collector area for harbor trash. The lack of water exchange, the direction of the prevailing winds, and the use of this stagnant water by people, especially children, may make the water quality unsafe in and of itself. This would be exacerbated by the location of the new public boat ramp as the seaside lagoon may become a collecting area for oil and gas from the boat ramp area. The whole Seaside Lagoon may be rendered unusable.
There are numerous safety hazards that also need to be analyzed as part of the EIR. The location of the Seaside Lagoon and proximity to the access road for the mall and parking structure creates a hazard that is not there today because of the fence that separates Seaside Lagoon from the current parking lot. The flow of pedestrian traffic to and from the area, the reconfiguration of the bike path and increased bike use, combined with the change and increase in traffic flow create hazards and safety concerns between vehicular traffic and pedestrians and bicycles.

And as discussed elsewhere, the new boat ramp, reconfiguration of the Seaside Lagoon, the addition of new moorings, and the location of the dinghy dock and small hand launched boat launch change boating traffic patterns and will increase and concentrate human powered, sailing, and motor craft activities, which will increase the potential for navigation hazards in the harbor. This is especially true in that many trailer boaters and stand up paddle boarders are novices with little or no training on their vessel or on the boating “rules of the road”. The proposed location of the boat ramp is far more impactful and potentially hazardous than the current location of the boat hoists, which are isolated from the turn basin and small boat launch/dinghy dock.

c. **Hydrology:** The water usage of this site will increase dramatically and could significantly increase demand for water despite a multi-year drought and increasing water shortages.

d. **Land Use and Planning:** The project plan shows a wall of development that will separate the community from and limit access to waterfront coastal dependent recreational uses. This is in conflict with the General Plan and the approved Local Coastal Plan. The access impacts could be significant.

In the deliberations of the AES power plant project, CEC staff deemed that certain areas of the AES site fall under the definition of protected wetlands. The impact of construction and increased traffic on these areas should be evaluated.

In general, the proximity, density, and impacts of the commercial development and parking structure represent uses incompatible with existing coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses.

e. **Public services:** The proposed project could have substantial impact on police and fire access and response times well beyond the project boundaries due to substantial increases in traffic and associated delays at intersections and driveways. The increased crime associated with commercial intensification will put additional burden on our police department. This burden will increase if the mall is unsuccessful. Increased use
of the area and the increased interaction of vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists will likely lead to more calls for medical emergency support from the fire department. And the reconfiguration and concentration of boating uses and traffic patterns at the proposed boat ramp area will increase demands on the Harbor Patrol.

There will be a substantial impact on the public lands and waters of and around the harbor. The project as proposed eliminates Dedication Park and shrinks the publicly usable portion of the Seaside Lagoon beach/grass lawn area. What is left of the beach area has commercial development added to it, further decreasing the availability, usability, and desirability of the public parkland. Additionally, because the Seaside Lagoon must be dredged much deeper to open it up to the tidal waters of the harbor, the smaller beach will have to slope more, which may impact usability and erosion.

Currently, the plan does not show any relocation of the small boat hand launch/dinghy dock which was recently expanded using state funds to accommodate boaters using the new mooring field in the harbor. If this dock is not replaced, the ability of mooring guests to come to shore is negatively impacted. And depending on placement safety may be impacted. It appears the swimming/wading area of the Seaside Lagoon is significantly smaller and will be even further negatively impacted if this smaller area is to be shared now by SUP’ers and other small craft users. As stated before, the poor water quality of an opened Seaside Lagoon may preclude its use by swimmers, waders, etc.

The highly touted public waterfront “esplanade” is not substantive as a waterfront walkway exists today. In fact the opening of Seaside Lagoon will interrupt the existing walkway and force people to walk through the mall area beside the street added beside the Seaside Lagoon.

Reconfiguration of the bike path and pedestrian walkways through the CenterCal development combined with the density of the development, the addition of streets internal to the development, and the elimination of the International Boardwalk may have significant impact on the safety and desirability of these uses in the harbor and pier area. Especially moving from Torrance Blvd to Harbor Drive.

f. **Recreation:** Recreational impacts of the project exceed those defined in the IES.

The Seaside Lagoon Park is considerably smaller and Dedication Park is eliminated from the proposed plan. It appears the internal roadway west of the Seaside Lagoon encroaches on the Seaside Lagoon Park contributing to the reduction “beach” area in the park. Also, the plan shows multiple commercial buildings in the park that will
further detract from and encroach upon public parkland space available for recreation. The smaller Seaside Lagoon tightly surrounded by mall development and the three story parking structure will be less desirable to the public and will likely decrease utilization. Potential users will be reticent to be exposed in their bathing suits and bring their kids to a comparatively small recreational feature so exposed to shoppers and restaurant goers. How many people would show up to a mall in their bathing suits? Today the commercial areas of the pier and International Boardwalk are well separated from Seaside Lagoon and the fencing with shading material provides further separation. The shrinking of the park area combined with the encroachment of incompatible uses represents a significant impact to recreation in the harbor area.

Water quality of the opened lagoon is not addressed nor is periodic requirements for dredging. This area of the harbor already collects garbage and the open lagoon would create a large stagnant area. The location of the new boat ramp and dinghy dock also may cause gas and oil to collect in the open lagoon. All these combined may make the open lagoon waters unfit/unusable and or undesirable for swimming and wading.

The project plan substantially reduces parking for trailer boaters, fishermen, small craft boaters, and SUP’ers, and those intending to swim at the Seaside Lagoon. Parking structure parking is not adequate for these users due to the equipment that must be transported to the use area. Additionally, the height of the parking structure floors may prevent kayakers and Stand Up Paddleboarders from being able to use the parking structure due to the combined height of their vehicle and the watercraft transported on the roof.

The proposed parking lot for the boat ramp is insufficient for the trailer boaters. According to other studies completed by the city, the ramp parking lot would only hold about 28 trailer/tow vehicles. This is greatly reduced from the number of parking spots required for the current boat hoists by city zoning ordinance. The Coastal Commission’s stated intent in requiring a boat ramp was to increase accessibility and use. The limited parking would have the opposite effect.

Discussion about the boat ramp also indicated that the City may consider the boat ramp parking lot to be the parking for those who hand launch boats in the harbor. First if the final intent is for hand launch boaters to use the new boat ramp, mixing trailer boats with human powered craft in the ramp area would be hazardous. Second if the city intends for the hand launch boaters to launch in the smaller water area of the Seaside lagoon, mixing children playing the water with human powered craft is hazardous as well and would impact families using the Seaside Lagoon for swimming, wading, playing, etc. In either case, the use of the boat ramp parking for hand launched watercraft only
exacerbates the parking problem. Limited ramp parking artificially limits the use of harbor for boating activities.

The hand launched boat/dinghy dock is not shown on this plan though they are called out in the description. This hand launched boat/dinghy dock is well used today and the new mooring field will increase use. Location and size are critical to usability and could impact public safety as well depending on proximity to power boats launching at the boat ramp.

The elimination of surface parking for boaters with slips in Redondo Marina provides these boaters no reasonable parking solution for access and transfer of equipment to and from their vessels. Parking and access for the commercial boaters is not addressed at all and looks to be severely impacted. Parking in the parking structure across the new street would be an unreasonable burden on those with boats in the Redondo Marina and would decrease desirability of those slips. It would also be a hazard to transport boating/fishing/family gear to and from this parking structure and across an active roadway and bike path.

In addition to the shrinking of recreational resources and lack of parking and infrastructure to support these existing uses, the increased traffic of the intensified retail and restaurant development and boat ramp could have a substantial impact on the accessibility and desirability to use the harbor for coastal dependent recreational and commercial due to the traffic density and increased time to get to the resources. This is especially true at Portofino Way, and its intersection with Harbor Drive, which will now concentrate parking structure traffic, trailer boater traffic, hand launch boat traffic, valet parking from the Shade Hotel, Portofino Marina boaters, Seaside Lagoon users and Portofino Inn guests, diners, and employees. This traffic problem is further exacerbated by the new two bike path on the west side of Harbor Drive and the exit of the pedestrian esplanade onto Portofino Way. The Harbor Drive/Portofino Way/Beryl Street intersection will become gridlocked. And that gridlock will be further exacerbated by the short block on Beryl between Catalina Avenue and Harbor Drive. While this is specifically a traffic problem, the gridlock will act as a barrier to access and turn potential waterfront recreation users away.

Redondo Beach has actually reduced its parkland to resident ratio through the years. The Recreation and Parks element of the General Plan cites a goal of 3 acres/1000 residents, which Redondo has never achieved. In looking for areas to expand, the Recreation and Parks element specifically calls out for the exploration of the use of the old octagonal building site for public recreational uses. Indeed today, the City/Pier Business Association uses this site for projecting public movies in the summer. The
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The project as depicted does not contemplate a public recreational use for this site – instead it shows commercial development on this site.

Finally, the pedestrian bridge supporting the commercial development would eliminate use of the Redondo marina for sailboats and for the larger commercial boats. This violates the Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act.

The project states there will be public open space within the commercial retail/restaurant area but it does not define them. This will not replace public parkland impacted by the development. These open spaces should not be considered replacement for coastal dependent recreational resources. Likewise, the project description touts the pedestrian waterfront Esplanade as though it were a new amenity in the harbor. While in some places the esplanade may be wider, a public waterfront walkway exists today throughout the harbor and pier area. Today this path also allows kayakers and stand up paddleboarders to drop off their vessels and equipment at the hand launch boat dock. The CenterCal plan eliminates this access.

g. Traffic: Today during the summer weekends and weekday evenings, the limited circulation infrastructure and the area geometry regularly create gridlock conditions. Currently the turn into the Decron lease parking lot often has long turn queues that back up through traffic in either direction and create hazardous interactions with the bicycles and pedestrians on the west side of Harbor Drive. Torrance Boulevard is especially challenged due to the short block between Catalina Ave and PCH, which is exacerbated by the stop sign controlled Broadway intersection in the middle. The pedestrian crosswalks from Broadway are hazardous as they are not signaled and new visitors do not notice people in the cross walk. Turn queues often overflow at the intersections of Torrance Boulevard and PCH and Torrance Boulevard and Catalina Avenue blocking through traffic. Longer lights associated with pedestrian signals exacerbate this problem today. The intersections of Torrance Blvd and PCH and 190th and PCH already perform below City standards specified in the General Plan Circulation Element.

With double the commercial development and the addition of a boat ramp, traffic will increase dramatically thus exacerbating the already gridlocked situations that exist today and likely creating new ones on Beryl, Harbor Dr., Portofino Way, Yacht Club Way and Pacific Ave. Adding to this dilemma the reconfiguration of the bike path to the west side of Harbor Drive and the increased use of the bike path by more bicyclists will increase the frequency and magnitude of overflowing turn queues into and out of Harbor Drive’s unsignaled driveways. These overflowing turn queues will also impede through traffic and increase the hazard of bicycle car accidents. Likewise increased
pedestrian traffic will only make the situation worse.

The new roadways internal to the mall area and immediately adjacent to the Seaside Lagoon combined with the elimination of fencing for the Seaside Lagoon increases the potential of vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian accidents in these areas. Forcing recreational users of the waterfront to traverse the parking structure and commercial areas with their families and gear also increases this hazard.

As stated before the increase in vehicular traffic and reduction of level of service of the circulation system will impede public safety response times and impact access for coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses.

It does not appear that the EIR contract requires any analysis of the Pacific/Catalina stop signed intersection. This intersection must be analyzed from and LOS and safety perspective. The short roadway segments between traffic light controlled and partially stop sign controlled side street intersections on Harbor, Herondo, and Beryl Street also need special attention in analysis. Standard city traffic evaluation techniques do not account for overflowing queue conditions, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, and the potential hazards associated with them. The Highway Capacity Manual specifically cites that the intersection models typically used by the City are invalid in turn queue overflow conditions and when upstream traffic impedes flow through the intersection being analyzed. Thus, currently reported intersection LOS for many of the City’s intersections do not reflect the real conditions. In order for the EIR to accurately project the impact of the development, the appropriate methods must be used and bicycles and pedestrians must be considered. Additionally, the increase in trailer boaters will have an impact on intersection and lane capacity. If the City proposes increased mass transit, the analysis needs to reflect the increased mass transit traffic, the location of the stops and its impact on lane capacity and lane changing behaviors. Several intersections are already adversely impacted when a bus stops to load and unload passengers. Again, the City’s current analyses do not take these impacts into account.

h. **Cumulative impacts:** The IES does not assess known and predictable projects in the immediate vicinity. The new Shade Hotel guest, employee and delivery traffic combined with the valet parking to and from the Triton oil site will substantially impact traffic flow on Harbor Drive and Portofino Way. The new bike path project will impact the ability of vehicles to exit and return to harbor Drive in the project area using both roads and driveways. The Green Street development has been built but is not yet populated with tenants, which will impact traffic flows in the project area. The AES property will be undergoing extensive construction activities regardless of whether a new powerplant is constructed or not and will result, either way, in an increased intensity of land
use...especially in light of current elected official statements about their opposition to parkland. Thus construction and post construction traffic should be included in any analysis. Likewise, the "dirt farm" property was recently sold. And it is likely that the new owner will repurpose the site. The traffic impacts of this repurposing should be considered as well. Additionally, continued infill development will increase traffic on major circulation roads in the project vicinity. These cumulative impacts should be assessed.

In the harbor, the cumulative impacts of changing where power boats are launched, where the dinghy dock is located, where small craft will be launched, the increasing popularity of stand-up paddleboarding, and the location of new moorings may create a hazardous change to use and traffic patterns in the harbor. The turn basin is designed to let incoming sailboats safely drop sail. Now it appears we are collocating more uses which could become a hazardous navigation area due to the cumulative impacts of all these changes.

i. **Visitor Serving Commercial uses:** Advertising and public discussion about the proposed mall speaks to the high end, boutique nature of the shops, restaurants, movie theater and hotel. The high end nature of these establishments would impact the ability of many visitors and residents from frequenting the harbor waterfront. This is exacerbated by the negative impacts on the mall project on existing recreational uses both in size, intensification of recreational use, parking usability and availability, and decreased vehicular access around and within the project. Likewise, scenic vistas from Harbor Drive enjoyed today by passing bicyclists, runners and pedestrians are severely impacted.

3. **Applicable Coastal Act Sections**

The following sections of the Coastal Act may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

- 30211 – Development shall not interfere with access
- 30212 – Public access in new development projects
- 30212.5 – Public facilities distribution
- 30220 – Protection of certain water-oriented activities
- 30223 - Upland areas support of coastal recreational uses
- 30224 – Recreational boating use, encouragement, facilities
- 30234 – Commercial fishing and recreational boating facilities
- 30234.5 – Economic, commercial, and recreational importance of fishing
- 30250 – Location; existing developed area
- 30251 – Scenic and visual qualities
- 30253 – Maintenance and enhancement of public access
30255 – Priority of coastal-dependent developments

This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

4.  California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The following sections of the CEQA may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

15124 – Project Description
15125 - Environmental Setting

This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

5.  Applicable City of Redondo Beach Code

The following sections of Redondo code may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

Coastal Land Use Plan
   Exhibit H
   Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 1
   Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 2
   Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 6
   Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 15
   Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 17
   Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 18
   Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 20

Title 10 Chapter 5 Coastal Land Use Plan Implementing Ordinance
   Article 1 General Provisions
      10-5.102

   Article 2 Zoning Districts Division 3
      10-5.800
      10-5.811
      10-5.812
      10-5.813
      10-5.814

   Article 5 Parking Regulations
      10-2.1706
Redondo Beach General Plan
  2.1.4 Objective 1.7
  2.1.4 Policy 1.7.1
  2.1.4 Policy 1.7.2
  2.1.4 Objective 1.9
  2.1.4 Goal 1J
  2.14 Objective 1.44
  2.14 Objective 1.45

Parks and Recreation Element
  3.4.5 Objective 8.2a
  3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.2
  3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.4
  3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.8
  3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.10
  3.4.5 Objective 8.2b
  3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.3
  3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.4
  3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.5
  3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.8
  3.4.5 Objective 8.2c
  3.4.5 Policy 8.2c.2
  3.4.6 Implementation Programs

Circulation Element
  Goal 2
  Goal 6
  Policy 9
  Goal 11
  Policy 12
  Policy 25

Redondo Beach Municipal Code
  Article 2, Chapter 5, Title 10
  10-5.800
  10-5.811
  10-5.812
  10-5.813
  10-5.814

This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

6. Summary and Conclusion

The project description is overly vague in many areas for a specific development project. This vagueness leads to the inability of the public to adequately assess potentially significant impacts. The
IES as submitted to the public is cursory and does not adequately represent the impacts of the proposed development. These concerns and questions represent significant impacts to the harbor area that are not assessed by the IES today.

The harbor was built for public coastal dependent recreation and commercial activities. State and City policies and code prioritize and protect coastal dependent recreational and commercial activities and resources over non-coastal dependent uses. The current project represents a significant degradation in the ability of the public to enjoy and utilize these coastal dependent recreational and commercial opportunities and assets. The impacts are driven by the amount of development of commercial retail, entertainment, and restaurant uses, none of which are coastal dependent. The project should not sacrifice coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses for non-coastal dependent commercial uses. The public deserves a thorough analysis of all the impacts and concerns noted in this submission. Because of the severity and cumulative nature of these impacts, the project will likely represent a violation of the City’s Local Coastal Plan and General Plan as well as the Coastal Act.

BBR strongly urges the City take action to adjust the project now, prior to investing the time and money on an EIR. If the City decides to alter the plan post EIR and those alterations are not adequately and specifically assessed as an alternative or mitigation in the EIR, the City would have to do another EIR assessment to consider the specific impacts of the proposed plan alterations. With the outcome of an EIR already very clear, it would be far more efficient and effective to develop a more balanced project now, than waste the time and money on the project as proposed.
I respectfully submit the attached two documents - EIR Residents Input and Visitor Parking Lot Suggestions

BCCClub [jim_hannpon@bccclub.org]

Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 10:19 AM
To: Katie Owston
Cc: Bill Brand; Steve Aspel; Jeff Ginsburg; Matt Kilroy; Stephen Sammarco

Attachments: Waterfront Development - P~1.pdf (1 MB); Waterfront Development - E~1.pdf (735 KB)

To: Katie Owston, Project Planner,
Copy: City Council and staff

I respectfully submit the attached two documents - EIR Residents Input and Visitor Parking Lot Suggestions for your review and consideration.

In advance, thank you for taking the time to review the documents and all you do for the great City of Redondo Beach.

Jim Hannon
USA Cycling Coach • League Cycling Instructor • Beach Cities Cycling Club • South Bay Bicycling Coalition • Redondo Beach Public Works Commissioner • (310) 341-8701

__________ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10136 (20140722)

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.
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To: Katie Owston, Project Planner, @: katie.owston@redondo.org

Subject: Redondo Beach Waterfront Revitalization / Environmental Study Residents Input

Debbie & I have live in District 2 (33 years) and the Waterfront Revitalization project is in our back yard. Yes, we live in one of the condo complexes above the pier called Seascape 3 and we might have the most (property values & quality of life) to lose or the most to gain from the Waterfront Revitalization project.

For that reason, we have been following the Waterfront Revitalization project since day one and attended most of the Waterfront Revitalization Workshops.

Even knowing CenterCal is primarily a shopping center developer, we were optimistic and excited to participate in the workshops, and witness the many creative ideas coming from the residents. However, during the last workshop the design shown by CenterCal looked like a shopping mall.

What happened? We think CenterCal may have calculated the potential cost of all these creative ideas and simply determined more retail space was needed to make the project profitable.

At the same time, we keep reading that malls in the USA are dead and locally we may have reached a market saturation, with the Plaza El Segundo, Manhattan Beach Mall, Del Amo Mall, two malls in Palo Verdes and the Redondo Galleria. Also, if history repeats itself, we could end up with another white elephant on the pier, much like the shops and restaurants that failed in the late 1980's.

We believe a Waterfront Revitalization project needs to go forward, but we would encourage a more moderate approach and with an appearance that doesn’t resemble a shopping mall.

However, even with a moderate build out there will still be an increase is traffic, pollution, noise, parking and structures that will jeopardize ocean views of the residents and visitors, and increase the burden on city services, electrical, sewage, security, etc.

I think it would be in the best interest of the city and its citizens to:

- Before submitting the project for EIR approval, we feel the City should define the “Village Concept” and identify the percentages of allocated space (Sq. Ft.) for each of the elements; retail stores, hotels, restaurants, theater and parking. In addition we hope to see a big percentage of open space where people can congregate and really appreciate the ocean/harbor views, and sunsets (much like we do). Visitor come to Redondo Beach to “SEE” the Beach, Ocean, Harbor, Pier and then to eat, stay and shop. Please do not block the visitors view with parking structures! A few examples might be; Santa Monica Pier, Huntington Beach Pier, Laguna Beach, etc.....you have an Ocean view from the street going to these wonderful destinations.

- During the EIR Process,
  - We hope the City/CenterCal will continue to collect the public input on important subjects like; the best way to move large numbers of people to/from the waterfront.
- What strategy will be used to encourage people to walk or bike (or other means) to the waterfront and hopefully leave their car at home!
- Perform a detailed traffic study, collect parking options and maybe:
  - Review all offsite parking options
  - Utilizing municipal transportation, green taxis, possible monorails/electric-trams to move people to/from off-site parking areas, park n ride shuttle service.
  - Provide bicycle parking on or near the pier
  - Incentive electric-car owners with charging stations
  - Minimize the need for large parking structures to only what is absolutely necessary to support the hotels, services and city vehicles.
  - Consider making the pier parking so expensive it will encourage visitors to take advantage of the alternative parking.
- Include Noise pollution: establish a Redondo Beach "enforceable noise policy" (during & after construction) to ensure the locals have some quality of life and ensure the City has the equipment to regulate, and enforce noise violators.
- Include Views: most cities in the area have a view ordinances (like PV) to protect property owners and we have Measure G which only addresses view corridors, and it’s not enough. But, we need to respect the existing homeowner’s quality of life, property values, as well as ensuring that visitors have a great view of the water/harbor.
- Include specific environmental thresholds for air quality and water, with measureable goals and performance metrics, and available to the public.
- Remember we have a large number of seniors that live downwind from the pier, they will be more vulnerable with poor air quality and during the parking demo/reconstruction. Are there any plans to relocate susceptible people during the demo/reconstruction?

Also, we would encourage the City to engage the Public Works, Planning, Safety and Harbor Commissions to hold public workshops, evaluate innovative ideas to make Redondo Beach a world class destination and in part, because of the cities approach to innovative environmental concepts and multi-mobility sensitivity on this project.

Thank you

Debbie and Jim Hannon
510 The Village, #304
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
(310) 376-3123
To: Katie Owston, Project Planner, @: katie_owston@redondo.org

Subject: Redondo Beach Waterfront Revitalization / Off-site Parking Suggestions

My name is Jim Hannon and I live in Redondo Beach (for 33 years), in the Seascape 3 condo complex located above the pier. The new Waterfront Revitalization project is in our back yard.

I believe it is in the best interest of the city and its citizens to revitalize the Waterfront. I also believe that if the project is successful, it will increase the number of visitors; locals, tourists, etc.

Attracting more visitors will increase traffic, pollution, noise and the need for more parking structures. If the parking structures are located on the waterfront, they will block the views of the ocean and make the project far less attractive to the visitors.

I encourage the City and CenterCal to take a more creative approach on parking requirements and how we move people to/from this new waterfront destination. Please consider the following suggestions:

- Deploy an engineering strategies that encourages visitor to walk or ride their bike and leave their car at home!

- A reasonable goal might be to reduce the number of parking spaces at the waterfront by 75% and pursue offsite parking. The advantages of this approach include:
  - Freeing up more space for other elements; open space, ocean views places, which might be the reason they are visiting the area.
  - Drastically reducing the parking structure cost, because the builder would not have to deal with the high water table.
  - The new offsite parking would be closer to some of the major arteries, like PCH, which has the capability to better move traffic in and out of Redondo Beach.

- Potential offsite parking locations might include several properties located only blocks from the harbor:
  - The 80-year-old Redondo Beach City Hall and Police Station property. I know there is a plan underway to relocate these city facilities, so consider accelerating that plan, putting bond money of the upcoming special ballot and using the funds allocated to the Pier super parking structures to fund offsite parking, and perhaps new city facilities.
  - The 38+ acres of AES power plant property - parking could be built near the Post Office and near two major streets 190th and PCH.
  - The vacant lot on Torrance Blvd, near El Comino where the old car wash was located.
- Redondo High is the biggest High School west of the Mississippi and there may be room for a New City Hall, Police Station and/or overflow parking for the Pier?
- The City could maximize municipal transportation, green taxis services, electric-trams, monorails, park n ride type shuttles to/from off-site parking lots, build bicycle parking lots near the pier, incentives for electric-car owners (charging stations) and “minimize” the parking structures near the ocean, to only which are absolutely necessary to support the hotels, service/city vehicles, and maybe make the pier parking more expensive, so to encourage visitors to use the offsite parking.

I understand the options (above) might require a certain amount of land for transportation options to/from the pier....but, it seems like it might be worth the cost to truly give the project a true Village atmosphere and appearance.

Also, this off-site parking concept might be used for the commercial property buildings north of the waterfront development and on the west side of Harbor Dr.

In addition, I would encourage the City to engage the Public Works Commission, Planning Commission, and Safety and Harbor Commissions to continue to hold public workshops and evaluate innovative ideas that will make Redondo Beach a world-class destination and in concert with our city’s innovative approach to sustainable concepts and our multi-mobility sensitivity as part of the city’s commitment to Living Streets.

Thank you

Jim Hannon
510 The Village, #304
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
(310) 376-3123
Katie,

While there may be sufficient Environmental Impact Reports to justify this aggressive Waterfront Project, we feel that the residents of Redondo Beach should be able to have a say in the implementation. It should not be forced on the current and future population of this wonderful city. There have been so many prior projects that, in retrospect, many residents feel they got taken!

Some of our concerns are related to the increased traffic and required public services related to the influx of people. Furthermore, there is no concrete evidence in all of the proposed material that the city will recoup the necessary funds to pay for all of the city’s investments and on-going costs. Perhaps starting with a smaller project would be more expeditious at this time.

In any case, a project of this magnitude should be brought to the vote of the entire population of the city of Redondo Beach and not just a handful of council people.

Thank you,
Terry & Kathy Benson
431 N. Prospect Ave.
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
310-503-9357

http://www.eset.com
RE: The Waterfront - Notice of Preparation of the Draft EIR, Notice of Initial Study, and Notice of Scoping Meeting
Elizabeth Benton [betsybenton46@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 9:58 AM
To: Katie Owston

Will attend. Thank you.
Betsy Benton, Commissioner
Suspension Appeals Board
Redondo Beach

From: Katie Owston [mailto:Katie.Owston@redondo.org]
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 9:44 AM
To: Katie Owston
Subject: The Waterfront - Notice of Preparation of the Draft EIR, Notice of Initial Study, and Notice of Scoping Meeting
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH
Community Development Department

Notice of Preparation/Notice of Initial Study/Notice of Scoping Meeting

To: Interested Parties
From: City of Redondo Beach
Community Development Department
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Date: June 19, 2014


Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Redondo Beach, as the Lead Agency, will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for The Waterfront project (the proposed project). Your agency may need to use the EIR prepared by the City when considering permits or other approvals associated with the proposed project and your comments on the environmental scope of the EIR are requested. If you are not a public agency with any statutory/regulatory responsibility concerning this project, your comments on the environmental scope of the EIR are requested so that the EIR may be prepared in light of the concerns of the community and surrounding areas.

Project Description: The proposed project, located in the City of Redondo Beach's Coastal Zone south of Portofino Way, North of Torrance Boulevard, and west of Harbor Drive/Catalina Avenue (see map below), would revitalize approximately 35.6 acres of land and water by redeveloping and expanding local and visitor serving commercial uses, enhancing public access and recreational opportunities and facilities, and improving the aging support infrastructure and parking facilities. The project also proposes substantial improvements in site connectivity, public access and public views to and along the waterfront. The proposed project is specifically designed as a new waterfront village to reconnect the Pier and Harbor area with resident and visitor serving uses. As such, the proposed project seeks to integrate the best of the public and private needs and interests in a revitalized village providing broad coastal access and enjoyment. The proposed project is designed to reconnect the public with the waterfront and to help resolve a long-standing separation of uses and disconnection from the community.

The main components include proposed demolition of approximately 221,347 square feet of existing structures, demolition/replacement of the existing pier parking structure, and construction/replacement of up to approximately 523,732 square feet (289,906 square feet net new development) to include retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, a market hall, and a boutique hotel. The proposed project includes public recreation enhancements such as a new boat launch ramp, improvements to Seaside Lagoon, new parking facilities, and pedestrian and bicycle pathways. Site connectivity would be improved by the establishment of a new pedestrian bridge across the Redondo Beach Marina Basin 3 entrance and the reconnection of Pacific Avenue.

Based on the findings of the Initial Study prepared in conjunction with the NOP, the City has identified potential significant impacts for the following topics: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic and Utilities/Service Systems. A copy of the Initial Study and NOP can be reviewed at: City Hall, Community Development Department, 415 Diamond Street; City Clerk, 415 Diamond Street; Redondo Beach Public Library, Main Branch, 303 N Pacific Coast Highway and North Branch, 2000 Artesia Boulevard; and online at www.redondo.org (follow link to Waterfront on Home Page). The documents referenced may be obtained at City Hall, Community Development Department, 415 Diamond Street, Door "E".

The NOP public review period is scheduled from June 19, 2014 to July 21, 2014 (5:30 P.M.). However, Responsible Agencies and Trustee Agencies may submit their responses no later than 30 days after receipt of the NOP. Please send your response to Katie Owston, Project Planner at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California 90277 or katie.owston@redondo.org. Please provide your name or the name of a contact person in your agency. If you have questions, please contact Ms. Owston at (310) 318-0637, x1-2895.

A public scoping meeting/open house will be held on July 9, 2014, 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm at the Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center, 1935 Manhattan Beach Boulevard, Redondo Beach, CA 90278.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) -- Scoping Process

Name:                     Mary R. Buel
Organization (optional):  South Bay Park Conservancy
Address:                  415 N. Arcadia Ave, Redondo Beach
Zip Code:                 90277 - 3014
Phone (optional):         310 - 376 - 6725
E-mail (optional):        maryrwel@verizon.net

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [X] Aesthetics
- [X] Cultural Resources
- [X] Air Quality
- [X] Agricultural and Forest Resources
- [X] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [X] Geological/Soils
- [X] Cultural Resources
- [X] Mineral Resources
- [X] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [X] Noise
- [X] Recreation
- [X] Land Use/Planning
- [X] Public Services
- [X] Transportation/Traffic
- [X] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: The park, poor city, further eliminating open space, for public access views of the water from publicly accessible areas, aesthetically blocking, impeding public view from bike paths, on Harbor Dr. further obscuring view from 3-story parking garage. Tiny or negatively impact the ability to use waterfront for coastal dependent recreation, i.e. boating, commercial fishing; eliminating 5-3 boat slips = taking away housing from live-a-boards/who cannot afford other R.B. housing! Shrink in the already limited usable parking, causing traffic gridlock that prevents access, forcing people to walk through high density retail/Commercial site with equipment or boats to get to the waterfront, having to park across a trafficked street.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
to get to Seaside Lagoon or boat slip from the Redondo Marina.

Hazardous environmental aspects—Impacts to public safety, exposure to hazardous pollution, excessive freshwater consumption increased police fire response due to traffic.

Increased need for police due to heavy concentration of restaurants + retail uses.

Increased traffic congestion of 30,000 - 40,000 trips on week-ends adding to poor air quality from car exhausts.

Noise level during construction will be unbearable. 2-3 Senior Citizens Residents who were qualified to live at Salvador de Los Angeles Salvation Army, as well as Seniors on SCAT due to low income. Their needs for aesthetics are being disregarded (as they were at the "Public Meeting" at the Performing Arts Center 9/29 when they were forced to stand during the "No Questions-Asked" City Meeting and were only able to write their concerns on paper—indicative of no real action). Their voice in the community and their particular vulnerability in place. Air quality for them is being sacrificial also—forever...
Hello Katie,

I'm a new resident to Redondo Beach and I recently received a color marketing brochure on The Waterfront Project from CenterCal Properties. The brochure was short on details, so I went to the website. Unfortunately, the website doesn't even include a summary description of the concept, let alone the copies of the plans that can be downloaded and reviewed! This is a huge red flag and adds to my deep concerns about the density and the fit of the proposed plan for the Redondo Pier.

I have obtained my knowledge of the plans from the media. I believe a boutique hotel is unnecessary. I also do not want the Pier to turn into an extension of Manhattan Beach; with all due respect to Manhattan Beach.

Thank you for accepting public comment on this important decision for Redondo Beach's future.

Regards,
Janice Boyd

1906 Mathews Avenue, Unit A
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
Not in Favor
Wayne Bradshaw [wayneb@waynebradshaw.com]
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2014 6:02 PM
To: Katie Owston
Cc: Dawn Esser [info@dawnesser4treasurer.com]; John W. McLellan, CPA [john@jwmcpa.com]; Rob Gaddis [robgaddis@orbmediagroup.com]; Rob Gaddis [robgadd@yahoo.com]; Jill risner [jilt.l.risner@boeing.com]
Importance: High

Katie, I am not in favor of what the City Council is currently planning for our water front. Please register my opinion and let me just say, that I have not met or talked to one single resident...and I know and talk to people EVERYDAY...not one wants this currently proposed “shopping mall” or whatever you want to describe it as.... to go through. **NOT ONE!** And the “financial” deal that the council made with the developer makes everyone’s jaw drop. Financially irresponsible? The “Heart of the City” folks are bombing out again.

Wayne W. Bradshaw
30 year resident
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Patricia Brieland

Organization (optional):

Address: 2704 Vanderbilt Ln. #10, Redondo Beach, CA

Zip Code: 90278

Phone (optional):

E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

[ ] Aesthetics
[ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources
[ ] Air Quality
[ ] Biological Resources
[ ] Cultural Resources
[ ] Geology/Soils
[ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
[ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
[ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
[ ] Land Use/Planning
[ ] Mineral Resources
[ ] Noise
[ ] Population/Housing
[ ] Public Services
[ ] Recreation
[ ] Transportation/Traffic
[ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:
I am concerned about the “size” of the Mall that is being planned. I don’t think it could be nearly as large as planned. It would look “monotonous” and destroy the charm of that area.

Also, the Malls in Redondo area are not doing that well. Look at what’s happening to the Galaria. We need the small, unique shops, not the same big chains that are everywhere else! Keep it local, Redondo! (Perhaps take a more “historic” approach.)

A huge mall will probably mean lot more traffic into the area. These people will not necessarily

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comment continued:

Come to shop. People come to the beach, primarily for the beach. They want the beauty of the place. They want recreation. They don't always plan to spend much money.

A large increase in traffic will cause more problems with traffic jams, air quality, and more difficulty for pedestrians.

Good air quality is one of the big things! We usually have pretty good air quality in this area. Double the amount of cars in the area would certainly affect that.

As a long-time member of the community, I have always loved the area. Smart development is reasonable. Why destroy a beautiful place? There must be more reasonable, more attractive, more balanced alternatives.

Please think smaller! Leave more of our open lands open. No three-tier parking structures. No obstructed views. No spreading construction on the beach.

Thank you.

[Signature]
Waterfront Revitalization plan needs to be put to vote

jill brown [lilyofthesea8@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 11:22 AM
To: Katie Owston

Dear Ms. Owston,

I have been a resident of the South Bay for 26 years and a resident of Redondo Beach for 11. I moved to Redondo Beach the community feel, the casual living style, and most importantly for the very special privilege of living at the Pacific Ocean.

I had no desire then, and still have no desire, to live at or near a congested, high traffic shopping center and I firmly believe the vast majority of the residents of this very special city feel exactly as I do. There is no question that a revitalization of the area is needed and long overdue, but the scope of what is currently being proposed will turn our city into a congested metropolis, and if implemented, the magic of this wondrous beach community will be lost forever. I am firmly opposed to the current plan and would like to see a significantly lower density option for the revitalization.

There are so few places like Redondo Beach on the planet, and for the life of me I cannot imagine why any city official would be willing, and even eager, to sacrifice even an inch of it to what is in essence, no more then a beach front mall. I also cannot imagine why any city official would object to putting the plan to a citywide vote of the residents, unless they fear that the response will be against this plan. Is something to be lost by the individual or individuals, if the current plan is opposed by the very residents who live, work, and support this community?

The residents of Redondo Beach deserve the opportunity to vote on this plan. We also deserve to know why any city official feels that we the residents of Redondo Beach should be deprived of such a vote.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jill Brown
11 year resident of Redondo Beach
26 year resident of South Bay

Sent from my iPad
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Waterfront Project
Kathleen Brozee [k.brozee@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 4:57 PM
To: Katie Owston
Cc: bbrand@earthlink.net; Steve Aspen; Stephen Sammarco; Jeff Ginsburg; Pat Aust; Matt Kilroy

Dear Katie:

I have lived in Redondo Beach for 33 years and my husband has lived here for 28 years. This is to provide feedback on the available material on the Waterfront Project.

I am disappointed that Mayor Aspen vetoed the City Council's recommendation to put the project in front of the citizens for a vote. The Council was on the right track, even though the vote is an advisory vote only and non-binding, it is important to involve the residences in the process. The vote in 2010 is over 4 years old and things change.

Although we are generally in favor of the Waterfront Project, we feel the square footage for retail space from the current 221,347 square feet to 523,732 square feet of development, is too large. I understand the motivation here is more tax revenue for our City, but as a long term citizen here, I would much prefer that we have more open space for picnics, outdoor concerts and just quiet contemplation along the water.

I am concerned that the scope of the project is too ambitious. Given that our city has had a previous experience with a bankruptcy on the development of the offices/parking structure above the pier, it seems prudent that this new project be done in stages to test viability before we commit wholeheartedly to the entirety of the plan.

I like the changes to the bike path, the green area (not big enough) and water feature (also not big enough). Both the barn like facility for a "farmer's market" and the boat launch are great. I also think the plan, and our city in general, is missing good public transportation to bring us all in and out of local retail. I would like us to be more forward thinking about how to green the city, such as bike stations (like Long Beach has) trolleys that goes along PCH and from the Green Line and takes us in and out of the area and things that will help us create a greener future for Redondo.

We need to embrace the 21st century and invest in a high tech, environmentally friendly city. California is arid and frequently has drought conditions. Are solar, water conservation, wind power, etc being considered. Why can't this be a LEED certified project/building(s). This would create additional interest and tourism to the city.

Without being different and without transportation, why would people come (in the numbers needed) to Redondo for shopping when they can go to the Santa Monica, The Grove (next to the Farmers Market), and the soon to be The Point on Sepulveda Blvd, etc.

If they do come, can Redondo handle the additional traffic? We certainly don't handle the traffic and parking for the 4th of July.

Don't we all live here so we can enjoy the amazing ocean views and play in our water? The small town feel seems to be disappearing. We are getting more and more retail buildings, condos, and large scale development. Let's not turn Redondo into a paved mall along the water. Please, let's reduce the buildings and make a beautiful
outdoor space along our water with some retail as opposed to retail with a drop of space along the water.

Thank you,

Kathleen Brozee
301 Sapphire St #A
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

http://www.eset.com
Redondo Re Development/EIR
Elaine Burlin [eburlin@aol.com]
Sent:Wednesday, July 09, 2014 9:14 PM
To: Katie Owston
Cc: bbrand@earthlink.net

Dear Katie,

I was unable to attend the meeting this evening for discussion on the development of our Redondo Pier area. This note is to let you know that my family and I are adamantly opposed to this current over blown development.

I only have rhetorical questions to ask........

1. Who exactly benefits from the over building of this project? Not Redondo residents.
2. Who is the shopping mall going to serve? Not Redondo residents.
3. What is the impact on the current Redondo shopping center? What happens when Nordstrom leaves? What is going to fill Nordstrom's a Walmart? This shopping mall currently is sad at best. Redondo residents?
4. Why haven't other beach cities like La Jolla or Laguna or Monterey or Pacific Grove or Santa Cruz built major shopping malls on their beach front properly? Can you just imagine how this would "help" their community? NO! and neither can they!
5. What about the small business that will not be able to afford rent in the mall? Put locals out of business. The Macy's in our mall is the worst store in the chain. Rated a #1. Want to know why?
6. What is the traffic impact for the first few years. After that the stores will close because no one needs another best buy or movie theater. How does traffic help Redondo?
7. What is the crime impact on our beach city? What is the plan for more police and fire?

I could go on and on but for the sake of time and emotions I leave you with this........

It seems our current mayor and most of the city council are not looking to do the job they were voted in for; take care of our city and the citizens now and for the future. Shame on them all.

Elaine Burlin

Sent from my iPad
Waterfront Project EIR
Shirley Cabeen [scabeen@hotmail.com]
Sent:Thursday, July 10, 2014 8:32 PM
To: Katie Owston
Cc: Kelly Charles Village HOA [kellyhoa12@aol.com]; Nadine Meisner [redondo.rad@hotmail.com]

Dear City Council,

I went to the meeting on July 9, 2014 and was severely disappointed how little information was presented and no questions allowed. Having to stand up was also not conducive to people staying and really concentrating on what was presented (the little there was). There were many, many people upset and feeling more untrusting. The last meeting that Centerpointe did long ago was also a waste of time with no questions allowed. It still stings. This is an example of disrespecting those who make a big effort to come.

As far a environmental issues to be addressed, everything not starred on your list has some import. Among the crowd, the biggest issues are the massive scale of the project, how it is being financed, and the effect on quality of life. Waterfront projects are difficult to design for success. There are many failed ones. People are worried that a lot of quality of life might be compromised and the project may not even be successful.

I am a homeowner at The Village, just above the proposed development. I want to participate but so far the format does not promise much. For example, the speaker said the hotel would be two stories but obviously that is an answer that does not measure height, and underground parking, etc. could make the structure appear much higher. Our views are at stake.

A session without questions answered is just a waste of a valuable opportunity. It makes the City Council appear to be colluding with the desires of the developers rather than representing their constituents. The anger will build against the Council if there is little information and no chance for dialogue and fact-finding of the most basic kind.

Shirley Cabeen
630 The Village #210
Redondo Beach 90277
Dear Honorable Mayor, City Council, and City Planning Staff,

I write as I would like to express concerns about the waterfront itself, the waterfront development EIR process, and the current CenterCal proposal for development of the waterfront. The issues are intertwined, but I will try to distinguish between them.

I would also request that these comments be included in the project packages to be submitted to the Coastal Commission, as they appear to be the primary decision makers.

I live at 140 The Village and can see most of the proposed redevelopment area from my windows. I love Redondo. I visit the Pier, Marinas, Harbor Drive and strand twice a week or more, and have walked through every part of existing developments down to the border with Hermosa in the past two weeks.

I recognize the visible age and wear of many existing properties, the benefit of renewing properties, and the City's need for additional revenue. The overriding problem I see is defining how to develop the waterfront, more than whether to develop it. A poorly conceived project will just be another expensive failure that will not meet the City's goals for revenue, will frustrate citizens by disrupting existing traffic, users, and local residents throughout the development process, and leave investors, banks, the City, and ultimately Redondo taxpayers holding the bag. You cannot fight basic economics.

The fundamental strengths of waterfront real estate are those of a waterfront. Its primary users will always be those who require access to the ocean - boating, fishing, beachgoers, tourists, and other recreational users who enjoy the view. People already willingly pay for parking year round simply to walk, run, or bike at the beach or walk or even sit on the pier and enjoy our fantastic weather. Destroying the views or hindering access will harm property values of existing real estate, drive away tourists and other waterfront users, destroying the waterfront and probably violating the Coastal Act.

The big weakness of the waterfront is access - its only non-local drawing population is in one direction, inland, it is far from any freeway, and to reach it requires crossing Pacific Coast Highway, the
primary commuter artery through South Redondo. It can never be a retail "destination" for any but waterfront users, or local residents of Redondo and West Torrance. For the rest of the world, access and congestion are better at Del Amo, the Galleria and Manhattan Village. Thus, any future successful retail will have the same characteristics as existing businesses, most aimed at tourists, waterfront users, and including upscale restaurants, bars and hotels that are selling ocean views and coastal access. Any form of retail not benefiting from beach / pier / marina traffic or ocean views will not be able to justify higher rent and poorer access compared to Pacific Coast Highway or inland malls. High volume or big ticket retail simply does not work economically west of PCH. It is just too far and too hard to get here, compared to existing retail centers.

In terms of revenue, South Redondo can never compete with North Redondo, home of all of Redondo's larger employers (the aerospace industry) because of access and location. Property taxes, retail sales taxes, public rentals, use and parking fees are all there is.

New development should also focus on fixing what is broken, not wasting money paving over what works. Many older structures need to be renovated or replaced. The boardwalk, breakwaters, and existing seawall walkways do not, speaking as one of the many users who is out there every day. There are views, and they are worth saving, which is why foot, skateboard and bike traffic is so heavy most of the year.

Concerning the EIR process, please bear with the following points, some of which may already be addressed in the existing scope:

1. Public outreach has been poor - I can see the entire project area from my home, and am less than 100 yards from parts of it, but I only found out about the project because a friend told me.

2. The July 1 City Council meeting had good public participation, in spite of certain Council members' insistence that the agenda was "receive and file a report". That was the recommendation, but the agenda was for "discussion and consideration", which is what happened.

3. Unfortunately, the public meeting July 9 at the Performing Arts Center was more about presenting the developer's perspective on their project proposal, than obtaining public feedback. Yes, written / electronic comments were obtained, but not in a public forum where they could be heard so that citizens could gauge public sentiment, as occurred at the City Council meeting.
4. The Mayor unfortunately vetoed the City Council resolution to hold an advisory referendum on the existing proposal in the upcoming election. Elected representatives should welcome formal public feedback, and an actual vote would provide the most accurate indication of voter sentiment.

5. The EIR should be based on multiple scenarios, not simply compare the base case / status quo to the proposed project. Other possible projects and variants of the existing project should also be evaluated for comparison, as projects with less impact are more likely to be successful and sustainable, by preserving the value of the coastal asset.

6. Environmental impacts that feed back and negatively affect project and city economics need to be expressly quantified. Traffic congestion is the most obvious example, as consumers will often check out a new shopping center because it is new, but if it is too crowded, noisy, ugly, or congested, they will not come back.

7. Aesthetic impacts need to consider the effects on tourism and recreational users, who may be driven away from Redondo to other beaches, resulting in broad losses in retail, restaurant and parking revenues.

7. Costs of impact mitigation need to be balanced against revenues.

8. Impacts that affect property values broadly over the long term may push Redondo downmarket, resulting in a long term net outflow of wealthier, bigger spending residents. The Village for example has no desirable characteristics except for the views and coastal access.

9. Evaluation of traffic effects has to consider the effect on all of South Redondo even more than in the area around the project. Increased congestion between Anita / Herondo and Torrance Boulevard could affect commute times enough to measurably reduce the desirability of South Redondo residences for the professional class, which would affect property values and existing retail businesses in all of South Redondo over the long term, effectively cannibalizing existing revenue sources.

10. Knock-on infrastructure costs need to be accounted for - congestion ultimately means building or widening roads and expanding commercial utility capacity in the broader area at significant costs.

South Redondo is fundamentally a bedroom community and locally important ocean tourism destination. Retirees and lifelong locals will always been here, but the majority of residents (working commuters) live here
because of the local beauty, charm, and coastal access. If you drive
them out through poorly conceived development, i.e., congestion or poor
aesthetics, the economic impact on the city will be negative, because
they are your biggest ticket consumers of everything but hotels.

Concerning the proposed project, my concerns are straightforward. By
way of background, as a consultant, I have experience with many
feasibility and market studies, including for real estate, retail and
hotel projects.

1. Pure shoppers who live even two miles from the site would never come
here for "destination" retail, i.e., a mall. In every direction there
are better options. Any development has to assume that it will survive
on those who are already here, or come here specifically for the beach,
pier or marina. Thus, big ticket or volume shopping cannot
realistically succeed, and if they did, they would be shifting revenue
from existing businesses on PCH. For access reasons, PCH is more
attractive for pure shopping.

2. If existing parking needs to be repaired / replaced, parking should
first be redone on the existing site - it is already excavated, and the
design of existing underground and surface parking leaves views
unimpeded. It may not be beautiful, but it is not in the way, and the
park areas are attractive. Pier Plaza, not so much. Renovating or even
rebuilding the existing structure will be less expensive and have the
least impact. If expanded parking is justified for a workable project
on Harbor Drive, it should be underground.

3. Any new construction on the waterfront should be single-story only.
Anything else would destroy the view and atmosphere on Harbor Drive,
surrounding parking areas, and would harm residents and businesses such
as the health clubs and existing hotel that now have unobstructed ocean
views.

4. A Seaside Lagoon open to harbor water will lose its most attractive
feature - clean, warm water. As long as the harbor is a harbor, it will
always have visibly poor water quality due to poor circulation, which
gets worse the further you go from the mouth of the harbor. If Seaside
Lagoon is not financially viable, it could be closed down. However, it
continues to be busy during the summer. One obvious issue is that it
closes too early (5pm) for long, sunny summer evenings, while the strand
the other side of the pier is still full at 7pm.

5. Any development has to consider the mix of people that come to the
waterfront, and not aim simply at the high end. The less expensive
restaurants and shops have prospered because of the large number of locals, fishermen, and day use tourists. Many nicer restaurants have lasted decades, but others come and go. But the Pier and Marina will never be 100% upscale, because its users are not.

Pier Plaza is an object lesson in poorly conceived real estate projects, that went into foreclosure shortly after completion.

I appreciate your consideration of my views. Please understand, I want whatever is done to ultimately succeed, but I believe that depends on taking a hard look at economic realities and the realism of various assumptions. It also depends on preserving the fundamental character of Redondo that makes it such a wonderful place to live or visit.

If you would like to discuss any of the points above, please contact me at your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Randall Cameron

140 The Village #101
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
310 937-2081
randallcameron@lionfish.org
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Listed below are my initial questions and comments to be addressed regarding the proposed CenterCal waterfront project. Sadly, the project description lacks the detail necessary for a more thorough assessment by the public. This factor alone should warrant the process to be paused until CenterCal submits their plans in much greater detail, and until the City of Redondo Beach conducts a more comprehensive and inclusive outreach to the public.

That said, in no particular order, please address my following initial concerns:

1) Redondo city staff are publicly defining the project area as 35 acres. The land area is approximately 15 acres. The project's density should be based on the "build-able LAND acres" without including the approximate 20 WATER acres on which the project cannot be built.

2) The project drawing depicts paving over of the Seaside Lagoon to accommodate part of a 3-story parking structure and adding 8 retail/restaurant spaces. This violates City zoning and possibly also the Coastal Act.

3) The proposed 3-story parking structure at the north-end of the project greatly decreases public views and public access to the harbor. It decreases the amount of viable parking for the Seaside Lagoon and the boat ramp, eliminates the hand launch, and blocks the boat usage of Redondo Marina with a pedestrian bridge. It also significantly and negatively impacts the public views and enjoyment of the natural coastal resources.

4) The proposed project has an emphasis on the addition of non-coastal dependent uses; uses not compatible with public access, use and enjoyment of ocean-dependent recreational uses.

5) The increased footprint and mix of commercial uses of this project will have an increased impact on city resources such as police, fire and the harbor patrol.

6) No public open space is depicted in the project drawings, however, it is cited in the description. In many instances, the project description does not match the project drawings. The public cannot accurately assess a project so loosely defined, and so contradictory. In fact, this major flaw denies the public the opportunity to engage in submitting comprehensive concerns.

7) The IES does not consider known projects in close proximity to the project development site. They are: the new Shade Hotel (Harbor Drive), the Redondo Beach Energy Project (RBEP - AES power plant - Harbor Drive)), possible oil-drilling in Hermosa Beach (southwest part of Hermosa), the new bike path (Harbor Drive) and the new Green Street strip mall (Catalina Ave.). The traffic impacts of Green Street are not considered in the IES. The elimination of two lanes of vehicle traffic associated with the recently approved bike path project are not considered. Construction traffic, noise, equipment etc. of the new Shade Hotel is not considered. Should all of these projects commence and/or overlap, there will be significant, negative impacts to the area that MUST be analyzed.
8) The project plan separates the community from and limits access to waterfront, coastal-dependent uses by a wall of commercial development. This is a direct conflict with the General Plan of Redondo Beach and the approved Local Coastal Plan.

9) We are in a drought. This project could substantially increase water usage.

10) Opening up Seaside Lagoon to the ocean may have other adverse impacts such as debris accumulating in the Lagoon, as well as Sea Lions infiltrating the Lagoon.

11) Open space is not adequately defined in the project description by either size or uses. It appears that "open space" might include the "outdoor dining patios" affixed to restaurants.

12) The new roads internal to the project area, adjacent to the Seaside Lagoon increases the potential of pedestrian, cyclist and vehicle accidents, exacerbated by the elimination of fencing for the Seaside Lagoon. Recreational users of the waterfront would be forced to navigate through the parking structure and commercial areas with their families and gear, increasing hazards.

13) CenterCal's P.R. for the project touts the project as a "high end development:" high-end boutiques, high-end restaurants, high-end retail establishments and a high-end movie theater. None of these commercial uses is coastal-dependent. And, "high-end" could prohibit many visitors and much of the local community from frequenting such a development on our waterfront. Market feasibility studies must be performed to not only ascertain the demographic of clientele, but to also compare the impacts of existing retail/commercial developments in the local region such as Plaza El Segundo, South Bay Galleria, Manhattan Village Mall, Del-Amo Mall, the Promenade at the Peninsula and Ports o' Call, to name the major ones nearby.

14) City policies, zoning, land use plans, ordinances, municipal codes and laws must be referenced as this project appears to violate several. Additionally, this project, even loosely defined, appears to violate the Coastal Act.

15) No alternate plan is in evidence. "Do nothing" does not seem to be an option supported by most of the public. Alternate plans need to be developed and considered, with public participation.

The CenterCal project significantly and negatively impacts public use and enjoyment of coastal-dependent recreational uses, as well as public views of the waterfront. Most residents of Redondo Beach favor revitalization of our waterfront at King Harbor. I strongly urge that the City take action now, to adjust and balance the size and scope of the waterfront development to a project that provides more balance and enhances the public use, access, views and recreational enjoyment of coastal-dependent activities in King Harbor.

Lezlie Campeggi
Redondo Beach, CA  90278
(310) 318-6304
Katie Owston

From: Marc Mitchell <marc@cerrell.com>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2014 9:29 AM
To: Katie Owston
Subject: RE: please add me to the email list

Waterfront info will suffice.

Thanks and have a great weekend, Katie!

Marc

Marc Mitchell
Vice President
Cerrell Associates, Inc.
320 N. Larchmont Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90004
Office: (323) 466-3445
marc@cerrell.com
www.cerrell.com

From: Katie Owston [mailto:Katie.Owston@redondo.org]
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2014 8:36 AM
To: Marc Mitchell
Subject: RE: please add me to the email list

Hi Marc,

I will add you to The Waterfront email and mail distribution list. Do you want to receive all notices from the City on their other projects as well?

Katie Owston
Project Planner

From: Marc Mitchell [marc@cerrell.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 5:27 PM
To: Katie Owston
Subject: please add me to the email list

I’d like to receive notices of public meetings in the city of Redondo Beach.

Thanks!
Marc
Marc Mitchell
Vice President
Cerrell Associates, Inc.
320 N. Larchmont Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90004
Office: (323) 466-3445
marc@cerrell.com
www.cerrell.com
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Change of Address
Sandra Friedlander [sandra@redondochamber.org]
Sent:Monday, June 23, 2014 2:22 PM
To: Katie Owston

Katie, we just received the Notice of Preparation/Notice of Initial Study/Notice of Scoping Meeting notice, which was addressed, to our old address.

Is it possible to get your website updated with our new address and any internal website where our address is listed and get changed as listed below. People keep calling and complaining they are being sent to our old address only to find out we are at the below address.

My understanding there has been phone calls made to get the website updated to no avail. I am hoping you can find an internal contact there that can assist in this matter.

Thank you in advance for all your help.

Sandra Friedlander
Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce & Visitors Bureau
Customer Service Relations
119 W. Torrance Blvd. Suite #2 | Redondo Beach, CA 90277
310.376.6911 ext. 126 | info@redondochamber.org
www.redondochamber.org  www.visitredondo.com

Please download our FREE mobile app “Visit Redondo Beach” at http://m.visitredondo.com to find out why there is always “More to Sea” in Redondo Beach!
EIR Comments
Kelly Charles [kellyvb2005@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 20, 2014 3:34 PM
To: Katie Owston
Cc: Bill Brand; Matt Kilroy; Pat Aust; Stephen Sammarco; Jeff Ginsburg; Steve Aspel; Eleanor Manzano
Attachments:P1120516.JPG (5 MB); P1160876.JPG (5 MB); P1160471.JPG (5 MB)

Dear Ms. Owston,
I have been a Redondo Beach resident/homeowner for 23 years. I have many serious concerns regarding CenterCal's huge over-sized waterfront/harbor development project that I feel need to be addressed in the EIR. They are as follows:

1) Traffic: Please see 3 attch'd pictures taken from my balcony. This is what our beautiful entrance into our waterfront/Pier looks like on any given day of the week. Mind you, this is NOW. Delivery trucks parked and unloading, and many buses line the entry into our Pier area daily. In the evening, the tour buses come down and illegally park in the loading/unloading area. We're lucky if they park. Most of the time they sit out there and idle. It is extremely loud. Our City does nothing to enforce this illegal tour bus parking. If it looks like this now, what will it look like after the over-development happens? What will it sound like? What will it smell like? We have not yet been told, after asking Mr. Bruning many times, where these trucks will go to unload their goods.
And there will be many more of them with the new restaurants and stores going in, not to mention yet another hotel. See the attch'd picture of the "Delivery" ramp down into the parking structure that was put in way back in the day. I have lived here for 23 yrs and the trucks have never used this so-called "Delivery" ramp to go down and unload their products. They line the circle creating traffic congestion and constant back-up beeping.

2) The CenterCal waterfront development plan violates city zoning by shrinking Seaside Lagoon Park in both public open space and water area. It paves over a large portion of the park for a road, a portion of the three-story parking garage, the pedestrian esplanade, and eight restaurant/retail shops. This violates both City zoning and the California Coastal Act. And, once Seaside Lagoon is opened up to the harbor, they also open it up to the sea lions. How are they going to keep them out?
This is a blatant example of CenterCal's lack of foresight and inexperience in developing a coastal area.
3) The CenterCal Plan creates navigation hazards in our harbor, decreases boating facilities, and eliminates much needed and well-used boater parking. It creates traffic gridlock that will make it difficult to even access the harbor.

4) The nice, glitzy elevation views of the CenterCal Plan posted on the City website and in the local papers don't match the plan CenterCal submitted to the City. The pretty pictures show a huge waterfront esplanade/boardwalk... much, much larger than depicted in their plan. The open areas are bigger in the glitzy drawings than in the plan. The buildings don't match the plan.

CenterCal promised residents a 3-D model of their development so we could visualize the view impacts. A year and a half after their CEO made that promise, we still don't have that model. CenterCal NEVER shows their mall drawings from the Harbor Drive perspective ... only from the perspective of looking in from the ocean. Residents wishing to gain a clear image of the CenterCal plan from which to submit concerns have NOT been afforded that opportunity due to OMISSION OF DATA!

5) Please compare the proposed CenterCal project to the nearby "Ports of Call," the failed waterfront shopping/restaurant area in San Pedro that is undergoing a similar revitalization process as we are with our harbor. Their waterfront area is 15 acres, the same LAND AREA as our harbor/pier area in the CenterCal mall project - 15 acres for possible development. Port of Los Angeles officials are not as enamored with over-development as our City Council. The maximum total development allowed in their 15 LAND acres is just 375,000 sq ft. Our Council is promoting CenterCal's 524,000 sq ft in 15 acres of LAND AREA available. That is 40% larger than what San Pedro is allowing over the same space.

6) The City is claiming an estimate of net average revenues of $2.8M per year from the CenterCal project, a paltry 3% of the City's annual revenues. But they have refused to give the public the details of their calculations. Does this include increased wear and tear on the roads? The increase in public safety costs? Regardless - to net just $2.8M per year for doubling our density does not justify the significant impacts to our quality of life and our harbor recreational access. The City analysis does show that the City knows there is a potential negative cash flow if the project does not perform. In a scenario where revenues from the project are
reduced 22% from their initial assumption, the project generates a loss of $48M. This is a huge, negative financial impact that needs detailed analysis. The downside of this project could far exceed a $48M loss; a downside that Redondo Beach cannot afford.

7) In the immediate vicinity (adjacent to and across the street from CenterCal’s proposed plan) are two other projects whose impacts need to be considered: 1) the construction of the new Shade Hotel and, 2) demolition of the power plant and construction of what will take its place. Additionally, a possible 3rd project is looming about 1/4 mile away, that being possible oil drilling in Hermosa Beach, with construction, congestion, noise and other negative impacts that could all be taking place simultaneously.

8) A local non-profit organization, Building a Better Redondo (BBR), has circulated an alternative vision to the CenterCal project that has received significant, positive response from the community. At a June 2014 City Street Festival, hundreds of Redondo Beach residents gave feedback in support of the BBR alternate plan being a welcomed and viable replacement of the CenterCal development project. Please compare, contrast and evaluate this alternative plan.

Yes, I have more concerns such as the addition of a road between Torrance Blvd. and Harbor Drive, the added height of the project; specifically, a 3-story parking garage that will block views, the lack of open space, and the competition with the other, non-coastal retail developments; Plaza El Segundo, Manhattan Village Mall, South Bay Galleria, Del Amo Mall, The Promenade at Rolling Hills, and Ports of Call, to name a few ... all of which should be analyzed regarding "market impact."

Redondo Beach has a unique, quaint harbor with scenic, coastal views that cannot be duplicated by our sister beach cities. Rather than hide it behind a wall of the CenterCal-proposed development that is not coastal dependent, the revitalization of our harbor should focus on harbor views for all the public, and easy access to coastal recreational uses like boating, sailing, fishing, paddling, and rowing. The great majority of people in Redondo Beach agree that our harbor needs revitalization. I strongly feel this way as well. I welcome revitalization, but this plan is too BIG and needs to be scaled down. There are several vacant spaces on our Pier now that have been vacant for a long time. I do not believe a plan of this size will be viable during the winter months. Our City officials need to wake up and learn from past failed projects. Let’s please understand the negative impacts of what CenterCal is proposing and re-direct the development.
project to something more appropriate, less dense, financially feasible, with shared-profitability between the developer and the City, and a project that does not violate our City Codes or the Coastal Act. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Kelly Charles
Redondo Beach Resident, 23 years

http://www.eset.com
I am a 16 year Redondo Beach resident and would like to go on record with my concerns about the pending CenterCal harbor redevelopment project.

1) The project proposal of 524,000 square feet is too big, too over-developed. It needs to be scaled back to a reasonable amount for the area; 375,000 or less.
2) The addition of a road between Torrance circle and Harbor Drive is totally unnecessary and will cause unneeded traffic congestion, noise, and pollution. A simple people mover like a trolley car would be a more acceptable idea. We don't need any more traffic circulating in the area. We are already bombarded with delivery trucks, torrance transit buses, tour buses, and regular traffic from the circle. And the general traffic along PCH, the obvious through-way to this development is not getting any less congested.
3) The addition of a 3 story parking garage to block views across from the Crown Plaza. How are the hotel tenants going to like that? Is this any way to treat the owners of that long standing business?
4) Have objective market studies been completed to determine whether businesses in this project can succeed? How will they compete with other shopping malls in the area? There are vacant businesses on the pier now. It appears no one is thinking of the longevity of this project 10 years down the road and many of my more senior neighbors remember the history of failed businesses on the pier.

There is no question we need redevelopment of this waterfront harbor, but the pendulum seems to have swung too far toward over-development without much forethought. Please scale it back and protect our history of beautiful scenic coastal views.

Sincerely,
Tim Charles
Redondo Beach resident
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Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: [Handwritten Signature]
Organization (optional): 
Address: 415 W. Main
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 818-568-7948
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: My understanding is that the Coastal Act protects the public's rights and I already suffer from asthma and allergies, so Air Quality is a major concern during after the project is built. Gas exhaust as 29,000 to 40,000 additional car trips across/around this Land use, planning, aesthetics are severely compromised, block public views of the Ocean from publicly accessible areas, impacting public views. Preventing impeding access to Coastal-dependent Waterfront recreational and commercial uses. Reducing 53+ boat slips, actually eliminating them for a mall when this is a harbor for small- and large boats. Elimination also of severely limited usable parking, location of boat ramp near hand-launched boats, having to park across a traffic filled street to get to Serrano Lagoon. (Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Maria Cincotta
Organization (optional):
Address: 4619 Sugarhill Dr
   Rolling Hills Est. CA 90274
Zip Code:  
Phone (optional): (310) 373-1901
E-mail (optional): 

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics
☐ Biological Resources
☒ Greenhouse Gas Emissions
☐ Land Use/Planning
☒ Population/Housing*
☒ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources*
☐ Cultural Resources
☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Mineral Resources*
☐ Public Services
☐ Utilities/Service Systems
☐ Air Quality
☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Noise
☐ Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

itures in Palos Verdes, we protect our coastline! This project will impact our ability to use the coast for recreation.

(A Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Re: Waterfront project
Carla Sridevi Cohen [carlac108@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 20, 2014 8:36 PM
To: SteveAspel@aol.com
Cc: Katie Owston; Bill Brand [bbrand@earthlink.net]; Steve Aspel; Stephen Sammarco; Jeff Ginsburg; Pat Aust; Matt Kilroy

Dear Steve

I think it is important for the council to see your response to my first email. I did speak MY mind freely in the first email.

Just to be TOTALLY clear, none of the people on this cc list contacted me or urged me to say anything to you. I am a little concerned over your belief that me expressing my opinion to you is the result of some prompting or misinformation campaign by Council members. I am happy to say, in this case, they are innocent.

Thanks for explaining your veto. I personally don't care that the vote would not have been binding. After all the back and forth (dating back to calling this project the "heart of the city" plan) I am delighted that the Council I got the message from the people and is trying to keep us more involved in the entire process and honor the input we gave them. As I said in my previous email, I believe wholeheartedly that in this instance, your veto was really wrong. There is no other way to say it. I am trying to say, I personally would like you to listen to our Council.

As to the conditions of the parking structure down at the pier, other cities manage to get people to pay for parking structures without committing to a full fledged overdevelopment project. I appreciate your concern over the fiscal aspects of this, but I don't agree that building dollars should control the future of our city. Unfortunately, you and some others are operating under the misconception that the voters here would rather have overdevelopment for tax revenue sake. Although I am sure there are constituents who would agree with you, I certainly am not one. I like the small town feeling of this place and over the years, I have watched it erode with overdevelopment for the sake of revenue.

A priority for me is the greening of our city, protecting our ocean/watefront resources, without shutting down development all together and finding a balance where we are proud of our waterfront and our city. After all, there are enough super malls, condos and apartments being built on every available square inch of the South Bay.

I also understand that you received a report from a "fiscal" expert about the profitability, but as Jerry McGuire said, "show me the money." There are plenty of experts who are wrong a lot and yet they continue to be called experts. I still think we can find a way to develop in stages as opposed to a full blown all or nothing approach.

As I said in my previous email, I am in favor of the project, but feel the building development is way too much (double what we have) and we need more green space, more water features, more places for families to listen to concerts, picnic or just have quiet contemplation. Please really hear me this time as, judging by your response to my first letter, you only heard what you needed to defend and not the input I offered.

Sincerely,

Carla

On Jul 20, 2014, at 8:31 AM, SteveAspel@aol.com wrote:
Hello Carla,

Many of you have called or emailed me about the proposed project in the Harbor. You may have received an email from a Council member that may be somewhat factual, but also purposely leaves out a few real facts. In addition, you may have received emails concerning my veto of an advisory vote concerning the harbor.

Yes, I did veto a proposal to have an "Advisory vote" concerning the Pier/Harbor development. I did so for two reasons:

1) Since it is an advisory vote only, it would be NON binding. Many citizens would assume that a vote on this item would become law. In fact, it would not.

2) Measure G was voted on by the citizens of Redondo Beach on November 2, 2010. The Measure was concerning the zoning that allows the development of the Pier/Harbor. Measure G PASSED. Measure G actually reduced the amount of square footage allowed. There are some who opposed Measure G and quite simply want a second bite at the apple. With that said, the citizens of our city have already spoken.

The following 2 points also need to be noted.

1) The Pier parking structure has only a few years left. It is disintegrating before our eyes. As a condition of the lease, Center Cal MUST pay for the new parking structure. Depending on who is quoting numbers, that cost is valued at anywhere from $25 to 50 Million. If Center Cal doesn't pay, you and I do!

2) After the project has been completed, every financial expert has told us that the city can expect $3 to 5 million in NEW tax income. This will be generated by the Hotel and various businesses.

This new revenue can be used for all the city services that we, as citizens demand.

Hopefully this gives you another perspective into this important issue. If yo have any questions, comments or concerns, please email them to me. Feel free to speak your mind. I need to know your thoughts!

Steve Aspel
Mayor
City of Redondo Beach
1200 S. Helberta Ave.
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Home: (310) 543-0416
Cell: (310) 947-1355

In a message dated 7/19/2014 10:26:53 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, carlac108@gmail.com writes:

Dear Katie,

My husband and I have lived here 20+ years on Avenue A. After looking over the available
material on the Waterfront project, I wanted the City Council and Mayor Aspen to hear our feedback on the Conceptual site plan.

Honestly, I am baffled why Mayor Aspen vetoed the City Council's recommendation to put the project in front of the citizens for a vote. In my opinion, the Council was on the right track and I am very upset that this transpired. In my opinion, this is an abuse of mayoral power and I feel quite angry about it. Clearly Mayor Aspel has lost sight of the fact that he is supposed to be serving the citizens of Redondo Beach and be looking out for the future of our city.

Although we are generally in favor of the Waterfront project, we feel the square footage for Retail space is way to large. As you know, the proposal currently is suggesting that we go from 221,347 of existing structure to 523,732 square feet of development - double the existing structures we currently have. I understand the motivation here is more tax revenue for our City, but as a long term citizen here, I would much prefer that we have more open space for picnics, outdoor concerts and just quiet contemplation along the water.

As a matter of fact, I feel the scope of the project is too ambitious. Given that our city has had a previous experience with a bankruptcy on the development of the offices/parking structure above the pier, it seems prudent that this new project be done in stages to test viability before we commit wholeheartedly to the entirety of the plan.

I do like the way the bike path has been incorporated, the green area (not big enough), water feature (also not big enough). the idea of large open, barn like facility for a "farmer's market" is great and the boat launch is great. I also think the plan, and our city in general, is missing good public transportation to bring us all in and out of local retail. I would like us to be more forward thinking about how to green the city, such as bike stations (like long beach has) trolleys that goes along PCH and takes us in and out of the area and things that will help us create a greener future for Redondo.

Don't we all live here so we can enjoy the amazing ocean views and play in our water? What has always appealed to me about this city is the small town feel, which seems to be disappearing. We are getting more and more apartment buildings, condos, large scale development. Let's not turn Redondo into a paved mall along the water. Please, let's reduce the buildings and make a beautiful outdoor space along our water with some retail as opposed to Retail with a drop of space along the water.

Sincerely,

Carla Cohen
825 Avenue A
Redondo Beach, CA. 90277
310-540-6640
The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.
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I was disappointed at the EIR scoping meeting the other night. There were NO architectural drawings giving residents ANY idea how many buildings or their HEIGHT or the SCALE of the planned development in the space being proposed. I would like you to please answer in detail the questions that have been submitted via Jim Light on behalf of Building a Better Redondo. In case you did not receive them, I am attaching it to this email. Please do not allow this project to continue without fully answering these questions.

Thank you!

Melanie L. Cohen
Redondo Beach Resident
115 S Guadalupe Ave Unit H RB 90277 310-374-4284
The CenterCal Mall project represents a substantial intensification of uses of our harbor area / waterfront that are not coastal dependent uses. The impacts of this level of intensification would be substantial under normal circumstances. In this case, the project site configuration, location and infrastructure exacerbate the impacts of this magnitude of intensification. **The impacts require close scrutiny as the project appears it will have significant adverse impacts on coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses of the harbor and waterfront by uses that are not coastal dependent.** The harbor was built by public funds for recreational boating and other coastal dependent uses. **The non-coastal dependent development should not have significant negative impact upon the public’s ability or desirability to fully use and enjoy these existing coastal dependent uses of our harbor and waterfront.** In fact, that would be a violation of Redondo’s Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act. Furthermore, the advertised high end nature of the shops, restaurants, hotel and movie theater would impact the ability of a large number of visitors from being able to enjoy and utilize this area of the waterfront. The IES assessment and project description lead to a number of questions, concerns, and comments which are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

1. **Questions – the project description is too vague** in many places to make substantive comments or fully develop concerns. The answers to questions below would allow a better development of concerns. **Without these details, the public is preventing from making a complete response to the IES as it exists.**

   a. The IES does not describe parking adequately. What is the current number of parking spaces and how many total are included in the current project? What are the number of space, square footage, and dimensions of the proposed new parking structure and the changes to the number of pier parking spaces, pier parking total square footage, and dimensions under the proposed configuration? What are the parking spaces allocated to boaters using the boat ramp, boaters/SUP’ers who hand launch small craft, and boaters with slips in Redondo Marina?

   b. The project description is unclear. Some city documents say 15 acres the IES states that the land and water combined are more than 15 acres. How many acres of land/pier are included in the project? The description describes new bicycle and pedestrian walkways, but other than and pedestrian esplanade, there is no further description. “High quality public open space” is undefined.

   c. The project description says there will be a new small boat launch but it does not appear anywhere in the site drawing or project description. The following details are needed to fully assess the impacts of the proposed project. Where is it? How big is it? How is it accessed by small boat users?

   d. Will all boat slips be maintained in the Redondo marina? What is the height of the proposed pedestrian bridge above the high high tide line? Will the commercial boats fit
under the bridge?

e. Has there been an analysis of the quality of water in the small boat launch area to determine if the lagoon would be safe for children to swim in? Will this stagnant water area be able to support swimming, wading, and play while maintaining acceptable water quality? The small boat launch area is only inches deep at low tide. It shoals after a few years. Will the opened Seaside Lagoon be dredged regularly – is that included in any fiscal analysis? What will keep the dramatically sloped beach in place? What is the final size of the water area compared to current and what is the size of the public open space/usable beach/grass area compared to current conditions?

f. The current drawings show a very narrow road for the new road connecting Harbor Dr and Torrance Blvd. What is the configuration of the bike and pedestrian paths through this same area? Are the bike and pedestrian paths protected? How do they link up with the bike and pedestrian paths at Harbor Dr?

g. The project plan is vague on public open space. What is considered public open space and what is its size and uses? Much of the area looks like it would tables for eating restaurant food from the mall vendors... is this considered public open space? How much is truly public, city controlled space and how much is controlled by the developer/leaseholder? Will access and uses to this public open space be controlled or limited? If so, what will be allowed and prohibited in these areas? How is the 10% public open space requirement met in each zoning area?

h. The boat ramp as depicted in the IES does not have a breakwater. Other city documents show a new breakwater. Configuration of the boat ramp is critical to assess the hazards associated with the reconfiguration. The location of the dinghy dock is not show either. The impact of surge, which is great in this area of the harbor; the mixing of small human powered craft with just launched or returning power boats and dinghies; the flow of gas/oil from the boat ramp area and dinghy dock into the opened Seaside lagoon; the mixing of newly launched and returning power boats into the turn basin where sailboats drop their sails and many human powered craft traverse and congregate; and the ability to navigate safely into and out of the boat ramp are all concerns that cannot be adequately assessed without more detail. What is the proposed configuration of the new public boat ramp and the missing dinghy dock? How is the public espalandle requirement met in the northern end of the project with the break in the SeaSide Lagoon and what is the connectivity with the California Coastal Trail?

i. What is the calculation of total new square footage based on the cumulative development including the new Shade hotel?
2. Comments/Concerns:

a. **Aesthetics**: A top level analysis of views from Harbor Drives reveals approximately an 80% reduction in views of the harbor, ocean, cliffs of Palos Verdes, and Catalina Island from the roadway, bike path and pedestrian sidewalks along Harbor Blvd. This analysis could be far worse depending on use of landscaping, umbrellas, fountains, pergola, and other amenities in the two narrow corridors that remain. This would be a significant impact on scenic resources and could substantially degrade both the visual character and quality of the site.

The three story parking structure on the corner of Portofino Way and Beryl would create a huge aesthetic impact from both Harbor Drive as well as from the Seaside Lagoon. The parking structure and attached retail/restaurant uses are pushed right to the edge of the now smaller Seaside Lagoon area and will create the effect of a huge three story structure looming over and dominating the views from the much smaller Seaside Lagoon “beach” area and the water. This would impact the attractiveness of the Seaside Lagoon to the public.

b. **Hazards and hazardous materials**: The plan as described may have significant impact on the ability to evacuate the area in the event of an earthquake, tidal surge, tsunami, fire, or other natural or man-made events. Also disturbance of the current fill and demolition of existing structures could expose the harbor to toxic substances.

The water quality of the proposed opening of the Seaside Lagoon has not been assessed or considered in the IES. The small boat launch area today is a collecting point for harbor trash. Opening Seaside lagoon will likely create a large area of stagnant water and a large collector area for harbor trash. The lack of water exchange and the use of this stagnant water by people, especially children, may make the water quality unsafe in and of itself. This would be exacerbated by the location of the new public boat ramp as the seaside lagoon may become a collecting area for oil and gas from the boat ramp area. The whole Seaside Lagoon may be rendered unusable.

There are numerous safety hazards that also need to be analyzed as part of the EIR. The location of the Seaside Lagoon and proximity to the access road for the mall and parking structure creates a hazard that is not there today because of the fence that separates Seaside lagoon from the current parking lot. The flow of pedestrian traffic to and from the area, the reconfiguration of the bike path and increased bike use, combined with the change and increase in traffic flow create hazards and safety concerns between vehicular traffic and pedestrians and bicycles.
And as discussed elsewhere, the new boat launch, reconfiguration of the Seaside lagoon, the addition of new moorings, and the location of the dinghy dock and small boat launch change boat traffic patterns and increase and concentration of use that will likely create increased navigation hazards in the harbor. The proposed location of the boat ramp is far more impactful and potentially hazardous than the current location of the boat hoists, which are isolated from the turn basin and small boat launch/dinghy dock.

c. **Hydrology:** The water usage of this site will increase dramatically and could significantly increase demand for water despite a multi-year drought and increasing water shortages.

d. **Land Use and Planning:** The project plan shows a wall of development that will separate the community from waterfront water dependent recreational uses. This is in conflict with the General Plan and the approved Local Coastal Plan. The impacts could be significant. Also in the deliberations of the AES power plant project, it was deemed by CEC staff that certain areas of the AES site fall under the definition of protected wetlands. The impact of construction and increased traffic on these areas should be evaluated. The proximity, density, and impacts of the commercial development and parking structure represent uses incompatible with existing coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses.

e. **Public services:** The proposed project could have substantial impact on police and fire access and response times well beyond the project boundaries due to substantial increases in traffic and associated delays at intersections and driveways. The increased crime associated with commercial intensification will put additional burden on our police department. Increased use of the area will likely lead to more calls for medical support and other support from the fire department. And the reconfiguration and concentration of boating uses and traffic patterns at the proposed boat ramp will increase demands on the Harbor Patrol.

There will be a substantial impact on the public lands and waters of and around the harbor. The project as proposed eliminates Dedication Park and shrinks the publicly usable portion of the Seaside Lagoon beach/grass lawn area. Likewise the plan does not currently show any relocation of the small boat launch/dinghy dock which was recently expanded using state funds and meant to accommodate boaters using the new mooring field in process in the harbor. It appears the swimming/wading area of the Seaside Lagoon is significantly smaller and will be negatively impacted if this smaller area is to be shared now by SUP’ers and other small craft users. The increase in the public waterfront walkway is not substantive as a waterfront walkway exists today. In fact the
opening of Seaside Lagoon will interrupt the existing walkway and force people to walk through the mall area.

Pedestrian crossings interior to and external to the project (leading to the project area) represent a hazard and the increase in both pedestrian and vehicular traffic would compound these hazards.

f.  **Recreation:** Recreational impacts of the project exceed those defined in the IES.

The Seaside Lagoon park is considerably smaller and Dedication Park is eliminated from the proposed plan. It appears the internal roadway west of the Seaside Lagoon encroaches on the Seaside Lagoon park contributing to the reduction “beach” area in the park. Also, the plan shows multiple commercial buildings in the park that will further detract from and encroach upon space available for recreation. The smaller Seaside Lagoon tightly surrounded by mall development and the three story parking structure will be less desirable to the public and will likely decrease utilization. Potential users will be reticent to be exposed in their bathing suits and bring their kids to a comparatively small recreational feature so exposed to shoppers and restaurant goers. How many people would show up to a mall in their bathing suits? Today the commercial areas of the pier and International Boardwalk are well separated from Seaside Lagoon and the fencing with shading material provides further separation. The shrinking of the park area combined with the encroachment of incompatible uses represents a significant impact to recreation in the harbor area.

The project plan substantially reduces parking for trailer boaters, fishermen, small craft boaters, and SUP’ers, and those intending to swim at the Seaside Lagoon. Parking structure parking is not adequate for these users due to the equipment that must transported to the use area. The proposed parking lot for the boat ramp is insufficient for the trailer boaters much less the small craft boaters and SUP’ers. While the addition of a boat ramp is intended to increase utilization by trailer boaters, the number of parking spaces apparent in the project drawing is greatly reduced from current parking regulation minimum for the existing boat hoists. This situation is further exacerbated if the outrigger canoe club is collocated at the Seaside Lagoon as has been proposed.

The small boat launch and dinghy dock are not shown on this plan though they are called out in the description. This dinghy dock is well used today and the new mooring field will increase use. Location and size is critical to usability.

Water quality of the opened lagoon is not addressed nor is periodic requirements for dredging. This area of the harbor already collects garbage and the open lagoon would
create a large stagnant area. The location of the new boat ramp and dinghy dock also may cause gas and oil to collect in the open lagoon. All these combined may make the open lagoon waters unfit for swimming and wading.

The elimination of surface parking for boaters with slips in Redondo Marina provides these boaters no reasonable parking solution for access and transfer of equipment to and from their vessels. Access to the commercial boaters is not addressed at all and looks to be severely impacted.

In addition to the shrinking of recreational resources and lack of parking and infrastructure to support these existing uses, the increased traffic of the increased development and boat ramp could have a substantial impact on desirability to use the harbor for coastal dependent recreational and commercial due to the traffic density and increased time to get to the resources.

City policy specifically cites exploring the use of the old octagonal building site for public recreational uses. The project description does not contemplate a public recreational use for this site. The City should explain why this site is not appropriate for public recreational use.

Finally, the pedestrian bridge would have a significant impact on use of the Redondo marina for sailboats and for the larger commercial boats. This violates the Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act.

g. **Traffic:** The increased traffic and changed traffic patterns combined with the relocation of the bike path to the west side of Harbor Drive could have a substantial impact on hazards related to mixed pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular traffic including an increase in trailered boats. The lack of controlled driveway and parking structure entrances exacerbates this hazard. The new roadways internal to the mall area and immediately adjacent to the Seaside Lagoon combined with the elimination of fencing for the Seaside Lagoon increases the hazard of vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic in these areas. Forcing recreational users to traverse the parking structure and commercial areas also increases this hazard. As stated before the increase in vehicular traffic will impede public safety response times and impact access for coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses. It does not appear that any analysis is required of the Pacific/Catalina stop signed intersection. This intersection must be analyzed. The short roadway segments between traffic light controlled and partially stop sign controlled side street intersections on Harbor, Herondo, and Beryl Street also need special attention in analysis. With current development these intersections and turn queues are saturated during busy periods severely impacting traffic flow. Heavy pedestrian traffic combined
with their extended traffic light and uncontrolled pedestrian crossings further exacerbate is situation. For example the pedestrian crossing at Broadway and Torrance is already hazardous. Standard city traffic evaluation techniques do not account for these overflow conditions, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, and the potential hazards associated with them.

h. **Cumulative impacts:** The IES does not assess known and predictable projects in the immediate vicinity. The new Shade Hotel with valet parking at the Triton oil site will substantially impact traffic flow on Harbor Drive and likely Portofino Way. The new bike path project will impact the ability of vehicles to exit and return to harbor Drive in the project area using both roads and driveways. The Green Street development has been built but is not yet populated with tenants, which will impact traffic flows in the project area. The AES property will be undergoing extensive construction activities regardless of whether a new powerplant is constructed or not and will result, either way, in an increased intensity of land use...especially in light of current elected official statements about their opposition to parkland. Thus construction and post construction traffic should be included in any analysis. Likewise, the “dirt farm” property was sold. And it is likely that the new owner will repurpose the site. The traffic impacts of this repurposing should be considered as well. Additionally, continued infill development will increase traffic on major circulation roads in the project vicinity. These cumulative impacts should be assessed. In the harbor, the cumulative impacts of changing where power boats are launched, where the dinghy dock is located, where small craft will be launched, the increase in human powered craft use, and the location of new moorings may create a hazardous change to use and traffic patterns in the harbor. The turn basin is designed to let incoming sailboats safely drop sail. Now it appears we are collocating more uses which could become a hazardous navigation area due to the cumulative impacts of all these changes.

i. **Visitor Serving Commercial uses:** Advertising and public discussion about the proposed mall speaks to the high end, boutique nature of the shops, restaurants, movie theater and hotel. The high end nature of these establishments would impact the ability of many visitors from enjoying the harbor waterfront. This is exacerbated by the negative impacts on the mall project on existing recreational uses both in size, intensification of recreational use, parking usability and availability, and decreased vehicular access around and within the project. Likewise, scenic vistas from Harbor Drive enjoyed today by passing bicyclists, runners and pedestrians are severely impacted.

### 3. Applicable Coastal Act Sections

The following sections of the Coastal Act may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:
30211 – Development shall not interfere with access
30212 – Public access in new development projects
30212.5 – Public facilities distribution
30220 – Protection of certain water-oriented activities
30223- Upland areas support of coastal recreational uses
30224 – Recreational boating use, encouragement, facilities
30234 – Commercial fishing and recreational boating facilities
30234.5 – Economic, commercial, and recreational importance of fishing
30250 – Location; existing developed area
30251 – Scenic and visual qualities
30253 – Maintenance and enhancement of public access
30255 – Priority of coastal-dependent developments

This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

4. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The following sections of the CEQA may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

15124 – Project Description
15125 - Environmental Setting

This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

5. Applicable City of Redondo Beach Code

The following sections of Redondo code may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES and as noted earlier in this submission:

Coastal Land Use Plan
Exhibit H
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 1
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 2
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 6
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 15
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 17
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 18
Section VI, Subsection D, Policy 20

Title 10 Chapter 5 Coastal Land Use Plan Implementing Ordinance
Article 1 General Provisions
10-5.102
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Article 2 Zoning Districts Division 3
10-5.800
10-5.811
10-5.812
10-5.813
10-5.814

Article 5 Parking Regulations
10-2.1706

Redondo Beach General Plan
2.1.4 Objective 1.7
2.1.4 Policy 1.7.1
2.1.4 Policy 1.7.2
2.1.4 Objective 1.9
2.1.4 Goal 1J
2.1.4 Objective 1.44
2.1.4 Objective 1.45

Parks and Recreation Element
3.4.5 Objective 8.2a
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.2
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.4
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.8
3.4.5 Policy 8.2a.10
3.4.5 Objective 8.2b
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.3
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.4
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.5
3.4.5 Policy 8.2b.8
3.4.5 Objective 8.2c
3.4.5 Policy 8.2c.2
3.4.6 Implementation Programs

Circulation Element
Goal 2
Goal 6
Policy 9
Goal 11
Policy 12
Policy 25

Redondo Beach Municipal Code
Article 2, Chapter 5, Title 10
10-5.800
10-5.811
10-5.812
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10-5.813
10-5.814

This may not be an exhaustive listing due to the vagueness of the project description in many areas as evidenced in previous questions and comments.

6. Summary and Conclusion

The project description is overly vague in many areas for a specific development project. This vagueness leads to the inability of the public to adequately assess potentially significant impacts. The IES as submitted to the public is cursory and does not adequately represent the impacts of the proposed development. These concerns and questions represent significant impacts to the harbor area that are not assessed by the IES today.

The harbor was built for public coastal dependent recreation and commercial activities. State and City policies and code prioritize and protect coastal dependent recreational and commercial activities and resources over non-coastal dependent uses. The current project represents a significant degradation in the ability of the public to enjoy and utilize these coastal dependent recreational and commercial opportunities and assets. The impacts are driven by the amount of development of commercial retail, entertainment, and restaurant uses, none of which are coastal dependent. The project should not sacrifice coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses for non-coastal dependent commercial uses. The public deserves a thorough analysis of all the impacts and concerns noted in this submission. Because of the severity and cumulative nature of these impacts, the project will likely represent a violation of the City’s Local Coastal Plan and General Plan as well as the Coastal Act.

BBR strongly urges the City take action to adjust the project now, prior to investing the time and money on an EIR. If the City decides to alter the plan post EIR and those alterations are not adequately and specifically assessed as an alternative or mitigation in the EIR, the City would have to do another EIR assessment to consider the specific impacts of the proposed plan alterations. With the outcome of an EIR already very clear, it would be far more efficient and effective to develop a more balanced project now, than waste the time and money on the project as proposed.
The Waterfront
sbcoleman@fastmail.fm
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 4:11 PM
To: Katie Owston

There are numerous environmental impacts that need to be considered regarding the proposed roadway that might be added as part of the Waterfront Project (i.e., the proposed extension of Pacific Avenue through what is currently the Boardwalk and connecting to Torrance Blvd.).

-- The obvious negative impacts of such a roadway include increased noise and air pollution for nearby residents.

-- But there are other negative impacts as well. The space available (plans as presented leave the harbor where it is now) makes it likely that there will be serious conflicts with both bicycle and pedestrian traffic. The space is not wide enough for two lanes of car traffic plus two lanes of bicycle traffic plus any space at all for pedestrians. Separate lanes for each direction of travel would be needed for bikes as much as for cars.

- The roadway will very likely invite additional drive-thru traffic (that is, site-seeing car trips through the pier area with no intention of stopping at the Pier or Harbor).

- Relief from traffic congestion on Catalina Avenue in the area around the Pier is one reason given for a new roadway, but congestion on Catalina does not really exist currently, and congestion is much more likely to be an issue for the proposed new roadway than for Catalina Avenue in the future.

- Improving site connectivity (reconnecting the public with the waterfront) should mean a focus on more easily getting people to the Pier and Harbor, not on traveling through it.

Sinclair Coleman
510 The Village Unit 401
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

--

sbcoleman@fastmail.fm
--
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I believe the City Council is making a huge mistake in going forward with the current HUGE revitalization plan. Something should have been learned from the lack of interest in the upper level of the Redondo Pier. These shops and offices have been mostly empty for over 30 years! And we’re thinking of putting in more shopping????

What the Council should have done from the start is ask the residents what they feel is needed. To have a development company (which will benefit from this much more than the residents) come in and tell us what THEY think we need is more than ludicrous.

Putting in additional higher-end shopping in an area where we’ve got two new shopping centers in El Segundo, as well as shopping centers in Manhattan Beach, the Galleria, Old Towne Center and Del Amo (currently updating and enlarging) seems majorly redundant.

The City Council is biting off much more than it can possibly manage with this project, and is putting the City at risk for major losses in the future. Please look at other major seaside projects that are under-utilized and seem to draw a lower class of clientele.

I am strongly opposed to this project and to the high-handed rulings of the mayor and council members who are trying to push this project through.

Sue Coppock
njtom8r@aol.com
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Dean + Nancy Curtin
Organization (optional): 
Address: 412 N. Harra Avenue
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 310-993-1786
E-mail (optional): dean.curtin@ymail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources* ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning ☐ Mineral Resources* ☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing* ☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic ☐ Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

please see attached letter

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
As a long-time resident and home owner in Redondo Beach, I am submitting my formal public opposition to the proposed King Harbor Revitalization project. Similar to the many other Redondo residents in opposition, I too agree that the Harbor area could use a face lift, but I am whole heartedly against the current CenterCal plans, as well as the process that we have followed to get us where we are now.

I list below my biggest concerns with the currently proposed "mall" project in order of importance:

1. **CONTINUOUS LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN LEADERSHIP DECISION-MAKING AND VISION:** The Council and Planning Commission have a long history of making pro-growth decisions that have been bad for the community. We are still living with many of these bad planning decisions today - i.e., Over-condo'ization of the Esplanade, previous failed commercial projects at the pier, run down SB Galleria (soon w/ no Nordstrom), Crystal Cove Apartments, etc. The Council and Planning Commission should focus on fixing these bad decisions versus developing a new shiny Mall at the harbor, which could potentially be another future bad decision that we'll look back on.

2. **LACK OF INTEGRITY AND TRANSPARENCY OF VENDOR SELECTION PROCESS:** It's shocking to me that this multi-million dollar, multi-year project was sole sourced to a single vendor who has no experience in large-scale waterfront developments. With only one vendor in the race, we residents will have to accept only one narrow vision (currently ignoring public input), and are unable to baseline the competing visions and associated project costs from other independent submissions. From an (ex)auditor's perspective, this is a huge red flag (in the real world) which carries a significant risk of fraud, insider dealing and financial kickbacks. I wouldn't be surprised to learn that this was happening here.

3. **DEAL STRUCTURE IS BAD FOR REDONDO:** How did CenterCal get such a sweetheart deal? 30 year lease free rent? 10% return on invested capital? Control over operational management, including leasing decisions and rent levels? They must have good friends in City Hall! What incentive does CenterCal have to control development costs if they can lock in a guaranteed 10% return? How do we control the quality of the future tenants, particularly if vacancy rates rise in the future and CenterCal needs to achieve their expected return on investment? What were the proposed deal structures for the other bidders? Oh yeah, we didn't have any other bidders since Aspel & Co. sole sourced this to CenterCal. Again, this smells really bad.

4. **QUESTIONABLE LONG-TERM FINANCIAL VIABILITY:** Currently, my wife and I go down to the pier/harbor 1-2 times per week mostly for recreational purposes, or to have a beer at Naja's. We buy 80% of our household purchases on-line. If our short-sighted leaders take away more recreational access (and Naja's) and turn the harbor into a crowded mall, we will not go down there as often, but I will continue to buy 80% of my household purchases on-line. My teenage kids rarely shop in stores anymore, which points to the reality of the changing demographics and how its killing traditional malls (like Southbay Galleria.) It's bad that our stodgy-old leadership cannot grasp this reality. Hopefully AECOM's study will infuse this financial reality into the minds of our pro-growth Council/Commission. If not, I'm supporting a (yet another) resident action, legal or otherwise.

5. **LACK OF A COMPREHENSIVE VISION THAT INCLUDES THE FUTURE AES PROPERTY** - Did I already mention short-sighted leadership with questionable integrity? Think I did, enough said here.

6. **HIGH CONCENTRATION OF COMMERCIAL SPACE:** The ratio of leasable space to land size is very excessive and out of line with other malls (and recreational centers) in the area. What is the city leadership's real objective here? I would hope that the primary focus is on improving the quality of life and security of the city's residents. However, it's becoming apparent that increasing sales revenue per resident is a higher priority. If the council were running a business and I were an investor, then I'm interested in the latter. However, they are NOT! They are elected officials, so I evaluate their decisions and performance on improving our quality of life. I believe that this "mall project" will clearly erode our quality of life, and bring financial risk to the City. I will only
support a revitalization plan that does not significantly increase the current commercial footprint at the harbor.

7. **TRAFFIC:** As I understand it, the financial viability of the mall requires 30,000 additional trips per day. City leadership should find ways to bring 30,000 additional trips to the South Bay Galleria to ensure its financial viability, and leave King Harbor a harbor. I hope that this will be the ultimate deal killer for this bad vision.

8. **LIMITED VIEW CORRIDORS:** The residential "condo wall" along the Esplanade was clearly a bad planning decision by legacy (and some current) leadership. So now the City's leadership wants to repeat this historical mistake by doing the same thing along the harbor. This is crazy! Are the sales tax revenues from the commercial tenants more important than the property tax revenues collected from me and my neighbors? Why then would they be afforded more preferential ocean views than the residents like us - behind the mall wall? Again, the out-of-touch leadership needs to refocus efforts on improving resident quality of life instead of revenue growth for the City.

9. **LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPER INDIFFERENCE TO PUBLIC INPUT:** Here we go again! I thought that City leadership would have already learned their lesson about the potential blowback that can result from not engaging the Public as an equal stakeholder. Obviously not. If they don't change course, there will likely be another resident action and/or law suit again. However, unlike prior resident actions where I was only passively involved, I will be fully committed to this one, both financially and organizationally. This is clearly avoidable, and it's up to Aspel and the Council to do the right thing and solicit community input. Not wave the veto pen!

In summary, I'm open to a smaller-scale vision for harbor revitalization that does not negatively impact resident quality of life or expose the City to future financial risk. As such, I do not support the Mayor's and CenterCal's vision due to the concerns stated about. It seems that Aspel & Co. are trying to shove an unpopular plan down our throats, while silencing the growing opposition. I believe that Redondo could come up with a better vision if all interested parties work in good faith and demonstrate a genuine willingness to compromise. I hope that this can be done before yet another polarizing issue further divides the City. We'll see.

Kind regards.

Suan & Nancy Curtin
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
joancurtin@yahoo.com
Fwd: Written statement against development
Denise Dangelo [denisedangelo@me.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 7:25 PM
To: Katie Owston; Bill Brand [bbrand@earthlink.net]

Begin forwarded message:

From: Denise Dangelo <denisedangelo@me.com>
Date: July 9, 2014, 7:21:11 PM PDT
To: "katie.owston@redondo.org" <katie.owston@redondo.org>
Subject: Written statement against development

My name is Denise Dangelo and I have been a resident of Redondo Beach for 53 years- make that 54, as my birthday is tomorrow! I not only grew up in R.B, but I own a home in R.B. and I work (RBUSD teacher) in R.B!
I have witnessed many changes in our city, mostly positive. However, I am NOT in agreement with the current (mall-like) plan being considered by our city council and planning commission.
My concerns include, but are not limited to:
Traffic/congestion/over-building/and the major (negative) environmental impact.
Please put a STOP to this idea that our city needs this development! Bigger is NOT always better!
I may be one voice tonight, but I speak for many who have worked over the years to find a suitable compromise for this space-since Heart of the City was presented and voted out!
My son was in second grade when I began speaking up about over-development- he's now in his second year of college! Please remember to listen to those who continue to strive to make Redondo Beach a better community- this development would ruin our town! I do not want this design, over-development in my town!
Thank you!
Mary Delehanty [marydel@prodigy.net]

Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 12:25 PM
To: Katie Owston

Dear Katie,

I did think of requesting or asking if the traffic flow study would include the projected traffic of the new developments at Roscrans (plaza El Segundo II) and the new Manhattan Mall.. Del Amo is also remodeling as well as Ports of Call near the 10 FWY and PCH. A traffic study based on our project alone and todays traffic would be not fully accurate.. we would want to create good flow and direction lanes etc to mitigate future problems.

Thank you,
Mary

On Tuesday, July 15, 2014 2:00 PM, Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org> wrote:

Thank you for your response to the Notice of Preparation for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/ Notice of Initial Study/Notice of Scoping Meeting for The Waterfront project. Your comments will be included as part of the public record with all comments received during the scoping process to help determine the scope and content of the EIR.

Please visit the City’s website at www.redondo.org and follow the link to the Waterfront on the home page for more information. As detailed in the Notice, if you have additional comments, they will be accepted by email and mail through 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.

Katie Owston
Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
Community Development Department
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
310-318-0637, 1-2895
Hi Katie,
I am trying to collect my thoughts regarding the project, it looks to be a challenging project, especially the engineering of a road in the area of the int. boardwalk, and the opening of the lagoon. Water Quality: with the liquefaction, and the new standards toward rising sea levels- the support, (pilings?) needed for the new road are of concern. Public safety, and water quality during construction are of interest. Storm runoff, and construction pollution need adequate preparation. I am even concerned with the effect on the pelicans, and rock birds in the area.

The opening of the lagoon is an engineering feat.. hopefully with a clear understanding of the WQMD's expectations. . Before we destroy the discharge/declorination equipment- a very clear and functional plan should be discussed with the public. How the tides and erosion affect the swim area and the safety of the little ones needs to be reviewed. The current water in the harbor is contaminated by marine life, boat fuel etc..will seals be coming in for people food at the picnic area? silly but plausible.. what impact on safety? I also wonder how the tidelands fund will be replenished without ground rent? It helps to fund the maintenance and sustainability of the harbor.

With financing of 30 years rent free, and a 10% return on the developers investment before the city receives income..I try to think of how many people need to come and spend how much money to create the revenue we need. The pathways to the new development: Beryl St. with two elementary schools, stop signs, and a direct connection to the north boundary of the project.
will see a huge change in traffic flow.

Roscrans/Aviation corridor was negatively impacted with backflow onto the 405 when the new shopping areas on Roscrans opened. Now that Plaza El Segundo is expanding and Manhattan Village, we need to factor how much longer it is going to take to travel to this area. Prospect and Aviation need to be evaluated.

Ingelwood Ave to 190th to the water., Del Amo and Torrance Blvd also will see more traffic as well as PCH. True estimates including signal lengths, turn lanes, speed limits and public safety concerns such as schools, churches. I would truly like to see all the pathways to the project evaluated. Ask the locals-we know the routes used. They are all important and traffic will affect our quality of life. (Honestly, a resident may have to plan an hour drive to LAX when currently it is a 30 minute drive. These are important changes.)

I am sad there will be a sound and emission increase with the new power plant. Its construction phases may overlap with the waterfront. I feel the waterfront would be better off without it as a neighbor. I think a parking lot on the AES site near Catalina and Beryl would be a more stable and easier access lot. It would positively affect the view issue with the seascape residents.

Traffic, water quality, and public safety are my top concerns.

thank you,
Mary Delehanty

___________ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10100 (20140715) ___________
7/23/2014

Re: Waterfront Project EIR

__________ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10101 (20140715) __________

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com

__________ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10136 (20140722) __________

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com
Hello: As a longtime resident and property owner in Redondo Beach, I attended all the workshops organized by Center Cal regarding the waterfront development project in effort to be a part of beautifying our beach community. In the end, the proposed development does nothing to enhance our unique small beach community but rather increases many of the concerns addressed in the EIR.

1. Substantial Adverse effect on a scenic vista: With the construction of the 1000 + parking structure on the South side of the project, residents and visitors alike who are walking, biking, runner, or rollerblading along the new Harbor Drive will have a view of a monstrous concrete parking structure instead of the ocean or pier. Subterranean Parking is encouraged for the following reasons:

   Rather than the parking structure having the picturesque view of the beach and Peninsula, the location could be utilized for open space and green belts along with commercial uses. This would provide an area for community gathering and enjoyment of the ocean view.

   A Subterranean Parking Structure would buffer the sounds and pollution from automobiles

   It would eliminate the possibility of having the glare from windshields blinding others, as they do in Santa Monica

AES should be another consideration for parking as there is enough space to accommodate parking to satisfy new development.

2. Air Quality: With the new road, additional parking structures, and increased access for delivery trucks there will be a clear increase in pollution due to auto exhaust and not mention noise for the entire area of the new project and surrounding neighborhoods.

3. Cultural Resources: This is a beach community and we should be promoting walking, biking, and other forms of transportation such as trolleys and Pedi cabs and not turn our pier area into a concrete mall by the sea where the only ocean view is the one seen by the giant parking structures
4. Transportation and Traffic: Opening a new road will bring more traffic congestion to Catalina and will back up into an already congested PCH. Holiday and weekend traffic will be at a standstill on Catalina and the new Harbor Drive exasperating an already increase in noise and traffic pollution.

There is no doubt that we all want to see a new development as seen by the number of people that participated in the Center Cal workshops. It makes sense to take a step back and re-evaluate the feasibility of such a giant project, the long term impact on the local community, and whether or not it is the right project for us.

DeAnna DeNaro

South Bay Resident, 20 years
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Jeanette Dibrell
Organization (optional): Redondo Beach Unified School District
Address: 516 Faye Lane
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 607-661-9838
E-mail (optional): jeandebrell@hotmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

*These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

I do not approve of the idea that the City of Redondo Beach will pick up the cost of the project if the "owner/investor fails to make a profit. Under this arrangement there is not incentive for the developer to even try to meet the target. In fact, just the opposite.

In a capitalist free market economy, part of the myth is that risk is part of the deal. Without risk what you have is protectionism, fascism and lack of care for public interests.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Lorraine DiBrell
Organization (optional):
Address: Elle Faye Lane, Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Zip Code: 310-316-8203
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional): lorraine.dibrell@verizon.net

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources* ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning ☐ Mineral Resources* ☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing* ☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic ☐ Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:
I am opposed to the construction of the proposed mall on the waterfront. It's size, potential ugliness and congestion to the beauty of the beach which should be for residents, not masses of tourists. Malls are not the place for them. They do not belong on the waterfront where people go to recreate, not to shop. I hope a rumor it's not going to make money and it's foolish for the city to support this developer who messes up the place with no profit. People are shopping online these days not going to malls. If they can help it, please don't destroy the beach and the environment with congestion, crowding, traffic.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
I read the article in the beach reporter and was told this was to send written comments.

As a boat owner in King Harbor, I am 100% against the addition of the boat ramp to the development. The increased traffic would be bad from both an environmental and safety standpoint.

As boaters, there are already navigation issues in the already small harbor because of Kayakers, stand up paddlers and most importantly Jet ski and paddle boat rentals. The biggest problem is that these people are completely unaware of their surroundings and have no regard for maritime rules cutting off boaters constantly who are doing their best to navigate the small harbor. The addition of the boat ramp will increase access to these inexperienced people exponentially which will absolutely, POSITIVELY lead to accidents, injuries and property damage.

From an environmental perspective, increased access to the harbor will cause a substantial amount of pollution generated by both additional boats and the additional traffic that will be associated with it. As a fisherman, there is already a tremendous amount of pressure on the local fishing spots, the artificial reef and more importantly Rocky Point in Palos Verdes. Redondo sportfishing party boats take hundreds of fish daily at rocky point and additional access to anyone with a boat would put even more pressure on local fish populations, not to mention local Lobster and crab...Fishing locally in the south bay is already challenging, the boat ramp would guarantee to make things worse.

A full study would need to be conducted just about the boat ramp...Environmentally, fish and game and even some attention paid to our juvenile white shark population that has always been around but has gotten a lot of press lately because everyone has a GoPro camera.

I can't speak to the rest of the development, I don't have any experience with any of the potential problems the planned development might incur. I wanted to comment on something I am passionate about and have experience with. I didn't even get into land issues associated with land aspects, parking of cars and trailers and their regulation, that is a whole other issue. A boat ramp in King Harbor is a VERY bad idea!
Sincerely,
Nathan Dickinson

[Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10070 (20140709)]

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com
Ms. Owston.....

We will not be at the July 9th Water Front meeting, because we will be supporting the Hollywood Bowl Wednesday night.

Here's the "short" version of King Harbor's economic development history........

Not only did Ron Saffern's Seaport Village go bankrupt in the 80's, so did Chuck Johnson's 150+ room hotel (Now the Sheraton Crown Plaza) and convention center.

Don't you think it's easier to keep a hotel like the "Sheraton" in King Harbor in the "black," if you only paid 25 cents on the $1.00 of the original development and building costs for the hotel. Several Harbor Director's and Commercial Realtor's have not been able to find restaurants for the remaining two restaurant sites on the newer north portion of the concrete "Pier" that was rebuilt after the 1988 "Pier" fire. The ballot measure to build a new concrete "Pier" stated the estimated construction costs at $4,000,000. I seem to remember the actual cost was about $17,000,000.

**************************************************

Last month on Charles Payne's, "Making Money" FOX Business 466..... the financial health of shopping malls was discussed. Since 2005 more than 300 Malls in the country closed their doors. Hundreds of malls are turning to housing and medical clinic business models. Sears, J. C. Penney's, Radio Shack and others will be closing hundreds of stores in the near future, which likely will cause hundreds more malls to close.

Don't you think the "Brick and Mortar" retail face an up hill battle against the likes of Amazon.com and the Costco big box wholesale retailer's?

I will not be surprised by another financial "train wreck" at the bigger and better King Harbor and Pier "downtown."

Do we need to "gamble" that a 15 acre site, with 500,000 SF of development, three story parking garage, new roads, traffic congestion and noise, cinema, "Pike's" market, and a 100 room rectangular hotel all blocking quality view's from public and private places is the only choice to pay for the demo and construction of a $50,000,000 replacement 300 car ocean front garage?

I think it's crazy for anyone to pay $166,000 for each of the 300 parking spaces in a new garage.

Can the cars be parked else where for a lot less money?

Old buildings are saved and retro fitted for earth quakes.

Can't we be creative with the existing concrete and rebar parking structure and save it for about $25,000,000? Has anyone even looked into seriously considering it?
Decades ago didn't families come to Redondo Beach and the "Pier" to eat, drink and watch the sunsets.
Will this outrageous over development on only 15 acres improve the quality of peoples lives? I doubt it.
Sincerely..... Greg and Mary Lou Diete

____________ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10070 (20140709)
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Hi Bill,

I will not be able to make the meeting on July 15th due to vacation; however, I want to voice my opinion once more regarding CenterCal and their relationship with the EIR. Since CenterCal is footing the $1M cost for the EIR study, as the saying goes "you don't bite the hand that feeds you." I believe that unless the EIR votes with their conscience, they will approve CenterCal's project.

Your being the only council member at the July 9th meeting speaks volumes regarding the respect that these other council members (and our mayor) have for the residents of Redondo Beach. It's truly disgraceful! Not providing chairs could appear as such a small item that it could be overlooked; however, it shows just how considerate the organizers of this meeting were toward those who would not be able to stand for the 2 hour meeting. They should be ashamed of themselves!!

Thank you for being the voice of reason and for representing those of us who are truly concerned about what happens to the future of Redondo Beach.

Joan Donner
Redondo Beach Resident
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name:  

Organization (optional):  

Address:  

Zip Code:  

Phone (optional):  

E-mail (optional):  

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Agriculture and Forest Resources*  
- Air Quality  
- Geology/Soils  
- Hydrology/Water Quality  
- Noise  
- Recreation  
- Aesthetics  
- Biological Resources  
- Cultural Resources  
- Geology/Soils  
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials  
- Mineral Resources*  
- Public Services  
- Utilities/Service Systems  
- Land Use/Planning  
- Transportation/Traffic  

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

Family is emphasized propheticilly!  
1) Movie theatre with cocktails/upscale food 2) Wine goes to 'beach' to see a movie especially kids. They want to see fish (at Tar Pits) Waterway - To be demolished To play in sand/foam, eat an ice cream cone.  
2) Long-standing restaurants (Patry's) Peeled, Reality Station are demolish for upscale establishments - kids & I don't it!  
3) You say everyone likes 'last' - complaining P.B. To man b/nehmen  
4) Hermosa - The place a boozers paradise crime, fights, rape - a real family experience!  

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:  
Katie Owston, Project Planner  
City of Redondo Beach  
415 Diamond Street  
Redondo Beach, California 90277  

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.  
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Another opens. And not family-oriented.

For who wants noisy kids & an upscale taste?

Yes, Bill's Pancakes & Kettle are wonderful,
but we have similar goals.

But the style & charm are being diluted.

The $ could be an upscale clientele.

Will you have space for the behaved
Menciachis weekends of quality? They
certainly not upscale, but the common
people and kids are delighted.

E) The "Hell." disappoints! That's where you place our
little shop, favorite tastes of the commoners,

ice cream parlors, will vendors and itineraries

survive or溃败 to wrong clientele?

F) We do not need an amphitheater at a beach!

we are not San Francisco! we do not need
a fountain! it wastes water (our drought,
Remember?) and what is wrong with ocean
Tides! will it change colors and play music?

In conclusion I agree we need a remodeled pier
area - but your concept is frightening,
not economically feasible for the city, too
ambitious.
Ms. Ousden -

Any previous short note was resumpt of Breeze article to write you.

Then, I attended the Site meeting and received formal forms.

So, trying again; I hope negative replies are also included.

E. E.
Redondo project should reflect area, community

Redondo Beach is on the brink of a huge decision to revamp our waterfront. I'm afraid the proposed plan is inappropriate for our oceanfront community. No matter what the developer calls it (Lifestyle Center), the plan is a glorified mall with a theater, a three-story parking garage blocking any view of the ocean at the entrance on Beryl Street, and a market hall complex to house "major retailers."

This is the death knell for local establishments, the funky and iconic traditional places like Polly's and Tony's Quality Seafood and the already disappeared Shark Attack. The ocean is an incredible resource with its own beauty; building a fountain that shoots colored water at night is like taking coal to Newcastle.

Let's put our money into refurbishing and creating places for residents and visitors to gather, not to go "mallifying," but to walk, picnic, swim and launch boats and surf. We need gathering places for the arts and for organizations like the Cancer Support Community.

These are all things that came up in the eight public planning meetings, but ignored in the proposal. Let's make this project reflect the thoughtful, environmentally aware community we can be — something our children and grandchildren can be proud of.

— Linda R. Neal, Redondo Beach

Ms. Düsseldorf
Redondo Beach

Dear Ms. Düsseldorf,

In attached "Letters" Ms. Neal has more eloquently voiced the views of many concerned Redondo residents. She has absolutely captured my feelings for our waterfront. We do not need a "mall" for a movie theatre serving upscale food/drinks (who goes to the beach to see "Ghostbusters" etc.), a fountain (we have the ocean tides), or relocation of favorite restaurants to uncomfortable coastal areas and obscure corners.

Please! Don't let this development mimic the disastrous Plaza now dominating the parking structure for these many years!

Concerned Citizen
Dawne M. Endres
July 19, 2014

To: Miss Katie Owston, Project Planner

Subject: Notice of Preparation of Draft Environmental Impact Report, Public Review

From: Barbara and Jack Epstein, Residents of Redondo Beach

justbarb56@gmail.com

We are writing to formally notify the City of Redondo Beach, The County of Los Angeles, and the State of California that we object to the proposed taking of the Redondo Beach Waterfront from the people of Redondo Beach and gifting this valuable, rare, and treasured land and all its contents to a private shopping center development company against the will and wishes of the people of Redondo Beach and neighboring beach cities. This contract has a life span of ninety nine years, spanning generations that the public must give up its voice concerning its waterfront, which to these citizens, constitutes a gift to CenterCal by the City.

On Tuesday, July 15, 2014, the Mayor of Redondo Beach, Steve Aspel, and two councilmen, Councilman Aust and Councilman Ginsburg conspired to deprive the citizens of Redondo Beach of their rights by vetoing and voting down the chance for the said citizens of their democratic rights of self determination and due process by removing the possibility of the public’s chance of voting on the CenterCal project in the coming November election. We view the actions of Aspel, Aust, and Ginsburg at that council meeting during the past week as an obstruction of justice, political mischief, and a violation of the people’s right to due process, and request that a public inquiry be initiated by the State of California, and possibly, if appropriate, departments in the County of Los Angeles. For this reason, and for reasons to follow below, we request that this EIR and the project itself be cancelled pending a public investigation into this immoral, undemocratic, and illegal obstruction of justice and violation of the people’s constitutional rights to due process.

Our objections to the Waterfront project began last year when it became clear that the City of Redondo Beach and the CenterCal Corporation had conspired to entice the public into a series of “public planning meetings” in order to market the CenterCal Mall project to the community. They may have wanted to put on these false community meetings in order to pretend that they had included the public in the planning process for this project. Last July, 2013, the developer suddenly, without public notice, substituted a new drawing that included several elements that the public had clearly opposed during the “public planning sessions”. During that city council meeting many members of the public, who had given up their time, energy, and personal resources over a period of several months in order to present their vision for revitalizing the waterfront, testified against the changed plan, but the council majority ignored their citizens’ concerns and quickly voted for this new, unacceptable, plan.

These city officials told the audience at that time, July, 2013, that this agreement was not binding, merely a vote to go forward with the process, which does not appear to be true today. See the Summer, 2014 edition of the city newsletter, page 2, stating: “CenterCal Properties would like to say “thank you” to the citizens of Redondo
Beach for allowing us to become a part of the community, .......” The reality is that the community did not allow this role in the community for CenterCal; CenterCal assumed this role by fraud, deception and collusion with the City Council majority and members of the city staff, against the will of the citizens.

The City initially claimed that there was no other choice than to contract with CenterCal for a period of ninety nine years, removing prime coastal ownership from the public and gifting it to a private corporation, in order to provide necessary upgrades to the waterfront. This represents another example of fraud perpetrated by the City. We know that there are many other choices available to the citizens of Redondo Beach. One that comes to mind is to explore a partnership with organizations such as The Trust For Public Land. This organization has a proven track record of preservation and revitalization of public lands through creative and innovative partnering with communities across America. One example is Roswell Riverwalk, in Georgia, a seven mile park and trail along the Chattahoochee River, providing people opportunities to jog, hike, boat, fish, and enjoy one of Georgia’s most vital natural resources. This is the type of land use and revitalization that the local people envisioned last year at the “public planning meetings” in which they participated. The citizens made it very clear then, that they did not want a movie theater, retail building density, giant parking structures, and loss of views and open recreation space, which this project, unfortunately, displays in the present plan.

Demolition of the existing structures will cause unnecessary harm to nearby residents in terms of noise, air pollution, and stress. Demolishing perfectly serviceable structures makes no environmental or practical sense. All the present structures can be retrofitted and Pier Plaza could be re-designed to become the new boutique hotel, using the same footprint, with a little imagination. This would mitigate the environmental impact on the site, save money, and be a “greener” project by re-using existing structures and materials. Preservation of the structures would also help avoid the de-stabilization of the adjacent condominium grounds above the proposed project.

Construction of a new public street below the condominiums would provide new health, access and safety hazards:
- provide new sources of dangerous, toxic vehicle exhaust, including particulates, blowing into residents’ homes on the prevailing winds, damaging the good air quality that exists today.
- could well undermine the local geology and compromise the safety of residential structures immediately above.
- would create a new physical barrier between the adjoining neighborhood and the water, causing safety hazards for those, of all ages, attempting to reach the waterfront by foot or bicycle.
- would only benefit this development’s motor vehicle access, limiting full use and enjoyment for residents, pedestrians and cyclists. The citizen participants at the “planning meetings” made it very clear that this area was to be exclusively off limits to general motorists use. The participants suggested, instead, an electric trolley to move people from one side of the waterfront to the other. Motor vehicles would be incompatible with pedestrians and cyclists for health, space, and safety reasons.
- vehicular noise would destroy the present quality of life for local residents in what is now a quiet area with free, safe, and open access for all. The resulting stress ruins the peace and tranquility we all expect in a residential setting.

Many present visitors are low income and middle income families who must be able to afford access to the Waterfront. Their access would be limited by high parking fees, an expensive private hotel which could block public access to the Waterfront, and add to the already high fees for the Lagoon Park. There has been no discussion, that we’re aware of, about the future economic impact on affordable public access for this plan.
The aesthetics of the waterfront would be severely damaged by structural overcrowding and density. The plan has too many unnecessary buildings, such as a new hotel, a movie theater, a very large parking structure, and retail shops that would only benefit the developer, not the general public. The plan obliterates much of the open space and parkland that is there now, blocking the views and feeling of freedom of movement that exists today. There are too many structures in too small of a space. This plan creates a feeling of claustrophobia by just looking at the drawings.

Residents of Redondo Beach and visitors enjoy the pier and waterfront very much at this time, as evidenced by high daily and weekend usage. There is no reason for the City of Redondo Beach to:

Remove the waterfront from the public domain and gift it to a private, for profit corporation, especially a corporation who deals in deception and is not a decent, honest partner with the people of Redondo Beach

Deny the public a choice and a voice by vetoing the motion to put the question on the November ballot

Ignore the efforts of the participants during a series of eight “public meetings” and using this form of fraud in order to pretend the public had input. The public clearly said that this type of land use was not appropriate and therefore these meetings should not be used to demonstrate that the public was involved.

Deny the public the opportunity to explore other ways of funding and revitalizing the Waterfront

Ruin the aesthetics of the Waterfront through overcrowding and overbuilding

Seriously impair views and open space and reduce available public parkland and recreation space

Compromise air quality

Compromise safety on many levels

Compromise free public access

Compromise the quality of life that now exists, introducing noise and traffic at the waterfront and surrounding neighborhoods

We conclude that the agreement between the Redondo Beach City Council majority be withdrawn and a truly democratic process, made up of residents, be formed to work on a new plan to renew the Waterfront as the special place that it is, and will be in the future. As retired public school educators we have deep backgrounds in American history and the ideals of the Founders and the Constitution, and American political thought. We have benefitted greatly from travel to all parts of the United States and the world, and have seen what makes a place special. Redondo Beach can also be one of those special places, not the site of yet another mall.
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July 19, 2014

To: Miss Katie Owston, Project Planner

Subject: Notice of Preparation of Draft Environmental Impact Report, Public Review

From: Barbara and Jack Epstein, Residents of Redondo Beach
        justharb56@gmail.com

We are writing to formally notify the City of Redondo Beach, The County of Los Angeles, and the State of California that we object to the proposed taking of the Redondo Beach Waterfront from the people of Redondo Beach and gifting this valuable, rare, and treasured land and all its contents to a private shopping center development company against the will and wishes of the people of Redondo Beach and neighboring beach cities. This contract has a life span of ninety nine years, spanning generations that the public must give up its voice concerning its waterfront, which to these citizens, constitutes a gift to CenterCal by the City.

On Tuesday, July 15, 2014, the Mayor of Redondo Beach, Steve Aspel, and two councilmen, Councilman Aust and Councilman Ginsburg conspired to deprive the citizens of Redondo Beach of their rights by vetoing and voting down the chance for the said citizens of their democratic rights of self determination and due process by removing the possibility of the public’s chance of voting on the CenterCal project in the coming November election. We view the actions of Aspel, Aust, and Ginsburg at that council meeting during the past week as an obstruction of justice, political mischief, and a violation of the people’s right to due process, and request that a public inquiry be initiated by the State of California, and possibly, if appropriate, departments in the County of Los Angeles. For this reason, and for reasons to follow below, we request that this EIR and the project itself be cancelled pending a public investigation into this immoral, undemocratic, and illegal obstruction of justice and violation of the people’s constitutional rights to due process.

Our objections to the Waterfront project began last year when it became clear that the City of Redondo Beach and the CenterCal Corporation had conspired to entice the public into a series of “public planning meetings” in order to market the CenterCal Mall project to the community. They may have wanted to put on these false community meetings in order to pretend that they had included the public in the planning process for this project. Last July, 2013, the developer suddenly, without public notice, substituted a new drawing that included several elements that the public had clearly opposed during the “public planning sessions”. During that council meeting many members of the public, who had given up their time, energy, and personal resources over a period of several months in order to present their vision for revitalizing the waterfront, testified against the changed plan, but the council majority ignored their citizens’ concerns and quickly voted for this new, unacceptable, plan.
These city officials told the audience at that time, July, 2013, that this agreement was not binding, merely a vote to go forward with the process, which does not appear to be true today. See the Summer, 2014 edition of the city newsletter, page 2, stating: "CenterCal Properties would like to say “thank you” to the citizens of Redondo Beach for allowing us to become a part of the community,..." The reality is that the community did not allow this role in the community for CenterCal; CenterCal assumed this role by fraud, deception and collusion with the City Council majority and members of the city staff, against the will of the citizens.

The City initially claimed that there was no other choice than to contract with CenterCal for a period of ninety nine years, removing prime coastal ownership from the public and gifting it to a private corporation, in order to provide necessary upgrades to the waterfront. This represents another example of fraud perpetrated by the City. We know that there are many other choices available to the citizens of Redondo Beach. One that comes to mind is to explore a partnership with organizations such as The Trust For Public Land. This organization has a proven track record of preservation and revitalization of public lands through creative and innovative partnering with communities across America. One example is Roswell Riverwalk, in Georgia, a seven mile park and trail along the Chattahoochee River, providing people opportunities to jog, hike, boat, fish, and enjoy one of Georgia’s most vital natural resources. This is the type of land use and revitalization that the local people envisioned last year at the “public planning meetings” in which they participated. The citizens made it very clear then, that they did not want a movie theater, retail building density, giant parking structures, and loss of views and open recreation space, which this project, unfortunately, displays in the present plan.

Demolition of the existing structures will cause unnecessary harm to nearby residents in terms of noise, air pollution, and stress. Demolishing perfectly serviceable structures makes no environmental or practical sense. All the present structures can be retrofitted and Pier Plaza could be re-designed to become the new boutique hotel, using the same footprint, with a little imagination. This would mitigate the environmental impact on the site, save money, and be a "greener" project by re-using existing structures and materials. Preservation of the structures would also help avoid the de-stabilization of the adjacent condominium grounds above the proposed project.

Construction of a new public street below the condominiums would provide new health, access and safety hazards:
- provide new sources of dangerous, toxic vehicle exhaust, including particulates, blowing into residents’ homes on the prevailing winds, damaging the good air quality that exists today.
- could well undermine the local geology and compromise the safety of residential structures immediately above.
- would create a new physical barrier between the adjoining neighborhood and the water, causing safety hazards for those, of all ages, attempting to reach the waterfront by foot or bicycle.
would only benefit this development’s motor vehicle access, limiting full use and enjoyment for residents, pedestrians and cyclists. The citizen participants at the "planning meetings" made it very clear that this area was to be exclusively off limits to general motorists use. The participants suggested, instead, an electric trolley to move people from one side of the waterfront to the other. Motor vehicles would be incompatible with pedestrians and cyclists for health, space, and safety reasons. Vehicular noise would destroy the present quality of life for local residents in what is now a quiet area with free, safe, and open access for all. The resulting stress ruins the peace and tranquility we all expect in a residential setting.

Many present visitors are low income and middle income families who must be able to afford access to the Waterfront. Their access would be limited by high parking fees, an expensive private hotel which could block public access to the Waterfront, and add to the already high fees for the Lagoon Park. There has been no discussion, that we're aware of, about the future economic impact on affordable public access for this plan.

The aesthetics of the waterfront would be severely damaged by structural overcrowding and density. The plan has too many unnecessary buildings, such as a new hotel, a movie theater, a very large parking structure, and retail shops that would only benefit the developer, not the general public. The plan obliterates much of the open space and parkland that is there now, blocking the views and feeling of freedom of movement that exists today. There are too many structures in too small of a space. This plan creates a feeling of claustrophobia by just looking at the drawings.

Residents of Redondo Beach and visitors enjoy the pier and waterfront very much at the present time, as evidenced by high daily and weekend usage. There is no reason for the City of Redondo Beach to:

Remove the waterfront from the public domain and gift it to a private, for profit corporation, especially a corporation who deals in deception and is not a decent, honest partner with the people of Redondo Beach

Deny the public a choice and a voice by vetoing the motion to put the question on the November ballot

Ignore the efforts of the participants during a series of eight "public meetings" and using this form of fraud in order to pretend the public had input. The public clearly said that this type of land use was not appropriate and therefore these meetings should not be used to demonstrate that the public was involved.

Deny the public the opportunity to explore other ways of funding and revitalizing the Waterfront

Ruin the aesthetics of the Waterfront through overcrowding and overbuilding
Seriously impair views and open space and reduce available public parkland and recreation space

Compromise air quality

Compromise safety on many levels

Compromise free public access

Compromise the quality of life that now exists, introducing noise and traffic at the waterfront and surrounding neighborhoods

We conclude that the agreement between the Redondo Beach City Council majority be withdrawn and a truly democratic process, made up of residents, be formed to work on a new plan to renew the Waterfront as the special place that it is, and will be in the future. As retired public school educators we have deep backgrounds in American history and the ideals of the Founders and the Constitution, and in American political thought. We have benefitted greatly from travel to all parts of the United States and the world, and have seen what makes a place special. Redondo Beach can also be one of those special places with another vision and a better plan.

Barbara Epstein  
260 The Village #305  
Redondo Beach, 90277
To whom it may concern:

I wanted to be at the meeting tonight, but was not able to make it.

After the fact I would like to make a comment in any case. This project and the terms are not good for Redondo Beach. We do not need another mall and this is what the project looks like. Looking at the malls along Hawthorne Blvd we see that they are in constant (for lack of a better word) turmoil. Reconstruction and multiple spaces for lease. Empty parking lots.

The terms for the project are not favorable to Redondo. Yes, we need the business and tax revenue, but the developer is not contributing unless they make a 10% profit. That is unfair to us.

We need a project that will fit in with the waterfront. Movies and parking structures are not what I think of when I go to the beach. Please, we need some common sense. A mix of outdoor friendly venues with restaurants and maybe even residences would in my opinion make more sense. Yes, parking would be needed, but not a 3 story structure please.

Sincerely,

Thomas Etsten
Redondo Beach
Input on Harbor Plan EIR
Lisa Falk [kaholo@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2014 8:45 AM
To: Katie Owston

Please have them study the parking situation VERY carefully....it's already not good on crowded days!

Also, for the boat ramp, please have them address how many double spaces (for vehicle & trailer) will be needed.

In addition - the turning basin (currently south of the Crab Shack) is the location for larger sailboats to drop their sails in calm water - please ensure there will remain ROOM, between the new transient moorings and a new boat ramp (and the paddle boats, paddle boarders and kayakers) to continue to do so. This is a very important safety consideration, as those pretty sailboats must turn their bows into the wind for long enough to drop and secure their sails!

I look forward to the results - I am hopeful that THIS TIME the developers will stick with us through the process instead of abandoning it due to the vocal minority of anti-development activists!

Lisa Falk
120 S. Juanita Ave. #5
(Voter, property owner & KHM boat slip leasee....)
and I were thrilled to wish in the sixties are more and more shrill like.

and more wzelnzuzodo jumping. The truth is, there are multi-million dollar malls that you
drive through. You shop online, your purchases come to your neighborhood
buildings. You shop online, using repurposed brick-and-mortar
through delivery services — using repurposed brick-and-mortar
is said to be planning to focus its entire low-end neighborhood
drive-through delivery services — using repurposed brick-and-mortar
is said to be planning to focus its entire low-end neighborhood
drive-through delivery services — using repurposed brick-and-mortar
is said to be planning to focus its entire low-end neighborhood
Figure, WalMart

just this morning, the Wall Street Journal featured the plight of WalMart,

shopper.

Shopper.

Shoppers are starting to feel a loss of foot traffic to on-line
pre-Internet and pre-online-shoppers. The NOW is a time when brick
pre-Internet and pre-online-shoppers. The NOW is a time when brick
pre-Internet and pre-online-shoppers. The NOW is a time when brick
pre-Internet and pre-online-shoppers. The NOW is a time when brick
pre-Internet and pre-online-shoppers. The NOW is a time when brick

To repeat: But THAT was THEN, and THIS IS NOW! THE THEN was

Houston. Hah, oh!

Shopping zones are rapidly changing. Oh, oh! We may have a problem
been spectacular success. But that was THEN, and this is NOW! The
reportedly the dozens of shopping centers General has built have

Therefore, I conclude that General's focus, which is very reasonable,

hundreds of thousands of square footage

hundreds of thousands of square footage

Ceninal describes the size of its projects with words like:

—Premier Shopping Destinations

—Open-Space Retail Centers

—Fashion and Lifestyle Shopping Centers

—Major Retail Projects

build.

The question for me was where General has in mind for Redondo, so I

looked at their website to find out. Here is how they describe what they

Center at Aviation Blvd. and Manhattan Beach Blvd

Wednesday, July 31st, 6-8pm at the Redondo Beach Performing Arts

Redondo Harbor Revitalization
The edge of the sea.

From your home or old can participate in activities that can best be enjoyed at
harbor revitalization creates opportunities for families where all member
enjoy it. It is up to us who love Redondo to insure that the need
should strive to make it possible for as many people as we can to also
living at the edge of the sea. As we do, it is a special privilege, and we
the sea life for real. So finally, I think that we should recognize that
sea, going fishing yourself, watching whales, and even swimming with
sea, going fishing yourself, watching whales, and even swimming with
TV. But electronic devices can never substitute for really being at the
high seas. Aside for crab in Alaska and swim with the dolphins via the
of all kinds is opening up to all comers. Now everyone has ridden the
through the Internet the whole world of science, literature, and learning
Internet is making brick-and-mortar stores less valuable, conversely,
But there is something else too that is important to consider. Just as the

cANOUCING clubs, surf-boat rentals, sail boat rentals, etc.
swimming, which means consistribution, boat ramps, lodges, beaches,
harbor revitalization toward family activities — boating, fishing,
beaches and harbor. Moreover, to me it makes sense to offer most of the
ocean theme. Why? Because such a theme would be linked to our
up-scale restaurants and the boutique hotel. Moreover, they should all be
facilities for non-shoplifting activities like the little theater they propose.

Part of the answer might be for Central to expand its focus on

Redondo we have already been there and done that. Let's not do it again.
put in a short time all that could be left are deserted buildings. In
square feet of new shopping space in Redondo. It might start off well,
Shopping center launch that is now just off shore if it builds thousands of
The question I have is how Central plans to stem the on-line
Dear Ms. Owston,

It is apparent from the Environmental Impact Report that the proposed Redondo Beach waterfront development project will have a significant negative impact on the quality of life of many Redondo Beach residents. Shouldn’t the Redondo Beach mayor and city council be acting to protect the quality of life of Redondo Beach residents?

Leslie Fiske
620 The Village #317
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
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Redondo Beach Harbor EIR Comments
Hank Folson [hankfolson@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 1:14 PM
To: Katie Owston
Attachments: REDONDO BEACH EIR COMMENTS.pdf (38 KB)

July 21, 2014

Katie Owston, Project Planner
Community Development Department

REDONDO BEACH HARBOR EIR COMMENTS

BIG PICTURE & LONG TERM CONSIDERATIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS:

- Global Warming is real, and happening too fast to be ignored!
- Climate Change is increasing ocean levels worldwide.
  - The only argument is by how many feet?
- The Power Plant is scheduled for closure in 2022 by California Law.
- Redondo Beach is well below the California average for Parks & Open Space. The 53 acre Power Plant site offers an opportunity to improve our community.
  - A new power plant would have to be amortized over 3 or 4 decades.
  - The world will run out of affordable oil & gas long before then.
  - While oil & gas have to go up in cost, Solar Energy costs are going down. The cost curves are going to cross, and AES knows it.
  - The petroleum industry is experiencing rising costs for oil & gas exploration & development. A side effect has been to force reductions in their spending on alternative energy sources.
- The City has limited the focus of the Harbor renewal to West of Harbor Drive.
  - This decision completely ignores the negative effects of the Proposal to the whole area East of Harbor Drive.
  - The soon to be removed Power Plant was built over a natural Salt Marsh. This is the last opportunity to restore this small portion of our shrinking Coastal Wetlands.
    - With the rise of the oceans, the removal of manmade structures near and at water level will need to be addressed. This is an opportunity for preemptive action to make the best of the rising oceans caused by humans.
      - If Redondo acts now, the whole Coast of California can use this as an example of how to restore the Wetlands and wildlife along our Coast.

CenterCal HARBOR MALL

- The biggest failing of this Project as proposed is the total lack of consideration of what this Project will have on the environment inland.
  - This Mall will make any retail or restaurant use on the soon to be available AES property uneconomic. And, if a project were attempted there, both projects would suffer financially.
- CenterCal's 9 properties all have plenty of surface parking surrounded by their new buildings. There is little evidence that they are experienced in dealing with space & environmental limitations, and their Harbor Plan shows it.
- Everything the Mall proposes to sell is already available elsewhere in Redondo, or nearby.
  - A realistic evaluation of the congestion & parking problems will show that when some shoppers wish to look beyond the Galleria, they will choose to drive South on Hawthorne to the Del Amo Mall.
    - CenterCal's Mall cannibalizes the Galleria. As the Galleria gets weaker, more shoppers will be drawn to the larger & growing Del Amo Mall.
    - The Revival of "HEART OF THE CITY" (HOC) on the AES Property?
- HOC, as planned, was very profitable for AES: They would be the sole landowner, developer, builder, manager, and realtor for 3,000 Condos
  - The completed Project would bring in $900,000,000 to AES. (3,000 Condos at $300,000)
• It took 3 Petition drives (that each received over 5,000 signatures) to block the City Council legislation that approved HOC in 2001.
• Had the citizens not acted, AES had planned to begin building along Harbor Drive at the highest allowed density. The unsold condos built in time for the 2008 economic collapse would have destroyed property values West of PCH.

• Whenever the City of Redondo Beach gotten into a financial bind, there has only been one solution: INCREASE BUILDING HEIGHTS & DENSITY!
  ◦ The proposed doubling of the density in the harbor Plan is a classic example.
  ◦ The problem that is never addressed in any Redondo Beach EIR is the long term consequences of increased density.
    ■ It is only a matter of time until we run out of room or marketability.
  ◦ The EIR must consider other alternatives!

• Consider this: Had the HOC Plan that Mayor Aspel (then a Planning Commissioner) supported began as scheduled, it would have ground to a halt in 2008.
  ◦ Even without the HOC, Condo sales stalled for several years.
  ◦ With HOC, existing Condos located West of PCH in District 1 would have dramatically lost value, due to the competition, long before 2008. Condo sales and values would have plummeted after the 2008 crash directly reducing the City's income.
    ■ Had this played out, the City's response would have been to dramatically increase building heights and densities West of PCH — at a terrible cost to our citizens and environment.
  ◦ The downside of a failed CenterCal Plan is that we will be left with a doubled density of expensive buildings with no money in our coffers to fix the problems the Plan created.
    ■ There is every reason to believe that Mayor Aspel and some Council Members will try to revive the HOC, under a new name, but with the high density intact. It won't work.

• Saving Seaside Lagoon:
  ◦ The Lagoon exists because heated wastewater from the Power Plant could heat the pool. Simple Solar water heating panels built to also shade ground level parking spaces can supply heated water through insulated underground piping to the pool. This will extend the swimming season. There would be no need to reduce the Lagoon area. The cost to save the Lagoon could be less than the moving costs CenterCal imposes.

• There is no public access to the water's edge from the North end of the Boat Harbor at Hermosa Beach to the South side of the Redondo Pier, a distance of 9 city blocks!
  ◦ The CenterCal Plan does not improve this.

Sincerely,

Henry James (Hank) Folson
704 Elvira Ave.
Redondo Beach
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REDONDO BEACH HARBOR EIR COMMENTS

BIG PICTURE & LONG TERM CONSIDERATIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS:
• Global Warming is real, and happening too fast to be ignored!
• Climate Change is increasing ocean levels worldwide.
  • The only argument is by how many feet?
• The Power Plant is scheduled for closure in 2022 by California Law.
• Redondo Beach is well below the California average for Parks & Open Space. The 53 acre Power Plant site offers an opportunity to improve our community.
  • A new power plant would have to be amortized over 3 or 4 decades.
  • The world will run out of affordable oil & gas long before then.
  • While oil & gas have to go up in cost, Solar Energy costs are going down. The cost curves are going to cross, and AES knows it.
  • The petroleum industry is experiencing rising costs for oil & gas exploration & development. A side effect has been to force reductions in their spending on alternative energy sources.
• The City has limited the focus of the Harbor renewal to West of Harbor Drive.
  • This decision completely ignores the negative effects of the Proposal to the whole area East of Harbor Drive.
  • The soon to be removed Power Plant was built over a natural Salt Marsh. This is the last opportunity to restore this small portion of our shrinking Coastal Wetlands.
    • With the rise of the oceans, the removal of manmade structures near and at water level will need to be addressed. This is an opportunity for preemptive action to make the best of the rising oceans caused by humans.
    • If Redondo acts now, the whole Coast of California can use this as an example of how to restore the Wetlands and wildlife along our Coast.

CenterCal HARBOR MALL
• The biggest failing of this Project as proposed is the total lack of consideration of what this Project will have on the environment inland.
  • This Mall will make any retail or restaurant use on the soon to be available AES property uneconomic. And, if a project were attempted there, both projects would suffer financially.
• CenterCal’s 9 properties all have plenty of surface parking surrounded by their new buildings. There is little evidence that they are experienced in dealing with space & environmental limitations, and their Harbor Plan shows it.
• Everything the Mall proposes to sell is already available elsewhere in Redondo, or nearby.
  • A realistic evaluation of the congestion & parking problems will show that when some shoppers wish to look beyond the Galleria, they will choose to drive South on Hawthorne to the Del Amo Mall.
  • CenterCal’s Mall cannibalizes the Galleria. As the Galleria gets weaker, more shoppers will be drawn to the larger & growing Del Amo Mall.
The Revival of "HEART OF THE CITY" (HOC) on the AES Property?

- HOC, as planned, was very profitable for AES: They would be the sole landowner, developer, builder, manager, and realtor for 3,000 Condos
  - The completed Project would bring in $900,000,000 to AES. (3,000 Condos at $300,000)
- It took 3 Petition drives (that each received over 5,000 signatures) to block the City Council legislation that approved HOC in 2001.
- Had the citizens not acted, AES had planned to begin building along Harbor Drive at the highest allowed density. The unsold condos built in time for the 2008 economic collapse would have destroyed property values West of PCH.

- Whenever the City of Redondo Beach gotten into a financial bind, there has only been one solution: INCREASE BUILDING HEIGHTS & DENSITY!
  - The proposed doubling of the density in the harbor Plan is a classic example.
  - The problem that is never addressed in any Redondo Beach EIR is the long term consequences of increased density.
    - It is only a matter of time until we run out of room or marketability.
    - The EIR must consider other alternatives!

- Consider this: Had the HOC Plan that Mayor Aspel (then a Planning Commissioner) supported began as scheduled, it would have ground to a halt in 2008.
  - Even without the HOC, Condo sales stalled for several years.
  - With HOC, existing Condos located West of PCH in District 1 would have dramatically lost value, due to the competition, long before 2008. Condo sales and values would have plummeted after the 2008 crash directly reducing the City's income.
    - Had this played out, the City's response would have been to dramatically increase building heights and densities West of PCH — at a terrible cost to our citizens and environment.
  - The downside of a failed CenterCal Plan is that we will be left with a doubled density of expensive buildings with no money in our coffers to fix the problems the Plan created.
    - There is every reason to believe that Mayor Aspel and some Council Members will try to revive the HOC, under a new name, but with the high density intact. It won't work.

- Saving Seaside Lagoon:
  - The Lagoon exists because heated wastewater from the Power Plant could heat the pool. Simple Solar water heating panels built to also shade ground level parking spaces can supply heated water through insulated underground piping to the pool. This will extend the swimming season. There would be no need to reduce the Lagoon area. The cost to save the Lagoon could be less than the moving costs CenterCal imposes.

- There is no public access to the water's edge from the North end of the Boat Harbor at Hermosa Beach to the South side of the Redondo Pier, a distance of 9 city blocks!
  - The CenterCal Plan does not improve this.

Sincerely,

Henry James (Hank) Folson
704 Elvira Ave.
Redondo Beach
Scoping Comments for the Waterfront Development-EIR from the Protectors of Public Ocean Views
Dean Francois [savethestrand@yahoo.com]
Sent:Friday, July 18, 2014 12:23 PM
To: Katie Owston

Subj: Scoping Comments for the EIR – Waterfront Development

Dear Katie Owston:
<Katie.Owston@redondo.org>:

I am a former Public Works Commissioner. I head up the environmental groups: the Protectors of Public Ocean Views and the Friends of the South Bay Bicycle Paths. I am also a member of the Sierra Club and the Sierra Club's Conservation Committee. As Protectors of Public Ocean Views, we have organized several appeals to the California coastal commission and stand to ensure that development does not interfere with public views and access to the ocean as required by the Coastal Act.

I support the comments from other environment groups that may include, Surfrider, VOICE, and groups and individuals opposing the large scope of development proposed.

SCOPING COMMENTS

A. THE EIR MUST INCLUDE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS. According to State Environmental Law (CEQA), the EIR may be required to include analysis of alternative plans. A complete analysis of alternatives to this project should be completed including a scaled down version or no development at all.

B. AESTHETICS – There are clearly significant impacts and should be completely analyzed. The project must comply with the Coastal Act requirements for public views of the water. The development does not appear to have a waterfront type of theme which is badly needed.

Analysis should be complete to include other alternatives to make the project more aesthetic and specifically how the project needs to be modified so that no public view of the ocean is disrupted by the proposal.

Analysis should be done to ensure adherence to Section 30251 of the California Coastal Act. The act states that
“The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas…”

Also Section 10-5.102(b) of the RB Coastal Land Use Ordinance states that development should “…maximize public access to and public views of the coastline.”

It appears that the project impacts the public views of the water and public views of some scenic coastal areas from the public vantage point on streets such as Portofino Way, Beryl, Diamond, Catalina, Harbor Drive and PCH and from public parks such as Veterans Park.
We are particularly concerned about the view from Harbor Drive.

The development should not use their proposed improvements that claim to be enhanced public access to the water as a justification for blocking public water views. Such public access enhancements are required in any coastal development and that is a separate requirement. This additional access or enhancement can not be used to justify any blockage of a public ocean view. These views need to be maintained as they currently exist or enhanced, especially along Harbor Drive.

In a recent decision from the CA Coastal Commission regarding the 1000 Esplanade project, although the commission approved the project, they ruled that development must protect public views of the ocean even over private property.

C. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION AND HEALTH/SAFETY - THE CURRENT PROPOSAL HAS A SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM AND THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE COMMUNITY.

As a former public works commissioner and transportation commissioner, I personally know the implications that this will have on not only the effects of noise and traffic but the changes to the infrastructure and repaving and complete reconstruction of streets to handle the vehicles and traffic. The increased traffic will have an impact on cyclists traffic and the project does not go far enough to provide adequate safe space for cyclists and pedestrians to travel through the project area and visit the establishments. The 1-way cycle-track on one side of Harbor Drive will have devastating affects on cycling traffic and as a result that will cause more cyclists to get off that to avoid lengthy traffic signals and go through the development. The space allotted for pedestrian and cycling traffic must be increased. The developer knows this all too well and preferred to have 1-way cycle-tracks on both sides of Harbor Drive instead.

Section 30252 of the Ca Coastal Act states “The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing non-automobile circulation within the development”

Analysis should include whether this section is in compliance. It appears that not enough non-automobile circulation is provided and this should be enhanced with larger public walking and cycling areas.

D. AIR, NOISE, AND ENERGY RESOURCES (LONG TERM ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS) – THE PROPOSAL HAS AN ADVERSE IMPACT ON AIR QUALITY AND NOISE FROM INCREASED TRAFFIC, AND AN ADVERSE IMPACT ON ENERGY CONSUMPTION AND CONFLICTS WITH LONG TERM ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS.

E. WATER QUALITY, EARTH, GEOLOGY, AND SOILS – REDONDO BEACH MAY BE IN A LIQUEFACTION ZONE. Long Beach suffered a drop in their elevation since they started oil drilling. Hermosa Beach may drill for oil. Hermosa Beach has buildings densely close
together. In the Northridge earthquake in 1992, a parking lot in King Harbor and Docks were destroyed sinking many cars and boats due to Liquefaction. Also, the recent Shade Hotel development in King harbor had to be revised after approval because it was found after the fact that they could not dig as deep as proposed. We do not need this mistake again, so proper analysis is needed here. It appears that destruction could occur including the loss of life in an earthquake. A complete analysis is required on the liquefaction factor. And the affects of this development and its affects on water quality and geology.

F. CULTURAL RESOURCES – THE PROPOSAL SUGGESTS NOTHING TO BRING BACK SOME OF OUR PAST HISTORY OR CULTURAL RESOURCES.
As a former Redondo Beach Preservation Commissioner and a Historical Society board member, I appreciate the desire to add this to any development proposal.

G. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE – THE PROJECT IS ON A FAST TRACK AND HAS IGNORED THE MANY PUBLIC MEETING INPUTS ON WHAT PEOPLE WANT AND THUS CLEARLY HAS THE POTENTIAL Affect and DISADVANTAGE to LONG-TERM ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS. The actual Public scoping meeting did not allow people to provide oral input and could be in violation of CEQA. While all the potential adverse impacts may not be in the EIR, impacts could still be considered cumulatively considerable. The only way that the project can overcome these adverse impacts is to include as a mitigating factor TO REDUCE the size of the project and protect public views of the water.

Dean Francois
Protectors of Public Ocean Views
Friends of the South Bay Bicycle Path
www.SaveTheStrand.info
po box 1544; hermosa beach, ca 90254
310-938-2191

http://www.eset.com
Statement for the Harbor Revitalization Meeting

ROBERT FREEMAN [robertfreeman@mac.com]
Sent:Thursday, July 10, 2014 4:10 PM
To: Katie Owston

Dear Ms Owston,

I believe I have already submitted a copy of the statement I had prepared to read last night. It would have read OK, but thinking it needed a little rework, I have done so and I am hereby resubmitting it. I hope it will be useful in contributing to a harbor revitalization plan by focusing on the exciting possibilities that appear to be in our future. We all know that today we are starting to buy on-line. It must be true that tomorrow we will all be living on-line more and more, and that is the reality I am suggesting we embrace.

Robert Freeman, Redondo Beach, member of the Preservation Commission
611 Esplanade

Redondo Harbor Revitalization
Wednesday, July 9th, 6-8pm, at the Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center at Aviation Blvd. and Manhattan Beach Blvd

The question for me is what CenterCal has in mind for Redondo, so I looked at their website to find out. Here is how they describe what they build:
—major retail projects
—fashion and lifestyle shopping centers
—open-air, specialty retail centers
—premier shopping destinations
CenterCal describes the size of its projects with words like:
—hundreds of tenants
—hundreds of thousands of square footage
Therefore, I conclude that CenterCal’s focus, which is very reasonable, is to build large facilities to bring a large number of buyers and sellers together. Reportedly, the dozens of shopping centers CenterCal has built have been spectacular successes. But that was THEN and this is NOW! The shopping world is rapidly changing. Oh, oh! We may have a problem Houston. Hang on!

To repeat: But THAT was THEN, and THIS is NOW. The THEN was pre-Internet and pre-online-shopping. The NOW is a time when brick and mortar stores are starting to feel a loss of foot traffic to on-line shoppers.

Just this morning, the Wall Street Journal featured the plight of WalMart, the grand-daddy of all big-store shopping successes. Currently, WalMart is said to be planning to refocus its empire toward neighborhood drive-through delivery services — using repurposed brick-and-mortar buildings. You shop online, your purchase comes to your neighborhood drive-through. The truth is, that the multi-million dollar malls that you and I were thrilled to visit in the sixties are more and more sitting idle.

The question I have, is how CenterCal plans to stem the on-line shopping tsunami that is now just offshore by
building thousands of square feet of new shopping space in Redondo. It might start off well, but in a short time derelict buildings are all that could be left. In Redondo we have already been there and done that. Let’s not do it again.

Part of the answer might be for CenterCal to expand its focus on facilities for non-shopping activities like the little theater they propose, up-scale restaurants and the boutique hotel. Moreover, they should all be ocean themed. Why? Because such a theme would be linked to our beaches and harbor. Moreover, to me it makes sense to orient most of the harbor revitalization toward family activities — boating, fishing, swimming, which means constructing, boat ramps, toddlers’ beaches, canoeing clubs, surf-board rentals, sail boat rentals, etc.

But there is something else too that is important to consider. Just as the Internet is making brick-and-mortar stores less valuable, conversely, through the Internet the whole world of science, literature, and learning of all kinds is opening up to all comers. Now everyone has ridden the high seas, fished for crab in Alaska and swum with the dolphins via the TV. But electronic devices can never substitute for really being at the sea, going fishing yourself, watching whales, and even swimming with the sea life for real. So, finally, I think that we should all recognize that living at the edge of the sea, as we do, is a special privilege, and we should strive to make it possible for as many people as we can to also enjoy it. It is up to us who love Redondo, to insure that the needed harbor revitalization creates opportunities for families where all member from young to old can participate in activities that can best be enjoyed at the edge of the sea.

robertfreeman@mac.com, 7/9/14
Hello Ms. Owston,

I am the owner at 630 The Village #216 for the past 20+ years which directly overlooks the pier. The proposal to have a "Road" in between The Village/Seascape will increase noise, pollution, air quality (I have severe asthma) and will have a negative impact for the pier and surrounding residents.

Just the thought of having this road right in front of me (i.e. delivery trucks etc) is going to be a nightmare for our Village condo's. Everyone that I have spoke with is totally against this road. We all live at the Village for the peaceful ocean surroundings and we all want to maintain this peaceful beach front atmosphere. Maintaining the existing bike path and walkways is much preferred.

Any environmental impact study should clearly see how this road can be detrimental to our surroundings and health for many of the elderly in our complex. I hope you can understand our position.

Thank you,

Hiroshi Fujii CPA
310-415-3024 cell/text

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for The Waterfront project.

Your comments on the environmental scope of the EIR are requested so that the EIR may be prepared in light of the concerns of the community and surrounding areas. The project would revitalize approximately 35.6 acres of land and water by redeveloping and expanding local and visitor serving commercial uses, enhancing public access and recreational opportunities and facilities, and improving the aging support infrastructure and parking facilities. The project also proposes substantial improvements in site connectivity, public access and public views to and along the waterfront.

The proposed project is specifically designed as a new waterfront village to reconnect the Pier and Harbor area with resident and visitor serving uses. It includes demolition of approximately 221,347 square feet of existing structures, demolition and renovation of the existing pier parking structure, and construction/renovation of up to approximately
523,732 square feet (289,906 square feet net new development) to include retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, a market hall, and a boutique hotel.

The proposed project includes public recreation enhancements such as a new boat launch ramp, improvements to Seaside Lagoon, new parking facilities, and pedestrian and bicycle pathways. Site connectivity would be improved by the establishment of a new pedestrian bridge across the Marina Basin entrance and the reconnection of Pacific Avenue (THIS IS THE ROAD THAT WOULD GO IN BELOW SEASCAPES AND THE VILLAGE CONDOS).

The City has identified potential significant impacts for the following topics: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic and Utilities/Service Systems.


The NOP public review period is scheduled from June 19, 2014 to July 21, 5:30 pm
Please send responses to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
415 Diamond St., Redondo Beach, CA 90277 or

[katie.owston@redondo.org](mailto:katie.owston@redondo.org)

For questions, contact Ms. Owston at [310) 318-0637, x1](tel:3103180637x1)-2895
Katie,

One more suggestion:
If Mr. Bruning hasn't done so, he may want to check out the shopping area that surrounds the Malibu Country Mart near Cross Creek Road and Highway 1 in Malibu. This center offers a few mid-sized stores as well as many smaller ones and the courtyard which includes playground equipment for children and may places to sit and socialize, while still surrounded by office and retail space is really enjoyable and well-planned. There are many mature trees where night herons and cormorants nested. The space was full of people when I visited last Sunday.

Georgette Gantner
we took them to the Lagoon once and they found it boring; the pervasive smell of chlorine was offensive. They never had as much fun as they did at the beaches, where we could observe sea animals, build sand castles and dig holes that would fill with tidal ocean water. This is how my kids learned about the tides. And when they wanted to go swimming, my husband and I took them in and taught them. This is where they learned to respect this great body of water.

I always thought we would be better off without the Lagoon, considering all the fines we've paid. If we really are updating the pier, the Lagoon should go; it really cheapens the area. Please don't consider keeping it just to appease a few sentimental complainers. We all need to move on.

2) The rendering in this article shows a hotel that feels so solid and looming, looking too large in proportion to the property. If the hotel is to be built where the existing parking structure and office building are now, that is a lot of area. Once it's all razed, think about designing the hotel and parking lot further back from the water to give walkers and cyclists and boardwalk and the ocean some breathing room; currently, the parking lot cramps this area and is so ugly. Think about creating visual corridors for people to see the ocean; create a space that can provide for outdoor weddings overlooking the water in the hotel, much the same as the SHADE HOTEL is doing in Redondo Beach.

3) The plans call for a 66,000 square foot area that will accommodate many vendors. That's a lot of vendors that need to commit to keep this development flush. Your plan reminds me of Fanuel Hall in Boston. Do you have that many vendors that are interested now? In 5+ years?? And, I don't care what the nay-sayers are worried about: there is nothing wrong with including a few medium scale businesses on the pier such as Trader Joe's or a smallish Whole Foods or Sprouts or Fresh and Easy or even Banana Republic or Gap or J. Crew or Barns and Noble or Anthropologie. Redondo Beach will have to make up for the loss of Nordstrom tax dollars in a year. SO WHAT if these stores occupy the pier? It won't make it into a mall and, let's be honest: almost anything is better than what we have now. These stores have proven success, so why shouldn't one of two of them bookend this development as a mainstay in addition to smaller vendors. These stores will attract an upscale crowd who will spend their dollars to RB.

It is ironic that the people who complain the most are the ones who live in the condos that were built in the place of beautiful historic homes that were ripped
out to build their homes. It is ironic, that the adjacent park, Czuluger, is named after the mayor in charge when this development took place. Additionally ironic - this park is the most under-utilized and most beautiful piece of real estate in Redondo. WHY isn't it buzzing on the weekends to include food, music, dancing? (I know this is not part of your development, but just had to speak on this).

In addition, consider the restaurants that are successful in Manhattan and Hermosa Beaches like Tin Roof, MB Post, Rockefeller, Rock N Fish, others; they would update and bring youthful audiences to RB. Check out the micro-brew and gastro-pubs that are already successful in upscale communities such as Aspen or Carmel or San Francisco or Scottsdale who would pay a premium to own a piece of the So. Calif. coastline? It would be great to keep Tony's BUT Tony's really needs to fork over some $ to fix their restaurant. They've been in the same location for 62 years and lately, I visited. It is disgusting. I would not return. Have they ever remodeled their space? They have no room to complain.

4) I don't love the movie theater at the pier ---- unless it's located someplace that does not block any of the views of the ocean. Otherwise, why visit the pier with the best view around and crawl inside of a black box? Torrance, Redondo, and PV already have a nice sharing of live and film theaters.

5) If you must install a road to help vendors deliver goods to their stores, I think that is helpful. The way the pier is configured now, trucks have to park on the far south side and dolly stuff in, which is a royal pain. However, can you limit the hours when the trucks deliver ---- like before 10AM on weekdays and before 9AM on weekends? This way, the road will remain a safe place for pedestrians and cyclists. Or construct this road so that it is far away from the ped walkways.

6) I hope that you intend to retain the Monstad Pier in terms of the wood floor planks and other parts - that is so historically beautiful.

I hope that you will not touch the "OCEAN STEPS" where, in 2009, mosaic artists Patti Linnett and Debbie Collette have meticulously crafted the mosaic stairs near the south end of the pier, near the fish market. This is now considered a Public Art piece listed by the Public Art Commission in Redondo Beach. You can't successfully move that kind of thing.

I hope that a concrete pads will be provided to accommodate future public art
such as sculptures
and water features and other three-dimensional visions to enhance the pier's beautiful design.

I hope that fishing is banned on the pier. In light of the incident at the Manhattan pier recently, where young sharks are frequenting the area in the summer, we need nothing more to attract them. This is for the safety of people as well as the ocean creatures that live there, who should remain protected and left alone. In general, fishing on all piers is disgusting and unhealthful for those who partake. Don't the posted signs caution people of the hazards of consuming the local fish? Then why is it allowed? And, does the City really financially benefit from fishing licenses? Again, this activity cheapens what you are trying to accomplish.

I hope that we can walk our dogs on all parts of the Pier, that they will be allowed in the outdoor restaurants and that containers to dispense bags will be provided for their clean-up.

7) Please do not allow anyone try to convince you otherwise: WE NEED a sizable and new parking structure to accommodate the public who we are trying to attract to visit our pier so they can spend their money to keep the Pier alive. However the top story is to be configured, please consider doing a lot of landscaping!! Maybe a roof-top park? People love the green spaces but limited to full shrubs that don't grow too tall as to block the view of the living spaces behind.

IN CONCLUSION: Think green on ALL of the pier design, planting water tolerant trees that provide shade ----- hopefully NO palm trees, but lots of succulents and non-sticky cactus.
I have a drought tolerant garden and so does my daughter, and these plants bloom in the winter. Then, please make sure that these areas are well maintained and kept free of trash. Provide ample amounts of recycling containers and maintain a janitorial and gardening staff. It will be one thing to develop this area - it will be quite another to keep the community loving it. The water features you suggest are good too -- as long as the water effectively recirculates and doesn't require more water to operate. This development has to be extremely ecologically sound in consideration of our lack of rainfall. As long as you follow those rules, you will have fewer valid complaints which will pave the way for smoother construction.
The ongoing construction of the re-envisioned waterfront in Seattle (guided by artists), is an exciting inspiration for our own pier.

Thank you for all your workshops.

Thank you for your offer of an art gallery space of 2500 square feet.

Thank you for your patience.

If you can accomplish this design, you truly will perform a miracle, after so many decades. A successful design on the Redondo Pier will uplift the spirit and morale of our community and bring people together, in many ways. If we are to be your first Waterfront Project, let us be the shining example for all others to emulate.

I really do love Redondo Beach. There is infinite potential and our artist community looks forward to the beauty and innovation that you will bring to our city.

Sincerely,
Georgette Gantner

Chair, Redondo Beach Art Group POWER OF ART, 2014 (2009, 2010)
Member, Redondo Beach Art Group since 2003
Public Art Commissioner since 2009
Chair, South Bay Hands on Art, 2003-2004
Member, 1995-2006
Member, Leadership Redondo, 2007-2008
Artist (printmaker), writer, mom, progressive and community member since 1980
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Comments

The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) -- Scoping Process

Name: Denyce Giannoules

Organization (optional):
Address: 200 Avenue G #320
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional):
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems

Air Quality
Geology/Soils
Hydrology/Water Quality
Noise
Recreation

* These issue areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: As an aspiring vitality city we need more nature trails and parks that a person can walk in and feel connected to trees and plants. I'd love to see and experience a trail and park with the feel of the "chip trail" in Hermosa Beach. Majority of parking for the waterfront should be away from the shoreline, maybe in the dirt yard land. - with an electric shuttle or rail to and from the waterfront. Keep Redondo (South) quaint! We need outdoor activities at the beach, pier -- not more shopping & movies. More businesses means more traffic and we're already congested.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Oweston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
I urge you to carefully visualize this project. There won't be a do-over.

Learn from mistakes made:
The remodel on top of the pier
The high rises - condos on the Esplanade

We have a beautiful community and with Shade coming soon, Portofino and the renovated hotel on harbor.... Well all I can say is that it would be nice to see a project compliment what is there
Dana Point is a fine example...
I urge you to spend more time and effort on our future.
Sincerely,
V. Gonzalez
108 Palos Verdes Blvd
Redondo Beach
RE: The Waterfront - Notice of Preparation of the Draft EIR, Notice of Initial Study, and Notice of Scoping Meeting

Thomas Gray [tom@retirementpro.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 10:21 AM
To: Katie Owston

Katie: we urge you to move as quickly as possible to make this happen. We support this development!

- tom

Thomas A. Gray, MBA
Financial & Investment Consultant
Managing Partner
Retirement Protection Group
322 Vista Del Mar
Redondo Beach, CA  90277
310-375-1300 x 15
310-375-1391 Fax
www.retirementpro.com

Securities offered through
Triad Advisors, Inc., Member: FINRA, SIPC

---

From: Katie Owston [mailto:Katie.Owston@redondo.org]
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 9:44 AM
To: Katie Owston
Subject: The Waterfront - Notice of Preparation of the Draft EIR, Notice of Initial Study, and Notice of Scoping Meeting
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH
Community Development Department

Notice of Preparation/Notice of Initial Study/Notice of Scoping Meeting

To: Interested Parties  
From: City of Redondo Beach  
Community Development Department  
415 Diamond Street  
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Date: June 19, 2014


Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City of Redondo Beach, as the Lead Agency, will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for The Waterfront project (the proposed project). Your agency may need to use the EIR prepared by the City when considering permits or other approvals associated with the proposed project and your comments on the environmental scope of the EIR are requested. If you are not a public agency with any statutory/regulatory responsibility concerning this project, your comments on the environmental scope of the EIR are requested so that the EIR may be prepared in light of the concerns of the community and surrounding areas.

Project Description: The proposed project, located in the City of Redondo Beach’s Coastal Zone south of Portofino Way, North of Torrance Boulevard, and west of Harbor Drive/Catalina Avenue (see map below), would revitalize approximately 35.6 acres of land and water by redeveloping and expanding local and visitor serving commercial uses, enhancing public access and recreational opportunities and facilities, and improving the aging support infrastructure and parking facilities. The project also proposes substantial improvements in site connectivity, public access and public views to and along the waterfront. The proposed project is specifically designed as a new waterfront village to reconnect the Pier and Harbor area with resident and visitor serving uses. As such, the proposed project seeks to integrate the best of the public and private needs and interests in a revitalized village providing broad coastal access and enjoyment. The proposed project is designed to reconnect the public with the waterfront and to help resolve a long-standing separation of uses and disconnection from the community.

The main components include proposed demolition of approximately 221,347 square feet of existing structures, demolition/renovation of the existing pier parking structure, and construction/renovation of up to approximately 523,732 square feet (289,906 square feet net new development) to include retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, a market hall, and a boutique hotel. The proposed project includes public recreation enhancements such as a new boat launch ramp, improvements to Seaside Lagoon, new parking facilities, and pedestrian and bicycle pathways. Site connectivity would be improved by the establishment of a new pedestrian bridge across the Redondo Beach Marina Basin 3 entrance and the reconnection of Pacific Avenue.

Based on the findings of the Initial Study prepared in conjunction with the NOP, the City has identified potential significant impacts for the following topics: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic and Utilities/Service Systems. A copy of the Initial Study and NOP can be reviewed at: City Hall, Community Development Department, 415 Diamond Street; City Clerk, 415 Diamond Street; Redondo Beach Public Library Main Branch, 303 N Pacific Coast Highway and North Branch, 2000 Artesia Boulevard; and online at www.redondo.org (follow link to Waterfront on Home Page). The documents referenced may be obtained at City Hall, Community Development Department, 415 Diamond Street, Door “E”.

The NOP public review period is scheduled from June 19, 2014 to July 21, 2014 (5:30 p.m.). However, Responsible Agencies and Trustee Agencies may submit their responses no later than 30 days after receipt of the NOP. Please send your response to Katie Owston, Project Planner at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California 90277 or katie.owston@redondo.org. Please provide your name or the name of a contact person in your agency. If you have questions, please contact Ms. Owston at (310) 318-0837, x1-2895.

A public scoping meeting/open house will be held on July 9, 2014, 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm at the Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center, 1935 Manhattan Beach Boulevard, Redondo Beach, CA 90278.
Comment on Waterfront Revitalization Project
Grellmann Hans [pvegrellmann@dslextreme.com]
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 2:24 PM
To: Katie Owston

I am not a resident of Redondo Beach, but I am a boatowner with a sailboat at King Harbor. I oppose the very large redevelopment project being planned for the harbor area. If built, I will boycott the development.

Hans Grellmann
Janet M. Griswold  
OWNER, VOTER in Residence  
650 THE VILLAGE #109  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277  
July 18, 2014

To those planning Redondo Redevelopment

1) Those attending preliminary planning meetings were in favor of:
   1) Bike path connecting Hermosa bike path to Redondo/Peninsula bike path
      South of Redondo Pier
   2) Redondo Pier to Hermosa—a sidewalk for families

No one spoke favoring a street
   for trucks and cars between
   Torrance Blvd and Redondo to Hermosa.
   Because, it to be viable it would
   have to be 4 lanes wide and then
   bike lane’s sidewalk
   
   There simply is not room.
   Weekend/holiday traffic to slow—
too congested, too polluting to
   residents above and too noisy!

2) All flat roofs, peaked roofs
   unnecessarily encroach into views.

Janet M. Griswold  
650 The Village  
July 18, 2014
Katie Owsen
Project Planner
415 Diamond
Redondo
Re: Corrected Email Address for Comments
Frank Groark [frank.groark@hotmail.com]
Sent:Thursday, July 10, 2014 5:21 PM
To: Bill Brand [bbrand@earthlink.net]; Katie Owston

Due to an incorrect email I believe my comments my not have been included in the record for the Wednesday night meeting on the harbor development EIR. If possible please add my comments to the record. I am out of town and could not appear in person.

Thanks,
Frank Groark

My comments:
I am a 34 year resident of Redondo Beach. I have owned 3 boats and kept them in King Harbor. I frequent the Redondo Pier, I run on the beach and walk ways. I am a consistent user of much of the Redondo Beach waterfront area. I do not support the CenterCal vision for developing Redondo Beach waterfront. We do not need another hotel that will limit residents access to the waterfront. We do not need a movie theater on the beachfront. We do not need retail shops catering to high end products on the beachfront. We do not need a multi story parking structure that will block views of the ocean. We do not need a developer that does not understand the value of the beachfront and harbor except for their vision of retail based income.

What we should strive for is a world class development based on positive environmental and ocean centric opportunities even if they do not provide the huge income payoffs that CenterCal and our city council desire. I can’t define exactly what the harbor and beachfront should look like, but I know that it is wrong minded to treat that precious area as another mall type retail centric development that benefits the developer much more than it benefits the residents of Redondo or our beach and ocean environment.

I adamantly oppose continuing the EIR on a project that is so diametrically opposed to creating a environmentally positive beachfront and ocean centric environment. The developer that the city council has selected does not have the correct experience or capability to develop our unique beach, ocean and harbor areas.

Please stop this project now and consider what is best for the residents of Redondo and our unique environmental resource that the ocean front represents.

Frank Groark
2500 Spreckels Lane
Redondo Beach
310-922-6234

Sent from my iPhone
Hello Everyone,

Unfortunately, the email address for where to send your written comments for the record that I copied and pasted into my previous email was wrong. Below is the correct one. Please resend your comments and submit for the record. Even if you testify tonight, which is much better, please be certain to submit a written comment as well. CC me if you don’t mind.

katie.owston@redondo.org

Thanks,

Bill
310-809-4405

Greetings Everyone,

Nothing could be more powerful and accurate than simply quoting one of the individuals most responsible for the overdevelopment plan slated for King Harbor.

Fred Bruning, CEO of CenterCal Properties, was quoted in the Easy Reader last week: “I believe a few people are really just looking for a way to stop any project, and are willing to bend the facts to suit their goals — a very ‘lightheaded’ approach to the truth.”

There you have it! If you’re against their plan that more than doubles development and guarantees them a 10% return before they pay a dime in rent to the City of Redondo, then you’re ‘lightheaded’ and against ‘any project.’

Come to the meeting this Wednesday, July 9th, 6-8pm, at the Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center at Aviation Blvd. and Manhattan Beach Blvd. This two hour window will be the publics’ only chance to make verbal comments on what issues the EIR (environmental impact report) should address. Two hours. That’s it!

Speak up or forever hold your peace. See below where to send written comments if you can’t make it. If you don’t mind, please cc me so I can share your comments. Everything will be part of the public record regardless.

Call anytime,

Bill
310-809-4405

What is an EIR?
An Environmental Impact Report is a scientific study and reporting of a project’s impact on the environment as required by the California Environmental Quality Act. Its purpose is to inform governmental agencies and the public of a project’s environmental impacts, as well as identify mitigations and alternatives to the plan that would reduce or eliminate environmental harms. An EIR is required if there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. After a draft of the EIR is prepared, it enters a 45 day public review period. The EIR is then amended according to input and submitted as a final report at which point the developer decides if and how the project will proceed. Appeals and litigation are permitted at any point throughout the process.

How do I provide input?

Email: katie.owston@redondo.org

Mail: Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Bill
310-809-4405
Hello Ms. Owston,

My name is Michael Hamilton and I own a condominium at Seascape II and the exact address is 110 The Village #402, Redondo Beach. My condo faces the ocean and is located in the upper most corner of the building at the corner of North Catalina and North Pacific Avenues.

Today I received the Notice of Preparation/Notice of Initial Study/Notice of Scoping Meeting regarding the proposed Redondo Waterfront Project. Although I understand the need for revitalization of the waterfront area, I want to know if the proposed Redondo Waterfront Project will impact my oceanview from my condominium.

Currently, my view is partially impacted by the Crown Plaza directly across from me as you will see in the attached photo as well as the attached document.

How can I obtain information regarding this project with proposed drawings and the impact to the complex where my property is located?

I appreciate your response.

Kind regards,

Michael Hamilton
kshamilton@cox.net
Waterfront Revitalization comments
Bruce Hazelton [bruce.hazelton1@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 4:32 PM
To: Katie Owston

Dear Ms. Owston,

Thank you for adding our comments and concerns regarding the proposed Waterfront project to our fellow residents' point of views.

Environmental Impact Report Concerns:

1. Building height. As proposed the two-story buildings will adversely impact neighbors in the condominiums to the east. The massive block of structural concrete will negatively harm citizens' right to light and ocean breeze.
2. The construction will also cause significant air, water and noise pollution. This is very concerning to both humans and animal/sea life. What will be done to make sure animals and humans are protected? Will you hire marine biologists? Noise abatement experts? Therapists?
3. The buildings themselves do NOT reflect the historic nature of the Pier. As indicated in the EIR, there is a significant concern that the development will destroy historic buildings, land. The current renderings do NOT reflect the charm and history of our city. They are generic office buildings that are fine inland, but DO NOT enhance the ocean setting. GENERIC. There needs to be open space that supports ocean health--not more shops. This is a prime location that can educate the public about responsibility. As is, this plan merely promotes consumerism.
4. The hotel: How will this help residents? Economically, yes. But the hotel will cater to affluent people. It isn't for residents. As is, at least the plaza can be utilized by residents. This needs to be a PUBLIC ACCESS area. Not a hotel. A concrete block, multistoried building, will hurt views and accessibility to residents.
5. The Seaside Lagoon: I would not want my grandson swimming in a sea water pond that emptied into the well-traveled marina. The boat launch is right next to the new Lagoon. Oils? Gas? Trash? No, this is not well planned and not healthy for children.
6. Mice, rats, dust will all end up in our neighborhoods to the east during demolition. What will be done to stop that? How will we be ensured that we will not be impacted?
7. We are very concerned about the proposed Pacific Avenue road. Back in the day, before the condominiums, there was room for a road. As is, the road will cause congestion/pollution/and hurt access to the waterfront for pedestrians. We live along the coast. People should be walking and biking, not driving their cards. I’m all for pedestrian and cycling paths--but no road. It takes up precious space.
8. Visual clutter: The current rendering shows a lot of buildings, a lot of visual clutter that will look old and dated in 10 years: Buildings with retail and shop space. What happens when they go out of business? Been there done that with the current waterfront. The buildings are too high and too crammed impacting the longing for nature, the desire to be outdoors, it's like Universal Walk or the Del Amo Mall. The density of the project will adversely impact the environment. The scale is environmentally dominating.

I have been a Redondo Beach resident for 58 years. I work here, all of my family has gone to school here. I shop here. Live in an historic home blocks from the Pier. I have every reason in the world to want change and improvement. I love this city, as do all members of my family. We hope that our concerns, along with the fears of neighbors, will be taken into account and acted upon accordingly. We are grateful for the opportunity to provide
feedback and pray it doesn't fall on deaf ears. Together, we're better.

Look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Janet Barker, Bruce Hazelton, Katie Kwok
510 Garnet Street
Redondo Beach CA 90277

Wendy Barker and Beverly Nollner
714 Paulina Ave.
Redondo Beach CA 90277
Katie Owston

From: Maggie Healy <maggiethealy@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 01, 2014 2:15 PM
To: Katie Owston
Subject: Re: Waterfront Project

Katie,
Thank you so much for your response to my inquiry regarding the Waterfront Project. I did note that the EIR includes a "traffic impact analysis" but it seemed to address a very limited area, major intersections. Do you know if it will address the impacts on residential streets off of Torrance Blvd, East and West of PCH? Especially those used for egress. I also did not see where the EIR addresses parking.
Maggie

-----Original Message-----
From: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>
To: 'Maggie Healy' <maggiethealy@aol.com>
Sent: Tue, Jul 1, 2014 11:32 am
Subject: RE: Waterfront Project

Thank you for your response to the Notice of Preparation for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/ Notice of Initial Study/Notice of Scoping Meeting for The Waterfront project. Your comments will be included as part of the public record with all comments received during the scoping process to help determine the scope and content of the EIR.

Please visit the City’s website at www.redondo.org and follow the link to the Waterfront on the home page for more information. Also, I encourage you to attend the scoping meeting/open house to be held on July 9, 2014 from 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m., at the Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center, 1935 Manhattan Beach Blvd., Redondo Beach, CA 90278. A short presentation will be given at 6:15 p.m.

As detailed in the Notice, if you have additional comments, they will be accepted at the scoping meeting and by email and mail through 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.

Please note, the EIR will be including a traffic impact analysis and detailed information on parking.

Katie Owston
Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
Community Development Department
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
310-318-0637, 1-2895

From: Maggie Healy [mailto:maggiethealy@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2014 5:11 PM
To: Katie Owston
Subject: Waterfront Project

Hello Ms. Owston,
In scanning the online document (albeit a quick scan), I didn't see an indication of how many parking spaces will replace the current 1300 spaces, can you provide any details on parking plans? Also, the EIR does not appear to address traffic
and parking impacts in surrounding neighborhoods (especially those adjacent to Torrance Blvd and PCH.) Can you point me to any details that address or plans to study such impacts? or is it not part of the study? Thank you for any information you can provide!
Maggie Healy
Redondo Beach resident and retired City employee

http://www.eset.com
Dear Katie—and everyone else concerned with this project—

My husband and I are very excited about the plan to renovate the pier area. We go to the pier at least 3-4 times a week and understand that it needs some upgrading. We are thrilled with the idea of a pedestrian bridge linking the pier and the marina. Right now you have to go through a couple of parking lots to do that. However, we would hate to see the area become too upscale; we have Manhattan Beach for that. The wonderful thing about the pier is that everyone, all kinds of people, feel comfortable going there. I would hate to lose this feeling.

Another concern is the construction period. Can you do it one segment at a time, so as not to impact too deeply the life that goes on there right now?

We will be watching and hoping that the plans maintain this openness to all kinds of people. I know that you plan on more open space—that is a wonderful goal. I hope it doesn’t get compromised.

Sincerely,
Ann Marie and Jay Hebert

555 Esplanade #416
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Hi Katie,

I was unable to attend the meeting concerning the redevelopment of the harbor area. I read about it in the paper and hence I am adding my comments. I happen to think it is a great idea and concept! Redondo has gone on for too long nursing its current facilities down at the pier and harbor. I have been in facilities work for over 30 years and I have seen the current buildings, parking structure, pier elevator and old escalator fall into disrepair and either be abandoned or become an eyesore. It is high time Redondo Beach regained its glory from the early part of the 1900s when the Red Car used to bring people in and we were a destination to be proud of. Don't get me wrong, I'm not that old, but I know our city history. Let me know if I can help in any way to achieve this goal.

Yes, there will be congestion, but there is today as well. No pain, no gain. I think most of us in the City of Redondo Beach would put up with a little more traffic to ultimately gain such a beautiful pier area.

Sincerely,
Terry Hind
e-mail: wilobe7462@yahoo.com
The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com
Development
Darlene Holy oak [darlene90277@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 2:18 PM
To: Katie Owston

I agree that the harbor area needs to be revitalized. I am a longtime Redondo Beach resident.
I am concerned about the traffic control in the Center Cal development. What will be in place to prevent vehicles from joyriding on the proposed through road, creating pollution and noise, not more business? What will be the view from east looking west? Above ground parking structures are not a pretty sight. If those close to the development suffer property devaluation, who will move in to sustain the upscale retail? Please consider the noise, congestion and view blocking of this proposed development. The last development on top of the pier garages failed.
If indeed more people will come from outside the city because of this project, consider the impact on city roads and the larger police force needed for public safety.

Thank you,
Darlene Holubiak
Lifelong resident

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.
My suggestion about the shopping mall is to open a store outlets. People come to store outlets from far distances for bargains. these outlets are for expensive items. ordinary stores will not bring business. Also next meeting there should be 3-d views of the development with elevations so a common person can understand it. 99.9 percent people do not understand the drawings with plan view only. Also I will like to have a aesthetics study for this project. I live in The village and have paid tons of money for the view. If my view is obstructed then my answer for this project is NO. Thanks.

Surjit S. Hora
Dear Ms. Owston:

I am not a public agency, just a proud citizen of Redondo Beach -- who moved here years ago to escape the congestion of Los Angeles and the Westside. What concerns me, and what I hope will be addressed in EIR(s), is the effect this development and its future use as a business & tourist mecca will have on parking and traffic in adjacent areas.

Has an individual traffic/parking impact report been requested as part of the EIR?

We who live on either side of Torrance Boulevard, as well as north and south of Pacific Coast Highway are well aware of the traffic and parking impact during the summer, as well as key holidays like Memorial Day, Fourth of July and Labor Day. A few days out of the year is tolerable. My fear, however, is that those of us tax-paying citizens who call South Redondo Beach home, will end up in the type of maelstrom common to Santa Monica, Marina del Rey, and even Manhattan Beach.

If you would be so kind as to refer my concerns to the proper party or parties for response, I'd be grateful.

Yours truly with thanks,

Leslie G. Jacobs
Fw: King Harbor development
earthgirl7@earthlink.net
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 4:49 PM
To: Katie Owston

-----Forwarded Message-----
From: earthgirl7@earthlink.net
Sent: Jul 8, 2014 4:18 PM
To: katie.owston@redondobeach.org
Cc: bbrand@earthlink.net
Subject: King Harbor development

Here is my public comment on the King Harbor project.

This project should not happen. It will cause all kinds of traffic, vehicular and human, and add to the pollution already there. It is way too much for our small community, and it will ruin the essence of Redondo Beach. It will destroy the small businesses, and Harbor activities, like the summer concerts. Any money that comes from it is not worth the cost in the environment, ground, air and ocean.

Please reconsider and cancel this development, this overkill of development, now. It is not worth it.

Thank you,

Renee Jeska
Torrance resident, but a Redondo Beach-goer.
Comments: We hope this is more than an empty ritual.

1. Population/Housing: Should be considered because it directly and indirectly affect other considerations (i.e., traffic, transportation, noise, public services).

2. More tourist attractions in the area will inevitably mean more people, more cars (traffic congestion) and more pollution.

3. The additional construction will deprive many residents of an ocean view.

4. Creating a duplicate of Manhattan Beach will lower the quality of life of many Redondo Beach residents with any compensatory benefits.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Dear Ms. Owston:

I understand that you're asking for more community response regarding the proposed mall that we're also supposed to call by another name but I can't remember what it is.

I'm for reinvigorating the pier area but in a conscious and sustainable way. I feel that we can be leaders into the future. I can't imagine how the EPA (or whatever body regulates this area) could possibly put through what the developer is proposing.

People are feeling defeated and as if all these meetings we've been attending are a sham. It's being pushed through as if it's a done deal. On a feeling level, I can't understand why or council people would sell us out like this...and I'm glad they weren't Kennedy's advisers during the Cuban Missile Crisis. I hope greater minds, with more complex thinking, (not based on immediate gratification or greed) will prevail.

Thank you,
Lorrie Kazan
Redondo Beach resident
Katie,

Here is what was distributed to the Boating and Harbor Community, to solicit inputs.

Mark
Mark Hansen
Chair
King Harbor Boater's Advisory Panel
310-601-0710 C

SEE ATTACHMENTS

Waterfront Revitalization
Environmental Impact Report
Public Scoping Meeting
July 9 – Wednesday
6:00 pm to 8:00 pm
RB Performing Arts Center
1935 Manhattan Beach Blvd.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for The Waterfront project. Excerpts from Notice follow.

Your comments on the environmental scope of the EIR are requested so that the EIR may be prepared in light of the concerns of the community and surrounding areas.

The project includes demolition of ~220k square feet of existing structures, including the pier parking structure, and the construction of ~524k square feet of new development, to include retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, a market hall, and a boutique hotel. The proposed project includes public recreation enhancements, such as a new boat launch ramp, improvements to Seaside Lagoon (opening up to harbor), new parking facilities, and pedestrian and bicycle pathways. Site connectivity would be improved by the establishment of a new pedestrian bridge across the Marina Basin 3 entrance and the reconnection of Pacific Avenue.

The Initial Study and NOP are posted at:
www.redondo.org/civica/inc/displayblobpdf2.asp?BlobID=27706

The NOP public review period is scheduled from June 19, 2014 to July 21, 5:30 pm

Please send responses to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
415 Diamond St., Redondo Beach, CA 90277 or katie.owston@redondo.org
For questions, contact Ms. Owston at (310) 318-0637, x1-2895

OVERFLOW PARKING - BOAT RAMP
REQUIRED TO MITIGATE IMPACTS ON RECREATION AND TRAFFIC

https://mail.redondo.org/owa/?ae=Item&t=IPM.Note&id=RgAAADazFsWF94SLhgoKl5fOU1BwAH6prw3D6WSZ4Q2tfAeBeMAAAAmCN5AAAH6prw3D6WS…
Boater Input Meeting on Boat Ramp - February 6 - KHBAP Report - Excerpts

It was acknowledged that the South Turning Basin is currently regularly used for the dropping of sails on larger boats, and for both youth and adult sailing instruction. The firm suggested that, in order to minimize the outward incursion into the Harbor, and to preserve the most navigable water in the Basin, the Boat Ramp could potentially be located within a "subtraction" into the land of the Mole. Of course, this would have some impact on the available parking space.

Boater Input Meeting on Boat Ramp - February 27 – KHBAP Report - Excerpts

Overflow Parking

Over time, demand will likely result in our contemplated two (2) lanes being very highly utilized. DBW directs: “The typical minimum parking requirement per launching lane is 20-30 car/trailer spaces.” In order to meet the expected demand on peak days, sixty (60) spaces may eventually be required. The marine engineering firm has indicated that the site can [only] accommodate forty-plus parking spaces.

In order to minimize incursion into the busy Turning Basin, the engineers have suggested that the ramp could potentially be set into a "subtraction" into the land. This concept has been favorably received by the boating community. However, this would obviously [further] reduce the space available for parking. If boaters wish to preserve navigable water in the basin, and meet the peak parking demand in the future, overflow parking outside of the site will be required.

The City and the Waterfront Developer can be engaged to help identify overflow-parking options.

RB CITY COUNCIL - MARCH 18 - BOAT LAUNCH FACILITY - FEASIBILITY STUDY - Excerpts

The public outreach included meetings on February 6 & 27 as well as two visits to the Harbor Commission. These meetings were attended primarily by members of the boating community who provided valuable input regarding the details of potential boat ramp configuration as well as insights related to water and land side traffic patterns and conditions in the Harbor.

During the brainstorming session, participants were broken into groups to consolidate preferences. Sailors [One Input] - Minimize encroachment of the boat ramp facility into the turning basin

Notice provided courtesy of the King Harbor Boater's Advisory Panel

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for The Waterfront project. The proposed project is located south of Portofino Way, north of Torrance Boulevard, and west of Harbor Drive/Catalina Avenue.

Your comments on the environmental scope of the EIR are requested so that the EIR may be prepared in light of the concerns of the community and surrounding areas.

The project would revitalize approximately 35.6 acres of land and water by redeveloping and expanding local and visitor serving commercial uses, enhancing public access and recreational opportunities and facilities, and improving the aging support infrastructure and parking facilities. The project also proposes substantial improvements in site connectivity, public access and public views to and along the waterfront. The proposed project is specifically designed as a new waterfront village to reconnect the Pier and Harbor area with resident and visitor serving uses.

It includes demolition of approximately 221,347 square feet of existing structures, demolition and renovation of the existing pier parking structure, and construction/renovation of up to approximately 523,732 square feet (289,906 square feet net new development) to include retail, restaurant, creative office, specialty cinema, a market hall, and a boutique hotel. The proposed project includes public recreation enhancements such as a new boat launch ramp, improvements to Seaside Lagoon, new parking facilities, and pedestrian and bicycle pathways. Site connectivity would be improved by the establishment of a new pedestrian bridge across the Marina Basin 3 entrance and the reconnection of Pacific Avenue.

The City has identified potential significant impacts for the following topics: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic and Utilities/Service Systems.

The Initial Study and NOP are posted at: www.redondo.org/civica/inc/displayblobpdf2.asp?BlobID=27706

The NOP public review period is scheduled from June 19, 2014 to July 21, 5:30 pm

Please send responses to: Katie Owston, Project Planner
415 Diamond St., Redondo Beach, CA 90277 or katie.owston@redondo.org
For questions, contact Ms. Owston at (310) 318-0637, x1-2895
Based on the findings of the Initial Study prepared in conjunction with the NOP, the City has identified potential significant impacts for the following topics: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology/Water Quality, Noise, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic and Utilities/Service Systems.

Boater Input Meeting on Boat Ramp - February 6 - KHBAP Report - Excerpt

It was acknowledged that the South Turning Basin is currently regularly used for the dropping of sails on larger boats, and for both youth and adult sailing instruction. The firm suggested that, in order to minimize the outward incursion into the Harbor, and to preserve the most navigable water in the Basin, the Boat Ramp could potentially be located within a “subtraction” into the land of the Mole. Of course, this would have some impact on the available parking space.

Boater Input Meeting on Boat Ramp - February 27 – KHBAP Report - Excerpt

Overflow Parking

Boaters, located closer to King Harbor than Marina Del Rey or Long Beach, will prefer to use this ramp. The Long Beach area has two sand-launch facilities and four ramp-launch facilities. The ramp-launch facilities each have four lanes, for a total of sixteen (16) ramp-launch lanes. Marina de Rey has one sand-launch facility and one ramp-launch facility with eight (8) ramp-launch lanes. Over time, demand will likely result in our contemplated two (2) lanes being very highly utilized.

DBW directs: “The typical minimum parking requirement per launching lane is 20-30 car/trailer spaces.” In order to meet the expected demand on peak days, sixty (60) spaces may eventually be required.

The marine engineering firm has indicated that the site can accommodate forty-plus parking spaces. In order to minimize incursion into the busy Turning Basin, the engineers have suggested that the ramp could potentially be set into a “subtraction” into the land. This concept has been favorably received by the boating community. However, this would obviously further reduce the space available for parking. The engineers can certainly satisfy the scope of work, and design a ramp within the footprint of the site, including the minimalist forty parking spaces. However, if boaters wish to preserve navigable water in the basin, and meet the peak parking demand in the future, overflow parking outside of the site will be required. The City and the Waterfront Developer can be engaged to help identify overflow-parking options.

RB CITY COUNCIL - MARCH 18 - BOAT LAUNCH FACILITY - FEASIBILITY STUDY - Excerpts

The public outreach to date has included meetings on February 6 and 27 as well as two visits to the Harbor Commission in January and February. These meetings were attended primarily by members of the boating community who provided valuable input regarding the details of potential boat ramp configuration as well as insights related to water and land-side traffic patterns and conditions in the Harbor.

During the brainstorming session, participants were broken into groups for purposes of consolidating preferences. [Fishing Club / Power Boaters / Sailors / Human-powered Group] Sailors [Input] - Minimize encroachment of the boat ramp facility into the turning basin
Waterfront Revitalization

Proposal includes a new Public Boat Launch Ramp and Seaside Lagoon opened to the Harbor for Paddle Sports
Seaside Lagoon Rendering
"Written Comment" RE: Proposed King Harbor Development
Al Lay [al_lay@hotmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, July 13, 2014 3:38 PM
To: Katie Owston; Steve Aspel; Jeff Ginsburg; Bill Brand; Pat Aust; Stephen Sammarco; Matt Kilroy
Importance: High

Members of the Redondo Beach City Council,

Redondo Beach does NOT need an over-developed "Mega Mall" on its water front... Period.

I have lived in the South Bay for 42 years, and I am personally sick & tired of all the "OVER-DEVELOPMENT" done in the name of "progress" and "betterment" for our community.

Why must everything be so BIG? Why must everything that has been for so many years be DESTROYED to make way for something new & untested?

It seems to me that "Greed" must be the name of this old & tired game, and, as usual, the proponents of the "Mega Mall" insist that we swallow this bitterest of pills with a smile and listen to them because they know what's best for you & me.

In fact, Fred Bruning, CEO of CenterCal Properties, took a very disrespectful step further when he was quoted in the Easy Reader last week as saying: "I believe a few people are really just looking for a way to stop any project, and are willing to bend the facts to suit their goals — a very ‘lightheaded’ approach to the truth."

Who does Mr. Bruning think he is? He has some nerve to speak about the majority of the people who live & grew up here in such an arrogant & flippant manner.

He would like for all of us to just shut up, and take "what's best for us," which is a "Mega Mall" that will destroy our beloved King Harbor as we've known it, and replace it with something that will not benefit the community in the long-term, but will no doubt make him (and others) a lot of money in the short-term.

I emphatically repeat:

Redondo Beach does NOT need an over-developed "Mega Mall" on its water front... Period.

Sincerely,

Al Lay
Concerned Citizen, South Bay of L.A.
Dear Ms. Owston,

I'm a homeowner at the Village Condos and I'm very concerned about the Development project that is proposed for the RB Pier. I live here in South Redondo because I enjoy the Quality of Life and slower pace that the other beach cities. Having a Mall built can ONLY degrade the Quality of Life for everyone that lives nearby. Traffic can ONLY get worse, Traffic noise can ONLY get worse, Air pollution can ONLY get worse, and all of this can ONLY lead to a more STRESSFUL life living in South Redondo. The traffic is already bad enough in the area but adding a Mall will make Catalina ave. and PeH a parking lot. We DO NOT NEED This !!!!
I would rather pay more in taxes than raise my STRESS Level and lower my Quality of Life.

When is enough enough?? It's always about more. We DON'T need more, We need less, less traffic, less noise pollution, less stress, and a better Quality of Life!!

Sincerely,

Mark Levy

____________ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10136 (20140722) ______________

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com
To the city officials, Center Cal and South Bay neighbors-

As a Director of eCommerce and Retail Operations for an established (30+ years) local consumer electronics company and enjoying a very successful 25 year retail career including long stints at Macy’s, Neiman Marcus and Virgin Megastores (entertainment retail), I was very interested in the development proposal that has been presented by CenterCal. I live retail, I know business and among other responsibilities, I have negotiated mall lease agreements. There are many red flags raised with this Waterfront Development Plan.

If you review Center Cal’s Properties and prior projects, their core competencies include outlet mall, grocery store and big box shopping experiences. They have little experience in Waterfront development or boutiques. I am hoping that this will not prove detrimental and that they will keep this project in line with the culture of Redondo Beach.

If you have spent any time at the pier, it is evident that opening high end boutiques is very aspirational and not pragmatic. Count the storefront vacancies in Manhattan Beach, Redondo Beach and Hermosa Beach. 2 long-established boutiques that catered to the Manhattan Beach set – Magpies and Christie’s – went out of business because of the lack of local support. Mysterious Galaxy Bookstore in Redondo couldn't make it work. And in case you aren't aware- brick & mortar businesses are slowly dying as more people transition to online retail.

Redondo’s clientele is very different- which will take many years to change the shopping behavior. It took 15 years+ for Hermosa’s Pier to evolve and many of the stores continue to rotate in & out of business. Please take that in consideration.

I would encourage honoring the established restaurants that currently drive locals to the pier. This would include Naja’s that enjoys a great South Bay following, Old Tony’s & Captain Kidd’s. Reach out to those local successful restaurants that you would want to
replicate at the Pier. Hudson House, The Standing Room (ooops- Hermosa Beach snagged them), Chez Melange, Eat at Joes, Original Pancake House, Riveria Mexican Grill, ortega120, Catalina Coffee and Good Stuff. Ask the owners of Fringe, Maison Luxe, Tabula Rasa why their businesses are thriving. Understand what they would need in order to open a location at the Pier. These local businesses would be able to give the council concise information on how to be successful at the new waterfront development. Residents would be thrilled as they want to maintain a local flavor on the Pier.

People travel west to the beach to enjoy the view and experience nature. Building structures that block scenic ocean views and creates more vehicle traffic just replicates what most people are trying to escape inland. Visitors to the beach aren’t interested in shopping and the movies- they want something that they can’t get east of PCH- ocean breezes, a sunset cocktail, bike routes, and easy access to the water while creating great memories with their families. A shopping mall and parking structure won't provide these. It will just increase the traffic logjam on PCH and deter residents from spending their money locally.

We need to protect our waterfront and make that the centerpiece of the development. We don’t need a movie theater (ask Del Amo & South Bay Galleria how a theater impacts crime statistics) at the beach. Those activities can be reserved for inland cities that don’t have a spectacular waterfront and the history of sun, surf and sailing that we have in Redondo. We don’t need fast food chains on the waterfront either. If Redondo Beach truly wants to be a blue zone city, then the leaders need to keep fast food off the pier and trade cars for a bike path that will allow residents from Torrance to Santa Monica make the Redondo Pier a destination.

Where there is no vision, the people perish. I expect our council to have a vision and demand that Center Cal will execute a well thought out blueprint that will enhance the quality of life for those who live, work, visit and play in our community. We deserve a project that Redondo can be proud of. You are the leaders. The citizens of Redondo Beach are asking you to lead. Thank you for your time.

Best, Maureen & Bill Lewis
Hermosa Beach, CA
Dear Ms. Owston,

My family and I are gravely concerned about Center Cal's Mega-Development plan for King Harbor. Re: the Environmental Impact, such a massive development will negatively impact our waterfront by 1) creating a new street bringing cars closer to the condominiums and harbor, 2) increasing the traffic several times over current traffic to the pier and 3) straining the city's sewage and utility systems.

Additionally, such a "mall" development will destroy the unique charm of the harbor/pier waterfront. (Cf: Hermosa Beach and Manhattan Beach-- neither beach town puts a mall on it's waterfront). Let the beach and harbor be the main attractions, not a multi-plex-Del Amo mall.

Moreover, this Center Cal development, with it's multi-storied buildings, will block the views of many homeowners, thereby lowering
property values and angering many voters, such as my family.

It is time to consider alternative, smaller development project designs, such as the two that Jim Light has offered. Modernization can be done but not over-scaled and shoe-horned into a small waterfront acreage.

Why should Center Cal be the only design that is considered? Why should Center Cal decide the scale/size of the development?

Thank you.

Cordially,

Diane, Roberto, Natalie and Kathleen Liberman (4 Registered Voters)
101 South Guadalupe Ave.
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
For the public record on the CenterCal Mall project.

The attached graphic overlays the current boundary of Seaside Lagoon Park and the boundary of the water area on the CenterCal Mall Plan submitted to City Council. This graphic very clearly shows the encroachment of retail/restaurant uses and the new internal street onto what is now public Seaside Lagoon park space... effectively and substantively decreasing the usable park space. Public testimony and documents show there is discussion about hand launching boats and SUP’s from this site. The end result is coastal dependent recreational uses are being crammed together in a much, much smaller space, with no drop off or surface level parking allocated. This is a clear violation of the City’s Local Coastal Plan and the California Coastal Act.

Why do residents have to show these inconsistencies? Why is City Staff and the City Council not correcting these blatant violations prior to an EIR?

Jim Light
310-989-3332
Sea Lion Impacts

Light, Jim [jim.light@linquest.com]
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2014 1:03 PM
To: Katie Owston; Eleanor Manzano; Steve Aspel; Stephen Sammarco; Matt Kilroy; Jeff Ginsburg; Pat Aust; Bill Brand
Cc: James Light [jim.light1@verizon.net]

For the Public record on the CenterCal Mall IES:

In addition to the other submissions by myself/BBR on behalf of the people of Redondo, the EIR should evaluate the potential and impacts of sea lions using the Seaside Lagoon once open. In La Jolla, sea lions began using Casa Beach, also called Children’s Pool, to give birth, nurse their young, and train them. Sea Lions using shallow beach areas in harbors has been documented as well. Below is a photo of a Sea Lion suffering from domoic acid poisoning at Mothers Beach in Marina Del Rey.

The Marine Mammal Protection Act would likely prevent disturbing the sea lions if this were to occur in Seaside Lagoon and thus, we would lose the ability to effectively use the Seaside Lagoon beach area and waters.

Jim Light
310-989-3332

© 2011 P. WALLERSTEIN
EIR / WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
LJRLA@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2014 9:36 PM
To: Katie Owston

Ms. Owston...
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My main concerns are:

How is this oversized, unneeded and mostly unwanted development going to affect the surrounding coastal areas and the near by inland cities.

Including:

Air pollution
Noise pollution
Access to and use of this area for ALL, not just the “upscale”
Plus all of the already listed environmental issues.

The Pier area is already over max occupation on holidays; as an example this past July 4th there was a fire at one of the restaurants, about in the middle of the straight pier, if it had been worst there could very well have been an unknown numbers of injuries and/or fatalities.

When the fireworks were over the entrance/exit out of the Pier and surrounding areas took about one and a half hours (1&1/2 hr) to return to normal light traffic out of the parking garage by the cars and pedestrians off the Pier. The road into the parking and around the upper Pier was blocked with about 5 to 7 fire engines and at least 8 police cars and maybe 1 EMS truck. Fortunately no one was hurt; the fire was small and contained, WHAT IF IT HAD NOT BEEN SO QUICKLY CONTAINED AND BECAME OUT-OF-CONTROL AND LARGER!!!. I was there and witnessed this myself.*

Even though there will be two entrances/exits to this area it will also be at least twice the buildings but many more people, cars and other vehicles, etc.

I feel the developer, the mayor and most of the city council are taking a big risk with our safety and our very lives.

PLEASE TAKE THE TIME TO INVESTIGATE THESE VERY REAL SAFETY ISSUES.
*See small attached picture, it is difficult to tell what is happening but take a good long look and image flames rising up above the buildings on the Pier or the Boardwalk area.

Gretchen Lloyd
310-376-5223

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com
The entire project takes away what Redondo Beach is. We are not Manhattan Beach. All of us residents know a mall will fail. I believe the project will progress but I strongly feel the integrity of Redondo will be lost.

Marita Majka

Sent from my iPhone
FW : EIR Scoping Process Comments

Diana Mann [dmann90277@hotmail.com]

Sent: Friday, July 11, 2014 6:39 PM
To: Katie Owston
Cc: jm_mann@hotmail.com

Dear Ms. Owston:

We are the owners of and reside at 230 The Village #302, Redondo Beach, CA 90277, a condominium in Seascape I. Our home tel. no. is 424-257-8542. Our comments are as follows:

Land Use/Planning and Recreation

People come to the ocean side at Redondo Beach to enjoy the ocean and ocean-related activities, not to shop or see movies.

Some improvements to the waterfront would be good, improvements that take advantage of its location next to the ocean. The Center Cal project would block access to and even sight of the ocean. It treats the waterfront as if it were a piece of open land in an inland suburb. Retail stores, offices, a cinema -- these have nothing to do with the ocean or ocean-related activities. The project should be scaled down substantially and tailored to take advantage of the great natural resource we are fortunate to have right on our doorstep -- the Pacific Ocean.

Furthermore, we encourage you to do a complete study of proposed sight lines. Czuleger Park views are supposed to be protected according to Measure G. When one sits in the park and looks down the hill at the ocean it is impossible to imagine those views not being completely obliterated by the "Market Hall" and all the retail and restaurant buildings they are proposing to build in that space. A 37 foot height limitation will completely remove the vistas of the water inlet, the boats, kayaks, crew teams, and paddle boards passing by, which is one of the most peaceful and beautiful experiences one can enjoy in Redondo Beach. This development will take that away completely according to the drawings.

Transportation/Traffic, Noise, and Hazards

A particularly objectionable feature of the project is the proposed "connecting" road. This will substantially impair the quality of life of local residents. Motorcycles, delivery trucks, and the constant hum of minivans, other recreational vehicles, and cars are what we can expect. The road makes access to Harbor drive a straight cut-through from Torrance Blvd. . . . . a perfect shortcut for north and southbound commuters trying to avoid traffic on PCH and Catalina. This would essentially enclose the entire Village community which would no longer be a beach front community and would instead become a condominium development surrounded by constant noise and traffic. Sound travels upward from the bottom of the hill. The noise would be deafening, would severely affect the quality of life and would reduce property values.

And there is no need for such a road. The distance it would go is just a short -- and pleasant -- walk (or bike ride)
for anyone moving north or south in the waterfront area. A road would be annoying even to the people the project aims to attract. Who wants to walk alongside traffic, or to have to cross a road? What about the families with young children or strollers? A promenade passing alongside the boats makes far more sense than a road.

Respectfully submitted,

John and Diana Mann
Hello Katie,

I have many concerns about the proposed extensive development for the Redondo Pier. Certainly, it needs to be revitalized, and the improvements that have been made so far are good. Redondo Beach's pier and beach area have always been wonderful for families of all ages and nationalities. Turning this area into a very upscale shopping and dining experience isn't appropriate. Rivera Village is close by which offers those facilities. Many families enjoy our pier and beach that couldn't afford expensive restaurants and shops. Are we going to take away this enjoyment for hundreds of people so a small majority can have a nice "out on the town".

Remember, the beach and pier area are for ALL the people, not just some of the people.

Martha Shaver  
565 Esplanade #316  
Redondo Beach, CA
Hello,
I am a resident of Redondo Beach. I currently live at the Village complex, in building 660. I have been following the proposed CenterCal project carefully, as I would be directly affected by the proposal, but even more importantly, paying attention to the impact on the current community.

There is no question that the Redondo Pier and Harbor area could benefit from a "facelift." Some of this has already started and has seemed to make a difference in the number of people coming to the pier area. However, I have great concerns about the proposed CenterCal project and how it would impact our community. I think a much smaller scale, environmentally friendly project that seeks to maintain the focus on the natural ocean beauty, while providing a more walkable, neighborhood-friendly area, should be the current focus of this project.

I have been a resident of the South Bay since 1999. I have lived in Manhattan Beach, Hermosa, and Redondo. I have seen what new development has done to Manhattan and Hermosa, and while increasing business, has also contributed to traffic, pollution, difficult parking and access for residents, and increased crime. I have the same concerns for Redondo should the project as planned were to go forward. I do not understand the need for a movie theater at the beach (how about an outdoor concert area instead!!) or big-name retailers that just make this another generic place to shop. There is so much potential for charm and individuality in this area. The Redondo Riviera Village is a much better example of how independent stores and restaurants can thrive and contribute to the community and maintain a special, unique place that attracts people to shop there often.

My biggest concern is the road connection proposal between Torrance blvd (pier area) to the Marina, going behind the Village condominiums. Quite frankly, this would be a DISASTER. We enjoy peace, quiet and tranquility in walking behind this area now, between the pier and the condos. To put in a road that has constant traffic would increase noise, pollution, and frankly RUIN what is a beautiful peaceful area to live. I cannot think of a WORSE idea. It would be easy enough to build an underground parking structure that connects the areas, and that's close to what exists now. More important that a ROAD is to improve the WALKING access at the pier/marina/harbor area so that people can bike and stroll along the ocean (and not back along the parking garage as they do now). P

PLEASE listen to the residents of Redondo Beach on this issue. This is such a great opportunity to improve the neighborhood and bring in good businesses and the type of clientele that would improve the area. Please remember the people LIVING here who have invested money, time, and energy into the community, and want to have a beautiful PEACEFUL area to live in harmony with the pier and marina. The current CenterCal plan is truly a monstrosity and a huge disappointment to everyone.

Find a company that can create a vision in harmony with the environment and the people that live here. Then you will see people rally in huge numbers behind it.

Sincerely,
Mary McCulley
660 The Village,
#303
Redondo Beach, CA
90277
Dear Ms. Owston........I'm extremely concerned about this proposed re-development of our Pier area as I can only imagine the increase in traffic congestion, air pollution and noise just to list a few....I've lived in the Village Condos since 1976 and I bought for the peace and quiet and the ocean view. When I look at the proposed plan all I see is a "horror story"....I'm not alone with this view and find it deplorable that the city will not allow us to vote upon this project....Sincerely, Ms. Vesta McDermott
King Harbor Development
Im2iris [im2iris@aol.com]
Sent:Wednesday, July 09, 2014 5:29 PM
To: Katie Owston

Mayor Aspel and City Council:

NO NO NO to CenterCal Properties.

Think small and beautiful for our city and our people. Think Catalina Island. Think Paris.

Iris McKinley
1400 EsplanadRedondo Beach, C310 792 0090
Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

Concrete produces the second most amount of methane gas emissions. I believe it is more cost effective to restore and fortify the existing parking structures and to remodel the public bathrooms.

It would be a travesty to demolish the lower level and construct a ‘road’. The bars, shops and fish market make this walk way unique, authentic and ‘funky’. However, the public bathrooms on that level do need to be remodeled. Buying eysters and crab and eating them on the tables has been our family tradition since the ‘60’s. We don’t need Disneyland at the Beach 2!

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Dear Council:

I am very concerned about the environmental impact the proposed expansion of the waterfront buildings will have on the city. There has been a high vacancy rate in the present buildings. To more than double the space almost certainly will result in an even greater number of vacancies, and this not only will look depressing, but also is likely to lead to a higher crime rate.

The proposal to put a street through the development is ill-advised because of the increased risk of pedestrian accidents when crossing the street. There is no problem now walking from one end to the other; it is only a block, and it is not necessary to dodge cars. The street means reduced space for enjoying the waterfront, contaminated air from car and truck emissions, and probable traffic and pedestrian accidents.

The Seaside Lagoon has been a popular place for years and has the advantage of not fighting with the ocean. An open pathway invites considerable opportunity for serious problems of erosion.

The boutique hotel is not needed because another one is already being built at the other end of the project, and there are 3 other hotels already in the immediate vicinity.

The destruction of the entire existing pier stores and parking structure will result in a tremendous amount of dust and contamination and is wasteful of resources. Remodeling would be far less intrusive on the environment and much less disruptive of businesses.

Yours truly,

Margaret McWilliams, Ph.D., R.D.
114A S. Guadalupe
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Myra Mendoza
Organization (optional):
Address: 2615 Carnegie Lane, Redondo Beach
Zip Code: 90278
Phone (optional): (303) 738-5457
E-mail (optional): keran510@yahoo.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing*
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: Impedes/prevents access to coastal-dependent waterfront, commercial and recreational uses.

Impacts public safety and exposure to hazardous pollution, Traffic will exceed legal standards, blocking of public views of the water from public accessible areas and aesthetically impacts public views.

Sincerely,

Myra Mendoza

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Hi Katie,

I sent this to the wrong address last time, not sure if you received it or not so resending. Please let me know that you received this.

Thanks,
Jim

---

From: James Montgomery <jim.f.monty@gmail.com>
Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2014 5:07 PM
To: <katie.owston@redondobeach.org>
Subject: Redondo Beach King Harbor Development EIR Inputs

Hi Katie,

Here are the comments I would like to submit.

My name is Jim Montgomery and I've lived in the South Bay since 1984. I lived in Redondo Beach for 20 years prior to moving to Torrance in 2008. My wife and I spend a fair amount of time and money in the harbor area so we have a desire in seeing a development that improves the quality of life for all instead of degrading it. I see this as a regional issue that concerns all of us that live, work and/or play in the South Bay. My general statement is that I am for smart development and revitalization of the harbor area but not for the densely built overdevelopment that is currently proposed. This development needs to be scaled back as I see that as the best way to mitigate the myriad of environmental issues I believe this overdevelopment will create.

Specifically, if the development is successful the increase in traffic will create gridlock that makes an already frustrating drive in the area even worse. Traffic will be at a standstill and the increase in air and noise pollution from all the vehicles will be an environmental hazard. If the development is not successful, it will be come a white elephant with empty buildings and a blight on the neighborhood that increases crime. Either way the residents and the environment of the South Bay will suffer. The development needs to be scaled to fit the traffic accessibility capabilities of the area.

The amount of development will more than double per the current plan and will destroy the character and livability of the region. The development should enhance the special nature of our harbor environment. The city should find a developer with experience developing in coastal areas, where there are special environmental factors to take into account, such as storm water runoff. Has provisions been made to deal with this? How much space will be hardscape versus areas where storm water can infiltrate instead of running off into the ocean? How will storm water be managed? The development will need to adhere to the federal Clean Water Act and how storm water is handled. They will have to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The EIR needs to address how they plan to achieve this.

Also, do NOT replace the bike/walk path that currently goes between Harbor Drive and Torrance Blvd with a road. We need to be increasing bike and walking access for the public, not decreasing it. King Harbor is special in that we are shielded from traffic noise and air pollution when on the pier and in the harbor, please do not degrade the environment by building a road through the harbor.
In addition, I would like to see the EIR address the following:

- LEED certification requirements on the development, the stricter the better
- A solar energy requirement to offset the increased electricity and carbon footprint of the development
- Steps to limit fresh water usage via landscaping with drought tolerant plants, use of greywater for watering landscaping and water efficient facilities (low-flow water faucets, waterless urinals, etc). There needs to be an estimate of the environmental impact of the increased water usage. We are in a serious drought. How will this development impact water usage?
- What environmental credentials does the developer have? We need examples of how this developer stacks up against alternative developers that have a proven track record. Why didn't we choose a developer with coastal development experience?
- Why aren't there any alternative plans presented with less development with a small environmental footprint?
- A study of human factors needs to be addressed; increased noise/air pollution and stress due to traffic congestion, what about potential for increased crime in the area, large developments like this increase crime such as the South Bay Galleria
- Why doesn't the public get to vote on this development?
- What will it take to force a binding vote on this that the residents can weigh in on. You need to know you are developing what the people want

Bottom line, I believe the development is too large and needs to be reduced. Use the Redondo Beach Landing revitalization as a model. That part of the pier looks very nice and a local chain has been brought in (Barney's Beanery) which fits well with our beach culture and harbor feel. The last thing we need is a massive overdevelopment full of big-box chain stores that obliterates the harbor, inundates us in massive traffic gridlock and a lower quality of life for all. We have a chance to design a development that will enhance the harbor area while not destroying the harbor/ocean feel.

Thank you for taking my comments

Jim Montgomery
112 Via El Chico
Redondo Beach, CA 90277 (I live in the part of Torrance that has a Redondo Beach mailing address).
818.257.0879
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I am sending this a second time. It may have been sent to the wrong e-mail address.

On Wednesday, July 9, 2014 4:23 PM, Thelma Muzik <thelmam32@yahoo.com> wrote:

it did not get kicked back

On Wednesday, July 9, 2014 4:07 PM, Bill Brand <bbrand@earthlink.net> wrote:

Hi Thelma,

Great to hear from you! Great email too! Unfortunately, the address of Katie Owston I copied from the Easy Reader article was wrong. Here is the correct one:

katie.owston@redondo.org

Please resend with corrected address. Did it get kicked back?

Bill
310-809-4405

On Jul 9, 2014, at 7:56 AM, Thelma Muzik <thelmam32@yahoo.com> wrote:

We oppose the proposed mall in Redondo Beach for the following reasons.

Since the proposed mall will be on the coast, the traffic arteries for access to the proposed mall are cut by 50% because the ocean is on the West side. If this mall attracts the amount of customers that is hoped for, the quality of life in Redondo Beach will be severely damaged by traffic and pollution. There are no easy access routes to the coast of Redondo. Thus, this mall would cause major traffic jams on Pacific Coast Highway and Torrance Blvd.

The City has tried different retail, restaurants and office spaces above the current parking structure.
They all failed. There are no guarantees if a mall is built that customers will come. If customers don't come, this mall will become a blight on the coast.

Redondo Beach already has one large mall, The Galleria South Bay shopping center. We don't need another.

As long time residents and home owners in Redondo Beach, we believe adding a mall to the Redondo Beach coast would lower our quality of life and all those who live here. The beach is the draw to Redondo and that is as it should remain.

Thelma J. Muzik and
Thomas L. Rooney
1201 Ynez Avenue
Redondo Beach, Ca 90277
310 543-3119
No overdevelopment of King Harbor
Tamara Namay [tnamay@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 11:48 PM
To: Katie Owston
Cc: Bill Brand [bbrand@earthlink.net]

King Harbor should be granted historic status and preserved as is. No more development, no more traffic, no increased density – preserve the current quaint charm of the harbor, and do not sell our quality of life to the highest bidder.
Thank you,
Tamara Namay
Resident

This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.
This is an addendum to my first form.

Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Linda Neal
Organization (optional): Redondo Beach for Responsible Development
Address: 1110 Gayla Ave. 1C
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 310-816-4931
E-mail (optional): Lindaneal2@gmail.com

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:
- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Sols
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:
Less density, more open space – off-site parking?

We need to appeal to our best selves, the Redondo that is a Blue Zone, with lots of outdoor activity space, less emphasis on shopping.

We need to think long-term, something that is unique to the waterfront (you expand the harbor to be a safe, green to access for boats of length, and paddle boat access, you to a plan to swim, plans to move in nature with nature. People come to the ocean to fish, eat, wander, explore, enjoy outdoor sports, stroll, swim, and eat – not to shop.

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.

We need to keep Redondo Beach, funky, quaint.
Hello Katie,

My concerns on the environmental scope of the EIR are.....

I want to know where all the delivery trucks are going to go. I want to know how much noise and pollution the enormous number of trucks needed to support this horror of a mall are going to add to the area. Our AIR QUALITY is going to be severely impacted.

I want to know where the accesses for the emergency vehicles are going to be. Would this fall under "PUBLIC SERVICES"?

I want to know how much pressure this massive mall is going to put on the water, gas, power, and sewage lines. Or are there plans to build a new infrastructure? Does this fall under UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS?

I want to know what amount of gridlock there's going to be from this and how far will it extend. Does this fall under TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC?

Do "view corridors" fall under "AESTHETICS"? They seem to have disappeared from this so called "Plan".

How is the present system of the buses using the horseshoe curve for parking going to be impacted? Does this fall under TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC?

Under which category does "green space" fall? Imagine my fury when I was told that the Pier is considered "green space" on the plans shown at that recent poor excuse of a public meeting held at the R B Performing Arts Center. Since when is concrete considered green space!!!!!!!

Under which headings does Seaside Lagoon fall? I can come up with several. Take your Pick. Making it smaller....another dumb move......opening it to the Ocean.......how can the quality of the water be kept safe?

All of the so called "Plans" so far are not going to impact my view but all of the "Plans" so far will sure as heck impact my QUALITY OF LIFE !!!!!!!

NOW..........TO MY COMMENTS

At the "meeting" at the R.B. P. A..C. in looking at the latest incarnation of the Development Plan.....each one is worse than the last.......it shows a miniscule amount of green space at the south end of the development. That's unacceptable. No matter what color you fill in on paper for it, the Pier it is NOT green space.

The change in the footprint of the hotel is scandalous and disgusting when the only real purpose is for the developer to cram even more retail down our throats by making the ENTIRE first floor RETAIL and the second floor the hotel. I was so enraged when I saw that I had to walk away from the drawings of the plans before I destroyed them.

Mr Bruning has extensive experience in building Malls but it is extremely evident that his Company has no experience in doing a true Waterfront Development. When doing that, his designers have proved themselves so inept they couldn't find their own fannies with both their own hands. His Company had the opportunity to design a World Class Waterfront and enhance their own reputation but rather than do the work that that entails he came up with another Mall and a terrible one at that. Half of our area to draw visitors from is Ocean and I don't know of any fish that have disposable income, do you?

The parking structures in the plans are ghastly. They are being built on some of the best "view" property on the
Waterfront. That’s what I mean about being “inept”. I sure if we were using a developer who had experience in Waterfronts they would have been much more sensitive to saving all the views possible and been much more creative.

Santa Monica Waterfront has just been put on a list as #4 of the top ten things to do in Los Angeles as they have a place to take a trapeze lesson !!! Plus Santa Monica has their iconic Ferris Wheel that is famous world wide. Can you imagine how easy it is to market that Pier as a place to go? What have we been given in this monstrosity of a plan? Ugly concrete structures, box stores and a fountain. Really? A fountain? OMG.......... That’s suppose to make people want to come here?

WE NEED A WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT THAT HAS THINGS TO DO AND THINGS TO SEE AND THINGS TO BUY THAT NO ONE ELSE HAS !!!!!!!! What part of that does the City Council not understand. They are free to contact me at any time to explore my ideas & suggestions but I imagine that has as much chance of happening as ice water being served in Hades.

Sincerely, Joanne Newman
694 The Village
Redondo Beach, Ca.
33 Year Resident
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Comments on CenterCal Project Initial Environmental Study

Gerry O'Connor [gfoconnor@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 5:30 PM
To: Katie Owston

-----Original Message-----
From: Gerry O'Connor <gfoconnor@aol.com>
To: katie.owsten <katie.owsten@redondo.org>
Sent: Mon, Jul 21, 2014 5:29 pm
Subject: Comment on CenterCal Project Initial Environmental Study

I fully support the 13 page document submitted to you on July 12, 2014 by Jim Light and Build a Better Redondo, that is also posted here:
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The CenterCal Mall project represents a substantial intensification of uses of our harbor area/waterfront that are non-coastal dependent uses. The impacts of this level of intensification would be substantial under the multiple-use concept. In this case, the project site configuration, layout and infrastructure exacerbate the impacts of this magnitude of intensification. The project requires close scrutiny as the project appears to have significant adverse impacts on coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses of the harbor and waterfront by uses that are not coastal dependent. The harbor was built by public funds for recreational boating and other coastal dependent uses. The non-coastal dependent development should not have significant negative impact upon the public's ability or desirability to fully use and enjoy the existing coastal dependent uses of our harbor and waterfront. In fact, this would be in violation of Republic's Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act. Furthermore, the advertised high end nature of the shops, restaurants, theater and movie theater would impact the ability of large numbers of visitors from being able to enjoy and utilize this area of the waterfront. The LS assessment and project description lead to a number of questions, concerns, and comments which are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

1. Questions: The project description is too vague in many places to make substantive comments or fully develop concerns. The answers to questions below would allow a better development of concerns.

   a. The LS does not describe parking adequately. What is the current number of parking spaces and how many are to be included in the current project? What is the number of space, square footage, and dimensions of the proposed new parking structure and the changes to the number of parking spaces, parking lot square footage, and new driveways under the proposed configuration? What are the parking spaces allocated to locations using the best usage? Is there different parking for hotel and general mall visitors, and visitors with disabilities in the facilities?

   b. The project description is unclear. Some key documents state the LS states that the land and water conditions are more than 50 acres. How many acres of land are otherwise included in the project? The description describes near bicycle and pedestrian walkways, but then the pedestrian explain there is no further direction. (Highway to public open use is) is undefined.

   c. The project description says there will be a new small boat harbor but it does not appear anywhere in the site drawing or project description. The following details are needed to fully assess the impacts of the proposed project. What is it? How big is? How is it increased by and footprints?

   d. Will all steps be made in the pedestrian waterfront? What is the height of the proposed pedestrian bridge above the high tide line? Will the coastal resident fit?
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CenterCal Mall Project IES Comments and Questions
Submitted by Jim Light and Building A Better Redondo
9 July 14
The CenterCal Mall project represents a substantial intensification of uses of our harbor area /
waterfront that are not coastal dependent uses. The impacts of this level of intensification would be substantial under normal circumstances. In this case, the project site configuration, location and infrastructure exacerbate the impacts of this magnitude of intensification. The impacts require close scrutiny as the project appears it will have significant adverse impacts on coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses of the harbor and waterfront by uses that are not coastal.
dependent. The harbor was built by public funds for recreational boating and other coastal dependent uses. The non-coastal dependent development should not have significant negative impact upon the public's ability or desirability to fully use and enjoy these existing coastal dependent uses of our harbor and waterfront. In fact, that would be a violation of Redondo's Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act. Furthermore, the advertised high end nature of the shops, restaurants, hotel and movie theater would impact the ability of a large number of visitors from being able to enjoy and utilize this area of the waterfront. The IES assessment and project description lead to a number of questions, concerns, and comments which are discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

1. Questions - the project description is too vague in many places to make substantive comments or fully develop concerns. The answers to questions below would allow a better development of concerns. Without these details, the public is prevented from making a complete response to the IES as it exists.

a. The IES does not describe parking adequately. What is the current number of parking spaces and how many total are included in the current project? What are the number of space, square footage, and dimensions of the proposed new parking structure and the changes to the number of pier parking spaces, pier parking total square footage, and dimensions under the proposed configuration? What are the parking spaces allocated to boaters using the boat ramp, boaters/SUP'ers who hand launch small craft, and boaters with slips in Redondo Marina?

b. The project description is unclear. Some city documents say 15 acres the IES states that the land and water combined are more than 15 acres. How many acres of land/pier are included in the project? The description describes new bicycle and pedestrian walkways, but other than the pedestrian esplanade, there is no further description. "High quality public open space" is undefined.

c. The project description says there will be a new small boat launch but it does not appear anywhere in the site drawing or project description. The following details are needed to fully assess the impacts of the proposed project. Where is it? How big is it? How is it accessed by small boat users?

d. Will all boat slips be maintained in the Redondo marina? What is the height of the proposed pedestrian bridge above the high high tide line? Will the commercial boats fit under the bridge?

e. Has there been an analysis of the quality of water in the small boat launch area to determine if the lagoon would be safe for children to swim in? Will this stagnant water area be able to support swimming, wading, and play while maintaining acceptable water quality? The small boat launch area is only inches deep at low tide. It shoals after a few years. Will the opened Seaside Lagoon be dredged regularly - is that included in any fiscal analysis? What will keep the dramatically sloped beach in place? What is the final size of the water area compared to current and what is the size of the public open space/usable beach/grass area compared to current conditions?

f. The current drawings show a very narrow road for the new road connecting Harbor Dr and Torrance Blvd. What is the configuration of the bike and pedestrian paths through this same area? Are the bike and pedestrian paths protected? How do they link up with the bike and pedestrian paths at Harbor Dr?

g. The project plan is vague on public open space. What is considered public open space and what is its size and uses? Much of the area looks like it would tables for eating restaurant food from the mall vendors... is this considered public open space? How much is truly public, city controlled space and how much is controlled by the
developer/leaseholder? Will access and uses to this public open space be controlled or limited? If so, what will be allowed and prohibited in these areas? How is the 10% public open space requirement met in each zoning area?

h. The boat ramp as depicted in the IES does not have a breakwater. Other city documents show a new breakwater. Configuration of the boat ramp is critical to assess the hazards associated with the reconfiguration. The location of the dinghy dock is not show either. The impact of surge, which is great in this area of the harbor; the mixing of small human powered craft with just launched or returning power boats and dinghies; the flow of gas/oil from the boat ramp area and dinghy dock into the opened Seaside lagoon; the mixing of newly launched and returning power boats into the turn basin where sailboats drop their sails and many human powered craft traverse and congregate; and the ability to navigate safely into and out of the boat ramp are all concerns that cannot be adequately assessed without more detail. What is the proposed configuration of the new public boat ramp and the missing dinghy dock? How is the Public Esplanade requirement met in the northern end of the project with the break in the Seaside Lagoon and what is the connectivity with the California Coastal Trail?

i. What is the calculation of total new square footage based on the cumulative development including the new Shade hotel?

2. Comments/Concerns:

a. Aesthetics: A top level analysis of views from Harbor Drive reveals approximately an 80% reduction in views of the harbor, ocean, cliffs of Palos Verdes, and Catalina Island from the roadway, bike path and pedestrian sidewalks along Harbor Blvd. This actual view impact could be far worse depending on use of landscaping, umbrellas, fountains, pergola, and other amenities in the two narrow corridors that remain. This would be a significant impact on scenic resources and could substantially degrade both the visual character and quality of the site. The three story parking structure on the corner of Portofino Way and Beryl would create a huge aesthetic impact from both Harbor Drive as well as from the Seaside Lagoon. The parking structure and attached retail/restaurant uses are pushed right to the edge of the now smaller Seaside Lagoon area and will create the effect of a huge three story structure looming over and dominating the views from the much smaller Seaside Lagoon "beach" area and the water. This would impact the attractiveness of the Seaside Lagoon to the public.

b. Hazards and hazardous materials: The plan as described may have significant impact on the ability to evacuate the area in the event of an earthquake, tidal surge, tsunami, fire, or other natural or man-made events. Also disturbance of the current fill and demolition of existing structures could expose the harbor to toxic substances. The water quality of the proposed opening of the Seaside Lagoon has not been assessed or considered in the IES. The small boat launch area today is a collecting point for harbor trash. Opening Seaside lagoon will likely create a large area of stagnant water and a large collector area for harbor trash. The lack of water exchange, the direction of the prevailing winds, and the use of this stagnant water by people, especially children, may make the water quality unsafe in and of itself. This would be exacerbated by the location of the new public boat ramp as the seaside lagoon may become a collecting area for oil and gas from the boat ramp area. The whole Seaside Lagoon may be rendered unusable.
Seaside Lagoon from the current parking lot. The flow of pedestrian traffic to and from the area, the reconfiguration of the bike path and increased bike use, combined with the change and increase in traffic flow create hazards and safety concerns between vehicular traffic and pedestrians and bicycles.

And as discussed elsewhere, the new boat ramp, reconfiguration of the Seaside Lagoon, the addition of new moorings, and the location of the dinghy dock and small hand launched boat launch change boating traffic patterns and will increase and concentrate human powered, sailing, and motor craft activities, which will increase the potential for navigation hazards in the harbor. This is especially true in that many trailer boaters and stand up paddle boarders are novices with little or no training on their vessel or on the boating "rules of the road". The proposed location of the boat ramp is far more impactful and potentially hazardous than the current location of the boat hoists, which are isolated from the turn basin and small boat launch/dinghy dock.

c. Hydrology: The water usage of this site will increase dramatically and could increase demand for water despite a multi-year drought and increasing water shortages.

d. Land Use and Planning: The project plan shows a wall of development that will separate the community from and limit access to waterfront coastal dependent recreational uses. This is in conflict with the General Plan and the approved Local Coastal Plan. The access impacts could be significant.

In the deliberations of the AES power plant project, CEC staff deemed that certain areas of the AES site fall under the definition of protected wetlands. The impact of construction and increased traffic on these areas should be evaluated.

In general, the proximity, density, and impacts of the commercial development and parking structure represent uses incompatible with existing coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses.

e. Public services: The proposed project could have substantial impact on police and fire access and response times well beyond the project boundaries due to substantial increases in traffic and associated delays at intersections and driveways. The increased crime associated with commercial intensification will put additional burden on our police department. This burden will increase if the mall is unsuccessful. Increased use of the area and the increased interaction of vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists will likely lead to more calls for medical emergency support from the fire department. And the reconfiguration and concentration of boating uses and traffic patterns at the proposed boat ramp area will increase demands on the Harbor Patrol.

There will be a substantial impact on the public lands and waters of and around the harbor. The project as proposed eliminates Dedication Park and shrinks the publicly usable portion of the Seaside Lagoon beach/grass lawn area. What is left of the beach area has commercial development added to it, further decreasing the availability, usability, and desirability of the public parkland. Additionally, because the Seaside Lagoon must be dredged much deeper to open it up to the tidal waters of the harbor, the smaller beach will have to slope more, which may impact usability and erosion. Currently, the plan does not show any relocation of the small boat hand launch/dinghy dock which was recently expanded using state funds to accommodate boaters using the new mooring field in the harbor. If this dock is not replaced, the ability of mooring guests to come to shore is negatively impacted. And depending on placement safety may be impacted. It appears the swimming/wading area of the Seaside Lagoon is significantly smaller and will be even further negatively impacted if this smaller area is to be shared now by SUP'ers and other small craft users. As stated before, the poor water quality of an opened Seaside Lagoon may preclude its use by swimmers, waders, etc.

The highly touted public waterfront "esplanade" is not substantive as a waterfront walkway exists today. In fact the opening of Seaside Lagoon will interrupt the existing walkway and force people to walk through the mall area beside the street added beside the Seaside Lagoon.

Reconfiguration of the bike path and pedestrian walkways through the CenterCal development combined with the density of the development, the addition of streets internal to the development, and the elimination of the International Boardwalk may have significant impact on the safety and desirability of these uses in the harbor and pier area. Especially moving from Torrance Blvd to Harbor Drive.
Recreation: Recreational impacts of the project exceed those defined in the IES. The Seaside Lagoon park is considerably smaller and Dedication Park is eliminated from the proposed plan. It appears the internal roadway west of the Seaside Lagoon encroaches on the Seaside Lagoon park contributing to the reduction "beach" area in the park. Also, the plan shows multiple commercial buildings in the park that will further detract from and encroach upon public parkland space available for recreation.

CenterCal Mall Project IES Comments and Questions
Submitted by Jim Light and Building A Better Redondo
9 July 14
The smaller Seaside Lagoon tightly surrounded by mall development and the three story parking structure will be less desirable to the public and will likely decrease utilization. Potential users will be reticent to be exposed in their bathing suits and bring their kids to a comparatively small recreational feature so exposed to shoppers and restaurant goers. How many people would show up to a mall in their bathing suits? Today the commercial areas of the pier and International Boardwalk are well separated from Seaside Lagoon and the fencing with shading material provides further separation. The shrinking of the park area combined with the encroachment of incompatible uses represents a significant impact to recreation in the harbor area.

Water quality of the opened lagoon is not addressed nor is periodic requirements for dredging. This area of the harbor already collects garbage and the open lagoon would create a large stagnant area. The location of the new boat ramp and dinghy dock also may cause gas and oil to collect in the open lagoon. All these combined may make the open lagoon waters unfit/unsuitable and or undesirable for swimming and wading.

The project plan substantially reduces parking for trailer boaters, fishermen, small craft boaters, and those intending to swim at the Seaside Lagoon. Parking structure parking is not adequate for these uses due to the equipment that must transported to the use area. Additionally, the height of the parking structure floors may prevent kayakers and Stand Up Paddleboarders from being able to use the parking structure due to the combined height of their vehicle and the watercraft transported on the roof.

The proposed parking lot for the boat ramp is insufficient for the trailer boaters. According to other studies completed by the city, the ramp parking lot would only hold about 28 trailer/tow vehicles. This is greatly reduced from the number of parking spots required for the current boat hoists by city zoning ordinance. The Coastal Commission's stated intent in requiring a boat ramp was to increase accessibility and use. The limited parking would have the opposite effect. Discussion about the boat ramp also indicated that the City may consider the boat ramp parking lot to be the parking for those who hand launch boats in the harbor. First if the final intent is for hand launch boaters to use the new boat ramp, mixing trailer boats with human powered craft in the ramp area would be hazardous. Second if the city intends for the hand launch boaters to launch in the smaller water area of the Seaside lagoon, mixing children playing the water with human powered craft is hazardous as well and would impact families using the Seaside Lagoon for swimming, wading, playing, etc. In either case, the use of the boat ramp parking for hand launched watercraft only exacerbates the parking problem. Limited ramp parking artificially limits the use of harbor for boating activities.

The hand launched boat/dinghy dock is not shown on this plan though they are called out in the description. This hand launched boat/dinghy dock is well used today and the new mooring field will increase use. Location and size are critical to usability and could impact public safety as well depending on proximity to power boats launching at the boat ramp.

The elimination of surface parking for boaters with slips in Redondo Marina provides these boaters no reasonable parking solution for access and transfer of equipment to and from their vessels. Parking and access for the commercial boaters is not addressed at all and looks to be severely impacted. Parking in the parking structure across the new street would be an unreasonable burden on those with boats in the Redondo Marina and would decrease desirability of those slips. It would also be a hazard to transport boating/fishing/family gear to and from this parking structure and across an active roadway and bike path.
In addition to the shrinking of recreational resources and lack of parking and infrastructure to support these existing uses, the increased traffic of the intensified retail and restaurant development and boat ramp could have a substantial impact on the accessibility and desirability to use the harbor for coastal dependent recreational and commercial due to the traffic density and increased time to get to the resources. This is especially true at Portofino Way, and its intersection with Harbor Drive, which will now concentrate parking structure traffic, trailer boater traffic, hand launch boat traffic, valet parking from the Shade Hotel, Portofino Marina boaters, Seaside Lagoon users and Portofino Inn guests, diners, and employees. This traffic problem is further exacerbated by the new two bike path on the west side of Harbor Drive and the exit of the pedestrian esplanade onto Portofino Way. The Harbor Drive/Portofino Way/Beryl Street intersection will become gridlocked. And that gridlock will be further exacerbated by the short block on Beryl between Catalina Avenue and Harbor Drive. While this is specifically a traffic problem, the gridlock will act as a barrier to access and turn potential waterfront recreation users away.

Redondo Beach has actually reduced its parkland to resident ratio through the years. The Recreation and Parks element of the General Plan cites a goal of 3 acres/1000 residents, which Redondo has never achieved. In looking for areas to expand, the Recreation and Parks element specifically calls out for the exploration of the use of the old octagonal building site for public recreational uses. Indeed today, the City/Pier Business Association uses this site for projecting public movies in the summer. The CenterCal Mall Project as depicted does not contemplate a public recreational use for this site - instead it shows commercial development on this site.

Finally, the pedestrian bridge supporting the commercial development would eliminate use of the Redondo marina for sailboats and for the larger commercial boats. This violates the Local Coastal Plan and the Coastal Act.

The project states there will be public open space within the commercial retail/restaurant area but it does not define them. This will not replace public parkland impacted by the development. These open spaces should not be considered replacement for coastal dependent recreational resources. Likewise, the project description touts the pedestrian waterfront Esplanade as though it were a new amenity in the harbor. While in some places the esplanade may be wider, a public waterfront walkway exists today throughout the harbor and pier area. Today this path also allows kayakers and stand up paddleboarders to drop off their vessels and equipment at the hand launch boat dock. The CenterCal plan eliminates this access.

Traffic: Today during the summer weekends and weekday evenings, the limited circulation infrastructure and the area geometry regularly create gridlock conditions. Currently the turn into the Decron lease parking lot often has long turn queues that back up through traffic in either direction and create hazardous interactions with the bicycles and pedestrians on the west side of Harbor Drive. Torrance Boulevard is especially challenged due to the short block between Catalina Ave and PCH, which is exacerbated by the stop sign controlled Broadway intersection in the middle. The pedestrian crosswalks from Broadway are hazardous as they are not signaled and new visitors do not notice people in the cross walk. Turn queues often overflow at the intersections of Torrance Blvd and PCH and Torrance Boulevard blocking through traffic. Longer lights associated with pedestrian signals exacerbate this problem today. The intersections of Torrance Blvd and PCH and 190th and PCH already perform below City standards specified in the General Plan Circulation Element.

With double the commercial development and the addition of a boat ramp, traffic will increase dramatically thus exacerbating the already gridlocked situations that exist today and likely creating new ones on Beryl, Harbor Dr., Portofino Way, Yacht Club Way and Pacific Ave. Adding to the this dilemma the reconfiguration of the bike path to the west side of Harbor Drive and the increased use of the bike path by more bicyclists will increase the frequency and magnitude of overflowing turn queues into and out of Harbor Drive's unsignaled driveways. These overflowing turn queues will also impede through traffic and increase the hazard of bicycle car accidents. Likewise increased pedestrian traffic will only make the situation worse.
The new roadways internal to the mall area and immediately adjacent to the Seaside Lagoon combined with the elimination of fencing for the Seaside Lagoon increases the potential of vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian accidents in these areas. Forcing recreational users of the waterfront to traverse the parking structure and commercial areas with their families and gear also increases this hazard.

As stated before the increase in vehicular traffic and reduction of level of service of the circulation system will impede public safety response times and impact access for coastal dependent recreational and commercial uses.

It does not appear that the EIR contract requires any analysis of the Pacific/Catalina stop signed intersection. This intersection must be analyzed from and LOS and safety perspective. The short roadway segments between traffic light controlled and partially stop sign controlled side street intersections on Harbor, Herondo, and Beryl Street also need special attention in analysis. Standard city traffic evaluation techniques do not account for overflowing queue conditions, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, and the potential hazards associated with them. The Highway Capacity Manual specifically cites that the intersection models typically used by the City are invalid in turn queue overflow conditions and when upstream traffic impedes flow through the intersection being analyzed. Thus, currently reported intersection LOS for many of the City's intersections do not reflect the real conditions. In order for the EIR to accurately project the impact of the development, the appropriate methods must be used and bicycles and pedestrians must be considered. Additionally, the increase in trailer boaters will have an impact on intersection and lane capacity. If the City proposes increased mass transit, the analysis needs to reflect the increased mass transit traffic, the location of the stops and its impact on lane capacity and lane changing behaviors. Several intersections are already adversely impacted when a bus stops to load and unload passengers. Again, the City's current analyses do not take these impacts into account.

h. Cumulative impacts: The IES does not assess known and predictable projects in the immediate vicinity. The new Shade Hotel guest, employee and delivery traffic combined with the valet parking to and from the Triton oil site will substantially impact traffic flow on Harbor Drive and Portofino Way. The new bike path project will impact the ability of vehicles to exit and return to harbor Drive in the project area using both roads and driveways. The Green Street development has been built but is not yet populated with tenants, which will impact traffic flows in the project area. The AES property will be undergoing extensive construction activities regardless of whether a new powerplant is constructed or not and will result, either way, in an increased intensity of land use...especially in light of current elected official statements about their opposition to parkland. Thus construction and post construction traffic should be included in any analysis. Likewise, the "dirt farm" property was recently sold. And it is likely that the new owner will repurpose the site. The traffic impacts of this repurposing should be considered as well. Additionally, continued infill development will increase traffic on major circulation roads in the project vicinity. These cumulative impacts should be assessed.

In the harbor, the cumulative impacts of changing where power boats are launched, where the dinghy dock is located, where small craft will be launched, the increasing popularity of stand-up paddleboarding, and the location of new moorings may create a hazardous change to use and traffic patterns in the harbor. The turn basin is designed to let incoming sailboats safely drop sail. Now it appears we are collocating more uses which could become a hazardous navigation area due to the cumulative impacts of all these changes.

i. Visitor Serving Commercial uses: Advertising and public discussion about the proposed mall speaks to the high end, boutique nature of the shops, restaurants, movie theater and hotel. The high end nature of these establishments would impact the ability of many visitors and residents from frequenting the harbor waterfront. This is exacerbated by the negative impacts on the mall project on existing recreational uses both in size, intensification of recreational use, parking usability and availability, and decreased vehicular access around and within the project. Likewise, scenic vistas from Harbor Drive enjoyed today by passing bicyclists, runners and pedestrians are severely
impacted.
3. Applicable Coastal Act Sections
The following sections of the Coastal Act may or will be violated by the project as described in the IES
and as noted earlier in this submission:
30211 - Development shall not interfere with access
30212 - Public access in new development projects
30212.5 - Public facilities distribution
30220 - Protection of certain water-oriented activities
30223- Upland areas support of coastal recreational uses
30224 - Recreational boating use, encouragement, facilities
30234 - Commercial fishing and recreational boating facilities
30234.5 - Economic, commercial, and recreational importance of fishing
30250 - Location; existing developed area
30251 - Scenic and visual qualities
30253 - Maintenance and enhancement of public access
30255 - Priority of coastal-dependent developments
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The current plans for pier development under review by the Redondo Beach city government are out of control, far too big for a small area, and the traffic and parking problems it will create will cost the city in the need for more public services. Lois Olsen
Hi Katie,

One other question: What is the environmental impact of all of the vacant retail businesses in the waterfront area.. Del Amo is building something like a 130 retail stores and we already see lot's of vacancies in the mini-malls and malls in our community -as well as the pier. Don't folks get it -retail is dead! In the past year I have made almost all of my purchases on-line. Just look at the national statistics- what will the next 10 years be like(not good for retail). The on-line purchase transition is swiftly underway and will only lead to a dramatic increase in vacancies- so how will all of these vacant retail businesses affect the environment?

On Mon, Jul 21, 2014 at 3:30 PM, Jay Penn <jayppenn11@gmail.com> wrote:

Katie, I have a number of questions regarding the EIR NOP

1) Traffic and access: the proposed development is incredibly dense and appears to only have a negative impact on the access for auto traffic, pedestrians, emergency vehicles, and will cause overall gridlock- How will it be guaranteed that the already bad congestion won't get any worse under this development?

2) Pollution: I live on Beryl St. just up from the proposed development and the amount of soot from automobiles trying to make it up the steep hill currently leaves a tremendous layer of soot on my balcony and that of all of the residents in the area. We live in a nice area yet must breathe this stuff every day. Since this street is a major access corridor for the development and will only have increased traffic it will clearly exerbate the current situation with a great increase in pollution. How will the development make sure there will be no negative pollution consequences to the local neighborhood?

3) Parking: It is virtually impossible, particularly on street cleaning days, to find parking on Beryl and numerous adjacent streets (Lucia, Maria, Juanita, etc.) - it seems this development will only compound this problem- how will this additional parking congestion be mitigated?

4) Waterfront usage: How will the Waterfront Development affect my ability to use the waterfront for recreation. It seems like the Seaside lagoon will decrease in size? how will the development affect my ability to park to use the boat ramp, the elimination of the hand launched boat ramp is currently a nice access point for small boats- it seems this will be eliminated?

5) The large amount of structures/development will degrade the view of the waterfront and the bike path aesthetics will seem to be degraded? What will be done to not have a negative consequence on the public views of the harbor area?

6) City services and associated costs: It seems that with all of the additional visitors -we will have a need for increased city services: police, fire, trash, water, infrastructure maintenance, etc. How will this be accomplished without taxing city services? (As the developer will yield an average of 10 % average IRR before the city sees anything and it is incredibly easy to hide IRR (profits) thru salaries, how will this not degrade the overall
quality of life in the area (e.g. what is the impact of rationed/redirected city services to accommodate the needs of the waterfront (without any realizable additional revenue to cover this cost)?

7) I love Redondo and have lived here for over 30 years and although I am typically forward looking and positive for progress and development I just can’t see any possible benefit for the residents of Redondo and surrounding cities of the currently proposed development - and on top of that no new revenue only additional drains on our local economy. Why is this even being considered? - we need an alternate plan with dramatically more recreational area and lower density. I know of at least one alternative that has been proposed but not taken seriously by the City Council. I thought the Mayor and the Redondo City Council are here for the residents - this project as it is proposed clearly proves this belief incorrect.

In closing, When will we receive responses to these questions that do affect a wide range of residents and visitors across a wide range of environmental impact areas?
Dear Mrs Katies Owston,

The questions that I would like to have addressed are in regards to the increased traffic expected from the $200M re-development. And what steps are being addressed to handle the additional parking required as the current structure is to be removed?

Thank you

Sincerely

Fred Pinczuk

400 Esplanade, Unit 3
Redondo Beach, CA
90277
Hi Katie,

I am writing in response to the request for input from the public in determining the proper scope for the EIR on the proposed Redondo Beach Waterfront Project.

Let me start by saying that I am not opposed to revitalization of the Redondo Beach Pier and marina area, including the addition of some new structures and businesses there. The area is rundown and includes many functionally obsolete buildings and structures, and would benefit from revitalization and improvement. However, I am opposed to the project as it is currently proposed. I believe that the currently proposed project is too massive, dense and tall for the area, that it is poorly configured and proposes a number of land uses that are inappropriate for the location. Because of these factors, I believe the project would result in a multitude of adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding neighborhood, community and the South Bay region as a whole. I highlight a number of these potential impacts below.

In general, to have fewer environmental impacts, the new project should respect, complement and connect with the existing surrounding development in terms of scale, density and architectural style, not overwhelm and wall off the existing development from the waterfront.

The density of proposed new development is much greater than and is incompatible with the general density of development in the City of Redondo Beach and the South Bay beach cities as a whole. While some increase in density may be appropriate given that this is proposed to be a commercial center, this is way too dense and is totally incompatible with the surrounding development and area. This is the South Bay of Los Angeles County; it is not Manhattan, New York, Hong Kong, or even San Francisco. Let’s try to propose a development that is at least moderately appropriate for and compatible with the area in which it will be built.

The project will generate significant traffic impacts. Even if the new development has sufficient on-site parking and driveway space to accommodate the traffic generated, trips to and from the waterfront will still have to pass through and be constricted by the existing street system through the surrounding neighborhoods, which is already congested much of the time. New and worsening traffic delays will further impact the residents and businesses of the surrounding neighborhoods, and would make traveling to the waterfront an unpleasant and frustrating experience for visitors, which will likely over time discourage many people from traveling to the waterfront, ultimately resulting in the failure of many businesses there, high vacancy rates, and empty and unused buildings and spaces in the waterfront.
The increase in commercial space, restaurants, stores and other development, and the attendant increase in traffic and number of pedestrians in the project and the surrounding area will create significant additional noise impacts on the surrounding residential neighborhood.

As proposed, the project will block ocean views of existing residents and businesses, as well as many public views of the ocean and marina from adjacent streets and sidewalks. Even if the City of Redondo Beach doesn’t protect private views, it should acknowledge that many residents have invested their life savings in their homes and pay taxes to the City, and should seek to maintain those views as much as possible. Also some of the views of businesses, such as from the Crowne Plaza Hotel, may adversely affect those businesses’ economic viability if they are ruined. Public views, such as from streets and sidewalks and public open space areas, are protected by the California Coastal Act of 1976.

One of the nice things about the existing marina is that as one drives south along Harbor Drive from Hermosa Beach, you start seeing the boats in anchorage in the marina through spaces between the current restaurants along the street, then upon crossing Beryl Street, drivers can see the water of the ocean and marina. That prompts many of them to pull into the parking lot there to enjoy the area, and they ultimately end up patronizing some of the restaurants and other businesses there. That will be lost when those views are blocked if the current plan is built. Overall, I believe this needs to be carefully considered, and the project should be rethought as a lower-rise, less dense development with more consideration given to preserving existing views in the area. With careful planning, it should be possible to refurbish or replace many existing buildings and add in new development in a manner to take advantage of the views and coastal environment of the location, while still preserving many of the treasured existing views in the area.

The project, as it has been proposed, will turn its back to and essentially wall off the existing neighborhood from the beach, pier and marina. This will negatively impact coastal access and quality of life for many existing residents and businesses in the area.

By blocking views and coastal access from existing nearby neighborhoods, the project is inconsistent with the provisions, spirit and intent of some existing land use and planning laws, including the California Coastal Act and the State Tidelands Trust Law. Even if some provisions of those laws may not legally apply to parts of the project, since the project is a waterfront, the spirit and intent of the laws should be carefully considered. As it is currently proposed, the project is inconsistent with the intent of these laws.

The project will impact air quality due to exhaust from vehicles in the traffic generated by the new development, as well as from restaurants and other businesses that will vent exhaust into the atmosphere. Smoke and cooking smells from the existing restaurants on the Redondo Beach Pier and the marina area and traffic fumes can already
be smelled many nights from the surrounding residential area, and this will no doubt get significantly worse with the addition of many new restaurants and development that will generate significantly more traffic than the existing waterfront draws to the area.

The project will also impact water quality through increased polluted runoff from the parking areas, restaurants and other businesses, and pedestrian areas, which would drain into the ocean further polluting Santa Monica Bay. In addition, the increased number of businesses and visitors will result in an increase in general litter that will ultimately find its way into the ocean.

In addition to operational impacts, the impacts of the construction phase of the project on both air and water quality must also be considered.

Some of the businesses and uses proposed, such as the movie theaters, are not waterfront oriented or related. Theaters, in particular, are a poor choice for an oceanside use, because they require very large bulky buildings that block views, and the high cost of land adjacent to the coast ensures that ticket prices would have to be too expensive for such a theater to compete successfully with the many existing theaters in the surrounding communities. People go to the waterfront to enjoy the ocean and water-related uses, not to watch movies. The theater project would be a disaster; it would soon go out of business and leave a huge bulky empty building blocking views and creating a nuisance in the area.

The proposed hotel is another poor land use choice. With the Portofino Inn, Crowne Plaza, Sunrise, and several other nearby motels, there is already a massive number of hotel rooms in the immediate vicinity of the Redondo Beach Pier and marina area, and most of these rooms sit vacant most nights of the year. Another hotel in the vicinity is simply not needed; there is an excess of empty rooms now. Even if the new development is successful in drawing additional visitors to the area, given the high land cost and the number of hotel rooms already existing, a new hotel will not be economically feasible. It too would soon be empty, just sitting there taking up space, blocking views and creating a nuisance. The poor land use choices currently proposed in the project that cannot realistically be successful will have an adverse economic impact on the area and create a nuisance that will worsen the physical environment and require additional police and fire protection resources.

Above-ground parking structures, like proposed in this project, are quite rare in beachfront areas. This is because by their very nature they are ugly structures that create a negative aesthetic impact on surrounding residents and businesses as well as blocking views from public streets in the area. The existing pier parking structure, which has most of its spaces below grade where they do not create negative aesthetic impacts, should be refurbished, modernized and retained in the new project to reduce the number of new parking spaces that will need to be constructed, thereby reducing the impacts of the parking on the fragile coastal environment and the surrounding area. And the new parking spaces constructed should be carefully planned in the same manner to
minimize impacts to the unique coastal environment.

The increased size, number of buildings and businesses and people will create the need for additional resources for police and fire protection. There will be increased potential for crime, and the number of people and places of assembly (such as restaurants, hotels, theaters, concerts/performances, etc.) create potential for fire hazard. The fire hazards of restaurants and other businesses in the pier area are well documented, including in 1988 when a large portion of the pier burned down, and just this past July 4 (2014) when there was a fire on the pier. Also, the proposed economic terms of the project, where the City of Redondo Beach would not make any revenue from this project until after and unless the developer has achieved a certain return on its investment raises additional doubt on the City’s ability to successfully provide the increased police and fire protection resources that the new project would require.

The impact of the construction and the project’s additional number of visitors, traffic, and related air and water quality impacts on the fragile marine ecosystem and ocean life must also be studied and considered.

Given the project’s location, it is obviously subject to seismic impacts from earthquakes on the nearby Palos Verdes and Newport-Inglewood faults, as well as many other active faults in the region. And it would also be subject to possible tsunamis and tidal surges from the ocean. The project’s safety and impacts relative to these factors need to be studied and considered.

While I’m not certain if all of the existing buildings are to be demolished, the ones that will should be evaluated to determine if they have any potential historic value that could result in cultural impacts if they were demolished. Some of the older structures may have potential historic value. For example, Tony’s Restaurant on the pier has a facade, second-floor cupola and signs that are quite old, iconic and reminiscent of an older time period. Some of the storefronts on the lower level of the southerly basin of the marina are also quite old. The possible historic value of all improvements proposed for demolition or modification should be evaluated and considered.

These are some (though I'm sure not all) of the potential environmental impacts of this proposed project that need to be evaluated and considered. As you can see, it is a fairly lengthy list of possible impacts, and I'm sure I didn't think of them all. I certainly hope that all of these impacts are thoroughly studied and carefully considered before moving forward with this project. As I indicated throughout, I think many if not most of these impacts could be avoided or at least substantially reduced with a better thought out, less dense and more appropriate project. I really hope these factors are considered and this project revised into one that will benefit and enhance the existing neighborhood and the City, rather than destroy its environment and way of life. As I said at the outset, I am not opposed to the refurbishment and some expansion of the existing pier and waterfront. I just think it needs to be carefully planned at a proper nature and scale to complement and be compatible with the surrounding City and neighborhood, and make certain it will be a benefit, not a detriment, to the local community.
Thank you for your consideration, and please add me to the mailing list for this project.

Sincerely,

Jeff Pool

640 The Village #317

Redondo Beach, CA  90277
As an home owner and resident in Redondo Beach, I am all for revitalizing the Redondo Beach Pier; however, I don't see any necessity of creating a huge project and especially a new road by the pier. As it stands now, on every summer weekend, the volume of vehicles near the pier already exceeds the capacity of the area. Creating an elaborate shopping facility and a new road will only create more congestion, noise and pollution in what should be a pristine beach community. Do we really want out waterfront to look like Long Beach, CA? Thank you for listening to the residents of the city.

Sincerely,

Chad Proctor
650 The Village
Unit 215
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
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My primary concern with the EIR Draft is how the environment, including water, air, and ambient sound will be impacted permanently. The scope of the draft does not fully measure the impact of the extension road from Harbor Blvd, park and adjacent neighborhoods. I urge Redondo Beach City elected officials to revisit the project as stated and consider a lower density, downsized project to address environmental concerns.

**Water:** The ocean water quality in and around the Redondo Beach Pier and Harbor has consistently ranked poorly. The high bacteria levels, especially during the winter months, will be further impacted by the additional influx of development.

**Air:** While Redondo Beach enjoys good air quality today the proposed demolition and construction could jeopardize this resource. Further study of both short and long term effects of contaminates on both wildlife and residents are warranted.

**Noise:** The EIR draft does not adequately measure sound generated by natural and existing development w of Harbor Drive. Sound is significantly amplified by reflecting off elevated residential properties and further exasperated by our existing dense marine climate. The impact of noise is substantial and varies tremendously from site to site and neighborhoods within 1+miles area surrounding the Harbor. In addition, vibration noise from parking structures is not accounted for in this project, and its impact to the harbor and neighborhood.

**Definition of Impacted Residents:** The Draft Proposal needs to broaden the description of impacted residential areas East of Harbor Dr. to include a larger area. The ripple effect impacting area neighborhoods with additional traffic, that includes sensitive populations of Redondo Beach High School and multiple senior living facilities within half mile of the proposed project.

**Land Use Conflict:** The Draft does not address the land use conflict with Czueleger Park as a pedestrian entrance to the development.

The Quality of the City is reflected in the ability of Elected Officials to protect and preserve the environment for the future.

Sincerely,

Joan Riley
230 The Village #301
Redondo Beach, Ca 90277
Forgot to add these comments to my "comment sheet" from last nite's meeting...
Erika Robinson [redondobeachartist@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2014 9:55 AM
To: Katie Owston

Please include places for PUBLIC ART!

AND also, PLEASE PLEASE KEEP THE OCEAN STEPS (the mosaic steps just to the south of Naja's - OR please find a way to "move them" - THEY WERE A COMMUNITY EFFORT AND IT TOOK US AN ENTIRE SUMMER TO MAKE THEM! and they're beautiful!

--
Thanks y'all!
Erika Snow Robinson
www.redondobeachartist.com
310.946.5421
Re: Redondo Beach Water Front project
roger.e@verizon.net
Sent:Tuesday, July 15, 2014 10:09 PM
To: Katie Owston

Thank you for all of your hard work and concern for all. Have a great rest of the week. Sincerely; Roger Everett

On Tuesday, July 15, 2014 2:07 PM, Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org> wrote:

Thank you for your response to the Notice of Preparation for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/ Notice of Initial Study/Notice of Scoping Meeting for The Waterfront project. Your comments will be included as part of the public record with all comments received during the scoping process to help determine the scope and content of the EIR.

Please visit the City’s website at www.redondo.org and follow the link to the Waterfront on the home page for more information. As detailed in the Notice, if you have additional comments, they will be accepted by email and mail through 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.

Katie Owston
Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
Community Development Department
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
310-318-0637, 1-2895

---

From: roger.e@verizon.net [mailto:roger.e@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, July 10, 2014 3:55 PM
To: Katie Owston
Subject: Redondo Beach Water Front project

Dear Katie. Sorry that you got stuck with all of the work. My name is Roger and I have been a resident of the south bay since 1952 and redondo beach since 1967. I do not know what the council men are thinking of or are they? Look
at the seaside lagoon and you will see the same people on the redondo pier and they are not residence of redondo or any other beach city, but from Los Angeles. The seaside lagoon from what I hear has lost money every single year it has been open and now we want to expand the lagoon which is senseless. Let's talk about the shops and boat ramp. My father, brother and I used to launch a boat in redondo and we would leave to fish, return and come home. We didn't shop anywhere and I hope that the council would realize that fishermen don't shop after being on the water. The clientele that you would have at the water front will not change and the traffic would be unbearable to say the least. I know that a few of the councilman think that this would be like it was years ago when there was a resemblance of a town by the water, but it won't be. I would be willing to sign a petition against the water front project the way it is presented to the public at this point. Thank you for listening; Sincerely; Roger P.S. Sorry Katie but I didn't read the part that we had to be at the council meeting on July 9th but I had to express my feelings in case asked.

__________ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10100 (20140715) __________

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com

__________ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10101 (20140715) __________

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com
I'm a level headed South Bay resident and I am opposed to any over development plans for the harbor. I am a proponent if revitalizing the harbor without over-commercialization. I think we can beautify the harbor while maintaining it's allure, that had kept generations coming back to this beautiful seaside town.
Date: July 9th, 2014  
To: Mayor, City Council and Staff, Redondo Beach, CA  
From: Paul Schlichting – Resident on South Broadway, Redondo Beach  
Re: Proposed Waterfront Development Plan by CenterCal Properties

Dear Mayor, City Council, Mayor and Staff,

I would like to express my position that I am against the currently proposed waterfront enhancement project. I don’t think it is the right project for this area, the city, nor its citizens. The waterfront is Redondo’s “crown Jewel” – and this area is the only area that has it. It appears to be much bigger than the shoreline build-out plan for even Heart of the City, and I oppose it for the following reasons:

1. Wrong location for a large mall in that, geographically, this location has the ocean on fully ½ - or 50% of the potential. Below is a graphic similar to that I had drawn up during the Heart of the City campaign. Besides having the ocean for half its base area, there are other Malls in the area that already tap much of the remaining customer base, including:
   a. The Manhattan Village Shopping Center
   b. Redondo’s own South Bay Galleria
   c. Del Amo Mall
   d. The Shops at Palos Verdes
   e. The Torrance Promenade
   f. Plaza El Segundo
   g. Rolling Hills Plaza
   h. The Promenade at Howard Hughes Center (aka / formerly The Bridge)
   i. The Carson Mall

   ![Diagram of ocean, mall, and customer base]

   In the drawing to the left, the ocean takes up basically ½ of the geography of the potential customer base, hence a very large development here will have only ½ the customer base, and would be unlikely to survive, particularly when other competing malls in the area are considered.

2. City losing 10% over 30 years. The city should never guaranty a private enterprise a profit at potential cost to its residents, with possible further tax and/or fee implications. Why should the developer get sole rights over the city’s “Crown Jewels” if they either couldn’t guaranty a profit, or feel comfortable enough with their own business plan and investment that they need public-subsidized help? Further, how do we know that there might not be some creative accounting performed in order to avoid those payments? 30 years is a very long time, a generation and a half – crossing many Mayor and Council elections and participants – with the potential that all while the city loses money from this project. The possibility of losing all that money over that period of time – across all those administrations – would be very bad for the city. Also, would the city have any escape clauses?

3. If this turns out to be a lemon – all who approved and/or pushed this will have their names on it – for better or worse – most likely worse – forever. You need to be very, very sure that you are making the right decision for the people of Redondo Beach. Right now there is not sufficient information, presented in an understandable way, for a proper decision to be made. See the recently-received flyer and associated box below.
In addition, a couple of other points to bring up include:

4. **High end hotels**, where all lodging near the beach is already and understandably relatively expensive, would put rooms out of reach for many of the locals who might have family and friends that periodically come for a visit. Also, Redondo should have no near-beach lodging that enjoys any kind of bed-tax break, since a high-end hotel is already going in (the Shade), cost is obviously not an concern for prospective customers.

5. **Too much, too fast** in that this is a **HUGE** project, and although there have been a few public meetings during the selection process, the public needs time to digest and give feedback on any plan and design, including a 3D model that can be visited by the public – such as at the Public Library, or other such venue. The public needs more time, and a real method of posting their feedback, and aggregate feedback is considered before any kind of go-forward should be considered.

6. **Look at the Riviera** – a bunch of cute, quaint shops – all across the affordability spectrum. This area obviously grew, over time, on its own, and is a very popular area of South Redondo. Maybe we don’t want to afford the time, but maybe also one big solution for the whole waterfront is not to have one giant solution, but many smaller ones. Yes, we did have the segmented lease-holds for years, but that helped evolve the beachfront to its currently diverse state.

Thank you very much.

Paul Schlichting  
South Broadway  
Redondo Beach, CA  90277

I will submit more later. (Before July 21st)  
Thank you

---

This is the front page of the flyer, recently sent by CenterCal Properties, that contains “sounds good, feels good” information, but no firm examples, drawings, nor layout for the plans. Even I would say this sounds great. However, I now know better, and want to know the details and see the models, as should everyone.
Katie Owston,

I have been a Redondo Beach homeowner since 1998. I have many serious concerns regarding CenterCal's huge over-sized waterfront/harbor development project that I feel need to be addressed in the EIR. They are as follows:

1) Traffic: Delivery trucks parked and unloading, and many buses line the entry into our Pier area daily. In the evening, the tour buses come down and illegally park in the loading/unloading area. We're lucky if they park. Most of the time they sit out there and idle. It is extremely loud. Our City does nothing to enforce this illegal tour bus parking. If it looks like this now, what will it look like after the over-development happens? What will it sound like? What will it smell like? We have not yet been told, after asking Mr. Bruning many times, where these trucks will go to unload their goods. And there will be many more of them with the new restaurants and stores going in, not to mention yet another hotel. See the attch'd picture of the "Delivery" ramp down into the parking structure that was put in way back in the day. I have witnessed the trucks. and the trucks have never used this so-called "Delivery" ramp to go down and unload their products. They line the circle creating traffic congestion and constant back-up beeping.

2) The CenterCal waterfront development plan violates city zoning by shrinking Seaside Lagoon Park in both public open space and water area. It paves over a large portion of the park for a road, a portion of the three-story parking garage, the pedestrian esplanade, and eight restaurant/retail shops. This violates both City zoning and the California Coastal Act. And, once Seaside Lagoon is opened up to the harbor, they also open it up to the sea lions. How are they going to keep them out? This is a blatant example of CenterCal's lack of foresight and inexperience in developing a coastal area.

3) The CenterCal Plan creates navigation hazards in our harbor, decreases boating facilities, and eliminates much needed and well-used boater parking. It creates traffic
gridlock that will make it difficult to even access the harbor.

4) The nice, glitzy elevation views of the CenterCal Plan posted on the City website and in the local papers don't match the plan CenterCal submitted to the City. The pretty pictures show a huge waterfront esplanade/boardwalk... much, much larger than depicted in their plan. The open areas are bigger in the glitzy drawings than in the plan. The buildings don't match the plan.

CenterCal promised residents a 3-D model of their development so we could visualize the view impacts. A year and a half after their CEO made that promise, we still don't have that model. CenterCal NEVER shows their mall drawings from the Harbor Drive perspective ... only from the perspective of looking in from the ocean. Residents wishing to gain a clear image of the CenterCal plan from which to submit concerns have NOT been afforded that opportunity due to OMISSION OF DATA!

5) Please compare the proposed CenterCal project to the nearby "Ports of Call," the failed waterfront shopping/restaurant area in San Pedro that is undergoing a similar revitalization process as we are with our harbor. Their waterfront area is 15 acres, the same LAND AREA as our harbor/pier area in the CenterCal mall project - 15 acres for possible development. Port of Los Angeles officials are not as enamored with over-development as our City Council. The maximum total development allowed in their 15 LAND acres is just 375,000 sq ft. Our Council is promoting CenterCal's 524,000 sq ft in 15 acres of LAND AREA available. That is 40% larger than what San Pedro is allowing over the same space.

6) The City is claiming an estimate of net average revenues of $2.8M per year from the CenterCal project, a paltry 3% of the City's annual revenues. But they have refused to give the public the details of their calculations. Does this include increased wear and tear on the roads? The increase in public safety costs? Regardless - to net just $2.8M per year for doubling our density does not justify the significant impacts to our quality of life and our harbor recreational access. The City analysis does show that the City knows there is a potential negative cash flow if the project does not perform. In a scenario where revenues from the project are reduced 22% from their initial assumption, the project generates a loss of $48M. This is a huge, negative financial impact that needs detailed analysis. The downside of this project could far exceed a $48M loss; a downside that Redondo Beach cannot afford.

7) In the immediate vicinity (adjacent to and across the street from CenterCal's proposed plan) are two other projects whose impacts need to be considered: 1) the construction of the new Shade Hotel and, 2) demolition of the power plant and construction of what will take its place. Additionally, a possible 3rd project is looming
about 1/4 mile away, that being possible oil drilling in Hermosa Beach, with construction, congestion, noise and other negative impacts that could all be taking place simultaneously.

8) A local non-profit organization, Building a Better Redondo (BBR), has circulated an alternative vision to the CenterCal project that has received significant, positive response from the community. At a June 2014 City Street Festival, hundreds of Redondo Beach residents gave feedback in support of the BBR alternate plan being a welcomed and viable replacement of the CenterCal development project. Please compare, contrast and evaluate this alternative plan.

Yes, I have more concerns such as the addition of a road between Torrance Blvd. and Harbor Drive, the added height of the project; specifically, a 3-story parking garage that will block views, the lack of open space, and the competition with the other, non-coastal retail developments; Plaza El Segundo, Manhattan Village Mall, South Bay Galleria, Del Amo Mall, The Promenade at Rolling Hills, and Ports of Call, to name a few ... all of which should be analyzed regarding "market impact."

Redondo Beach has a unique, quaint harbor with scenic, coastal views that cannot be duplicated by our sister beach cities. Rather than hide it behind a wall of the CenterCal-proposed development that is not coastal dependent, the revitalization of our harbor should focus on harbor views for all the public, and easy access to coastal recreational uses like boating, sailing, fishing, paddling, and rowing. The great majority of people in Redondo Beach agree that our harbor needs revitalization. I strongly feel this way as well. I welcome revitalization, but this plan is too BIG and needs to be scaled down. There are several vacant spaces on our Pier now that have been vacant for a long time. I do not believe a plan of this size will be viable during the winter months. Our City officials need to wake up and learn from past failed projects. Let's please understand the negative impacts of what CenterCal is proposing and re-direct the development project to something more appropriate, less dense, financially feasible, with shared-profitability between the developer and the City, and a project that does not violate our City Codes or the Coastal Act. Thank you.

Sincerely,
D. Schaub, 640-The Village, Redondo Beach
Hello Katie,

I have many concerns about the proposed extensive development for the Redondo Pier. Certainly, it needs to be revitalized, and the improvements that have been made so far are good. Redondo Beach's pier and beach area have always been wonderful for families of all ages and nationalities. Turning this area into a very upscale shopping and dining experience isn't appropriate. Rivera Village is close by which offers those facilities. Many families enjoy our pier and beach that couldn't afford expensive restaurants and shops. Are we going to take away this enjoyment for hundreds of people so a small majority can have a nice "out on the town".

Remember, the beach and pier area are for ALL the people, not just some of the people.

Martha Shaver
565 Esplanade #316
Redondo Beach, CA
Redondo Beach Resident - comments to the Proposed CenterCal Project

Ryan Shea [r.d.shea@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2014 11:25 AM
To: Katie Owston

To Redondo Beach Staff:

With respect to the proposed CenterCal project--

As I understand the planned square footage for the project is roughly twice what is there today. I am a homeowner in the Beryl Heights area, which as you know is just up Beryl from the proposed project site. I am very concerned about the amount of new traffic that will be a result of the project and increased square footage. Particularly on Beryl and Diamond between PCH and Prospect which have schools on them. Also, I (like thousands of other Redondo residents) take PCH southbound in the afternoon/rush hour commute home from work. I'm concerned that this commute is going to get substantially longer for local residents due to this project and there is no alternative route to get home for local residents.

Before agreeing to a density/new square footage entitlement for this project, I hope that Staff looks very closely at the scope of work for the Traffic Study to see what effect this project will have on these streets. For example, if westbound Torrance Blvd gets jammed up with cars entering the project, will people start using Diamond and Beryl as a cut-thru/bypass? This has to be studied, as these are slow residential streets with schools on them. How many additional minutes will be added onto to the typical commuter's drive home in the evening around 6pm travelling south bound PCH?

I am happy that there is a re-investment planned for our harbor/waterfront and agree it is long over due, but I hope it doesn't come with traffic problems that cannot be mitigated and which change the quality of life of local residents.

I, like many other concerned residents, look forward to seeing the traffic study for this project and hope it is carefully considered by Staff, City Council, and Planning Commission before approving a density/square footage for CenterCal's project.

Regards,

Ryan Shea
434 N. Maria Ave
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
COMMENTS

The Waterfront Project

Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

To: Katie Owston, Project Planner
katie.owston@redondo.org

Name: Nick Sherbin
Address: 704 N. Lucia Avenue
City: Redondo Beach
Zip Code: 90277

The environmental issues I feel should be addressed in the EIR are:
1) Recreation, 2) Water Quality, 3) Exposure to Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Comments:
Opening of Seaside Lagoon to the waters of King Harbor. The Seaside Lagoon is utilized daily by hundreds of families for picnicking, swimming and water play and constitutes a significant source of recreation for the community. The Lagoon is completely enclosed by land. The water entering the Lagoon is filtered and circulated and bacteria is controlled by the addition of chlorine as necessary and chemically tested to ensure a bacterially safe, pollution-free swimming environment. If the Lagoon is altered by creating an opening into King Harbor raw sewage, oil, fuel, scum, and other toxic bilge discharges from boats as well bacteria and other contaminants from storm sewer outlets flowing directly into the Harbor, garbage and other floating debris which is present throughout King Harbor and Port Royal Marina will pass unobstructed into the Lagoon and will significantly degrade the quality of the water and create a potentially hazardous environment to the public that utilizes the Seaside Lagoon.

Additional considerations:
Any reduction in the size of the Seaside Lagoon including surrounding picnicking areas, impairment as a result of decreased access parking (making it harder to transport coolers, chairs, umbrellas and swimming gear) and as well as any increase in the cost of parking, are all factors that would negatively impact the public’s recreational access to the Seaside Lagoon.

Thank you.

Nick Sherbin
EIR Redondo Beach Waterfront
Nick Sherbin [nsherbin@verizon.net]
Sent:Friday, July 18, 2014 5:25 AM
To: Katie Owston

July 13, 2014

Ms. Katie Owston
Community Development Department
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California  90277

Re: Environmental Impact Report for Proposed Redondo Beach Waterfront Redevelopment

Dear Ms. Owston:

Thank you for the opportunity to present my concerns about the environmental impact of CenterCal’s tentative plan to develop the waterfront in Redondo Beach.

To give you some personal perspective, I reside in Redondo Beach, near the corner of Beryl Street and North Lucia Avenue in the house that my father built in 1945. As you are no doubt aware, Beryl Street to the South and 190th Street to the North form two of the major arteries into the proposed development. Traveling East on Beryl from this intersection are two elementary schools, a neighborhood shopping center and a hospital. Westbound traffic will impact a church and the senior center on the Salvation Army property.

We are concerned that what is currently proposed—a project 25% larger than Plaza El Segundo in less than half the space with projected 30,000 more daily weekend car trips—would represent a nightmare in terms of increased traffic and safety concerns especially with regard to not only nearby Beryl Heights Elementary but, also Towers Elementary in adjacent Torrance as well. Trucks transporting goods to supply the increased density of the proposed development present a particular problem for Beryl Street which runs entirely through a residential neighborhood.

Another issue is access to the ocean for the sailboats moored in King Harbor. The walkway, as presently proposed, would not allow sailboats to enter or leave the marina unless they had an expensive mast alteration in order to accommodate the walkway’s low overhang.

A project of this magnitude will also increase demand for municipal services such as police and fire as well as requiring additional infrastructure. The citizens of Redondo Beach are expected to underwrite these requirements while allowing CenterCal’s developers, who have no experience with coastal waterfront development, free rent for 30 years until their project receives a 10% profit on their investment each year.

CenterCal’s plans for a movie theatre, a three story parking garage, and a 66,000 square foot market hall, may work for an inland mall but not for a waterfront community hoping to encourage an active, healthy, outdoor lifestyle.
Both Mayor Aspel and CenterCal’s CEO Bruning state goals for our waterfront project as “happiness.” A more desirable goal is to follow Santa Monica’s Sustainable City Plan created to “enhance our resources, prevent harm to the natural environment and human health, and benefit the social and economic well-being of the community for the sake of current and future generations.”

An alternate vision to the one proposed by CenterCal would be one with less retail, more dining, and an emphasis on the open space and recreational aspects of the harbor. This would preserve the character of the area incorporating a major facelift which we can all agree needs to be part of the master plan for the waterfront.

Sincerely,

Shannon Sherbin
Do you get this?
Originally it went to redondobeach.org

A very important issue is the removal of the Seaside Lagoon.

Proposition G was specific to keeping the Seaside Lagoon. In fact the initiative would probably not have passed if it were not for “Save the Seaside Lagoon”.

   By definition:   AN INLET IS NOT A LAGOON.

There will be no separate clean safe area for families with children to play and swim. The area will be part of the dirty harbor and no one swims in the harbor now. How can the city possibly think that little children will swim and be safe next to a boat ramp.

Steve Shoemaker
140 The Village
Redondo Beach, California
From: steve3 <steve3@redondo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 11:22 AM
To: Katie Owston
Subject: RE: CENTER CAL DEVELOPMENT

Thanks, I plan to attend

From: Katie Owston [mailto:Katie.Owston@redondo.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 11:15 AM
To: 'steve3'
Subject: RE: CENTER CAL DEVELOPMENT

Thank you for your response to the Notice of Preparation for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/ Notice of Initial Study/Notice of Scoping Meeting for The Waterfront project. Your comments will be included as part of the public record with all comments received during the scoping process to help determine the scope and content of the EIR.

Please visit the City’s website at www.redondo.org and follow the link to the Waterfront on the home page for more information. Also, I encourage you to attend the scoping meeting/open house to be held on July 9, 2014 from 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m., at the Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center, 1935 Manhattan Beach Blvd., Redondo Beach, CA 90278. A short presentation will be given at 6:15 p.m.

As detailed in the Notice, if you have additional comments, they will be accepted at the scoping meeting and by email and mail through 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.

Katie Owston
Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
Community Development Department
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
310-318-0637, 1-2895

From: steve3 [mailto:steve3@redondo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2014 4:06 PM
To: Katie Owston
Subject: FW: CENTER CAL DEVELOPMENT

Do you get this?
Originally it went to redondobeach.org

From: steve3 [mailto:steve3@redondo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2014 4:02 PM
To: 'katie.owston@redondobeach.org'
Cc: Bill Brand (bbrand@earthlink.net)
Subject: CENTER CAL DEVELOPMENT

A very important issue is the removal of the Seaside Lagoon.

Proposition G was specific to keeping the Seaside Lagoon. In fact the initiative would probably not have passed if it were not for “Save the Seaside Lagoon”.
By definition: AN INLET IS NOT A LAGOON.

There will be no separate clean safe area for families with children to play and swim. The area will be part of the dirty harbor and no one swims in the harbor now. How can the city possibly think that little children will swim and be safe next to a boat ramp.

Steve Shoemaker
140 The Village
Redondo Beach, California

http://www.eset.com
I was going to talk about the pedestrian bridge in the project. If the bridge is too high people will not walk over it and if it is too low commercial fishing boats will not be able to pass. Is the bridge a lifting or separating bridge? What about the California Fish and Game and the harbor dedicated uses. I think commercial fishing is a guarantee.

Steve Shoemaker
The Village
Redondo Beach, California
I'm sure that the roadway planned to connect the hotel with the north end of the project has been addressed numerous times. I would like to comment that the traffic will create smog, noise and disturbances for the residents of The Village, of which I am one. When the condo’s were sold the buyers were told that no road would be there as the structure housing the International Boardwalk would not support a road. Czuleger Park was to connect Catalina with the ocean. Does the planned road remove the lower portion of this dedicated park? What about children playing in the park and running in front of a vehicle?

Steve Shoemaker
The Village
Redondo Beach
Gene Simon [Gsimon@rbusd.org]
Sent:Thursday, July 10, 2014 9:14 PM
To: Katie Owston

Ms. Owston,
I am a 21 year resident of Redondo Beach. I would like to see the plan for King Harbor's remodel adapted to not have an above ground 3 story parking structure. I hope this reduces the number of retail shops since parking will not be available for the current planned number.
E. Simon
Resident
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Mary Simun
Address: 501 N. Paulina Ave., P.B.
Zip Code: 90277

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

From an environmental standpoint, this is a bad idea. Shouldn't coastal access be the primary concern of redevelopment? In this proposal, it seems to be an afterthought. I read the entire report. In the report, it states "significant impact" predicted in areas of aesthetics, biological resources (species), air and water quality, wastewater treatment, cultural resources, paleo-geologic resources (including ground faultline and liquefaction), hazardous materials. It does not mention water availability - we are in a severe drought.

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Noise
- exceeding standards
- groundborne vibration
- permanent increase in ambient noise
- temporary/periodic noise increase

Public Services - negative impact on:
- police protection
- parks

Recreational
- increase use of parks
- construction/expansion of recreational resources

Transportation/Traffic
- conflict w/existing transport plans/patterns
- conflict of congestion management
Utilities + Service Systems

- exceed wastewater treatment requirements
- require construction of new wastewater treatment plant
- new stormwater/drainage facilities
- have significant water available

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

* degrade environment and harm native species
* cumulatively considerable impact
* adverse effects on humans
Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- generate greenhouse gases that may have a significant impact on the environment
- conflict with plans to reduce greenhouse gases

Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- create hazard to public or environment through the release of hazardous materials
  located on a hazmat site

Hydrology / Water Quality
- violate water quality standards
- alter existing drainage pattern of the area
- create/contribute to runoff
- degrade water quality
- place housing within flood hazard area
  - flood
  - tsunami + natural disaster
Project may have a significant impact on

- Aesthetics - scenic vistas

- Air Quality
  - conflict or obstruct air quality plan
  - violate air quality standard
  - net increase in pollutants

- Biological Resources
  - have substantial effects on native species (CSESAs)
  - have substantial effect on riparian habitat
  - interfere substantially with movement of native species

- Cultural Resources
  - cause an adverse change in significance of historical resource
  - destroy paleo or geological site

- Geology
  - seismic-related ground failure
- new stormwater drains
- addition of fill material (for modified topography)
- high quality open space

Construction includes

- dredging
- filling
- rock placement
- in-water concrete placement
- sheet pile installation
- pile driving
- shoreline protection

Based on initial evaluation (in report)

"I find that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and an EIR/IMPACT RPT is required."  - Aaron Jones, Conr.
Notes (from proposal on city's website) 79 pages long!

1st round - to address residents' environmental concerns about the project.

Last revitalization - 1970's

- minimum of 50% of buildings limited to 1 story
- replace parking structures
- enhance bike baths (😊)
- open seaside lagoon to beach (😊)
- improved access for boats
- more pedestrian promenades
- replace buildings on pier
- reinforce pier (maybe?)
- replace/refurbish boat slips
- demolish international boardwalk (over)
From: Jeanne & Barry Sinsheimer <sajb@aol.com>
Date: July 15, 2014 at 5:08:05 AM PDT
To: "pat.aust@redondo.org" <pat.aust@redondo.org>
Subject: Waterfront Revitalization Project

I live in your district and have been a resident of Redondo Beach since 1987. My employment is in the city of Redondo Beach and both of my children attended the public schools, participated in various sports programs growing up and graduated from Redondo High.

I have some questions regarding the new mall proposed at King Harbor.
1. I would like to understand why we are building another mall when we can not keep the current mall full of tenants?
   a. With Nordstrom leaving and many of the other spaces empty shouldn't this be a first priority?
   b. what will the impact be on Rivera Village?

2. Why would another movie theater be put in?
   a. Who goes to the waterfront to be inside for 2 hours?
   b. Why put a movie theater in when you have one at the Galleria that is approximately 2.5 miles away?
      - Would this not take away more business from the Galleria?

3. The parking at the marina on summer weekends in particular is a nightmare?
   a. My daughter is currently an employee in the Marina. She can not drive to work on weekends as it takes her 45 minutes to get home with getting out of the parking lot then sitting in traffic trying to cross PCH. We are approximately one mile away from the Marina. How is a parking structure going to help the situation?

4. Why is this development getting the tax breaks?
   a. Isn't that one of the complaints about AES?

Please reconsider this option. We need to have something that is water related not a bunch of
stores may impact other businesses in Redondo Beach. The Galleria needs attention with regard to revitalization.

Thank you for your time,

Jeanne Sinsheimer  
1915 Spreckels Ln  
Redondo Beach, CA 90278  
310-376-4191

Sent from my iPad
Hello Katie,

I just wanted to drop a note of support for the new Pier revitalization the city is trying to move forward. I am a relatively new resident of Redondo Beach, moving here about a year ago. I can see where the Pier needs a major make over and I am impressed with the layout the city and Center Cal have put out. I also love the Shade hotel that is being built as well.

Let me know if there is anything I can do to help this project move forward.

Thanks

Best Regards,

Brian Slagel
Chairman/CEO
Metal Blade Records Inc.
5737 Kanan Rd # 143
Agoura Hills, Ca 91301
http://www.metalblade.com
South Bay Parkland Conservancy


Comments:

The South Bay Parkland Conservancy’s goal is the preservation of open space throughout the South Bay. The South Bay is park poor* with Redondo Beach averaging 2.35 acres per thousand people. This figure includes the beaches. National park land is 12.9 per acre and a recommended federal level of 10 acres. Parkland is important to the health and well-being of all residents. The Conservancy supports environmentally friendly causes that foster open space, clean air and reduction of greenhouse gases, and reduced and reclaimed water uses.

*per Federal and Trust for Public Land recommendations

The information currently available to evaluate this project is inadequate. There are no three dimensional renderings or even an architectural rendering to support this particular project. Based upon the information available, the South Bay Parkland Conservancy respectfully asks the following questions be addressed fully before any project may be considered:

1) Land Use/Planning: The plan does not give any information on what would be considered publicly delineated space for physical activities such as walking, running, gathering, sitting, biking. Will pedestrians and bikers alike to able to access the harbor and adjacent pier areas without restraint? Will there be any accommodation for a public gathering space or park as requested by Redondo Beach residents in the 2005 advisory vote? Will this development adhere to State Lands Commissions rules? How will the California Environmental Quality Act be impacted?
2) **Air Quality:** Based upon the size of the development for the project, up to 30,000 car trips per day could occur. How will this exceed Coastal (CEQA), State, and Federal Air Quality regulations for carbon and ozone emissions? How will this impact residents and visitors alike- especially the very young and old- who are adversely impacted by these gasses? The environmental issues of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Transportation/Traffic and Noise will also be adversely impacted per this process.

3) **Hydrology/Water Quality:** What impact would this size development have on local groundwater issues?? What about water usage issues? How much water will be used when California suffers from severe drought impacting the residents and South Bay? What about sewer issues of runoff and overflow? How will this impact, residents, wildlife and the environment in general?? What about the potential for floods via extreme tides, tsunami or storm?

4) **Biological Resources:** How would the existing flora, fauna, fish and wildlife that currently accesses the Harbor and area be directly affected? How would the California Department of Fish and Game standards for wildlife or U.S. Fish and Game standards be impacted? What migratory birds and beasts would be affected?

5) **Aesthetics:** Views from project would be blocked** from several significant areas: Czelugar Park- from Catalina Avenue West to the current top floor of the Parking structure (See Figures 1- 3A)+

>Views from the Harbor Drive Parking Lot (See Figures 4 -7)

Several beautiful vistas will be lost due to the inclusion of 3 story buildings

>Beryl Street View West to North Harbor Drive (See Figures 8 and 9)

Creating a “concrete canyon” with a three story building on the SW corner of Beryl St and N Harbor Drive

** Per the State Coastal Commission Coastal Act protecting the public’s view of the coast, harbor and ocean.

Pictures are supplied separately+ I took the pictures with my Canon XD150.
6) Recreation: Will residents and visitors be able to continue to USE the Harbor without impingement of boating activities? According to the plan, the Seaside Lagoon size would be reduced, and then opened to the harbor. How will this be possible? Who will be responsible for the Seaside Lagoon’s upkeep from tidal flow of waters and wildlife (seal and bird intrusion?)

7) The South Bay Parkland Conservancy supports the comments and questions submitted by Building a Better Redondo and Jim Light.

South Bay Parkland Conservancy would like to work alongside a development team that is open to help plan a harbor centric development that will allow for the intersection of harbor life and tourism in a manner that benefits all who would live, work and visit this beautiful area—redevelopment not overdevelopment.

Respectfully submitted:

[Signature]

Melanie L Cohen - President – South Bay Parkland Conservancy
Good morning,

Please see the attached comments on the notice of preparation of an EIR regarding the Redondo waterfront.

Sincerely,

Michael Weber and Frances Spiwy-Weber
520 The Village Unit 109
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
July 21, 2014

Katie Owston
Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach, CA

Sent by email to Katie.Owston@redondo.org

Dear Ms. Owston,

We are submitting the following comments on the environmental scope of the Environmental Impact Review (EIR) that will be prepared regarding The Waterfront Project.

**General Comments**

Above all, the EIR should fully present and analyze a range of alternatives, including no action, the current proposal from CenterCal, and intermediate alternatives which reflect recent discussions in the community, among other things. The success of the EIR and the planning process will depend upon the degree to which the EIR informs the City Council of the impacts of these alternatives in an objective and balanced manner. Alternatives to the proposed project should not be tacit and should enable the City Council to select elements from different alternatives in order to develop a final preferred alternative reflecting a thoughtful review.

In describing the no-action alternative, the EIR should describe and evaluate the impact of future environmental conditions, including climate change, the deterioration of infrastructure, and continued operational impacts. As with all alternatives, the EIR should present both positive and negative impacts. The EIR should also explicitly discuss the selection of the geographical scope for analysis of different potentially affected environmental factors.

**Comments on the Notice of Preparation**

**Page 14, Aesthetics:** The EIR should include sketches and descriptions of site-lines in the immediate area of the project, at least as far east as Catalina Avenue. The lack of sketches has made it very difficult to evaluate the proposed project during the planning process so far. Sketches and description of sight-lines should be included for all alternatives and the aesthetic impacts compared.

**Page 26, Cultural Resources:** The NOP doesn’t establish a need for the evaluation of archeological or paleontological resources given that previous reviews have found no evidence of either type of resource on the site.

**Page 32, Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** The EIR should describe current and project emissions under all alternatives, including the no-action alternative. At least one alternative should include state-of-the-art methods of reducing greenhouse gas emissions through low-impact transportation, building design, and other methods.

**Page 40, Water Quality:** The EIR should include both point and non-point sources as well as design features that affect discharges, such as impervious surfaces. At least one alternative should include design features that retain stormwater onsite, reduce contamination of water discharged from the site.
through the use of state-of-the-art technology, such as waterless urinals and other green-building features, conservation, use of recycled water for outdoor irrigation.

**Page 44, Flooding:** The analysis should include the impact of catastrophic storm events, including storms whose impacts are aggravated by tide levels. The EIR should avail itself of the sea-level rise projections developed for the State of California by the National Academy of Sciences (citation?) and analyze impacts using the range of projections in that report.

**Page 51, Population:** The NOP dismisses the impact of the project on population growth by focusing solely upon potentially increased employment in the project. However, if the project does succeed in its aim of revitalizing the Waterfront so that it is more attractive, it stands to reason that more people will want to live in the area. That is not necessarily a bad thing, since increased demand will potentially increase property values in the vicinity—in contrast to the no-action alternative. In any event, the potential for population growth induced by project should be explored in the EIR.

**Page 57, Traffic:** The EIR should evaluate current and projected growth or changes in traffic patterns under all alternatives. We believe these projects should also be incorporated into other environmental factors such as greenhouse gas emissions.

**Page 61, Stormwater:** As suggested above, the EIR should include at least one alternative that retains stormwater on site.

**Page 61, Water Supplies:** The EIR should include an alternative that effectively reduces potential water use below current levels through conservation and enables the use of recycled water for landscaping for other such uses.

**Page 64, Cumulative Impacts:** The definitions of the environmental factors that the NOP suggests will not receive cumulative impact analysis are narrow, without any explanation of this narrowness. For example, the NOP confines aesthetic factors to scenic highways or physical features. It seems likely that in the immediate area of the project, there will be significant changes in esthetics in the coming years; for example, whether the AES powerplant is removed or downsized, the skyline will open up considerably.

We hope these comments are useful in preparing an EIR that can guide a thoughtful review of alternatives for the waterfront.

Sincerely,

Michael Weber and Frances Spivy-Weber
520 The Village Unit 109
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

cc. Mayor Steve Aspel
Councilman Bill Brand
Begin forwarded message:

From: Sari Staggs <saristaggs@earthlink.net>
Date: July 9, 2014 9:25:16 AM PDT
To: katie.owston@redondobeach.org
Subject: the harbor mall disaster area...

For city council member Bill Brand to read at meeting:

If one only takes into consideration the liquefaction factor that comes into play during an earthquake, that alone should be reason enough NOT to put in a mall down at the water's edge.

Doesn’t anyone remember the earthquake and tsunami in Japan only a few years ago? Didn’t anyone here watch as whole portions of that country were washed out to sea?

We live in earthquake country right here in REDONDO BEACH, along the same PACIFIC RIM as Japan’s. Debris from that catastrophe is still washing up on OUR shores.

Do we want to put all this investment of money and time and energy into something that at any second could be washed out to sea?

Doesn’t anyone remember when the PORTOFINO INN was all but destroyed by heavy winter storms only a few years back?

Money and income and profit go out the window when improper planning builds projects that are inherently flawed and should have been scrapped from their first moments on the drawing board.

PAY ATTENTION PEOPLE! I KNOW WHERE OF I SPEAK. THIS PROJECT IS A DISASTER WAITING TO HAPPEN. GET A GRIP!

Thank you for your time,

Sari Staggs, voter and concerned citizen
Redondo Beach resident since 2006,
Southern California Beach Resident since 1949
Fwd: the harbor mall disaster area...
It truly continues to amaze me that most of our city leaders still really think that most Redondo Beach residents/landowners want some big gargantuan development down at the harbor. I really don’t believe that they are that stupid so the only thing left is it makes me to believe that those that are pushing this agenda are in bed with the developers for their own aggrandizement. These people should be ashamed with themselves. I believe that these people took an oath to follow the people’s will and were supposed to have the residents best interests in mind not their own visions of glory and power. Most everyone that I have talked to about this ridiculous “Mall” like plan thinks that it is ill conceived, over the top, unnecessary, and in fact is truly detrimental to our city and its’ residents. We don’t want another Las Vegas here. If they must knuckle under to the developers how about at least keeping it more reasonable. Politicians and their greedy power grabs in league with developers will be the death of us all. Thank God that we have one councilman that has some idea of what the people really want. This is a great little city and I love living here but the politics sucks!

Barry Stark
517 N. Lucia Ave
Public comment on Harbor Development plans
Alexander [astarr66@yahoo.com]
Sent:Monday, July 21, 2014 1:28 PM
To: Katie Owston
Cc: Dolores Starr [doloresstarr@yahoo.com]

To whom it may concern:

I am 100% opposed to the plans to build a huge development on our harbor. This plan will destroy our local harbor businesses, destroy ocean views, and create traffic gridlock. Who wants to go to huge Mall when we want to have access to the ocean activities, and actually enjoy the harbor for what it is!

Redondo already destroyed our downtown in the past, and now they want to destroy our quaint harbor! Ridiculous.

I support modernizing our harbor area, not replacing it with a huge mall.

Alexander L. Starr
1803 Pullman Lane
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
Tel. 310-406-0433

Sent from my iPad
Katie,

I read that you are the focal for the EIR for the RB pier. From what I've seen of the plans for the pier I am not sure this plan is in the best interest of Redondo Beach. I think that a mix of higher density development with more open space and view corridors would be more acceptable not only to developers but also to the public at large. Same thing goes for the power plant property.

I am wondering how we converged on this particular solution without considering other options. This raises questions surrounding the city planning process. In order to be as constructive as possible, I wanted to share my thoughts on the planning process, not so much to criticize but just to be helpful.

Here are my thoughts:

My observations:

- Redondo Beach has an aversion to spending money on city planning, driven in part by a conservative anti-growth mindset by a vocal minority of local voters.

- Weak city planning results in a poor track record of uneven and incoherent growth.

- The non-existence of a centralized city growth plan makes the city vulnerable to the self-serving ad hoc interests of developers.

- Redondo Beach is in a reactive mode of subsiding and justifying developer suggestions, versus a pro-active mode of developing a plan with public engagement independent of developers, conforming to a plan, and measuring developer suggestions against their city plan.

- The city is locked into small minded thinking on growth, unconsciously ruling out growth alternatives that may be the best route in the long run, but don’t make the quickest buck for developers.

My views of what should be done:

- Undertake a city planning process that engages the public in its development and permits measured growth in a coherent, controlled, and consistent manner.

- Hire a firm to be an independent arbiter that runs a planning process for the city without representing any developer interests.

- Task this independent firm with publishing and routinely updating and maintaining a city growth management plan on behalf of the city council.
Planned growth could actually improve the quality of life for all Redondo Beach residents. For example, most voters might favor a series of 20 story towers on the waterfront in exchange for 4/5ths new “open space” that opens up view corridors for the enjoyment of the rest of the community.

My vision for Redondo Beach is one with new view corridors, with a published city plan that is well understood by all, and supported by a majority. One where there is more sensible development, more open space, where developers pay for their own Environmental Impact Reports, and are held to a consistent coherent city plan. I hope you share this vision. My only vested interest is that I want to live here for a long time, and to continue to enjoy this vibrant, growing community.

Some links for your consideration:

General Links:


http://www.useful-community-development.org/community-planning-process.html

Standards ideas from the UK:


Example Firm Parametrix Links:

http://www.parametrix.com/what-we-do/community-building

http://www.parametrix.com/what-we-do/project-management

Cc'ing my spouse Nancy who share some but not all of these views, just for her own information, as she is currently out of town. Nancy, feel free to chime in.

Best regards,
Yours sincerely,
Gary Stephenson
Hi Katie,

Thank you so much for your response to our request for The Waterfront Project application materials. I have successfully download the two files made available, which included the files titled “application final.pdf” and “Redondo Beach WF EAA Submission R04.pdf.” Should I have any questions regarding these materials, or other questions pertaining to The Waterfront Project, I will contact you.

Again, I very much appreciate your speedy response to our request.

Best regards,

Craig

On Jul 15, 2014, at 11:49 AM, Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org> wrote:

Mr. Cadwallader,

Aaron Jones has asked me to send you the application files for The Waterfront project. Given the large size of the files, I will send them via secure file transfer from CDM Smith. You will be receiving an email with a link and password to access the files for download. Please let me know if you have any trouble receiving the email or accessing the files.

Katie Owston
Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
Community Development Department
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
310-318-0637, 1-2895

Katie, Please follow up and see that he receives a copy of the application materials.
Hello Community Development Director Jones,

I enjoyed meeting and speaking with you last Wednesday at the Environmental Impact Report Notice of Preparation (NOP) Scoping Meeting for The Waterfront Project.

As we discussed, we are unclear how Surfrider would be able to provide meaningful and credible comments on the NOP with the minimal information contained in the NOP, that was communicated during the July 9, 2014 Scoping Meeting, or as currently available on the City of Redondo Beach Web site. As you and I further discussed, Surfrider very much would like to obtain a copy of the formal Application submitted for The Waterfront Project, including the specific project details that were used as the basis to create the formal NOP published for this project.

You mentioned to me then that you had The Waterfront Project Application materials available in digital form (PDFs) that you would provide to Surfrider, and we are very eager to obtain a copy of same in a timely manner as the remaining time to analyze these documents and submit comments on the NOP is rapidly diminishing. Given that the deadline to submit comments on the NOP is one week away as set for July 21, 2014 (5:30 p.m.), and we all are quite busy with other matters (as I’m certain you are as well), we again would very much appreciate it if you would please email those materials to us as soon as possible, so we can properly evaluate this project and submit worthwhile comments in a timely manner to meet this short deadline.

Please email these materials at your earliest possible convenience to: "Craig W. Cadwallader <chair@surfrider-southbay.org>”

Also, if you have questions or if there is some problem that has prevented these materials being emailed to me as I understood you would do following last Wednesday’s meeting, please feel free to call me at 310-545-3094 so we can determine how else we might obtain these important materials.

Thank you very much for your consideration and anticipated timely response to our request, for which we are sincerely grateful.

Best regards,

Craig W. Cadwallader
Chair, Surfrider Foundation - South Bay Chapter

--

Craig W. Cadwallader
Surfrider Foundation - South Bay Chapter
Chapter Chair
Rise Above Plastics (RAP) Chair
http://www.surfrider-southbay.org/
The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com

--
Craig W. Cadwallader
Surfrider Foundation - South Bay Chapter
Chapter Chair
Rise Above Plastics (RAP) Chair
http://www.surfrider-southbay.org/

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com
Re: the Redondo Beach Redevelopment

Florence Swiger [flomurmer@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 09, 2014 10:05 PM
To: Katie Owston
Cc: Bill Brand [bbrand@earthlink.net]

On Wed, Jul 9, 2014 at 7:19 PM, Florence Swiger <flomurmer@gmail.com> wrote:

I think this whole project needs to be rethought and revamped as it is entirely too large as now described for the area there is for it. The council and CenterCal would benefit from looking at the Dana Point recreation area as it has been very well done and thought out.

I do not believe this project should continue at the present area you have carved out as it is much too big for the area we have here and will cause traffic jams Redondo Beach manages to avoid most of the time.

For instance, Look at the traffic jam on July 4th this year. If there were more development than is already there, gridlock would be imminent.

Please send this project back to the planning Department and have more public meetings.

Florence Swiger
District 2
310-381-9890
Attached is a letter that I submitted to the City Council on Wednesday, July 24, 2013. I also attended the City Council Meeting on Tuesday, July 30, 2013 to discuss the letter. Copies of the letter were also submitted to the The Beach Reporter, The Daily Breeze, and Easy Reader on Monday, July 22, 2013. All three newspapers published redacted versions of the letter. The Easy Reader published the letter in its entirety.

The letter describes the major problems that I see with the Waterfront Development Project proposed by CenterCal. In addition to the issues presented in the letter, I have serious concerns about the financial feasibility of this project. CenterCal seems to ignore the fact that conventional brick and mortar retail sales are on the decline. Many people today buy goods and services on the Internet. They go to a shopping mall only to look at products, not buy them. This trend will continue.

Even the movie theater business has become a victim of the Internet. NetFlix revenue has soared with more and more people watching movies at home with streaming video and high-speed Internet. The prospects for people attending a movie on The Pier do not look good.

Please take these issues into consideration when preparing your EIR (Environmental Impact Report). The downside potential of this project far exceeds the upside. Who will service the debt when the project falls short of its revenue goals? This project has the potential to bankrupt the City of Redondo Beach. That's why I strongly oppose it.

Thanks for your consideration.
Roy Sykes
640 The Village #217
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
310-372-2489
LETTER TO BE RECEIVED AND FILED FOR THE 7/30/13, City Council Meeting, Waterfront Development/CenterCal, Item No. N1 (558 WORDS)

REDONDO BEACH WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT

Mayor & City Council,
Pave paradise and put up a parking lot? That seems to be the theme of CenterCal's latest site plan for the Redondo Beach waterfront published on May 11. Shown below are a number of issues that I have with the plan.

The Hotel
How did the boutique hotel morph into the behemoth that is now planned? What tourist wants a view of pier pilings during sunset? What happens to that fishing line and hooks anglers lose while pursuing their hobby? Wouldn't this be a risk to toddlers on the hotel beach? What happened to the underground parking? Isn't the roof parking a clever way to skirt the restrictions on maximum building height? What's to prevent a billboard-toting vehicle from parking on the roof for free advertising?

The Road
Why do we need a road connecting Harbor and Torrance Boulevards? Wouldn't it create congestion, noise, and pollution, and attract an unwelcome crowd to the neighborhood? On busy days, wouldn't it be a parking lot? Have you ever seen PCH in Malibu on the weekend? It's a zoo.

Wouldn't the road attract people cruising in their cars similar to Hollywood Boulevard, motorcycle gangs circling around the neighborhood using Catalina and the connecting roads as a circular track, drug dealers selling drugs from their cars, and rowdy drunk drivers looking for a party? Is this the family friendly environment that CenterCal envisions? Do we really need a road? What's wrong with electric people movers?

Westwood Village
Is there any doubt about what an unwelcome crowd can do to the commercial success of a project? Do you remember Westwood Village? During the 1970's and 80's Westwood Village was "The Place To Go" for dining, entertainment, nightlife, and shopping. What happened? As time
passed Westwood Village attracted a more unwelcome element of patrons. In 1988, an innocent bystander was shot and killed by rival gang members firing at each other. Patrons abandoned the area in droves. Do we really want The Road attracting such a crowd?

**Torrance Circle**

Torrance Circle traffic consists of three types (through traffic, visitors to the pier, and delivery trucks). Currently, each type is routed to a different location. Through traffic is routed to the top of the loop and circles around the loop and exits. Looky-loo traffic takes the same route. Visitors to the pier are routed down an entrance road to the underground parking. Delivery trucks are routed to a private entrance into the parking structure on the first level where all the retail businesses are located.

In CenterCal's latest design, it is not clear where delivery trucks would go, but they seem to be intermingled with all the other traffic. All three types of traffic (through traffic, visitors to the pier, and delivery trucks) would take the same route/destination and significantly increase congestion. The current design is much better than the new design.

**Summary**

I think Joni Mitchell's lyrics from Big Yellow Taxi, 1996, summarize it best.

Don't it always seem to go
That you don't know what you got 'til it's gone
They paved paradise
Put up a parking lot.

I hope the Mayor & City Council address these issues and insist upon a waterfront development that is more in line with the community's expectations.

Thanks,

Roy Sykes
640 The Village #217
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
310-372-2489
Unfortunately, I will be unable to attend the public meeting on Jul 9, so I am submitting this email with my comments.

As the EIR process moves forward I would like to be certain that the following be included in the scope of the study:

1) Boat Ramp Location
   The Waterfront development proposal includes the creation of a public boat ramp on the property where Joe's Crab Shack currently stands.
   The ramp would be within feet of the Portofino Hotel catering facility and its outdoor wedding location. The plan does not include modifications to the existing roadway serving both locations. Your study should include:
   1) The impacts of the noise at the boat ramp on both the indoor and outdoor adjacent catering facilities
   2) The impacts of traffic along Portofino Way on the hotel, the catering facilities and general public access to the marina
   3) The impacts on parking for the hotel, the catering facility and the boat ramp patrons
   4) The impact of cars with boat trailers to traffic flow including their limited ability to turn around and leave
   5) The impacts to water traffic moving in and out of Basin 3
   6) The practicality of boats entering the water at this location and the impact on the surrounding waterways
   7) An evaluation of alternative locations for the boat ramp

2) Seaside Lagoon
   The development proposes to open up Seaside Lagoon to the marina's waterways. Please include the following in your study:
   1) The impacts of ocean wildlife on the lagoon - fish, sea lions (seals), crabs, birds, etc.
   2) The possibility that sea lions will inhabit the lagoon and all the consequences
   3) The impacts of oil and gasoline from outboard and inboard engines on the Lagoon's water quality
   4) The impact on waterway traffic from land launched paddle boards, kayaks, canoes, etc. moving in and out of the Lagoon
   5) Alternate possible futures for the Lagoon

Thank you for your consideration.

Donald Szerlip
1525 Aviation Blvd #161
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
310-798-2285
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I have been a resident of Redondo Beach for my entire life: 24 years, and I am concerned about the proposed CenterCal development for the pier area. I feel the proposed project has some unrealistic ideas in it: a movie theater at the beach, ANOTHER large hotel, and high end boutiques that I feel will not appeal to visitors of the pier.

First, before I mention what I feel should be addressed by the EIR let me define what I feel the pier should have/be. It is a waterside area for residents and visitors to our city alike to enjoy our beach and harbor areas. People arrive expecting a warm and inviting beach, a beautiful view of the ocean, and all the small comforts you get when you visit the beach area. Those small comforts are things like small snack stands with hot dogs, churros, french fries, and all the fun junk food we enjoy at the beach. We go to the beach to enjoy the sun, swim in the ocean, and enjoy the boats that go in and out of the harbor area. Maybe even go into a few small gift shops to buy a novelty to remember coming to this pier. These are all things that we already have on the pier. Yes, some of the buildings are fairly old and need to be remodeled or developed a bit. Attractions like the fun factory could be upgraded because that is a huge draw. How many arcades are there anymore, anywhere in this city? I feel like that should be the focus on upgrading the pier, and not throwing in things like a theater, or high end clothing/makeup/whatever stores that you would find in the Del Amo Mall.

This is all important in considering the EIR report because I feel the report should cover the extent to which the view of the ocean and beach will be blocked by new shops and stores. If people drive down to the pier will they still be able to watch the sunset from nearly any spot on the pier, or will they just see shops and a vague notion of the sunset behind them? What about the small strip of beach between Tony's and Kincaid's restaurants that is blocked from use by visitors? Will that ever be opened up so people can enjoy the beach instead of just looking at it?

Will all the new proposed shops allow for good clean movement of foot traffic on the pier? Any time there are shops crowds start to form from people entering an exiting. Put too many close together and good luck getting anywhere on the pier when the walkways are cluttered with crowds.

I feel all of this is important to consider with the scope of the EIR. I've noticed the normal response has been a sarcastic reply about how this EIR is not related to the development.. that what is being built has even been decided yet and this is just for determining the impact on traffic, noise, etc. That seems extremely paradoxical to me. How can you address the impact to the environment without knowing what you are going to build? The impact will be different if you are building or landfill versus a hospital, or a parking lot versus a library. Theaters are inherently large buildings due to the size of the screens, as are hotels due to their purpose. It seems ignorant to claim that the EIR can be performed but the proposed image CenterCal provided can change drastically later.

So please consider whatever you are planning to build while setting up this EIR. More shops will undoubtedly lead to more traffic congestion, more noise, less view of the ocean and beach, and much the citizens here who enjoy their pier, their beach, and their ocean.
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: Cheryl Tchir

Address: 402 N. Lucia Ave. Redondo Beach
Zip Code: 90277
Phone (optional): 310 376-1728
E-mail (optional):

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:
- [ ] Aesthetics
- [ ] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing*
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources*
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Recreation

* These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments:

Aesthetics: Keep the view corridor at Culebra Park; it is one (the other: Veterans Park) along the proposed waterfront.

Biological: Pay close attention to ways to minimize adverse effects on the marine life – This is a prime spot for scuba diving (Redondo Canyon) and has become a key resting site for brown pelicans. A component, Harbor seals, could also live here.

Transportation/Traffic: If this development draws the hoped-for crowds, access seems insufficient 190th/direct Save-on-Bldg. Adding the reconnection of Pacific Ave. is a bad idea as it will bring traffic 900 feet instead directly to the waterfront, degrading the

(Please write on the back if you need more room)

Please drop the completed form into the box marked “COMMENTS” or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
Experience of walking/hiking alongside the ocean, air quality & noise ensure that every possible measure be taken to reduce dust/equipment emissions during construction. Three senior citizens housing projects are right next to the site with many potential sensitive people (Casa de 100 Amigos on Catalina, Seasons on PCH, Franciscan, & The Salvation Army senior living apartments on Beryl - 1 block from the northern edge of the development). In addition, Vet's Park regularly fills with preschool children - it's directly at the southern border of this project. And, of course, the condos along the eastern edge will be impacted in a major way.

Geology Soils

I read that fill has been used in past construction and will be used again in this one. This is a dangerous choice to place parking structures & buildings on. In the January 1994 Northridge earthquake, the King Harbor Marine parking lot crumbled due to liquefaction fill used there. Furthermore, the advent of fracking in Southern California increases our risk of earthquakes. Major structures should not be built on land composed of ‘fill’.
To whom this may concern,

I lived in Redondo Beach from 1986 - 2010 on Avenue A and even now my husband and I live right over the border in Torrance. The Redondo Pier (and most notably Old Tony's) has been a favorite of ours for almost 30 years. Yes we have seen the pier through thick and thin. We are very concerned about this proposed development as it just seems like too much and I fear losing the character of the pier and Redondo itself. We often eat at the pier and entertain our out of town family and friends. If it becomes like "Pier Avenue" or "any mall" in America, if it becomes unbearable with car noise and nothing but concrete, if it becomes overdeveloped and overpriced we will be saddened to no longer frequent it.

First I would like to list the proposed development I do believe could be an improvement: 1) Rebuilding the existing parking structure at Redondo Pier if in fact it is structurally a necessity. 2) Addition of a pedestrian walkway bridge across the Redondo Beach Marina Basin 3 entrance, 3) A new pedestrian walkway along the water's edge from the base of the pier to seaside lagoon, 4)redirection of the current pedestrian/bike path to not weave through the parking garage, 5) accommodation for new projected sea levels, 6) construction of a new stormwater drainage system to address storm water quality requirements 7) new park and town greenspaces depending on what that would mean.

I would note here that any new green space has a potential Biological Resource impact: We are in a 3 year drought with no end in sight. I would implore the developers to look long and hard at 1) Any development that will require use of more water albeit a fountain, structure, or otherwise. 2)That in clearing land be cognizant of impact removing native plants as well as impact to native species of insects, animals, etc. and 3) Any new planting in green space, medians, etc be used as an opportunity to use drought tolerant, native plants to ensure as little water usage as possible in the future while creating habitat for native species and restoring Redondo Beach closer to what it once was.

What I believe to be detrimental in order of most detrimental:

1) The proposed Pacific Avenue reconnection due to the following environmental impacts:
An estimated additional 30,000 cars per day on this road where there is now a boardwalk: Aesthetics, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Traffic, Noise, and Air Quality will all suffer tremendously. Currently walking on this boardwalk not a single car can be heard nor smelled. To me this is the biggest flaw in this plan and will have the largest negative impact to the waterfront again aesthetically as well as increase in air pollution, noise pollution, and overall quality of experiencing this special pier.

2) The mere size of the development 523,723 square feet due to the following environmental impacts:
- Aesthetics (Big Chain stores at the waterfront will degrade the unique character of the King Harbor waterfront to be like any other large scale mall development),

- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (created in the demolition and construction phases as well as water and electricity demand to operate)

3) Demolition of 221,347 square feet of current development including the entire international boardwalk and elevated walkway. This boardwalk is frequented both by local families as well as tourists in droves. Go there any weekend in the summer and witness this for yourself. Replacing this with a road will be a loss to both. Why would a tourist come to the new development if they could go to the same establishments anywhere? There is also an economic issue at play here. The establishments on the boardwalk including Quality Seafood and the Fun Factory are frequented by many for fun at low cost. These individuals and families I believe will be shut out of the new development due to cost alone besides the fact that it doesn't appear that the construction will be geared towards families with young children.

4) Much of the new development will be more than 1 story high including a new parking structure near Beryl and Harbor Drive. This is both an aesthetic and air space impact: It would be highly imposing to have any "higher than 1 story" development in this area. Just more concrete and potential for blockage of views. In fact the report says "building heights would vary from 1 to 3 stories with a minimum of 50% of the buildings south of Seaside Lagoon being limited to 1 story". 3 stories would again negatively impact aesthetics as well as views. And what does 50% of buildings mean? 50% of the number of structures or 50% of the total square footage? Those 2 could be very different. This needs to be clarified.

5) The proposed height of the new 2 story boutique hotel as well as new establishments on the horse shoe pier. The report says "1-2 stories as measured from the top of the current parking deck. The hotel would not exceed 30 feet from the grade of the current pier plaza office entry level." This has potential to be aesthetically displeasing, block views, and increase both noise, traffic, and air pollution.

It is actually difficult for me to picture these heights from these reference points as I am neither a civil engineer nor an architect. All drawings thus far have been 2-dimensional which is misleading at best. Models should be shown to the public making the new heights visible and easy to understand in reference to current surroundings. Better yet, why not put stakes and tape in place like the hillside overlay to let the citizens of Redondo Beach and those who frequent the waterfront see what is truly being proposed? It may surprise us all that some may have less impact than others. This way there will be no surprises later when it is too late to go back. If what is proposed is really such an improvement then why not give the public this view into the plan to buy into it as well?

I also believe that introduction of several businesses on the horseshoe would be detrimental aesthetically as well as polluting to the surrounding air and ocean. As much as I liked the earlier pier with Breakers, Cattlemens, and the Edge I think the city has done an amazing job with the new horseshoe design. It is so open and really puts the ocean and the sunsets at center stage, which is really why we all go there anyway. It should not be "cluttered" with structures which will block this "natural" view. Do not undo what the rebuilding of the new horseshoe had foresight to accentuate.

6) The northern part of the project may receive fill material range from 1 to 6
feet, in fact 150,000 cubic yards of fill on the land side. More worrisome to me is the water development to include: dredging, filling, rock placement, in-water concrete placement, sheetpile installation, and pile driving. This has obvious impacts to the plants and animals residing in this area as well as noise and possible water quality impacts.

Alternatives:
I am not against refurbishment as has been successfully done as of late with the Landing and the addition of Barney's Beanery. Something similar could be done with the existing "village" overlooking the Pier which has never been fully occupied. With the right design and establishments there is no reason this could not be successful.

I do also fear that current leasees will be forced out as rents rise. We need to be careful not to lose all continuity to our waterfront history. For instance Tony's and Polly's are long time establishments of more importance than the bottom $ line. We need to not lose all unique character that has developed over the years and also all "memory places" that families go back to generation after generation. Again, it will be a sad day when The Redondo Pier and King Harbor are no different than any other overdeveloped waterfront "mall" in the country.

Sincerely, April F Telles

112 Via El Chico
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
afrostitelles@yahoo.com
Hi Katie,

This is Ambrosia over at The Log. I’m unable to attend tomorrow night’s meeting but would like to still write a short follow up for this next edition. Would it be possible to speak on Thursday or Friday?

Best,
Ambrosia

Ambrosia Brody
Managing Editor, The Log Newspaper
17782 Cowan, Suite C
Irvine, CA 92614
Office: (949) 660-6150, ext. 226
Cell: (323) 423-9952
ambrosia@thelog.com
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Waterfront Opposition Letter
Karen Thomson [karenmthomson@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 1:16 PM
To: Katie Owston; Bill Brand; Jeff Ginsburg; Pat Aust; Stephen Sammarco; Matt Kilroy; Steve Aspel; Eleanor Manzano

Dear City Council,

I have been a resident and homeowner of Redondo Beach for the past 9 years and I am opposed to the proposed waterfront development. This is a beach city with waterfront property, the development need to use these resources to attract business. A mall or movie theater is not why people go to the beach. Adding busy congestion streets to our waterfront does not benefit anyone in the long run.

I am opposed to this proposed redevelopment project as it is proposed.

Thanks,
Karen Thomson
Redondo Beach Resident
EIR draft; resident comments
J Riley [onebigbird3@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 20, 2014 3:15 PM
To: Katie Owston
Cc: Bill Brand; Jeff Ginsburg; Pat Aust; Stephen Sammarco; Matt Kilroy; Steve Aspel

My main concern regarding the EIR draft is the impact to safety and security of both visitors and residents.

The addition of a road extending Harbor Drive South to Torrance Boulevard would negatively impact the quality of life, and security of visitors and residents.

The close proximity of the proposed road to the existing residential buildings, will negatively impact residents with additional noise, and air quality issues. One such building includes a senior living facility, whose impact must be taken into account.

Visitor’s pedestrian area would be adjacent to proposed road, and put visitors at potential risk from distracted drivers. As we saw in the Santa Monica Farmer Market incident in 2003, there is both a risk of injury and legal action to city.

Resident:
Joyce Topping
230 The Village #230
Redondo Beach, Ca 90277
Dear City Council and Community Development Department,

The last thing that our city needs is a huge development project, bringing in more traffic, more accidents, more congestion, the blocking of harbor views, and adding more noise and pollution. I am very concerned about the impact on our environment, and quality of life. It will be very negative if the project goes through.

The politicians and developers need to look at alternatives that will not double the development of the existing area, as the CenterCal Waterfront plan will do. Furthermore, no developer must be allowed to conduct rent-free business on the site.

I favor a modest development increase, as proposed by Jim Light, and recommended by Councilman Bill Brand, where sensible revitalization without another huge mall will be the result. It will be better for the environment, and for the citizens in and around Redondo Beach for years to come.

Sincerely,
Robert Torres
116E So. Guadalupe Ave.
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
Waterfront Project EIR Scoping Process
JoAnn Tredick [wavyjo2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 20, 2014 3:59 PM
To: Katie Owston

JoAnn Tredick
150 The Village #3
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
(310) 376-4672

The main issues the EIR study should consider are:

NOISE: As it is now the noise from automobile alarms, motorcycles and fire/ambulance vehicles is on a daily basis and will increase if all goes as planned.

TRAFFIC: will also increase with planned retail and extension of Pacific Avenue. This will add Air Pollution as well.

AIR QUALITY: During construction, which will take a lengthy amount of time, we will be exposed to dirt, dust, noise. Our windows are open a minimum of 12 hours a day for air circulation. (Have you ever been in a closed up house near the beach?) It's stifling.

AESTHETICS: What exactly will we be looking at? The mockup was never prepared as promised. I hope is isn't a bunch of box type buildings. Most retail stores are not 30+ feet high.
Dear Mayor Aspel and City Council Members:

I am writing you in regards to the Pier Redevelopment. I am 100% in favor of redeveloping the Pier but not with CenterCals’ over development plan. It is going to end up being a White Elephant Mall.

Mr. Aspel,

I am very displeased with your veto of Bill Brands motion, to put the Pier Redeveloping Project on the Ballot this November. I am more displeased that Councilman Aust and Ginsburg supported your decision. Considering the poling of the Voting citizens, for final approval makes more sense to me. Your decision to not allow the citizens a final vote on the project is inconsiderate to the Redondo Beach Citizens. I think that you three men think it will not pass in a citizens final vote.

The citizens deserve a final approval vote. We are all in this together and for three men to make a decision to move forward on a final approval plan without a vote of the citizens is unconscionable. You three men are giving CenterCal approval to move forward with out regards to the impact study. This White Elephant over development is jeopardizing the future of Redondo Beach. Redondo Beach and the investors will end up in Bankruptcy Court then lawsuits will fly in every direction. This Development needs to be downsized by 35%.

Mayor Aspel, Mr Ginsburg and Mr. Aust I am requesting that you three, separately, please write a letter to the Redondo Beach Citizens listings your credentials that qualify you to make a decision on a vast project like the Pier Development. I would like your response published in the three local Newspapers.

Is the failure of this huge project the legacy you three men want to leave at the door step of beautiful Redondo Beach?

Earl Turner
Redondo Beach
NOP RESPONSE.

Susan and David Udewitz

140 The Village #205

Redondo Beach, CA 90277

July 20, 2014

- Retail density of Northern portion is too high
- Northern portion proposed 3 story properties will make it look like a dense mall
- Not enough coastal park land
- None of the proposed retail looks like the Blackhawk Plaza Development, please increase the relationship between retail and the water front
- Bridge must be high enough for sail boats and commercial use boats to pass under
- Green space and bike bath should begin at Portofino Way and n harbor drive, current position of green space start is mid Portofino Way and has poor public access
- Buildings in northern portion including market hall and captain kids should be limited to one story as they significantly impact the views of The Village Condominiums
- Parking structure at north east corner height must be limited and is a concern. Proposed is 919 space structure, how much underground and how many levels above ground, current proposed is about 10 story parking structure. This is the physical north entrance and should not be a monster parking structure.
- Building heights should be limited to 1 story in north portion and as a result of less retail space; less parking should be a necessary requirement. The proposed plan appears to be too dense in terms of retail construction and too little incorporation of the retail with the waterfront.
- Retail should incorporate more waterfront in northern portion
- North east entrance of ingress/egress would be better suited with a combined bike and pedestrian entrance, currently the entrance is split between several places, one by the lagoon up the street and another by the old parking structure near Captain Kids.
- The two right angles in white for a street do not make sense near the entrance to Captain Kids.

https://mail.redondo.org/owa/?ae=Item&t=IPM.Note&id=RgAAADazFsWF94SLhgOKi5fOU1BwAH6prw3D6WSZ4Q2tFaBeMAAAAamCN5AAAH6prw3D6WS...
- Three story buildings along N Harbor Drive and parking structure will significantly block views of North Marina by the condos at The Village.

- Silhouettes must be used prior actual construction to insure integrity of the building height once construction is begun.

- North portion has two very large proposed big box structures with large footprints, what type of retail is this for, big box can’t compete at the beach as rent is too high, the north portion retail footprint should be reconfigured and eliminate large footprint or “big box” developments.

- Do they have any retail commitments from retailers that they want in the project, if so who and what does the community think, I would suggest an Apple Store as they bring lots of people and the area is so tech with all of the aerospace retirees. If Apple will not pay the extra rent, who will?

- Retail and walkway should be made to look more like Sea Port Village in San Diego, this is a great example of low density, “village”, with many small shops and restaurants, plus merry-go-round, and walking along the water that attracts many tourists
--

David and Susan
NOP RESPONSE.

Susan and David Udewitz

140 The Village #205

Redondo Beach, CA 90277

July 20, 2014

- Retail density of Northern portion is too high
- Northern portion proposed 3 story properties will make it look like a dense mall
- Not enough coastal park land
- None of the proposed retail looks like the Blackhawk Plaza Development, please increase the relationship between retail and the water front
- Bridge must be high enough for sail boats and commercial use boats to pass under
- Green space and bike bath should begin at Portofino Way and n harbor drive, current position of green space start is mid Portofino Way and has poor public access
- Buildings in northern portion including markethall and captain kids should be limited to one story as they significantly impact the views of The Village Condominiums
- Parking structure at north east corner height must be limited and is a concern. Proposed is 919 space structure, how much underground and how many levels above ground, current proposed is about 10 story parking structure. This is the physical north entrance and should not be a monster parking structure.
- Building heights should be limited to 1 story in north portion and as a result of less retail space; less parking should be a necessary
requirement. The proposed plan appears to be too dense in terms of retail construction and too little incorporation of the retail with the waterfront.

- Retail should incorporate more waterfront in northern portion
- North east entrance of ingress/egress would be better suited with a combined bike and pedestrian entrance, currently the entrance is split between several places, one by the lagoon up the street and another by the old parking structure near Captain Kids.
- The two right angles in white for a street do not make sense near the entrance to Captain Kids.
- Three story buildings along N Harbor Drive and parking structure will significantly block views of North Marina by the condos at The Village.
- Silhouettes must be used prior actual construction to insure integrity of the building height once construction is begun.
- North portion has two very large proposed big box structures with large footprints, what type of retail is this for, big box can’t compete at the beach as rent is too high, the north portion retail footprint should be reconfigured and eliminate large footprint or “big box” developments.
- Do they have any retail commitments from retailers that they want in the project, if so who and what does the community think, I would suggest an Apple Store as they bring lots of people and the area is so tech with all of the aerospace retirees. If Apple will not pay the extra rent, who will?

- RBMC, Title 10, Chapter 5, Article 2, Division 3.
Delia Vechi [pelu1917@yahoo.com]

Sent: Saturday, July 19, 2014 9:19 AM
To: Aaron Jones
Attachments: EIR Waterfront A-Jones 07~1.docx (18 KB) ; 1988 storm RBeach 2.jpg (2 MB) ; 1988 Storm RBeach.jpg (908 KB)

Please see attachments regarding my additional comments to my previous ones (July 10, 2014) to be included as part of the public record to help with the content of the EIR for the proposed Centercal Waterfront project.

Thank you,

Delia A. Vechi
District 2
310-372-8975
July 19, 2014

Aaron Jones
Community Development Director

City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

RE: Comments for inclusion into the EIR (Centercal waterfront project) as part of the Administrative Record.

Dear Mr. Jones:

This is an addition to my previous comments, submitted last July the 10th.

I am amending my previous comments to include quotations from studies done, by NOAA, the Pacific Institute, and University of Southern California regarding Climate Change affects to the California Coastal areas which includes the Redondo Beach waterfront.

“FUTURE DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE LIMITED IN AREAS AT RISK FROM RISING SEAS.”

“According to the National Research Council (NRC), global sea level has risen at increasing rate since the late 19th / early 20th Century, when global temperatures first start to rise. Climate researches believe sea level rise will drive storm surge and wave run-up higher than current conditions, thereby causing more extensive and frequent coastal, storm-driving flooding.”

This is the best time to remember the Redondo Beach 1988 storm and its damages [see attachments], where the cost estimate for storm damage and clean-up was about $16,000.000 in1988 dollars. The beaches were heavily damaged by erosion; hotels and business were heavily flood damaged from the tidal surge [high tides] because the breakwater was not able to protect property.

The scientific researchers estimate that a catastrophic calamity can occur along the coast line in the next 20 to 30 years, and then this is another important point to be mentioned on the EIR in detail by the implications of future flood threat that can erase our harbor forever.

Page 1 of 2 (plus 2 attachments)
If the City is negotiating a deal with Centercal that will be them 30 years free rent; if Centercal cannot make a minimum 10% annual profit, if Centercal is proposing a project that cover every square foot developable, who will pay for any economic loss to business, or for repairs to damages resulting from natural disasters? Would the City be required to set aside money from its General Fund for future potential? It does not appear the City’s Budget could take a hit from this yet unidentified amount? Furthermore, other city services would be impacted [reduced] if this is necessary set aside is necessary since NO income is being derived from the development to cover such events! This compounded disaster will mean our magnificent Waterfront is at risk and could disappear with a bankrupt city.

Clearly these issues identify that NOW is the time to start planning the sustainable limits of sane development in the Harbor. Planning should establish standards that will improve and “reduce future threats of life and property" and enhance the Quality of Life for the residents of Redondo Beach. This is urgently needed! Open spaces, parks and recreations centers, and restaurants, connected by wide friendly pedestrian promenades should be the answer to avoiding a loss of millions and millions of dollars and creation or a newer, more modern makeover, a form of the new urban blight.

I have come to the conclusion, I must stop or short of writing a book on this particular subject’ i.e., the Company hired by the City to do the EIR, but if I should, you can expect it to be the most impartial book ever written; a tell all, and one that really exposes all the perils the Redondo Beach coast line is exposed to, yes, spelled out, one by one, to the last detail.

Please save tax payer’s money and stop this project now just like the EIR demands!

Sincerely,

Delia A. Vechi  
District 2  
310.372.8975

CC: Katie Owston, Mayor and City Councilmen
Storm damage

January 1988 Storm Damage and Cleanup Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>$ Damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malibu</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuma Beach</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-Long Beach</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal Beach</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Coast Highway</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Beach</td>
<td>6,700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $28 million in damages throughout S. California
- Largest concentration of property damage occurred at Redondo Beach, CA (near LA)
Storm damage: Redondo Beach

$16 million in damages

Breakwater breached

Beaches to N and S were flooded and eroded

State of emergency declared on January 18, 1988
Please see attachment regarding my comments for inclusion into the EIR, Centercal project.
Thank you,

Delia A. Vechi
District 2
310-372-8975
July 10, 2014

Aaron Jones
Community Development Director
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

RE: Comments for inclusion in to the EIR (Centercal waterfront project) as part of the Administrative Record.

Dear Aaron Jones:

You have been part of the city staff, in the City Planning Division for some years now. You have been an eye witness of many natural disasters that have occurred in our harbor; from the liquefaction, to the high tides, the storm surges, the US Corps of Engineers raising of the breakwater, the massive fish die off, the salt water damage to the concrete parking structures, the attempts to do away with Seaside Lagoon, the pier fires, the reconstruction of the pier, the problematic traffic flows and horrible parking, the many years of city hall fighting for the preservation and inclusion of a pedestrian orientation and recreation in the harbor, Moonstone Park, the Boat Launch, and so on and so on…including being an eyewitness of the now recognized fiasco of old development along the waterfront, i.e., Pier Plaza, which oddly, the City Planning Department promoted and was highly supportive of back then when it pushed for the Approvals approved by the City Council.

It would seem from your years of experience that NOW is time for you stand tall and to expose what will be a non-reversible and non-mitigated impact by the EIR process: the changes in the sea level and the rising temperatures.

The consequences of the slowly rising sea levels associated with Climate Change, is a potentially significant impact along the entire California coastline which includes Redondo Beach. This leads one to think it would be addressed as one of the permanent, most dangerous, environmental impacts in the EIR! Furthermore you would reason from common sense that each one should be individually addressed.

However, the fact of the matter is the seriousness of the threat in the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was NOT addressed, nor was it in a separate Chapter on it in events in the items on “Hydrology and water quality”. Instead, it was only a one short paragraph at the bottom of the comments regarding tsunami, seiche, and
mudflow, which lumped together, are different kinds of natural phenomenon that may or may not happen.

This is a unique opportunity to show leadership and understanding of ALL the issues. You have an opportunity to recommend that our elected authorities put a limit on excessive development in our waterfront. You have an opportunity to educate them at the same time, and our community, about these potential threats to life and property. You know the City is part owner, in the cost of paying for any disaster repairs that may result from increases of the sea level along the coast or any natural disaster that would strike the harbor area.

We are in the early phase when we must estimate the sea level rise, and then incorporated it into the harbor urban planning development standards [criteria], as well as, include it in the design of all coastal buildings, because the waterfront is exposed directly. Furthermore, this phenomenon that is irreversible, consequently you should send what Centercal is proposing back to the drawing board until it truly reflects ALL the mitigated environmental issues.

Thank you for the time to read my concern and I wish you the best.
Sincerely,

Delia A. Vechi
3103728975

CC: Katie Owston, Mayor and City Councilmen
Hi Katie,

I am a 20+ year resident of Redondo Beach. I live within half a mile of the Redondo Pier. I am writing to express my extreme displeasure with the current CenterCal plan for the pier redevelopment.

The plan crams far too much stuff in a small area. Plaza El Segundo is a large development, and the CenterCal plan is larger than Plaza El Segundo, yet covers half the square footage. The plan includes a multi-story parking garage, but Mayor Aspel says the existing parking lot by Ruby’s is ugly?

Can the South Bay support ALL of the new retail that is being proposed? 12 restaurants, dozens of new businesses – these stores will need a lot of traffic in order to generate the revenue necessary to keep their doors open. Can the support base for this commerce come from the existing South Bay? My guess is no, due in part to the large amount of commercial space that is currently vacant. (Vacancies currently at the Pier, and at the Technology Center by the Post Office to name a few.) In order to survive, these businesses will need to attract customers from outside the South Bay, which will increase traffic and hassle, and the plan does not address any changes to the current road structure.

If the new plan does not survive, the city is stuck with a lot of vacant retail spaces right along the waterfront.

This plan is just too much. The Pier can be revitalized without having so much STUFF jammed onto and around it.

- Liz Walters
Greetings Members and Supporters:

The SOUTH BAY PARKLAND CONSERVANCY (SBPC) is dedicated to leaving a legacy of open space in the South Bay. We are a 501(c) (3) non-profit organization that relies solely on volunteers, public assistance and donations to continue this rewarding work to enhance our quality of life in the South Bay. **Exciting times are ahead in 2014-2015 and we need your help.**

The current focus of the South Bay Parkland Conservancy projects **where we need your help** to continue are:

- Advocate for parkland on the AES power plant site and throughout the South Bay
- Participate in local community events to build awareness and support for SBPC goals
- Work with private donors, public agencies, corporations and foundations to acquire open space in the critically "park poor" South Bay
- We also need help from residents who can help us build relationships with local community groups and local government bodies to foster SBPC goals as well as improve communications to ensure that all participating are informed

**Next up: June 28th and 29th:** Redondo Beach Village Festival- SBPC booth Space 148 for a free water wise plant and information on open space struggles in the South Bay.

**Coming in July:** **Is the South Bay destined to have another power plant? Will the Redondo Beach pier become a large mall? Will condominiums be sanctioned for the AES property?** Join us on Wednesday, July 30th at the Redondo Beach Veteran’s Park Library from 7:00p.m. - 9:00p.m. to meet, mingle, get answers to your questions, share your ideas, and learn how you can participate with like-minded community activists. Meet the SBPC board member at the first annual members and supporters meeting. **Learn how you can help with issues that are important to you!**

*Please donate through our website: http://www.southbayparks.org, or mail to the address below. Your donation is tax deductible!*

Melanie Cohen- President, Dawn Esser- Vice-President, Irene Kurata- Treasurer, Paula Tuckerman- Secretary, Jim Light-Board Member, Dave Wiggins-Board Member

115 So. Guadalupe Avenue • Unit H • Redondo Beach • CA • 90277 • (310) 374-4284 • www.southbayparks.org
Comments
The Waterfront Project
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – Scoping Process

Name: LUCRETIA A. WATKINS
Organization (optional): 
Address: 1204 S. GERTRUDA AV REDONDO BEACH
Zip Code: 90277-5124
Phone (optional): (310) 971-1803
E-mail (optional): NONE

Regarding what environmental issues you feel should be addressed in the EIR, please check the topics and describe what the issue(s) is/are:

- Aesthetics
- Land Use/Planning
- *Transportation/Traffic

- Agriculture and Forest Resources*
- Cultural Resources
- Hazardous and Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources*
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation

*These issues areas are not currently proposed to be further analyzed in the EIR.

Comments: WHY ARE WE BLOCKING OUR OCEAN VIEWS WITH A PLAN THAT PUTS IN A HUGE NEW PARKING STRUCTURE? TO ACCOMMODATE A HUGE MALL WITH MORE CHAIN STORES THAT ALREADY HAVE MORE ACCESSIBLE LOCATIONS WITH FREE PARKING, NO LESS. PEOPLE COME TO THE COAST TO ENJOY OUR OCEAN VIEWS AND LOCAL BUSINESSES, NOT NATIONAL CHAINS. TOURIST DO CHECK PRICES AS WELL AS AVAILABILITY (LOOK AT ALL THE ADS ON TV, ONLINE, ETC.) A NEW HOTEL AND MALL AND HIGH-RISE PARKING WILL PRICE MOST VISITORS OUT OF THE MARKET. THAT WILL NOT BE HELPFUL FOR OUR LOCAL ECONOMY. MAKE OUR BEACHES MORE VISIBLE, NOT LESS, REQUIRE DEVELOPER TO HAVE EXPERIENCE IN HARBOR/COASTAL DEVELOPMENT. Questioning Watkins

Please write on the back if you need more room

Please drop the completed form into the box marked "COMMENTS" or mail to:
Katie Owston, Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, California 90277

Comments may also be submitted via email to katie.owston@redondo.org.
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on July 21, 2014.
I am a 23 year resident of Redondo Beach and have raised a family herein. Consequently, Mayor Aspel and CenterCal's destructive and unethical approach to the excessive waterfront project proposed that will destroy and blight our pristine harbor and pier has me extremely concerned. Numerous residents that attended the final CenterCal meeting at the R B Performing Arts Center were appalled when they were not given the floor for comments and lack of accommodations by the city and CenterCal. Mayor Aspel seems to have conveniently tuned out the voices of those very residents who voted him into office and are taxpayers that support the city.

1. Traffic is a growing issue that will worsen on Torrance BL & Catalina and is presently a hazard
and out of control. The RBPD does not have adequate personnel to consistently keep-it-flowing now or cite tour buses illegally parked, and monitor truck deliveries violating the rules posted. Can the city & RB taxpayer afford to pay more salaries for additional officers?

2. Blocking of public waterfront views from the pier, Harbor Drive, bike path and shrinking Seaside Lagoon is unconscionable and thoughtless planning relative to CenterCal's lack of experience developing coastal property.

3. What is CenterCal's logic behind preventing or impeding access to boaters and pedestrians by excessively limiting parking and creating traffic gridlock? Redondo Beach is a city known for waterfront recreational activities that don't include movies and shopping in upscale boutiques but do include hot dogs, ice cream, seafood dinners not overpriced restaurants in keeping with expectations of visitors and residents.

4. Why would Redondo Beach need another hotel? Crowne Plaza and Portofino have high vacancy rates same as the others located along the harbor and Pacific Coast Highway. The proposed parking structure and hotel would again severely block ocean views.

A huge concern is the proposed road connecting Torrance Bl. with Harbor Drive. Creating increased congestion, pollution, pedestrian hazards and noise resulting in injuries and potential lawsuits? Why would this risk be in the planning and justified by the mayor and large percent of city council members? We do need to put this waterfront proposal to public vote next November and listen to the voices of the non-profit organization Build a Better Redondo and revisit scaled down plans that will enhance our city and not ruin our pier and coastline with a huge white elephant.

Sincerely,
Jody Wilkinson
Redondo Beach Resident & Educator
Waterfront Revitalization Project - My Concerns
Suzanne Thibodeau-Woelke [suzie_woelke@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 4:28 PM
To: Katie Owston

Dear Ms. Owston,

I am so disappointed how the last meeting went with CenterCal at the Preforming Arts building. No microphone to let our words be heard, no chairs (not even for the elderly) and only one City Council Member showed up. I'm not even sure why they had the meeting when they would not allow any interaction.

This Waterfront Revitalization project is all one sided and as an owner in The Village Condos for the past 15 years and a resident of Redondo Beach my entire life. I am discussed and disappointed in the majority of the Council for not allowing the people to vote on such an important project that effects so many people. This waterfront project has morphed into a monster and I find Mayor Aspel's action to veto and not allow the public to vote in November absolutely shameful. The Council Members should be looking out for the Redondo Beach rather than looking out for their own legacy.

I am already hearing several people stating they will never go the pier area if you put the CenterCal plans through how they are now.

Below is a list of some of my concerns on the project.

1. Road going all the way through North to South
2. 3-story parking structure
3. Traffic
4. Overbuilding of the entire project
5. Opening up of the Seaside Lagoon next to the boat ramp
6. View blockage
7. Deliver Trucks
8. Another hotel??
9. Revenues that CenterCal is getting from the project doesn’t seem right
10. EIR was good information and the Council Members are just ignoring it

Thank you for your time.

Suzanne Thibodeau Woelke
640 The Village # 316
Redondo Beach
Cell 310-213-0507
Home 310-374-9955
Hi Katie Owston, project Planner

I am 15 year resident at The Village Condos, The proposed waterfront project at Redondo Beach is a severe concern of how it will impact the Health and well being to me and all the home owners.

Environment

1 Traffic . Torrance Blvd/Catalina Ave. On typical weekends from Spring, Summer And Autumn and on any days when the weather is warm. The line of traffic approaching Torrance Bld entering the circle into the municipal parking lots is a nightmare to visitors and resident. The roads always are clogged. We do not need more traffic congestion

2. Pacific Ave..the proposed access road, how many lanes 2 or 4. ?How much commercial traffic will this add to service the new tenants? At present there are large trucks making deliveries to the pier daily. Also the issue with garbage dumpsters line up 2 to 3 times of the week Are lined up at the end of Torrance Bld, this is an safety and traffic hazard ,as the dumpster are parked for long periods. So obviously you cannot have a new2 lane

This is a noise and pollution concern

3. Redondo Beach attracts families who come here to enjoy the beach, picnics at the park, fish, and shop at fast food places. Its a beach community And should be kept for that way for the enjoyment as a beach. Families are not here for boutique shopping....We have Riviera Village. Movie theatre..There are multiplexes nearby, people come here for the uniqueness of the ocean. Upscale restaurants....so many have closed Maison Riz, Delzano, ..

4. Hotel: we have crown plaza and Portifino.. Do they have 100% occupancy rates, that we need another hotel. ?The height of the proposed hotel Will block the ocean views of existing condos thus devaluing our ocean front residential properties.

Lastly, the EIR open house held July 9th at the Performing Arts Center was and insult to the community and for all the neighbors who attended. We were packed into the Lobby Area, like cattles waiting to be slaughtered. There were many elderly who had to stand up as there were no seats. Standing we could not see and barely hear Mr Munchkinman reading off the charts. There was no dialogue from attendees. Sure, many questions were asked to during the breakout groups. With no answers. I strongly feel the proposed water front development must be put on the Ballot during the next election. Let the community decide the future Of our coastal front and not a commercial enterprise.

Sincerely
Susan yee
660 the village #215
Redondo Bch
Email: marqyee@aol.com
EIR

DrLoriZ [drloriz@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 12:35 PM
To: Katie Owston; Steve Aspel; Jeff Ginsburg; Bill Brand; Pat Aust; Stephen Sammarco; Matt Kilroy

Hello,

I am writing to express my grave concerns regarding the extremely negative impacts of the proposed overdevelopment on the Redondo Beach coastline. My main concerns involve the restrictions on small boat and kayak launching, the limitations on public access to the beach, the blocking of the public view and most importantly the unsafe water conditions that will occur in the Seaside Lagoon where many small children play.

I was very disappointed with the EIR (supposedly) public meeting that was held at the Performing Arts Center. I hope my concerns will be addressed.

Sincerely,

Lori Zaremski
3221 Gibson Place
Redondo Beach
310 374 1221
Comments on The Waterfront Protect

JOE ZELIK [RTANQUE@VERIZON.NET]
Sent: Saturday, July 19, 2014 4:17 PM
To: Katie Owston

COMMENTS
The Waterfront Project

FROM:
Joe & Linda Zelik
19405 Linda Drive
Torrance, CA 90503

We live about 1 mile from Redondo Beach Pier and visit the pier several times a week. We believe the proposed King Harbor Mall is not an appropriate redevelopment of the harbor area. Our comments are:

EIR COMMENTS:

Transportation/traffic:
Putting a mall in the harbor area would greatly increase traffic and congestion around the harbor and neighboring areas, including through Torrance, to get to the harbor. This is obviously undesirable. There also will be significantly more traffic noise for extended periods every day.

A mall of any sort will also increase the incidents of crime at the harbor.

With all the major malls just 2 miles or so distant, why would a new mall be expected to be even marginally successful?

Aesthetics:
The appeal of the harbor area is its simplicity and quaintness -- it makes you feel that you are at the ocean at Redondo Beach. This ambiance should be preserved not changed to an expensive, sterile resort with pricey restaurants and shopping.

Land Use/Planning:
Redondo Beach surely must be able to increase revenues with a redevelopment that preserves the charm of the current harbor area, and maintains the current public ocean and harbor views.

Also, if the currently proposed developer can negotiate with RB to not pay rent if developer’s profits are less than 10%/year, imagine how hard the developer will work to keep profits at 9.9%/year, even if that requires keeping the new development looking a bit shabby. This won’t benefit RB residents, but who in city government does it benefit?
I am a homeowner of 40 years, and love living here in Redondo. Our pier needs some repair, and rebuilding of the parking structure (because the last developer didn't protect the metal bars supporting the parking structure). But we don't need is a billion dollar makeover. We are a charming seaside town with a rich history. We are among the earliest beach towns in Southern California. Our City logo pictures the fishing pier, a boat and the date 1892 when we were incorporated.

We enjoy our pier and beach. CenterCAL specializes in creating malls - our beautiful location has a unique personality - it is NOT a mall. Keep our pier a place where families can celebrate the ocean and our pier.

Jianulla and Arnie Zimmerman
Waterfront Revitalization
Kristina Zorn [kzorn11@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2014 6:30 PM
To: Katie Owston

Dear Ms. Owston,

Sadly, I was unable to attend last week’s public comment meeting on the ongoing waterfront revitalization project.

As a resident, living 4 blocks from the Redondo Pier, I am very wary of the scope of this redevelopment.

Our home sits just off the intersection of Torrance Blvd & Guadalupe and the weekend traffic toward the pier is literally bumper to bumper. This pattern is consistent every weekend.

The intersection of Torrance & PCH is a constant traffic mess, no matter the day or time. During rush hours, our quiet street becomes a highway with speeding cars barreling through to cut the intersection of Torrance & PCH. This problem will only get worse if this redevelopment moves ahead as planned.

The existing roads cannot sustain vehicle traffic to a development that will be several times larger than what is currently at the Pier. This massive amount of retail space is unnecessary and opposes what many residents desire.

I absolutely want the waterfront to be revitalized and support this direction. It would be great to walk down to the pier for dinner and some unique shopping. However, the scope must to be scaled back.

This development, as currently proposed, will negatively effect traffic, noise, pollution and tax our city services. Our roads cannot support the traffic necessary to successfully support that much retail space.

I particularly oppose installing a movie theater. Theaters attract suspect crowds, no matter how upscale. The constant crime at the Galleria Mall is a prime example. Del Amo Mall also gets pretty sketchy at night now too. A $25 movie ticket will not deter out of city gang type characters from coming and hanging out. We don’t need a Galleria Mall on our waterfront and this is exactly what is proposed.

My hope is that the city will really consider its residents’ opinions. We don’t want a shopping mall on our waterfront!

Thanks for you time.

Sincerely,
Kristina Zorn

227 Camino Real
Redondo Beach
Comment Letters
Received After Close of Scoping Period
Hi Ms. Owston.
I am a lifelong Beach Cities resident, currently living in Redondo Beach. I strenuously object to several aspects of the waterfront project. First, it appears as if a private developer will be given way too much control over public land for years into the future, without sufficient input from the public before the decision is made. Second, from what I have heard, it sounds like a case of over-development. While I agree that some areas, such as the international boardwalk, need improvement, I do NOT agree that we need multi-level parking structures or a new bridge. I PARTICULARLY believe that extending the road (Harbor Drive) south from its current end point in front of Captain Kidd's is a terrible idea. We need to be decreasing areas of vehicular traffic and increasing pedestrian/bike access to the harbor, to promote safety, health, and aesthetics. People need to get OUT of their cars. We do NOT need to make the pier a major vehicular destination for shoppers; the beach is not the proper setting for a mall.

I do not recall details of the plan for replacement of the Torrance Blvd. parking structure and buildings (which currently includes a police substation, courthouse/open still?, businesses and a health organization). However, I do not believe that a newer, "better" multi-level structure is the answer. If the building/parking structure needs earthquake retrofitting and other repairs, let's pay for them. The city (and governments in general) should lead the way in preserving and restoring what exists rather than tearing down and starting over, using up declining resources.

In sum, I believe the project is (1) way too large for a single project; (2) improperly delegated to one private developer; (3) poorly thought out in terms of creating a human-scale, non-shopping-focused space for people to enjoy the beauty of the ocean's edge.

Please keep me informed of what transpires regarding the proposed boondoggle.

Susan Brakel
1802 Huntington Lane #3
Redondo Beach, CA  90278
310-374-1252

http://www.eset.com
I echo Kelly Charles' appeal to you this date. Dorris Cragg Village 610-102.
eom
Rocki99@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 10:40 AM
To: Katie Owston

Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10136 (20140722)
The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

http://www.eset.com
Re: Scoping Comments for the Waterfront Development-EIR from the Protectors of Public Ocean Views
Dean Francois [savethestrand@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 6:37 PM
To: Katie Owston
ADDITIONAL COMMENT TO ADD TO OUR COMMENTS

Please add this additional comment to our Section
C. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION AND HEALTH/SAFETY

With regards to the 1-way cycle-track that will be completed on one side of Harbor Drive: an EIR was not done for that project because it was considered categorically exempt with an incorrect assumption that it could encourage cyclist traffic. What this means is that when that project is complete, there will be lengthy traffic signals at 3 intersections and automobile traffic will be more congested when that project is complete. The traffic study then must include the affects of that project as well. Since it is a separate project, the study must not use current congestion and traffic numbers and signal synchronization but must use a a current condition the projected amounts with that completed project and then how this project will affect that.

With regards to view enhancements that may be proposed at the edge of the water, these are existing views of the water and therefore these enhancements should not be considered as mitigation for other public views of the water that will be lost due to the development. Essentially the proposed development may have to duplicate the existing footprint so as to comply with the Coastal Act. The Commission has already rules that view corridors do not have to be established to be protected. All ocean views from public land are protected.

Dean Francois
www.SaveTheStrand.info
po box 1544; hermosa beach, ca 90254
tele: 1-310-318-3326
cell: 1-310-938-2191

From: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>
To: Dean Francois <savethestrand@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 6:20 AM
Subject: RE: Scoping Comments for the Waterfront Development-EIR from the Protectors of Public Ocean Views

Thank you for your response to the Notice of Preparation for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/ Notice of Initial Study/Notice of Scoping Meeting for The Waterfront project. Your comments will be included as part of the public record with all comments received during the scoping process to help determine the scope and content of the EIR.

Please visit the City’s website at www.redondo.org and follow the link to the Waterfront on the home page for more information. As detailed in the Notice, if you have additional comments, they will be accepted by email and mail through 5:30 p.m. today, July 21, 2014.

Katie Owston
Project Planner
City of Redondo Beach
Community Development Department
Dear Katie Owston:

I am a former Public Works Commissioner. I head up the environmental groups: the Protectors of Public Ocean Views and the Friends of the South Bay Bicycle Paths. I am also a member of the Sierra Club and the Sierra Club’s Conservation Committee. As Protectors of Public Ocean Views, we have organized several appeals to the California coastal commission and stand to ensure that development does not interfere with public views and access to the ocean as required by the Coastal Act.

I support the comments from other environment groups that may include, Surfrider, VOICE, and groups and individuals opposing the large scope of development proposed.

SCOPING COMMENTS

A. THE EIR MUST INCLUDE ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS.

According to State Environmental Law (CEQA), the EIR may be required to include analysis of alternative plans. A complete analysis of alternatives to this project should be completed including a scaled down version or no development at all.

B. AESTHETICS – There are clearly significant impacts and should be completely analyzed. The project must comply with the Coastal Act requirements for public views of the water. The development does not appear to have a waterfront type of theme which is badly needed.

Analysis should be complete to include other alternatives to make the project more aesthetic and specifically how the project needs to be modified so that no public view of the ocean is disrupted by the proposal.

Analysis should be done to ensure adherence to Section 30251 of the California Coastal Act. The act states that “The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas…”

Also Section 10-5.102(b) of the RB Coastal Land Use Ordinance states that
development should “...maximize public access to and public views of the coastline.”

It appears that the project impacts the public views of the water and public views of some scenic coastal areas from the public vantage point on streets such as Portofino Way, Beryl, Diamond, Catalina, Harbor Drive and PCH and from public parks such as Veterans Park. We are particularly concerned about the view from Harbor Drive.

The development should not use their proposed improvements that claim to be enhanced public access to the water as a justification for blocking public water views. Such public access enhancements are required in any coastal development and that is a separate requirement. This additional access or enhancement can not be used to justify any blockage of a public ocean view. These views need to be maintained as they currently exist or enhanced, especially along Harbor Drive.

In a recent decision from the CA Coastal Commission regarding the 1000 Esplanade project, although the commission approved the project, they ruled that development must protect public views of the ocean even over private property.

C. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION AND HEALTH/SAFETY - THE CURRENT PROPOSAL HAS A SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM AND THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE COMMUNITY.

As a former public works commissioner and transportation commissioner, I personally know the implications that this will have on not only the effects of noise and traffic but the changes to the infrastructure and repaving and complete reconstruction of streets to handle the vehicles and traffic. The increased traffic will have an impact on cyclists traffic and the project does not go far enough to provide adequate safe space for cyclists and pedestrians to travel through the project area and visit the establishments. The 1-way cycle-track on one side of Harbor Drive will have devastating affects on cycling traffic and as a result that will cause more cyclists to get off that to avoid lengthy traffic signals and go through the development. The space allotted for pedestrian and cycling traffic must be increased. The developer knows this all too well and preferred to have 1-way cycle-tracks on both sides of Harbor Drive instead.

Section 30252 of the Ca Coastal Act states “The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing non-automobile circulation within the development”

Analysis should include whether this section is in compliance. It appears that not enough non-automobile circulation is provided and this should be enhanced with larger public walking and cycling areas.

D. AIR, NOISE, AND ENERGY RESOURCES (LONG TERM ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS) – THE PROPOSAL HAS AN ADVERSE IMPACT ON AIR QUALITY AND NOISE FROM INCREASED TRAFFIC, AND AN ADVERSE IMPACT ON ENERGY
CONSUMPTION AND CONFLICTS WITH LONG TERM ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS.

E. WATER QUALITY, EARTH, GEOLOGY, AND SOILS – REDONDO BEACH MAY BE IN A LIQUEFACTION ZONE. Long Beach suffered a drop in their elevation since they started oil drilling. Hermosa Beach may drill for oil. Hermosa Beach has buildings densely close together. In the Northridge earthquake in 1992, a parking lot in King Harbor and Docks were destroyed sinking many cars and boats due to Liquefaction. Also, the recent Shade Hotel development in King harbor had to be revised after approval because it was found after the fact that they could not dig as deep as proposed. We do not need this mistake again, so proper analysis is needed here. It appears that destruction could occur including the loss of life in an earthquake. A complete analysis is required on the liquefaction factor. And the affects of this development and its affects on water quality and geology.

F. CULTURAL RESOURCES – THE PROPOSAL SUGGESTS NOTHING TO BRING BACK SOME OF OUR PAST HISTORY OR CULTURAL RESOURCES. As a former Redondo Beach Preservation Commissioner and a Historical Society board member, I appreciate the desire to add this to any development proposal.

G. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE – THE PROJECT IS ON A FAST TRACK AND HAS IGNORED THE MANY PUBLIC MEETING INPUTS ON WHAT PEOPLE WANT AND THUS CLEARLY HAS THE POTENTIAL Affect and DISADVANTAGE to LONG-TERM ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS. The actual Public scoping meeting did not allow people to provide oral input and could be in violation of CEQA. While all the potential adverse impacts may not be in the EIR, impacts could still be considered cumulatively considerable. The only way that the project can overcome these adverse impacts is to include as a mitigating factor TO REDUCE the size of the project and protect public views of the water.

Dean Francois
Protectors of Public Ocean Views
Friends of the South Bay Bicycle Path
www.SaveTheStrand.info
po box 1544; hermosa beach, ca 90254
310-938-2191
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EIR Comments

Marina Kotsianas [marinak@cox.net]

Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 2:13 AM
To: Katie Owston; Bill Brand; Jeff Ginsburg; Pat Aust; Stephen Sammarco; Matt Kilroy; Steve Aspel; Eleanor Manzano
Attachments: P1120516.JPG (5 MB); P1160876.JPG (5 MB); P1160471.JPG (5 MB)

Dear Ms. Owston,

I am the owner of investment property in the Village, a 15-year taxpayer to the city, and very concerned about the City’s approach to the approvals process with CenterCal's plans.

Before the city goes ahead with the CenterCal plan, the city taxpayers need to get some answers and see some additional options evaluated thoroughly and professionally.

The great majority of people in Redondo Beach agree that our harbor needs revitalization. I feel this way as well. I welcome revitalization, but this plan is too BIG and needs to be scaled down. There are several vacant spaces on our Pier now that have been vacant for a long time. How do you know that this plan is viable during the winter months? Our City officials need to learn from past failed projects. Let's please understand the negative impacts of what CenterCal is proposing and re-direct the development project to something more appropriate, less dense, financially feasible, with shared-profitability between the developer and the City, and a project that does not violate our City Codes or the Coastal Act.

1 - What exactly is the financial feasibility / analysis?

The City is claiming an estimate of net average revenues of $2.8M per year from the CenterCal project, a paltry 3% of the City's annual revenues. But they have refused to give the public the details of their calculations. Does this include increased wear and tear on the roads? The increase in public safety costs? Regardless - to net just $2.8M per year for doubling our density does not justify the significant impacts to our quality of life and our harbor recreational access. The City analysis does show that the City knows there is a potential negative cash flow if the project does not perform. In a scenario where revenues from the project are reduced 22% from their initial assumption, the project generates a loss of $48M. This is a huge, negative financial impact that needs detailed analysis. The downside of this project could far exceed a $48M loss; a downside that Redondo Beach cannot afford.

2 – What about the Coastal Zoning Laws?

The CenterCal waterfront development plan violates city zoning by shrinking Seaside Lagoon Park in both public open space and water area. It paves over a large portion of the park for a road, a portion of the three-story parking garage, the pedestrian esplanade, and eight restaurant/retail shops. This violates both City zoning and the California Coastal Act. And, once Seaside Lagoon is opened up to the harbor, they also open it up to the sea lions. How are they going to keep them out? This is a blatant example of CenterCal's lack of foresight and inexperience in developing a coastal area.

3 - Traffic and access: Please see 3 attch'd pictures taken from a balcony. This is what the entrance into our waterfront/Pier looks like on any given day of the week. This is NOW. Delivery trucks parked and unloading, and many buses line the entry into our Pier area daily. In the evening, the tour buses come down and illegally park in the loading/unloading area. Our City does nothing to enforce this illegal tour bus parking. We have not...
yet been told, after asking Mr. Bruning many times, where these trucks will go to unload their goods. And there will be many more of them with the new restaurants and stores going in, not to mention yet another hotel.

The CenterCal Plan creates navigation hazards in our harbor, decreases boating facilities, and eliminates much needed and well-used boater parking. It creates traffic gridlock that will make it difficult to even access the harbor.

4 – What is the problem with the plans? The nice, glitzy elevation views of the CenterCal Plan posted on the City website and in the local papers don’t match the plan CenterCal submitted to the City. The pretty pictures show a huge waterfront esplanade/boardwalk... much, much larger than depicted in their plan. The open areas are bigger in the glitzy drawings than in the plan. The buildings don’t match the plan.

CenterCal promised residents a 3-D model of their development so we could visualize the view impacts. A year and a half after their CEO made that promise, we still don’t have that 3-D model. CenterCal NEVER shows their mall drawings from the Harbor Drive perspective ... only from the perspective of looking in from the ocean. Residents wishing to gain a clear image of the CenterCal plan from which to submit concerns have NOT been afforded that opportunity due to OMISSION OF DATA!

5 – How do we compare to others? Please compare the proposed CenterCal project to the nearby "Ports of Call," the failed waterfront shopping/restaurant area in San Pedro that is undergoing a similar revitalization process as we are with our harbor. Their waterfront area is 15 acres, the same LAND AREA as our harbor/pier area in the CenterCal mall project - 15 acres for possible development. Port of Los Angeles officials are not as enamored with over-development as our City Council. The maximum total development allowed in their 15 LAND acres is just 375,000 sq ft. Our Council is promoting CenterCal's 524,000 sq ft in 15 acres of LAND AREA available. That is 40% larger than what San Pedro is allowing over the same space. How do we justify that?

7) In the immediate vicinity (adjacent to and across the street from CenterCal's proposed plan) are two other projects whose impacts need to be considered: 1) the construction of the new Shade Hotel and, 2) demolition of the power plant and construction of what will take its place. Additionally, a possible 3rd project is looming about 1/4 mile away, that being possible oil drilling in Hermosa Beach, with construction, congestion, noise and other negative impacts that could all be taking place simultaneously.

8) A local non-profit organization, Building a Better Redondo (BBR), has circulated an alternative vision to the CenterCal project that has received significant, positive response from the community. At a June 2014 City Street Festival, hundreds of Redondo Beach residents gave feedback in support of the BBR alternate plan being a welcomed and viable replacement of the CenterCal development project. Please compare, contrast and evaluate this alternative plan.

More concerns: the addition of a road between Torrance Blvd. and Harbor Drive, the added height of the project; specifically, a 3-story parking garage that will block views, the lack of open space, and the competition with the other, non-coastal retail developments; Plaza El Segundo, Manhattan Village Mall, South Bay Galleria, Del Amo Mall, The Promenade at Rolling Hills, and Ports of Call, to name a few ... all of which should be analyzed regarding "market impact."
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marina Kotsianas
Redondo Beach real estate owner and taxpayer, 15 years
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FW: Mail delivery failed: returning message to sender
Mike Pauls [lmikep@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 9:43 PM
To: Katie Owston

----- Forwarded Message
From: Mail Delivery System <Mailer-Daemon@elasmtp-mealy.atl.sa.earthlink.net>
Date: Mon, 21 Jul 2014 19:50:47 -0400
To: <lmikep@earthlink.net>
Subject: Mail delivery failed: returning message to sender

This message was created automatically by mail delivery software.

A message that you sent could not be delivered to one or more of its recipients. This is a permanent error. The following address(es) failed:

katieowston@redondo.org

SMTP error from remote mail server after RCPT TO:<katieowston@redondo.org>: host mx4.redondo.org [208.251.67.67]: 550 No such user (katieowston@redondo.org)

----- This is a copy of the message, including all the headers. ------

Return-path: <lmikep@earthlink.net>
Received: from [24.152.133.25] (helo=[192.168.1.3])
by elasmtp-mealy.atl.sa.earthlink.net with esmtpa (Exim 4.67)
(envelope-from <lmikep@earthlink.net>)
id 1X9NLx-0003gh-9K; Mon, 21 Jul 2014 19:50:45 -0400
User-Agent: Microsoft-Entourage/11.4.0.080122
Date: Mon, 21 Jul 2014 16:50:43 -0700
Subject: EIR Comments
From: Mike Pauls <lmikep@earthlink.net>
To: <katieowston@redondo.org>
Message-ID: <CFF2F563.30394%lmikep@earthlink.net>
Thread-Topic: EIR Comments
Thread-Index: Ac+lPpVk1CrQJhExEeSFOwAiQTQBJA==
Mime-version: 1.0
Content-type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="B_3488806245_2302935"

> This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

--B_3488806245_2302935
Content-type: text/plain;
Katie -

My concern is that associated with height.

Past projects in other communities have cheated on height restrictions, which violated assumed height restrictions causing both technical and legal problems. I'd like this not to be repeated here. So the question here is what reference is used to support the EIR and where is it defined? Is it a constant number or does it vary depending on the site plan location?

I assume the height restrictions also apply to foliage. How does one keep foliage from exceeding height limits?

My other concern is density/congestion. From an aesthetic point of view a sense of openness and non geometrical path ways (rather curves and arcs) need to be included in order to integrate the openness of the ocean with the openness of the development.

Sincerely

Mike Pauls
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Sincerely<BR><BR>
Mike Pauls</SPAN></FONT>
</BODY>
</HTML>

--B_3488806245_2302935--
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Redondo Beach Waterfront Project
Carol Pleatman [c.pleafman@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 8:02 AM
To: Katie Owston

I have attended most of the meetings on the Waterfront Project. The meeting in the foyer at the Redondo Beach Performing Arts building was disgraceful. Questions weren’t answered or even worse were not allowed. We, the citizens of Redondo Beach were not heard, not listened to and no one cared.

I am writing this to let you know, as an intelligent and knowledgeable citizen of Redondo Beach I am opposed to the Waterfront Project as it now sits. First off, we do not need high rises to block the beautiful view of our Pacific Ocean. And that is what is proposed.

What Center Cal is calling a market, is really a mall. We do not need another mall when we have so many in Redondo, Torrance Palos Verdes, El Segundo and other surrounding cities. It would be awful for Redondo to have a mall that is badly attended and empty. We do not need people to mall shop on the ocean front. At one of the first meetings, we the citizens of Redondo Beach sat with maps and paper at our tables, telling the city what we wanted. We said we wanted upscale independent stores and have said that from the beginning. Not a mall or as Center Call calls it a market.

I am a movie buff and move movie lover. I started the series “Reel talk of S. Bay with Stephen Farber” at the Archlight Theater in El Segundo. I would love to see a Laemmle or another theater in the S. Bay, but never on the waterfront, blocking the view.

I hear that the company doing the EIR study has tiding with Center Cal and now an independent company is taking over at a huge expense. How did our elected officials make such a blunder?

Like I said, I’ve been to most of the meetings on the Waterfront project from the beginning. It has saddened me that none of our objections, suggestions, ideas and the like have been taken into consideration.

I am writing to put my protest to move forward on the Waterfront Project as it now sits.
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Dear Mayor Aspel and City Council Members:

I am writing you in regards to the Pier Redevelopment. I am 100% in favor of redeveloping the Pier but not with CenterCals’ over development plan. It is going to end up being a White Elephant Mall.

Mr. Aspel,

I am very displeased with your veto of Bill Brands motion, to put the Pier Redeveloping Project on the Ballot this November. I am more displeased that Councilman Aust and Ginsburg supported your decision. Considering the poling of the Voting citizens, for final approval makes more sense to me. Your decision to not allow the citizens a final vote on the project is inconsiderate to the Redondo Beach Citizens. I think that you three men think it will not pass in a citizens final vote.

The citizens deserve a final approval vote. We are all in this together and for three men to make a decision to move forward on a final approval plan without a vote of the citizens is unconscionable. You three men are giving CenterCal approval to move forward with out regards to the impact study. This White Elephant over development is jeopardizing the future of Redondo Beach. Redondo Beach and the investors will end up in Bankruptcy Court then lawsuits will fly in every direction. This Development needs to be downsized by 35%.

Mayor Aspel, Mr Ginsburg and Mr.Aust I am requesting that you three, separately, please write a letter to the Redondo Beach Citizens listings your credentials that qualify you to make a decision on a vast project like the Pier Development. I would like your response published in the three local Newspapers.

Is the failure of this huge project the legacy you three men want to leave at the door step of beautiful Redondo Beach?

Earl Turner
Redondo Beach
Dear Katie Clason,

I have been a resident in Rancho Beach for 50 years. I was here when another developer tried the power plant routine at the AES Plant. That is when I became a very active citizen attending Council Meetings, setting up block parties, drugstores, etc. gathering signatures against the project. We are not NIMBY's, we are a quiet family community and want to keep it just like it is. We don't have even our own hospital! What about Police and Firemen? When you people you have problems. Our crime rate in all the Beach Cities is growing. We have a large pool, lots of restaurants and shops. A great Riviera Village and again for our families to visit. Easy access to our Beach and in fact - we live in Paradise. We walk every day - take our visitors to all the local restaurants and plenty of hotel rooms just the way we are. We have a Performing Arts Center - Salt Water Lagoon for our kids and certainly DO NOT NEED or WANT (your) $200 million development coming in here. To change anything, I will do everything I can to stop you.

Sincerely,

Lavonne Dischendi - Peter Schwartz
448 Avenue E - 310-316-3172