
The Waterfront Scoping Summary
City of Redondo Beach
Attachment H

Comment Letters Received After Close of Scoping Period



The Waterfront Scoping Summary
City of Redondo Beach
Attachment H

Comment Letters Received After Close of Scoping Period



Opinions re Waterfront Project

Susan Brakel [inglesue@hotmail.com]

Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 10:03 PM

To: Katie Owston

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

_____ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10136 (20140722)

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

<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 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 ans 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

415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
310-318-0637, 1-2895

From: Dean Francois [savethestrand@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, July 18, 2014 12:23 PM

To: Katie Owston

Subject: Scoping Comments for the Waterfront Development-EIR from the Protectors of Public Ocean Views

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

Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10136 (20140722)

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

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 atch'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

_____ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10136 (20140722)

_____ The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>



WELCOME TO REDONDO BEACH

Redondo Landing
Food, Bars & Fun

briXton

ASTORIA LANDING
Fresh Seafood

Flonky's

NEWPORT
Seafood

NEWPORT
Seafood

Pacific Fresh Fish Co.
www.pacificfreshfish.com
TEL: 313-633-9260
FAX: 313-633-9260
700 E. 6TH ST. W.

INDIVIDUAL FOODSERVICE
IIFS
Food * Paper * Janitorial * Packaging
www.indfood.com
(323) 981-2800

SUMMER of MUSIC

STOP
RIGHT TURN ONLY
DO NOT ENTER

DELIVERIES



NOTICE
AUTHORIZED
PERSONNEL
ONLY

5
M P H

AUTHORIZED
PERSONNEL
ONLY





WELCOME TO BEDONK

COLD TIGER

WEST TORRANCE, CALIF.

RESTAURANT LANDING

Nature's Produce

COSTCO

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+HPpVk1CrQJhExEeSFOwAiQTQBjA==

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;

charset="ISO-8859-1"

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

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

--B_3488806245_2302935

Content-type: text/html;

charset="ISO-8859-1"

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<TITLE>EIR Comments</TITLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY>

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 vi=
ew 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 t=
he openness of the development.

Sincerely

Mike Pauls

</BODY>

</HTML>

--B_3488806245_2302935--

_____ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10136 (20140722)

The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

Redondo Beach Waterfront Project

Carol Pleatman [c.pleatman@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 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.

_____ Information from ESET Endpoint Antivirus, version of virus signature database 10136 (20140722)

_____ The message was checked by ESET Endpoint Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

CenterCal Pier Project on the Ballot.

Earl Turner [eeturn3@aol.com]

Sent: Monday, July 21, 2014 8:47 PM

To: Bill Brand; Jeff Ginsburg; Pat Aust; Stephen Sammarco; Matt Kilroy; Steve Aspel; Eleanor Manzano; Katie Owston

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 polling 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 Dwyer,

July 17, 2014

I have been a resident in Redondo Beach for 50 yrs. I was here when another Developer tried the Power Point routine at the AES Plant! That is when I became a very active citizen attending Council Meetings, sitting in front of markets, drugstores, etc, gathering signatures against the projects. We are not M.B. or H.B. - 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 pier, lots of restaurants & 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.

Joyanne Dismandi - Peter Schatz
448 Avenue E - 310-316-3172



LaVonne R. Dismondi
448 Avenue E
Redondo Beach, CA 90277



Katie Dunstan
Community Development Dept.
415 Diamond St.
Redondo Beach, Ca 90277