

# The Redondo Beach Waterfront

EDiels . <elisabethdiels@hotmail.com>

Sat 1/16/2016 8:49 AM

To:Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

> Hi Katie-

> I fully support the drastically needed redevelopment of "Our" Waterfront.

>

> I say "Our", because it's not for the use of only the very negative residents who live in proximity of "Our" jewel (NIMBY's who are against the draw of more people wanting to come down to "Our" Waterfront and have access to the coast) but in the hands of "Our" children who will truly be the benefactors of this redevelopment in their lifetime.

PC251-1

>

> For my family (and my 7 year old son who will grow up to enjoy "Our" Waterfront) I am in support of the drastically needed redevelopment of OUR Waterfront.

>

> Thank you.

>

> Elisabeth Diels

> Redondo Beach, CA

> ElisabethDiels@hotmail.com

>

>

# Polly's on the Pier - Photos

Bob Williams <mrbobwilliams@hotmail.com>

Sat 1/16/2016 9:49 AM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Cc: Bob Williams <mrbobwilliams@hotmail.com>;

Katie:

"Help Save Our Little Pier" article in Easy Reader.

You may enjoy some photos I took after breakfast one morning at Polly's.

Good luck with the "save the pier" campaign.

<https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=979509265453040&set=a.979506018786698.1073741844.100001819261588&type=3&theater>

I have the color originals if you need any.

Kind regards,

Bob & Emma Williams  
Manhattan Beach, Calif

(Emma is an L.A. native).

PC252-1

### Polly's on the Pier - Redondo Beach, Calif

By [Bob Williams](#) · Updated about 2 weeks ago

soon to meet the wrecking ball, hipsters prefer multi-million dollar condos to greasy eggs and spoons. Polly's has nourished us with football-size guacamole omelets and mountains of hotcakes, Like many cherished places, soon to vanish in the ghostly fog of our once young memory. post 2 January 2016.



George Durgin and Nash Ryan like this.

### Other Albums



Venice, California Farmer's Market - Saturday morning, 22 August

12 photos



Our Garden

7 photos



Grand Prix - Manhattan Beach, C

12 photos



25th Wedding Anniversary Tour - May 2015

25 photos



Hermosa Beach Lighthouse - Jazz Alumni

20 photos



Our Garden - on one day of

10 photos

See More

- Sign Up
- Log In
- Messenger
- Facebook Lite
- Mobile
- Find Friends
- Badges
- People
- Pages
- Places
- Games
- Locations
- About
- Create Ad
- Create Page
- Developers
- Careers
- Privacy
- Cookies
- Ad Choices
- Terms
- Help

Facebook © 2016  
English (US)

# Draft EIR comment

Diana Mann <dmann90277@hotmail.com>

Sat 1/16/2016 11:58 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

 1 attachment

EIR comments.docx;

Dear Ms. Owsten:

Please add my comments to the public record.

Thank you

*Diana Mann, resident of The Village  
230 The Village, #302*

PC253-1

TO: Katie Owston  
 FROM: Diana Mann, Resident of The Village  
 230 The Village Unit 302  
 Redondo Beach, CA 90277

DATE: Jan 16, 2016  
 RE: Draft EIR Report of the  
 Waterfront Development

I wish to call your attention to the areas of the EIR that cause great concern to us, the residents of The Village, next door neighbors to this project.

In section 3.13 Traffic and Transportation in the Draft EIR it states:

*The proposed project is expected to generate a total of 22,234 daily trips (763 AM peak hour trips and 1,475 PM peak hour trips) for a net new of 12,550 daily trips associated with the proposed project.*

PC253-1  
 cont'd

The report further states in Air Quality section 3.2-12 that since the increased vehicle volume is below a screening threshold of 24,000 cars per hour that this increase will have no significant impact on air quality.

I am not sure where such a threshold comes from or why that has any bearing on this project. How can the addition of 12,550 vehicles per day not have an impact on air quality?

I know we are moving toward cleaner cars but not everyone owns a Tesla or Prius yet. Even after mitigation measures are implemented, there will still be toxic emissions.

And we, the next door neighbors, the residents of The Village have the privilege of breathing in those fumes on a daily basis. How is this not a health hazard?

On noise pollution:

As stated in ES 7.2.4, NOISE NO1-3. of the report:

*Implementation of the proposed project would cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity (i.e. Torrance Circle/Boulevard between Catalina Avenue and the project site) above levels existing without the project and in excess of the city's standards.*

*No feasible or additional feasible mitigation measures are available that would avoid all the potential impacts or reduce all impacts to less than significant levels. **Therefore, potential impacts to these resource areas are considered significant and unavoidable.***

Consider the morning and evening commuters who will use this road to bypass the back-up at PCH and 190<sup>th</sup> (and don't think they won't), the morning truck deliveries to all the added restaurants, the evening traffic for the movies that let out, and my own personal favorites, the motorcyclists and motor bike clubs out for their weekend rides along the ocean. Noise levels will have a significant impact on the lives of the residents here.

PC253-2

The residents of the Village will be the most impacted by this road. Many of these condos were built during the 70s without air conditioning because it was a feature of them to "enjoy the ocean breezes" and, until recently, the afternoon breezes were indeed enough to cool down the units. We will no longer have the use of our windows for air at all, if we have to keep them closed all the time in order to

keep out road noise. Furthermore, our own CC&Rs do not permit us to install air conditioning. One resident was recently denied the use of a portable unit to put on her balcony due to the noise it would generate. We will suffocate in here in the summer months.

PC253-2  
cont'd

On congestion:

After living here for only a few years we are already seeking alternative routes to find our way to the freeway in order to avoid the back-up at PCH and 190<sup>th</sup>. This will worsen if the proposed development remains at the scale being shown to us today.

PC253-3

Note: the **voters of Redondo Beach voted against Measure A**, rejecting a zoning change of the AES power plant site, so that the addition of 600 new condos would not impact the congestion in this area. What is being suggested here is even worse. Our city officials are apparently so invested in this project that they have not heard the message that the citizens of our city sent them when that initiative failed.

Please listen: WE DO NOT WANT THIS ADDED CONGESTION, AIR AND NOISE POLLUTION  
IN OUR BACKYARD.

PC253-4

# Rescue our waterfront

ann chorbi <anchovy4@yahoo.com>

Sun 1/17/2016 8:54 AM

To:Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Hi Katie,

I'm a senior resident of Redondo Beach and I enjoy the 'low key' atmosphere in Redondo Beach very much....

In fact it's getting to be built up quite alot already down by the waterfront.....Enough I think for the limited parking and road conditions with the bikes taking over most of the roads down there.... I especially like 'the little pier' by Polly's one of my family's favorite breakfast places.....

I don't understand WHY we have to compete with other cities like Manhattan Beach and Santa Monica.....

places I don't even want to travel to BECAUSE they are SO CROWDED.....it's not fun.....at all finding parking and then walking around with so many people....

I like how Hermosa Beach closed off to autos the lower part of Pier Ave.....there are lots of people, but it's safe and fun to walk around.....

PC254-1

But with more projects planned for Redondo Beach to 'make money'.....it's going to turn into a failure because it will be too congested for people to enjoy and spend money..... There will be 2-3 hotels, isn't that enough?

People want to 'get away' from hustle and bustle and that's why they'll come to Redondo Beach.....instead of the other's I listed above.....

Please keep the 'laid back' atmosphere.....and please keep it in good shape for all to enjoy and relax....

My son has a small boat at King's Harbor and he hopes it stays the same as it is.....He lives in Torrance.

Thank you,  
Andy and Ann Chorbi  
2750 Artesia Blvd.

# Polly's on the Pier

Patti Brown <pattibrown@me.com>

Sun 1/17/2016 1:31 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

I understand the need for revitalization. But there are certain aspects of our waterfront that keep history and quaintness alive. I speak of Polly's and the sport fishing location on the little pier. This is exactly the type of locale I search for when I travel, be it in the United States or overseas. You cannot beat charm and the genuine, old fashioned friendliness that attracts so many. I am so worried we will have our hometown turn into an over inflated mall, for lack of a better word. Yes, updates on just not so grand a scale. Keep part of our local lore and homeyness. I believe those of us who live here and contribute to Redondo deserve some say.

PC255-1

Sent from my iPad

## Fwd: DEIR

REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com

Sun 1/17/2016 1:45 PM

To: Katie Owston &lt;Katie.Owston@redondo.org&gt;;

Cc: REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com &lt;REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com&gt;;

Katie...I noticed the email address I used for you when sending this originally was not exactly as was shown in the information we were given as to where to send our comments on the DEIR. Please use this copy as tho is were my original. Thanks you. Joanne Newman

---

From: REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com  
To: Katie.Owston@redondo.orgwww  
CC: REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com  
Sent: 1/15/2016 2:15:40 P.M. Pacific Standard Time  
Subj: DEIR

Regarding the DEIR

Was the addition of the many trash trucks which will be necessary to service this bloated Project included in the traffic study? If so how could the conclusion be reached that there would be no impact on traffic? They will surely increase the noise levels, the pollution levels, and the number of vehicle trips into the area and into the Project daily / weekly. These vehicles whether in or out of the Project and / or while within the Project itself certainly should be taken into account or was that considered not important enough to be included ????

Fortunately the EIR is only a **draft** EIR. Perhaps it's time to go back to the drawing board?

Thank you. Joanne Newman Redondo Beach, CA 310-372-9604 [www.redondoredhead@aol.com](http://www.redondoredhead@aol.com)

PC256-1

## Fwd: DEIR

REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com

Sun 1/17/2016 1:44 PM

To: Katie Owston &lt;Katie.Owston@redondo.org&gt;;

Cc: REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com &lt;REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com&gt;;

Katie.....Here again the email address I used for you on the original transmission of this email was not exactly as what was shown on the information we were given at to where to send our DEIR comments. Please use this as my official email comments on the DEIR. Thank you. Joanne Newman Redondo Beach

---

From: REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com  
To: Katie.Owston@redondo.org  
CC: REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com  
Sent: 1/16/2016 3:01:52 P.M. Pacific Standard Time  
Subj: DEIR

PC257-1

Regarding the DEIR

What provisions have been made for emergency vehicles getting into, our of and around while within the Project? Was that included in the traffic study or is that something that was neither considered.....or was left out on purpose.....or not considered important enough to be included in the analysis?. To me it certainly should be of the utmost important to be considered. Any time delays in the emergency vehicles getting into, around or out of the Project could cost someone their life !!!!! This definitely is an issue that must be visited if it has not been done so. Again it is fortunate that this a **Draft EIR** as the egregious flaws in many areas of the traffic analysis need to be corrected.

Thank you. Joanne Newman Redondo, CA 310-372-9604 [www.redondoredhead@aol.com](http://www.redondoredhead@aol.com)

# Support for Polly's on the Pier

Pratik Basu <pratikbasu@gmail.com>

Sun 1/17/2016 1:53 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Dear Ms. Owston,

This is a note in support of the wonderful Polly's on the Pier.

My wife and I have lived here in the South Bay for over a decade and have enjoyed our visits to Polly's. In an age of trendy establishments that seem to come and go with alarming regularity, it's nice to know that long-standing places with deep community ties still exist. Polly is a perfect example of this.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or need any more information.

Thank you for your time.

Cheers!

Pratik

--

Pratik Basu

Mobile: +1-213-985-0159

Sent from my mobile device

PC258-1

# Water Front Project public Input

Jonathan Nook <jonathannook@yahoo.com>

Sun 1/17/2016 3:20 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Hello Katie,

We are very much opposed to the "reconnection" of Pacific Avenue as CenterCal calls it.

It isn't like it's been disconnected in the recent past, so CenterCal's description is a bit inaccurate.

There is no reason that the proposed hotel cannot be accessed from the Torrance Blvd. side without adding this new thoroughfare 'Pacific Avenue'. Why expose all the pedestrian traffic to yet another roadway?

Every other project like this, that we've seen created in the last couple of decades, removed roadways instead of adding new ones. Hermosa Beach Promenade, Santa Monica Promenade, for example.

When I questioned CenterCal's Fred Bruning about the need for an additional roadway, he told me that many people would not walk from one side of the project to the other and would need to drive instead, which is preposterous.

All in all, we are for the project, but not for additional roadways.

Thank you,

Jonathan Nook

Redondo Beach Resident.

PC259-1

# Pier Redevelopment

JoAnn Tredick <wavyjo2@yahoo.com>

Sun 1/17/2016 4:25 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

 1 attachment

Pier November.docx;

**JoAnn Tredick  
150 The Village #3  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277-2584**

**January 17, 2016**

**Katie Owston**

**Subject: Pier Redevelopment**

**As a concerned resident of Seascape II, I would appreciate an understanding of how a two-lane street (N. Harbor Drive and Pacific Avenue) are going to handle the increased traffic. How will we be able to access our homes without waiting in line as we do for the 4<sup>th</sup> of July, The Christmas Boat Parade, and sunny days during the summer months, just to mention a few examples?**

PC260-1

**How long will the development/construction take to complete in front of my home? We were informed that the total project will take 2 to 4 years. That sounds like a lot of sacrificing on my part.**

PC260-2

**I realize that the Pier and Parking Structures are in great need of renovation. And I am all for it, provided it is done properly and with the human factor taken into consideration.**

PC260-3

**It seems to me that the project as it is now planned, will be done at the cost of the residents. We may go to the theatre occasionally; the same with the farmers market and fish market; the hotel is of no use for us.**

**Yours truly,**

**JoAnn Tredick**

# Save our Little Pier!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

LINDA MOREY <seagirl linda@msn.com>

Sun 1/17/2016 5:22 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

I was very distressed when I saw that the "Little Pier" was under siege. Polly's is a special local spot for breakfast where you may glimpse a Garibaldi while waiting for your turn at an outside table. It's a perfect place to catch a boat for a whale watching adventure. Families love it for a fishing experience. It's part of our history and heritage. We can't lose it!!!!!!

PC261-1

Linda Morey

# Waterfront development

Anita Caplan <arcaplan2@gmail.com>

Sun 1/17/2016 5:26 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

I like the idea of improving the waterfront but I think the proposal is too grand. I think every change needs to improve the enjoyment of the water and the pier. An inside shopping mall is not relevant to such enjoyment.

When I grew up in Redondo in the 40s and the 50s Redondo had an amusement park with a carousel, kiddie rides, and lots of beach type attractions. The pier, parking structure and international boardwalk certainly need to be updated but I do not think that a shopping mall is the way to go. PC262-1

I also will vote against any project that diminishes the already too small view of the ocean that we have. The "Village" was the worst thing that happened to Redondo. Don't make it worse.

Thanks,  
Anita Caplan  
homeowner  
402 South Lucia Avenue  
Redondo Beach 90277

## LETTER IN OPPOSITION TO CENTER CAL DEIR

Megan Sullaway <sullawaym@aol.com>

Sun 1/17/2016 9:26 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>; Megan Sullaway <sullawaym@aol.com>;

 1 attachment

Letter OPPOSING CenterCal DEIR.pdf;

I am strongly opposed to the CenterCal development and have several comments on the DEIR.

I am attaching a letter with these comments.

I am a resident of Redondo Beach (90277)

Megan Sullaway, Ph.D.  
Pacific Psychological Associates  
www.pacificpsychological.com  
33° 50' 23"N 118° 23' 29"W

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This transmission and any attachments are intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable federal or state laws. If the reader of this transmission is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify me immediately by email (pacificpsych@aol.com) or by telephone (310-536-0211).

PC263-1

pfeifer/dodge house  
605 garnet street  
redondo beach, Ca 90277

Katie Owston, Project Planner  
Planning Division  
415 Diamond St.  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277  
[katie.owston@redondo.org](mailto:katie.owston@redondo.org)

### Comments on WATERFRONT DRAFT EIR

January 17, 2016

Dear Ms. Owston:

I am **strongly** opposed to Center Cal's plans for the Redondo Beach waterfront area. I have lived in Redondo Beach since 1990, and have lived near the Pacific Ocean my entire life.

There are several MAJOR problems with the Center Cal plan as reflected in the EIR.

1. Loss of public access to and enjoyment of the ocean.

Redondo Beach is one of only two harbors on the Santa Monica Bay. Currently, it allows local residents and the general public full advantage of the ocean (sailing, sportfishing, paddle boarding, kayaking, swimming; a "Seaside Lagoon" which allows families with small children to safely swim, etc.).

All this would be severely curtailed or lost if the CenterCal project goes thru.

- a. The DEIR plan paves over 1/3 of Seaside Lagoon public park for a road and retail/restaurant lease spaces, fills in the pool, and removes the children's fountain and slide.
- b. Seaside Lagoon had 81,000 day guests last year; 600 kids attended day camps there. It is currently easily accessed.
- c. The DEIR plan creates a situation in which families have to park & take their kids thru a parking structure, through shopping and restaurants and across an active road JUST TO ACCESS THE LAGOON, which will have far fewer of its current attractions.
- d. There are only two public parks in the harbor. The Center Cal plan will impact both, paving over 1/3 the Lagoon, and totally cover Moonstone Park. This negatively impacts (among others) the outrigger canoe club.
- e. AND: the DEIR plan makes the sport fishing pier optional!

2. Contaminated Water

310-529-0370

PC263-1  
cont'd

PC263-2

- a. Once Seaside Lagoon is partially filled in, it becomes very similar in structure to Marina del Rey and Cabrillo Beaches – both of which have to be shut down regularly for violations of fecal coliform levels.
- b. The City of Redondo has not tested the water quality anywhere in the harbor!
- c. The DEIR changes will allow fuel and other marine pollutants (that currently do not reach Seaside Lagoon) to contaminate it. It is likely that California sea lions will take up residence on the swimming and boat-launch beach, fouling the water and beach (as is currently the case in La Jolla, California).

PC263-2  
cont;d

### 3. Decreased Public Safety

- a. In addition to the contamination concerns listed above, CenterCal is proposing to put automobile-launch lanes for trailerable boats near the modified lagoon. This means that children, swimmers, kayakers, stand-up paddleboarders, power- and sail boats will all be together, sharing a relatively small space. This area is already the turning basin for King Harbor, where all of the commercial fishing, whale-watching and sailboat charters navigate to get in and out of the harbor. It is inevitable that collisions, causing injury or death, will occur.
- b. According to the EIR consultant, no lifeguards are planned for the Seaside Lagoon's entry area into the harbor. (As it is not a County beach, the County will not be providing lifeguards).

PC263-3

### 4. Ecological concerns

- a. The Redondo Beach Waterfront is home to several protected species (great blue herons, humpback whales, California brown pelicans). The DEIR does not cover the needs of these protected species and, in fact, fails to qualify the great blue heron as a protected species.

PC263-4

### 5. Impacted Views

- a. CenterCal never presented a 3-D model of their proposal to the citizens of Redondo Beach (despite their promise to do so). This seems to suggest duplicity.
- b. Where there is now an open parking lot adjacent to the harbor there will be a 45-foot tall concrete parking structure, 560 feet long, between the road and the ocean.
- c. There will be a 240 long movie theater adjacent to it.
- d. 4/10ths of a mile of development on a 5/10ths of a mile site is being proposed in the DEIR.
- e. It defies logic to suggest views will not be impacted.

PC263-5

### 6. Violation of Zoning Cap

- a. Current zoning states "cumulative development for commercial recreation district sub areas 1-4 shall not exceed a net increase of 400,000 sq. ft. of floor area"
- b. According to the DEIR, there will be over 500,000 sq. ft. of development.
- c. This violates the zoning cap.
- d. This increases by 10 times the CURRENT level of development.

PC263-6

## 7. Traffic

- a. If the current development will (according to the DEIR) increase by 10x, the traffic will also increase dramatically. The DEIR in no way explains how this small area will accommodate that much traffic.
- b. At the same time, the parking assessment is 200 spaces short, and does not include the parking needs of the sport-fishing pier, whale and fishing boats, stand up paddlers and kayakers.
- c. Obviously there will be increased air pollution.

PC263-7

The bottom line is this: the CenterCal plan, per the DEIR, subordinates the use of the harbors parks and recreational features to restaurants and shopping. Pollution, ecological damage, and risk to public safety are logical consequences.

California has a most precious commodity – its ocean. The CenterCal plan, per the DEIR, makes access to and enjoyment of the ocean far more difficult, if not impossible, for California residents.

PC263-8

I oppose this project!

Sincerely,

Megan Sullaway Ph.D.

# Redondo EIR

Connie Abela <connieabela@adelphia.net>

Mon 1/18/2016 7:55 AM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Cc: Bill Brand <bbrand@earthlink.net>; candacekallen@gmail.com <candacekallen@gmail.com>; Steve Aspel <Steve.Aspel@redondo.org>;

Importance: High

Dear Katie,

I have lived and owned property at Seascape II for the last 13 years. It is extremely concerning to me that some of the significant concerns that I previously emailed to you for consideration for completion of the EIR was recognized as only minimal impact. I am quite concerned about the following impacts of the planned development for Redondo as being a significant impact on so many levels as follows:

- 1) Traffic will be have a significant impact on the level of noise along Pacific which is already very bad on weekends. Therefore, with the addition of all of the shops planned, traffic will make a significant impact on Pacific. As it is, there are many times that I can't get into and out of my driveway. PC264-1
- 2) Traffic will also have a significant impact on security and safety and require more policing in the area. Redondo will be 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? PC264-2
- 3) Lack of sufficient parking for the development will significantly impact the complex where I live since we have minimal visitors parking available. I fear that transients will use our visitors parking. This will affect additional expense for my condo association because we will need to hire extra security. PC264-3
- 4) Traffic will have a significant impact on making it more congested along Pacific and Harbor generated not just through the construction period but also after the new road is put in place. I fear how this will impact the ability of having reasonable access into my home along with my neighbors that live in the complex. PC264-4
- 5) There will definitely be a significant impact on our views of the waterfront. 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. Redondo will look like the overbuilt nearby cities of Hermosa Beach and Manhattan Beach. Therefore, this will have a significant impact not only on lifestyle but also home values. PC264-5
- 6) 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. PC264-6
- 7) Additional police protection will be required 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. The complex that I live in continually experience break-ins now. This will significantly impact higher expense for additional police protection as well as additional security for the complex that I live in. PC264-7
- 8) The air quality which will ultimately impact my health from additional vehicles, trucks, construction from this project will create a significant impact. PC264-8

- 9) The development will prevent or impeded 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. PC264-9
- 10) 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. PC264-10
- 11) 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%. This will be a significant financial burden for Redondo 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 99 years and the project is not successful to support the business being developed, Redondo will have vacant buildings, as we do now and Redondo will bear a significant financially burden to look after them if we need to tear them down. 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? PC264-11

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. PC264-12

Thank you for your consideration.

*Connie Abela*

**Connie Abela**

## DEIR

REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com

Mon 1/18/2016 9:01 AM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Cc: REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com <REDONDOREDHEAD@aol.com>;

Regarding the DEIR

I am so puzzled.....why wasn't an analysis done on the weekend traffic? Was that left out deliberately or was it an oversight? If an oversight, it can still be done. If not.....I do not understand why. To me doing a weekend analysis should have been of major importance and the lack of one certainly negates any conclusions noted in the DEIR traffic study as the analysis is seriously flawed by the lack of inclusion of the heavier traffic on weekends. | PC265-1

Thank you. Joanne Newman Redondo Beach, CA 310-372-9604 [www.redondoredhead@aol.com](http://www.redondoredhead@aol.com)

# Objection to CenterCal Project EIR

Dawn Esser <esserla@verizon.net>

Mon 1/18/2016 10:19 AM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Katie - As a 27 year resident and property owner in Redondo, I strongly object to the EIR on the CenterCal project stating this project will not have any significant environmental impact. This project will greatly impact the quality of life for the residents due to the large increase in traffic, the negative impacts to our harbor, the only harbor in the South Bay, and the face of our waterfront due to the following facts stated in the EIR:

1) Increased Traffic to already stressed roads - Anita, Harbor Blvd, PCH - 12,550 additional car trips per day;

2) 3 -Story Structures blocking 80% of views along Harbor Blvd;

3) Recreational: 67 trailer spots down to 20, less access for boaters, kayakers, swimmers, SUP'ers , and reducing the size of Seaside Lagoon to 1/3rd its current size;

4) Water Quality: ~25% of 2014 measurements exceed E-coli and fecal standards.

It should be the City's responsibility to ensure the quality of life of its residents, not developers. These environmental impacts are significant and need to be addressed and not dismissed.

Dawn Esser

803 Carnelian St. #B

Redondo Beach, CA 90277

PC266-1

# Harbor development

borretts71 <borretts71@gmail.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 10:43 AM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

My husband and I, 40+ yr. Redondo residents, want to go on record as opposing the massive redevelopment plans for our harbor area. We agree that the pier area is a mess but suggest that the existing area be torn down and rebuilt using with similar footprints and space. No more hotels; no upscale mall type businesses; no theater; lots of open, green, view space and no grand tourist destination mindset. The traffic and other environmental impacts are being ignored by the city politicians. We look forward to becoming pro active in the organizations that continue to be outraged by over the top development proposals. Enough is enough. Michael and Judith Borrett, Long Time Redondo Residents

PC267-1

# SAVE POLLY'S AND THE PIER

KatBullo3@aol.com

Mon 1/18/2016 11:03 AM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Hi Katie, this is my vote for today's deadline. Redondo Beach pier will not be the same without POLLY'S. PC268-1

Kathy Bullock, (310) 370-9944 Thank You!!

# Draft EIR comments

Rena T <lazyhiker@gmail.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 11:22 AM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

I am a resident of South Redondo Beach. I live a little off of Torrance Blvd. I do not want the traffic, noise, pollution, commotion that will be brought on by a new shopping mall and no pier. I cannot even get my car out safely onto Torrance Blvd as it is!! The Harbor has history and character. Many families, local and from the inner city, enjoy coming out to stroll on the Pier, visit the funky shops and restaurants, fish off the pier, take photos of the Pier, swim right near by, and just enjoy the special place we have. Pumping in bright, shiny, and boring designer shops will strip our Harbor of its wonderful character, and leave only memories of the wonderful Pier we once had. This would be very sad and a big mistake.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rena Tishman  
409 South Lucia Avenue  
Redondo Beach, CA. 90277

# DEIR Comment

Joan Irvine <joanirvineconsulting@gmail.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 11:48 AM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

I support the concept of the Waterfront Village.

I hope that they could make a few changes such as:

- Maintain the little pier where Polly's on the Pier is; keeping a little piece of our history
- Find an alternative for the parking structure at Harbor and Beryl that is planned for in front of the Crowne Plaza and The Redondo hotels.

PC270-1

Joan Irvine  
318 Ave I #245  
RB, CA 90277

[joan@joanirvineconsulting.com](mailto:joan@joanirvineconsulting.com)

+1 310 383 9895

<http://www.redondobeachweddings.org/index.php/experts/officiants>

<http://theperfectweddingceremony.net/>

[www.linkedin.com/in/joanirvine/](http://www.linkedin.com/in/joanirvine/)

[www.keeptheesplanadebeautiful.org](http://www.keeptheesplanadebeautiful.org)

# The Waterfront Draft EIR

Roger Light <rogerlight1@gmail.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 11:55 AM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Ms. Owston:

I have been a resident of Redondo Beach for the last 15 years and a resident of the South Bay for most of my life. I have a continuing interest in looking out for our truly unique waterfront town. I want to go on the record as strongly skeptical of much of what I have read and heard about the draft Environmental Impact Report. The misinformation that has been used as a smoke screen by many to tout this project as a "win-win" is anything but. On every level our city will lose.

To claim that the draft EIR covers all possible aspects of environmental impact of this poorly planned project is ludicrous. When you are looking at a massive project such as this that will take many years to construct, including impacting 36 of 150 acres of the waterfront of Redondo Beach you must be sure that this is the best possible alternative. This type of mall with 380,000 square feet of development brings forth so many unknowns that the draft EIR can not possibly address. To have such a massive development of retail space that will not open for well over the three years of claimed construction time is irresponsible from an environmental standpoint, or any other. The way people shop is in tremendous flux and this mall at the sea will be outdated before it opens. More and more of us are not purchasing from brick and mortar locations but rather from the ease of our home on the internet. That trend will only continue and to create a white elephant project such as this defies logic.

PC271-1

Large retail environments must be strategically place with an infrastructure that can support the anticipated influx of customers. To open such an "attraction" when a large portion of potential access is the ocean makes no sense what so ever. That the primary access road is now a single lane in each direction and already, at times, a nightmare to travel reduces the logic of this project to below zero.

Traffic impact and disruption in the construction and operation of this project has been woefully underestimated the the EIR. Noise pollution impact has not been studied in any systematic manner and the inevitable impact on the water quality of the ocean has been all but ignored. There is no way to predict or control what these large retailers will send into our ocean and on to our beaches.

PC271-2

The financial responsibility aspects of this project, while not directly relating to the draft EIR, are also troubling. The fact that this company Redondo Beach proposes to partner specializes in taking over other distressed projects is ironic since if the project is build in 10 years some such company will likely be taking over this disaster from them. That fact that the city of Redondo is on the hook for ensuring that this company makes money or else they don't pay much of anything is just bad business and a wonderful incentive for failure.

PC271-3

This project does not fit with the waterfront or greater Redondo Beach community and must be rejected and an alternative master plan developed. This project completely ignores the fact that something similar to this will eventually will be build across the street at the AES power plan site and without a comprehensive analysis of all future development in the area the chances of something viable and constructive coming out of this project are astronomically small.

PC271-4

Roger Light, PhD  
Redondo Beach Resident

3221 Gibson Place  
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

# Waterfront Draft EIR Comments

BCCClub <jim\_hannon@bccclub.org>

Mon 1/18/2016 11:59 AM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

 1 attachment

Waterfront Development\_EIR Report\_Hannons Comments.pdf;

Katie,

I would like to submit my attached Draft EIR Comments to be recorded in the Draft EIR and other related documents.

Thank you,

Jim Hannon

USA Cycling Coach • League Cycling Instructor • Beach Cities Cycling Club • South Bay Bicycling Coalition • (310) 341-8701

PC272-1

### Comments

The Waterfront  
Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR)



Name: James Hannon

Organization (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

Address: 510 The Village, #304,  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Zip Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (optional): (310) 341-8701

E-mail (optional): hannon\_jim@hotmail.com

**Comments on Draft EIR:** Other option for building a South Pier Parking structure (\$30-50 million  
dollar project?) Summary, I believe relocating about 90+% of the vehicle parking from the 100 West  
Torrance Blvd location would be money better spent; and still leave leave ample parking space  
for service, emergency, special needs and loading/unloading vehicles and temporary parking by hotels  
(this makes up the 10%). Then, this land could be reused for developed, parks, art, other, etc. and  
eliminate parked vehicles having an ocean view.

The Southern parking structure would be relocated to the Civic Center property, on Diamond and  
PCH (built in the mid-1950's), it has exceeded its life expectancy, and needs to be replaced.

We also know the city and police services cannot be suspended during the reconstruction and the Civic  
Center and Police Station will need to be relocated.

Background information leading up to my conclusion to relocate the Civic Center and Police Station:

1. Rebuilding the Pier's South Parking structure would be far less expensive (because of the water table  
& more) if it were built where the Civic Center is located now. We know it can be built by going down 3 or 4  
stories, much like the Main Library did. But, in this case the top surface could be used for open space or  
parkland (much like Pershing Square in L.A.). I also suggest we use clean electric trams to travel between  
the new parking structure and to distribute visitors to their Waterfront destination. This would mitigate the  
number of cars near the ocean, the end result being less traffic near the ocean, and less pollution and noise.  
(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](mailto:katie.owston@redondo.org).  
All comments must be received no later than 5:30 p.m. on January 19, 2016.

PC272-1  
cont'd



# Harbor revitalization

Mary Medina <metmedina@yahoo.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 12:27 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Dear Katie,

I am all for harbor revitalization - but I would prefer to see more boating, and more open space, in our Harbor and less buildings and definitely no mall!

Best Regards,

Mary Medina

Long Time Redondo Beach Resident

# Vote - SAVE the Pier

KatBullo3@aol.com

Mon 1/18/2016 12:36 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

**Yes, SAVE POLLY'S this is Kathy Bullock, (310) 370-9944**

Please do not take that part of the pier away. We have been dining outside at Polly's and walking by there for years. It is part of the Roots of Redondo Beach. It would not be the same without POLLY'S or that section of the pier. Thank You!!

PC274-1

# Polly's

jsaul37@aol.com

Mon 1/18/2016 1:17 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

I would like to see Polly's to Remain on the Pier.  
Jim Saul

PC275-1

# Comments on DEIR

catchir@aol.com

Mon 1/18/2016 1:50 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

 1 attachment

Comments on the DEIR for the Redondo Beach Waterfront.docx;

**Katie,**

Attached you will find my comments re: the Redondo Beach waterfront DEIR.

Cheryl Tchir 402 N. Lucia Redondo Beach, CA 90277

PC276-1

Comments on the DEIR for the Redondo Beach Waterfront  
 Cheryl Tchir  
 402 N. Lucia Ave.  
 Redondo Beach, CA 90277

As a 47-year resident and homeowner in Redondo Beach, I am very concerned about the potential negative impacts of CenterCal 's proposed waterfront development. I direct my comments to several of the 14 resource areas that were analyzed in the DEIR.

### **Aesthetics and Visual Resources**

According to the report, the development "would not have a substantial adverse effect on a designated local valued view available to the general public." I disagree. A 4-story parking garage would substantially affect the public view of the water as well as impacting the view from the recently renovated Redondo Hotel. The current 3-level pier parking structure would be replaced with a 5-level structure – with the attendant loss of views. Furthermore, CenterCal has never submitted a 3-dimensional design so the public CAN see exactly where the skyline/view will be changed. The drawings of the proposed development have warnings: "for conceptual purposes only" or "For discussion purposes only. Actual development and placement may vary." (Fig. ES-3) How are we to know what the aesthetics and visual impairments will be, and how could this impact report state that there would not be a substantial adverse effect when we have yet to see the proposed skyline?

PC276-1  
cont'd

### **Noise**

**NOI-3:** The project would cause substantial permanent increase in ambient noise in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project and in excess of the City's standards.. Significant and unavoidable – no mitigation is available.

I suggest eliminating Pacific Avenue, as that appears to be the addition that increases levels in excess of city standards. The EIR notes on NOI-3 alternative 5 that there would be no significant increase in ambient noise if Pacific Avenue were not created. Bringing the noise, air pollution, and general chaos of more autos closer to the water's edge is a bad idea for pedestrians, cyclists, and residents of nearby homes. It detracts from the beauty of the natural environment. Alternative 5 is the solution here.

PC276-2

### **Traffic**

**TRA-2:** would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program. The traffic modifications outlined in TRA-1 seem unlikely to prevent traffic gridlock in the waterfront vicinity. As the waterfront is today, traffic crawls at peak times on PCH, Herondo, and Catalina . Adding turn lanes and additional through lanes will not accommodate up to 12,550 additional car trips per day. This simply is not a good place for the size development proposed. Alternative 1 – no development as

PC276-3

proposed is the best solution, or alternative 7 – reduce the density by 50% is next best.

**TRA-3:** . The proposed project could substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses . Placing the boat launch at mole A , opening Seaside Lagoon (at 2/3 its former size)to the ocean, and placing paddle boats, standup surfboards, kayaks, and canoes within the reduced lagoon size is a recipe for traffic accidents. This is supposed to be an enhanced waterfront, yet these waterfront activities are being squeezed into a smaller and more hazardous location. The boat ramp should be placed elsewhere, and the lagoon should be larger to accommodate the ocean-going sports. One mitigation suggested sounds like a classic “passing of the buck”: “ Additionally, leases with tenants within the project site associated with the rental of paddle boards, kayaks, and peddle boats will be required to maintain records that the renters of this equipment have been instructed on safety and waterside signage.” This appears to place the responsibility for safety with the public rather than with the safe design of the project, where it should be. Redesign this area.

PC276-4

### Recreation

Although not evaluated in the way this EIR was designed, another area of recreation that is reduced rather than enhanced is the reduction of trailer spots for boaters, kayakers, and SUPers from the current 67 down to 20. If the selected boat launch site does not allow for more spots, a new ramp site should be chosen. Again, this waterfront development should be increasing access to waterfront activities, not reducing them.

PC276-5

### Water Quality

**HWQ-1:** The proposed project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water.

Although the project itself will not substantially degrade the water, it is important to note that the water quality at the Redondo Beach pier regularly receives a grade of F from Heal the Bay due to measurements that exceed E-coli and fecal standards. Opening the Seaside Lagoon to this water to become a tidally-influenced lagoon seems a sure way to make the “Mother’s Beach” unsafe for humans. The lagoon needs to be redesigned to remain closed or to find a new way to keep the area safe.

PC276-6

# Draft EIR Comment, Roger Carlson

Roger Carlson <rogerc@mac.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 2:07 PM

To:Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Cc:Roger Carlson <rogerc@mac.com>;

Hi Katie, thanks for your time, and good luck with the project. My comments on the DEIR are below.

Roger Carlson  
2605 Armour Ln  
Redondo Beach, CA 90278  
310-283-2505  
[RogerC@mac.com](mailto:RogerC@mac.com)

Greetings.

I've lived in the South Bay since 1992. I've lived in Redondo since 1998, and bought a house in Redondo in 2004.

I worked at TRW for 17 years.

I'm in the harbor area almost every day, it's my primary destination.

I've often had a boat in the harbor, right now I only have a kayak and my wife has a SUP.

I'm a member of the King Harbor Yacht Club. I've been in all 3 harbor yacht clubs, and all four of the marinas.

I've eaten at most of the restaurants in the harbor, they are our first choice for a night out.

I work out at Veteran's park 3 Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.

When I want a beer, I go to Naja's; I've been going there for 25 years.

I scuba dive at Vet's park wednesday nights and weekend mornings.

I've been fishing on Redondo Sportfishing boats.

I've used the boat hoist.

I've used the hand launch many, many times.

I've rented SUPs at several shops in the harbor.

I've been to many events in the harbor, and many events at Seaside Lagoon. I'm probably in seaside lagoon for an event a couple times a year, and in fact, we rented seaside lagoon and were married there in 2000.

We're always in the harbor for fireworks and the boat parade.

I've often gone to the sea fair, I always enjoy visiting the sea lab.

The harbor adds a great deal to my life; it makes my housing price and taxes and my time in traffic worth it.

There is a lot I like about the harbor now. It could certainly use increased maintenance, and some new businesses, and some fresh construction. There are elements of the CenterCal plan that I like.

I hope that the CenterCal plan will do something to attract and retain my interest, I hope it has something for residents and not just visitors driving in or staying in boutique hotels.

-The significantly, suddenly, increased density of the CenterCal plan seems like more than we need.

-The scale of the plan would seem to require high customer headcounts and high maintenance costs. It does not seem achievable or sustainable. We could end up with a very large, very empty, very expensive, white elephant.

-Some sections of the plan do not seem well thought out.

PC277-1

PC277-2

So, my questions:

**What will parking rates be in the new parking structures? What are current rates?**

**Will the new parking structure be able to bring in enough revenue to pay for its own maintenance, long term?** The current parking structure was not able to bring in enough money to pay for its own maintenance. How will the new structure be different? Is it assumed that there will be more cars? Year round? Will each car pay more for parking? I assume that some fraction of the parking rate currently goes to maintenance of the parking lot. I think we can agree, based on the condition of the lot, that that fraction has not been enough. **What fraction of the future parking rate will have to go to maintenance of the future lot?**

Let's leave aside per-car fractions. We haven't done a good job of doing yearly maintenance on the parking garage, we're in a hole. If we don't get the number of cars per day that the DEIR assumes we'll get, we could be in a deeper hole. I'm curious how bad it could be.

**-How much have we spent on parking garage maintenance each year for the last 10 years?** There have been some good years and bad years in there, so it's important to look over a few years.

**-How much should we have spent, on average?**

**-What is yearly maintenance on the new garage expected to cost?**

**-How can we be assured that we will meet this level of maintenance funding when we have not done so in the past?**

**-How can we be assured that we are not going to have a bigger maintenance shortfall, and a bigger problem, 10 years from now?** Increased revenue is not guaranteed, especially in a seasonal attraction like a pier, and public/private partnerships have let us down before: the relatively simple boat hoist was not maintained by our private partner.

The parking lot once offered a discount rate to residents launching boats or using the hand launch. Now only bars and restaurants offer parking validations. **Will there be any discounted rates for residents using the harbor or the mall, especially for healthy activity like SUP?** It would be nice to offer a better rate or some incentive to local residents to take advantage of the area, more than just a bar's parking validation.

I understand that the launch ramp is outside the CenterCal plan, but they are linked. **Will the launch ramp include area for rinsing trailers with fresh water?**

If there is no fresh water rinse, and we have only a small token launch ramp, I'd prefer to stick with the hoist. **Can we go back to the Coastal Commission and ask them to reconsider allowing us to have a hoist, which has a smaller footprint than a ramp?**

**Please describe in detail how a solo person will launch a SUP at the hand launch.** How long will the person's board be out of sight? Will the board be left alone in an area with high foot traffic? The current hand launch works pretty well: you drive down the access road past Polly's, drop off your board, drive back to the lot in front of the bar, and walk back to the hand launch. You are not out of view of your board for very long, and there isn't much foot traffic in the area. If someone swipes your board, they are likely to use the same path you're travelling on, or you're likely to see them with your board moving along the fence toward Joes. How will a new hand launch work? will it be a high traffic area, like the new open beach where seaside lagoon was? That seems like a risk of increased theft. Will the launch be at a hand launch near a boat ramp, near trucks that can easily steal your board? Will it be a long drive to park in a distant parking garage? Will it be shared parking at a hand launch near a launch ramp with a small parking lot? I have seen some launch ramp plans with parking space for 20-40 boats, sized to handle a number of boaters averaged over a whole year, without including hand launch SUPs and kayaks, much less handle summer weekend peak traffic.

**How many SUP and Kayak launches per day are expected? How many on a single, peak, summertime day?** not just a yearly average, please.

**How large will the hand launch parking lot be?**

**How many boat launches per day will there be at the ramp?** I have heard 20-40, based on a yearly average. **How many on a peak day?**

**How big will the boat ramp parking lot be?**

**Would it be possible to include SUP or kayak storage lockers for residents in the new layout?** Similar to the manner in which Lanakila outriggers are kept by the water. This would allow a resident to rent a locker, keep a SUP in the harbor, and use the harbor without transporting the board.

Some images show SUPs being launched from the seaside lagoon beach. **Will SUPs be allowed near swimmers at this beach? Will swimmers now be allowed in the harbor? What about prone paddleboards? Will scuba diving be allowed from this beach?**

PC277-6  
cont'd

**Will the new seaside lagoon layout be sized to handle large events like the superbowl 10k?**

**Will the new seaside lagoon be gated to handle private events, ticketed events or events with alcohol?** We have great events now like the lobster festival, will we have the room for that anymore?

The DEIR discusses traffic mitigation at several intersections. **Will the arteries themselves be widened to handle additional traffic and turning lanes?** For example, on mother's day 2015, traffic northbound on harbor drive, turning left into cheesecake factory, was backed up down harbor and up Beryl to the extent that the intersection at Beryl and Catalina was gridlocked. How will the project mitigate this level of traffic.

The harbor area is not "freeway close." It's a long drive on surface streets now, and these surface streets have already gotten worse. Reducing Harbor drive to one lane has already changed my driving pattern. I drive on Harbor as little as possible now. If I'm going to the yacht club or bluewater grill, I come in on Herondo, if I'm going to Naja's, I take Catalina to Pacific avenue to the southern pier parking lot. I avoid harbor drive and the intersection at Beryl/Harbor as much as possible. **Will Harbor be widened back to 2 lanes in each direction?** This will get us back to 2014 traffic levels. What will be done to accomodate centercal traffic levels?

**Was Harbor drive narrowed to 1 lane just so it can be widened for CenterCal,** just so that CenterCal can show there is some mitigation for traffic in the artery? Seems like a waste of money.

PC277-7

Traffic in the south bay is, in fact, backed up for many miles, ewen to the 405. At morning rush hour, the intersection at 190th and Inglewood is backed up to the west; at night, it's backed up to the north. **Will traffic be mitigated at these more distant arteries?**

**Will anything be done to improve traffic at the offramps on the 405 at the south bay curve?** They are all full now. At evening rush hour, the offramps on 405 north are full throughout the Curve. It can take 5 or 6 cycles of the traffic light to get off at Crenshaw. I work in long beach, and I often drive past the curve and get off at Hawthorne to avoid jammed offramps. Any further north, and I'm in heavy surface traffic coming from northrop and boeing. **Will anything be done to improve traffic flow from the 405 to the harbor?**

**Will traffic flow be assessed and planned by an accredited traffic engineer?** The current layout of harbor drive does not seem to have had that. Cars on harbor are going into bike lanes, and every intersection on Herondo has a different pattern of paint for the turning lanes. The area does not seem to have had the benefits of formal traffic analysis.

High speed road bikes prefer to travel on Harbor Drive with cars. **Will high speed road bike traffic be assessed separately,** in addition to foot traffic, strand cruiser bikes, and car traffic? How will it be handled in the area?

I've asked a lot about heavy traffic on peak days. I'm also worried about low traffic on cold winter days. A normal outdoor shopping mall can expect reduced business on colder days. **What level of business is expected on a rainy winter weekday?** How many people will be eating lunch or dinner or shopping on a cold winter tuesday? As I said above, I worked at TRW for 17 years. We rarely took the time to drive all the way to a beachfront restaruant for lunch; that was a 2 hour lunch, and there are lots of good places to eat on Artesia. **How will restaurants and shops survive a cold winter?**

**Will there be any mix of offices in the plan?** Offices near restaurants and retail can provide year round core customers and keep an area alive. I work in Douglas Park in Long Beach; the Hamburger Habit in the office park is the busiest in the nation, year round.

**What will the cost of office space square footage be, compared to the rest of Redondo?**

PC277-8

There is office space nearby, at Catalina and Francisca. Occupancy there has been low. I have twice tried to convince partners to open an office there. When I was dealing with local partners, they found the space too expensive per square foot. When I was dealing with partners further away (from outside the south bay, they'd have to take the 405 to get there), they found it far too far from the 405. **What will make office space in the CenterCal project succeed where this space hasn't?**

The Pike in Long Beach is close to freeways and major arteries, yet occupancy seems low, foot traffic seems low. **What will make CenterCal more successful than the Pike?**

There are offices, shops, and restaurants at the head of the pier now, above the parking garage. They are not heavily used, they are hard to find. **What will make CenterCal more successful than this area?**

**Will there be any electric car chargers in the new parking facilities?**

The Shade hotel took much longer to build and open than planned. There are old railroad beds in the area, and once clear of that the ground may require deep pilings. **Have these recently discovered costs and factors been included in building costs and schedules?**

Maintenance on the boat hoist was not performed properly during the years it was privately managed. That was a "public private partnership" similar to what is proposed by CenterCal. When that partnership failed, the city took the hoist over, and took nearly a year to repair it. There was no way to launch a boat in the harbor from November 2014 to October 2015. The city's estimates of repair schedule were poor; the website estimates were usually "next month or two" when in fact repairs took nearly a year. **How will the proposed drawbridge be better managed than the hoist?** How can we be assured that Centercal will perform proper maintenance on the drawbridge and the city won't be left trying to repair the drawbridge? It will be harder to design, build, and maintain, it will be harder to get bids on. The hoist is relatively straightforward; most industrial buildings and warehouses have overhead cranes similar to the hoist. A drawbridge seems much more unique and dramatically harder to maintain. If it took the city months to get bids on a simple hoist, the drawbridge will be much worse.

**Why is there no master plan for the harbor area, including the AES site?**

**If the Sportfishing pier is removed, will there be any Sportfishing party boats or whale watching boats in the harbor?**

**If sportfishing is not publicly available, will "sportfishing" be removed from the Redondo gateway sign at Catalina and PCH?**

**If sportfishing party boats are removed or reduced, will there be a bait barge in the harbor?** We can barely sustain one now, it basically exists to serve the sportfishing boats, with very limited hours, but live bait is important to california fishermen. Our style of fishing uses live bait heavily.

It is said that "Legacy Tenants" will have the opportunity to move into the new market facility. **What will the increased cost per square footage be?** Will residents wanting to visit legacy tenants find themselves in tiny spaces or paying twice the price for a beer? **Will the cost of a beer be more or less than on the Hermosa Pier?**

**What space will remain in the harbor for the Lanakila paddling club?**

**How will bulding heights and density compare to the new shade hotel on Harbor? How will it compare to views from Catalina avenue? Can we expect views similar to the view at Catalina and Garnet?**

PC277-8  
cont'd

# Stop the Centercal Development on our waterfront!

Lillian Light <lklight@verizon.net>

Mon 1/18/2016 2:39 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Dear Katie:

I very much oppose the CenterCal plan to double development on our beachfront which should be a place for swimmers, surfers, and beach recreation, not shoppers. 80 % of beach views will be stopped, traffic will increase, and parking will be a nightmare. I live in nearby Manhattan Beach, but I have enjoyed visiting the beach at Redondo. I will never shop there. The beach is not an appropriate place

For a mall!!

Sincerely yours,

Lillian Light

310 -545 1384

PC278-1

# Comments

Barbara Epstein <justbarb56@gmail.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 3:05 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

## Comments, City of Redondo Beach Waterfront Draft Environmental Impact Report

December 9, 2015

Revised January 18, 2016

By Barbara Epstein, Resident, Redondo Beach

Last month I objected to the CenterCal project for many reasons:

\* We came to live in Redondo Beach for the healthful exercise we enjoy on our daily walks around the pier and the waterfront, with fresh air, open spaces, views of sea, wildlife, and sky.

We do not want wall-to-wall buildings at the waterfront. The density of this project will be claustrophobic.

\* We participated in several planning workshops with the unfortunate result of all of our time, energy and hard work being ignored, leading us to realize that the workshops were nothing but a sham, and we had been victims of fraud and deception by the City Council majority and CenterCal, a shopping center developer. Clearly, the City Majority represents only special real estate interests in entering into this contract, not the residents who live at the waterfront.

\* The City is giving valuable public property to a private company over the objections of many Redondo Beach citizens. This is immoral and possibly illegal.

Today I will further object to this project: This Draft EIR is fatally flawed and should be discarded.

\* Constructing a new public street for vehicular traffic will dictate that cars, trucks, and motorcycles will dominate the space between Torrance Boulevard and Harbor Drive, cutting off public access and reducing foot and bike traffic from Catalina Avenue. The public will lose the ability to walk freely from Czuleger Park, or from the hundreds of nearby residences, to the waterfront without crossing traffic. This street presents a safety hazard and objectionable barrier for the walking public.

\* The noise coming from this new and unnecessary vehicular traffic will be a new and unreasonable burden for residents to bear.

\* Traffic from Harbor Drive to Pacific Coast Highway and beyond will be unmanageable. Residents and visitors will be under stress trying to access the area.

\* The hundreds of residents who live on the ocean side of Catalina now enjoy fresh air coming from the prevailing winds from the ocean. With the installation of a new public street these residents will now be subject to toxic fumes that is a serious health threat. We chose the location of our home very carefully to avoid these types of auto emissions.

\* The CenterCal drawings that have been made available to the public, supposedly to view, remain vague and impossible to analyze.

CenterCal never produced the three dimensional drawings they promised.

The city has not required the usual silhouette, or skeleton, at the site, in order to display just how tall, just how wide, or just how massive this development will be.

\* Recreation will be very negatively impacted in many ways.

The Seaside Lagoon will be diminished greatly, turning public parkland into commercial buildings for private profits.

Those waterfront visitors who come to exercise, enjoy views, wildlife, and open sky will be confronted with unwelcome and inappropriate auto traffic, noise,

auto emissions, and towering buildings, distracting from the pleasure of being at the seashore.

Boaters and Boarders will find parking impossible for their boats and boards in a parking structure.

Who wants to go boating and boarding in the middle of a mall like The Grove?

Recreational enjoyment of the waterfront will be seriously reduced by this project.

\* Land use. Residents want to retain the Waterfront for recreational boating, water sports, fishing, boarding, and passive relaxation. They have made it clear many times they do not want to live in or visit the Waterfront in order to shop, drive their cars, or go to the movies.

Movie theaters do not belong in this area.

Density is a serious problem in this plan.

Through traffic is not appropriate in this waterfront area.

These Environmental Impact workshops and the Draft Impact Report are clearly drafted to be just another fraud to pretend that the public is being included in this theft of their public land to benefit private gain.

This project needs to be cancelled, this EIR needs to be scrapped, and the City of Redondo Beach needs to look at forming a citizens committee to find the right land conservancies to help create a new and brilliant plan to fund and revitalize our waterfront. The City must include any citizen who wants to participate to be included in the planning.

The Public will not tolerate this fraud and theft of public parkland.

PC279-1  
cont'd

# Comments

Barbara Epstein <justbarb56@gmail.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 3:09 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

## Comments, City of Redondo Beach Waterfront Draft Environmental Impact Report

January 18, 2016

By Barbara Epstein, Resident, Redondo Beach

I declare this DEIR null and void because of the clear conflicts of interest that I have witnessed in the relationships between The City of Redondo Beach, DEIR preparers, and the developer, CenterCal. These conflicts have made an objective evaluation by the EIR preparers impossible.

The presentations by the DEIR staff were blatant marketing displays prepared by CenterCal with the blessing of the city. Their purpose was clearly to sway the public to support this project, not to present necessary facts.

There are many errors in the DEIR that I have previously addressed in earlier documents.

The city and developer deceiving the public that they were truly participating in the project planning process when they were not have fatally flawed the entire public participation process. The city and the developers conspired to perpetrate this fraud with the support of the Chamber of Commerce. This DEIR report is part of the fraud, fooling the public once again.

The residents of Redondo Beach have been denied due process in this city by their valid concerns being ignored, marginalized or dismissed out of hand. In many instances the residents were insulted and humiliated by members of the City Council when attempting to pursue their rights to petition their government.

We reject this flawed document in its entirety.

We reject this project as a taking of public land by private business interests.

The citizens of Redondo Beach will retain ownership and control of their public land, meet and plan with expert consultants to fund, plan, and create their own vision to refurbish, retrofit, and create a beautiful waterfront for all to enjoy.

PC280-1

# Currently Planned Mega Waterfront - unacceptable.

Carol Sommers <sommerscj@aol.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 3:46 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Greetings Ms. Owsten,

The residents of Redondo Beach do not want a "mega" waterfront. Not only does a commercialized, mega waterfront project with malls, massive parking structure, and hotels etc destroy our beautiful beach community and the current view/skyline - it threatens our way of life that we have created in the Redondo Beach community. Redondo Beach is a special place to live and raise a family - which I am doing. Residents already voted no and this is a bypass of the will of the people who fund the community with their tax dollars. Further, as someone who has lived on South Broadway between Emerald and Pearl, I have already watched the degradation of my specific neighborhood with excessive traffic and noise. PC281-1

Redondo Beach residents do not want to be the Long Beach port of the South Bay. Please work with developers to revitalize and enhance, not destroy our community. A drastically reduced footprint is warranted.

Please call me/email me with further questions.

Carol Sommers  
sommerscj@aol.com  
949-292-9601

# Pollys

Sssaddlaw@aol.com

Mon 1/18/2016 4:06 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

I love eating at Polly's (last time was just a few weeks ago). Please make all efforts to preserve this business and neighborhood icon and allow it to continue to serve the public. It's loss would hurt the culture of the neighborhood.

PC282-1

**Steve Sadd**  
**LAW OFFICES OF STEVEN S. SADD**  
**310-553-0877**  
**10100 Santa Monica Blvd. #300**  
**Los Angeles CA 90067**  
[sssaddlaw@aol.com](mailto:sssaddlaw@aol.com)

# The Waterfront DEIR Comments

Lisa Rodriguez <lisakay328@yahoo.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 4:28 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Name: Lisa Rodriguez, Resident District 2  
Address: 508 Susana Ave 90277

Comments on Draft EIR: Thanks for holding public hearings and allowing engaged dialogue from residents and concerned citizens.

I am in favor of Revitalizing Redondo Beach: our Pier and Harbor are in dire need of repairs, our locals in need of vibrancy and our businesses deserve a thriving economy. I support the efforts to keep this process moving forward, it is a complicated and expensive endeavor. I applaud The Waterfront developers CenterCal for being selected by our City Council as one of a handful proposals accepted. I'm glad for the opportunity we have with this investor and appreciate that it is not proposed at 100% build out of what Measure G allows.

PC283-1

I realize there are several alternatives to consider and that there is much room for collaborating an outcome that will be the PRIDE of the South Bay.

In reading through the Summary and seeing the proposed plans, I discovered a few impacts I'd like to see addressed:

First: In creating a "lifestyle center" - I noticed two options for the Sports Fishing Pier...to remove it or to re-do it. Please make sure this very important component is added back into the equation and ON your schematics and back onto the drawing board. I SUPPORT SAVING THE PIER - and the direct access to the water that it has provided and will continue to do so for locals and visitors to come. This area is a HARBOR first and foremost and the activities preserved as such.

SECOND: Logistically, I find flaws with the location of the Hand Launch Area. There is much excitement about opening up Sea Side Lagoon, but there does not seem to be an access road/route or easy unload for Kayaks, SUPs, Canoes, Dinghys to launch from the proposed east side of the lagoon. Please realize that these activities need drop off area and availability for temporary loading and unloading. It is not feasible to carry these items and gear from the current parking/access. Please evaluate the option of hand launch nearer to the boat launch. There should be more studies about the accessibility for waterfront activities involving ease of access to ocean over the accessibility for shopping and restaurants.

PC283-2

THIRD: To mitigate traffic and safety along the Pacific Avenue Reconnection Road, please consider incorporating a Red Car Trolley - Rubber Tire Bus Trolley, similar to San Pedro where pick up from Torrance Blvd turnabout to the North Side of the project. Encourages Bike-able, Walk-able community. Possibly a coalition from the Hotels, Restaurants, Shops to keep this hop on/off option free to utilize to eliminate the number of vehicles passing through and allowing a

PC283-3

more pedestrian friendly gateway. Be sure to make all pedestrian crosses UNDER the road, so that two way traffic along Pacific Ave may flow without the risk of pedestrian crossing as distracted driving and walking becomes more commonplace. ( I can envision that crossing on top will create a safety hazard at the speeds currently allowed).

PC283-3  
cont'd

FOURTH: By encouraging walk able, bike able Waterfront and creating a tram, trolley, bus system...it could mitigate number of vehicles parking directly at site (marketplace center). I believe the biggest contention and impact is the aesthetic visuals that a multi story parking lot creates right in viewpoint of the neighboring hotels, who have been long supporters of our community. Please work on creative ways to mitigate the number of vehicles parking and find alternatives to reduce an entire level and you may find far more support for the compromise made. (Even if that means significantly reducing the 700 seat theatre proposed - which may be difficult to sustain). As a long term resident - we value the outdoor ampitheatres to watch sunset or experience the sea breeze, sounds, etc. over indoor venues...we lost our outdoor summer concerts at Veterans Park nearly 10 years ago and nothing has brought all ages and generations together quite the same.

PC283-4

FIFTH: By opening Sea Side Lagoon, mitigation measures will need to be in place for our sea lions that will no doubt make this new entry their home. Building out a barge or an area that they may adopt as their own, may keep them from squatting on the newly accessible beachfront. They are state protected, so the impacts on the interactions could be problematic.

PC283-5

I am in favor of responsibly revitalizing this area. Please do the right things by taking into consideration the modifications that will produce the perfect fit in this intricate puzzle.

PC283-6

Thank you for your considerations.

# Please Address Deficiencies in Draft EIR for Waterfront Project

Marty Falk <phalks@earthlink.net>

Mon 1/18/2016 5:31 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

The draft EIR for the proposed waterfront project and public boat launch ramp fails to address several issues, as follows:

1. There is no current demand study included in this Boat Ramp Analysis, but in prior studies there were predicated demand/usage numbers estimated.

There is no comment regarding these prior demand studies, or a current demand estimate. The only reference is to the number of uses of the old hoists. The hoists' weight limits prevented many larger trailered vessels from utilization of those hoists. There is far greater demand than JUST that from the size boats that use the hoists.

Demand will clearly drive estimates for amount of needed boat/trailer parking - 20 forty-foot parking spaces doesn't even begin to meet the demand demonstrated by the prior studies.

A Tahoe towing vehicle is 17 feet long before you add the trailer hitch. A Suburban is 20 inches longer. The total allowed length for a boat trailer is 40 feet. Maximum allowed length for boat + trailer is 65 feet. Clearly almost any size tow vehicle and trailer will have to occupy two spaces. Thus on the DEIR drawing they are already down to 10 parking spaces for the public ramp? TEN? Even double that - TWENTY - will not begin to meet demand.

Please have the consultants address the demand and parking space available for boat+trailer combo, including the demand for vessels that are too large to utilize the current hoists.

PC284-1

2. There is no mention at all of the lost tenant parking – for those who have their vessels in slips adjacent Mole A – Docks G, H, I & J. There are 100+ vessels moored on those four docks with owners who come to their boat via car or truck.

Case authority points out that cars and other vehicles are physical objects that occupy space when driven and when parked. Therefore they MUST have some impact on the physical environment. But there is no mention and no mention about what should be done in mitigation of this impact. Please address this tenant parking issue and how it will be resolved for those 100+ boat owners.

3. There is no mention of the hazard present or mitigation of the 1-4 inches of sand that covers the roadway access to Mole A every time the wind blows 15-20 knots plus, year-round. This causes even regular vehicles to slip and slide, right at the northern & easternmost terminus of the breakwater, where surfers, bikers, skaters and walkers stand to watch the waves and surfers directly west of The Chart House. Please have the draft EIR address who will be responsible for prompt remediation of the unsafe road conditions - which, at present, are allowed to remain for up to a week at a time.

Thank you.

Martin Falk

Boater with vessel in King Harbor Marina (15 years) and Redondo Beach Resident (30 years); lifetime resident of the South Bay (born 1961 at Little Company of Mary Hospital). Current residence: 120 S. Juanita Avenue, Redondo Beach,



# Pier

Barbara Burke <barbara.burke@nadel.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 6:06 PM

To:Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Importance: High

Hi Katie,

I would like to voice my opinion concerning the renovation of the Redondo Beach Pier. It is a must that this renovation move forward for the residents of Redondo Beach. I moved to the Esplanade June 2014 from Newport Beach. I moved to the area because my son has been a home owner in Redondo since 2005 and I wanted to be closer to him.

I was really surprised to see how the Pier is falling apart in appearance and love from the community!! I still walk the Pier once a week and buy fish BUT it is usually deserted except for weekends. The weekends bring people to the ocean not the Pier. The joggers and bicyclist are coming from Hermosa and Manhattan Beach just passing through AND people from Redondo are going to Hermosa and Manhattan Beach for fun.

PC285-1

If the old and closed mind people holding up this project does not see the light for the next generation it is really, really sad. A house will not stand forever...it will always need renovation ...or be torn down and a new one built. That is called progress.

Please keep the residents of Redondo Beach in their city and make them proud to take their visitors and family to the Pier.

Take Care,

**BARBARA BURKE**

Branding Consultant

✉ [barbara.burke@nadel.com](mailto:barbara.burke@nadel.com) ☎ 310.733.9320 📠 424.603.5637

531 Esplanade | Suite 504 | Redondo Beach, CA 90277

JNI SHOP: <http://jnishop.nadel.com/>



**JN Jack Nadel**  
INTERNATIONAL

f t in i p nadel.com

## EIR

DrLoriZ <drloriz@aol.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 6:29 PM

To:Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

I am writing this letter to express my grave concerns regarding the EIR related to the Center Cal project. The EIR does not address the significant negative impacts that can clearly be predicted. The city appears to be rubber stamping this project that is all wrong for our community.

PC286-1

First the traffic and car exhaust will be tremendous. The entrance and exit will be jammed in a confined area. The traffic will be so congested with a concentration of car exhaust that will be very unhealthy.

Secondly, the seaside lagoon will be shrunk in size with the diesel polluted water increasing the chances for children to contract illness.

PC286-2

In addition, the bike path will become so dangerous that people will not be able to utilize it thus encouraging even more car trips.

PC286-3

The ocean view that belongs to the public, that provides access to natural beauty that is beneficial to the mental health of the general public will be destroyed.

PC286-4

The noise and light pollution that will result from this poorly conceived and drastically over sized project will decrease the quality of life and health for Redondo Beach residents.

PC286-5

Please listen to the valid concerns of the residents and start over. The current project is a horrible mistake and has not been properly researched.

PC286-6

Lori Zaremski, Ph.D.  
3221 Gibson Place  
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

## DEIR

gretchen lloyd <gclloyd\_2000@yahoo.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 6:36 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

## Comments on the DEIR

How will decreasing the amount of boat slips impact the future use of the Harbor. Is this the best use of our Harbor as a Harbor. | PC287-1

Gretchen Lloyd  
Redondo Beach

# Redondo Sportfishing

David Brand <thebrandclan@aol.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 7:50 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Please keep Sportfishing in Redondo Beach.  
This is a great for families and friends.  
Thank you

PC288-1

Sent from my iPhone

# Sport fishing

Ruth Scruton <ruth.foster@sbcglobal.net>

Mon 1/18/2016 7:52 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Hello Katie,

My husband and I are avid deep sea sport fisherman. We go out of the Redondo Beach as much as possible, that's our favorite spot to depart from the LA area.

San Diego is another we go out but that's so far of a drive from us living I'm the San Fernando valley.

We don't want to drive that far.

Redondo Beach is more affordable and easy to get to a win win situation.

Please keep us fishing in the LA area.

Thank you.

Ruth & Mark Scruton

Sent from my iPhone

PC289-1

# Redondo Sport Fishing

Bob Mackie <bob\_mackie@live.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 7:53 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Hi Katie,

Sport fishing and Redondo Beach have been synonymous for many generations. Close proximity to Redondo Canyon makes this experience unique and special. Let's make sure that future generations can continue to participate and enjoy sport fishing departing from Redondo Beach. | PC290-1

Sincerely, Bob Mackie

Sent from my iPhone

# Redondo Beach Sportfishing

Robert King <kingsizecigars@gmail.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 7:54 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Hello Katie,

My family and I have been fishing with Redondo Beach Sportfishing for well over 40 years. My son learned how to fish on the Blackjack Sportfishing boat back in the mid 80's. My daughter learned how to fish in the mid 90's on the Redondo Beach Special. Now just last winter my wife learned how to fish on the Indian Sportfishing boat.

I was born and raised in the South Bay but ended up moving to the Santa Clarita Valley in the late 90's. We still drive the 45-60 minutes to Redondo to go fishing almost every weekend. We also frequent the local businesses at that time. Annually we spend anywhere from \$,10,000 to \$35,000 in the Redondo community. So please do not close Redondo Beach Sportfishing.

Thank you,  
Robert King

PC291-1

# Waterfront Development project

Marci OBrien <MOBrien@propertyid.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 8:04 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Hi Katie,

My name is Marci O'Brien & I want to publicly state that I approve of the Waterfront Development project that Center Cal is proposing .

Please let me know if there is anything else you need from me.

Sent from my iPad

PC292-1

# waterfront comment.

Lauren Cotner |Teles Properties <lauren@laurencotner.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 8:09 PM

To:Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

I am a 4th generation South Bay girl. I lived many years in Redondo and now nearby Torrance, I also work in Redondo Beach and sell many homes in Redondo

The Waterfront concept as seen is Amazing and would revitalize a dilapidated pier and surrounding businesses.

Redondo could once again become a destination. Remember in the coming years there expected to be less cars, as many people will be using ride share. I honestly don't see traffic impacted. PC293-1

I wouldn't have to go to Surrounding areas for entertainment and fine dining.

I can't wait. when are you going to start.

Lauren Cotner - Teles Properties  
01242185  
310.508.5957

# Indian

kooguy802000 <kooguy802000@yahoo.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 8:17 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Please don't let the Indian, or Redondo Special go away. It's a part of life and we grew up with their deck hands and captains. We are like a family, and would make some of us that live locally drive further.

PC294-1

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

# KEEP SPORTFISHING IN REDONDO BEACH

Curt R <reppans@hotmail.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 8:19 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Hi,

Redondo sportfishing has been here all my life and needs to remain a part of our rich culture please!

PC295-1

Curt Rea

# Save the little pier

Charlie Piccaro <cpiccaro@gmail.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 8:24 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

I've been getting on fishing boats off the pier since I was a kid. It would be a shame if kids missed that opportunity.

PC296-1

Charlie Piccaro

# [S-P-A-M] EIR COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

Mary Ewell <maryewell@verizon.net>

Mon 1/18/2016 8:25 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Cc: Mary Ewell <maryewell@verizon.net>;

Importance: Low

📎 1 attachment

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT Jan 2016docx.docx;

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

### 3.9 Land Use and Planning (2.6 MB)

The overarching concern for the City of Redondo Beach and CenterCal as co-applicants to this proposal is the piecemeal development that is under the city's auspices. There appears to be no cohesive plan that covers the Lagado, the Knob Hill school site, and the waterfront mall development -- the latter two under the protection of the Coastal Commission. Please do not even consider removing these from the State and Coastal Commission's jurisdiction. Alternative to -- no project -- necessary infrastructure improvements. The foregoing alternative is necessary until there is the additional mitigation of an inclusive master building plan that is visionary in providing for the majority of the taxpayers who assume the burden as well as providing "for our common home", our natural resources at the Waterfront.

PC297-1

Redondo Beach is notably "park poor" and that comparison to other cities already includes the beach to defend itself against not providing enough walking park space. To commercialize the waterfront with three high-end "boutiques" and parking structures to service this commercial enterprise is indefensible.

PC297-2

Mole D, the Tidelands owned by the State and granted to the City of Redondo Beach is the most vulnerable. Basin 3, the uplands, in exchange for Mole D, so that CenterCal can build the market square portion of the development in the tidelands location is unacceptable; publicly-owned land should not be used for commercial development purposes. Once the Tidelands are no longer under the grant conditions of the State of California, they are open to be reduced/removed/ruined by CenterCal. The exchange of lands will violate conditions of the grant Chapter 57 and Sections 6307. By taking Tidelands and the Breakwaters that protects those Tidelands away where people can fish, walk, and enjoy nature.

PC297-3

By destroying the habitat of sea creatures, this contradicts and nullifies the 2005 Beach Bluff Restoration Project Master Plan. This plan was prepared with funding from California Proposition 12, administered by the California Coastal Conservancy and the Santa Monica Restoration Committee by a grant to the L.A. Conservation Corps in the Urban Wild Lands Group. This plan was prepared with the Project's Steering Committee in Redondo Beach, California; significant additional funding was provided by a grant from the City of Redondo Beach. You may download a copy of this plan from: <http://www.urbanwildlands.org/bbrp.html>

PC297-4

Other factors not considered adequately in the EIR:

Sierra Club letter from Sacramento, January 16, 2016: "Exercising the courage to say no" states that one of the key issues in climate change is dangerously rising sea levels

- A high-surf advisory warning has been in effect for the past 10 to 12 days
- The flooding at the Pier in the past warns us of the possibility of occurring again.

PC297-5

□ The need for NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) to review the conditions of the development proposal; see attached pages 1-7.

PC297-5  
cont'd

Conclusion: Alternative 4 --no property exchange with the State.

The State only allows a 65-year lease; CenterCal wants a 99-year lease on this property. It leaves this land exchange vulnerable to whomever CenterCal sells the property (or the Bank/Lender should CenterCal declare bankruptcy, which they are liable to do at their 10% profit requirement). An unknown buyer, not required to be a citizen of the United States, would have an undetermined timeline of control over the land which is integral to the structural integrity of the Waterfront. The Tidelands and Uplands both deserve the protection of the State of California so as to prevent a land exchange detrimental to it. Why were strict protections for these lands not addressed in the EIR draft? The taxpayers, property-owning residence, own Basin 3, but their collective wishes, as represented in eight public meetings over a two-year period where they asked for a smaller project than CenterCal demanded., have been ignored. Why was CenterCal's design allowed to move forward without modification? Rather, their design has expanded. Why was a three-dimensional model not provided by CenterCal after formal City Council and citizen request over a two and a half year period?

PC297-6

Mitigation: many residents would support a Bond measure to defray the cost of the parking/infrastructure repairs rather than have two above-ground, two- and three-story parking structures which will 80% of the view and obfuscate the possible ambience of a smaller scale pier/harbor redevelopment that could be agree on.

### Seaside Lagoon

As Redondo Beach residents are paying for this and the boat ramp upgrade (not CenterCal who has been allowed to take credit for it), the safety issue is not addressed sufficiently, if at all. Why was this left out? Reducing the size of Seaside Lagoon to one-third of its original size is not justified by what is claimed to be the benefits. Opening Seaside Lagoon to the ocean brings in water that is substandard in sanitation. What mother/grandmother would prefer that contamination over a chlorinated water supply? Safety issue 2: lack of enclosure leaves the area open to the boaters, all competing for space and gives the sea otters free range to enter the area. No sufficient reason given to reduce the Seaside Lagoon area which serves a minority of our population.

PC297-7  
all

Conclusion: alternative to no project -- necessary infrastructure improvements only.

### 3.9 Land Use and Planning Alternative 2 No Project -- Necessary Infrastructure Improvements

The maintenance of the OVERDEVELOPMENT is not addressed in the EIR draft which harkens back to a lack of responsibility for the infrastructure that caused the City to seek a developer to remedy this neglect. In each case, the City, as lead agency, has the liability for any failures in the project and these are passed on to the tax-paying residents -- a lose-lose outcome. The residents lose their access to beach and recreation and are "stuck with the bill" for failed development. It is sometimes referred to as entropy.

The EIR submitted to the public does not adequately represent the impacts to the Harbor area. The proposed design (i.e. boat ramp, reduced parking adjacent to it, and Seaside Lagoon) are so non-functional as to question the designer's capability to plan such a project. He has never developed a Waterfront project before this one.

PC297-8

The current project represents a significant degradation in the ability of the public to enjoy and utilize these coastal-dependent, recreational, commercial opportunities, and assets. The impact is 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.

### 3.13 Traffic and Transportation Alternative 2 No Project -- Necessary Infrastructure Improvements

The City has inadvertently demonstrated a conflict of interest regarding providing low-cost senior housing and then stating that there is "no significant environmental impact" to neighboring residences. The Torrance Boulevard of the CenterCal project which is slated to have a 2+ story parking structure will greatly obscure the view of the Casa De Los Amigos residence who have been on waiting lists for such an aesthetic, uplifting view of the ocean. They will also have to

PC297-9

deal with a "high-end boutique hotel" just below their building. They will have construction noise for more than two years. This is all the more true for the Salvation Army residents on the corner of Beryl and Catalina. These residents will have a three-story parking structure to block their view and the brunt of the tourist trade traffic.

PC297-9  
cont'd

- No street added below Harbor Drive -- no additional drive-thru traffic.

PC297-10

Conclusion: alternative to no project -- necessary infrastructure improvements only.

Applicable Coastal Act sections that may be violated by the CenterCal/Redondo Beach City proposal:

- 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
- 30234.5 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

PC297-11

California Environment Quality Act (CEQA)

The following sections may be violated by the project:

- 15124 Project Description
- 15125 Environmental Setting

PC297-12

The vagueness of the project and the Developer, Fred Bruning, when interviewed in the last month continues to be vague, raising further concerns that the developer has been given "a blank check" for him to fill in the amount of the project and the collateral damage to the environment.

Applicable City of Redondo Beach Code Coastal Land use Plan

- 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 Z Zoning Districts Division 3
- 10-5.800
- 10-5.811
- 10-5.812
- 10-5.813
- 10-5.814

PC297-13

Article 5 Parking regulations

- 10-2.1706

Mary R. Ewell, 40-year resident  
415 N. Maria Avenue  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

### 3.9 Land Use and Planning (2.6 MB)

The overarching concern for the City of Redondo Beach and CenterCal as co-applicants to this proposal is the piecemeal development that is under the city's auspices. There appears to be no cohesive plan that covers the Lagado, the Knob Hill school site, and the waterfront mall development -- the latter two under the protection of the Coastal Commission. Please do not even consider removing these from the State and Coastal Commission's jurisdiction. Alternative to -- no project -- necessary infrastructure improvements. The foregoing alternative is necessary until there is the additional mitigation of an inclusive master building plan that is visionary in providing for the majority of the taxpayers who assume the burden as well as providing "for our common home", our natural resources at the Waterfront.

Redondo Beach is notably "park poor" and that comparison to other cities already includes the beach to defend itself against not providing enough walking park space. To commercialize the waterfront with three high-end "boutiques" and parking structures to service this commercial enterprise is indefensible.

Mole D, the Tidelands owned by the State and granted to the City of Redondo Beach is the most vulnerable. Basin 3, the uplands, in exchange for Mole D, so that CenterCal can build the market square portion of the development in the tidelands location is unacceptable; publicly-owned land should not be used for commercial development purposes. Once the Tidelands are no longer under the grant conditions of the State of California, they are open to be reduced/removed/ruined by CenterCal. The exchange of lands will violate conditions of the grant Chapter 57 and Sections 6307. By taking Tidelands and the Breakwaters that protects those Tidelands away where people can fish, walk, and enjoy nature.

By destroying the habitat of sea creatures, this contradicts and nullifies the 2005 Beach Bluff Restoration Project Master Plan. This plan was prepared with funding from California Proposition 12, administered by the California Coastal Conservancy and the Santa Monica Restoration Committee by a grant to the L.A. Conservation Corps in the Urban Wild Lands Group. This plan was prepared with the Project's Steering Committee in Redondo Beach, California; significant additional funding was provided by a grant from the City of Redondo Beach. You may download a copy of this plan from:  
<http://www.urbanwildlands.org/bbrp.html>

Other factors not considered adequately in the EIR:

- Sierra Club letter from Sacramento, January 16, 2016: "Exercising the courage to say no" states that one of the key issues in climate change is dangerously rising sea levels
- A high-surf advisory warning has been in effect for the past 10 to 12 days
- The flooding at the Pier in the past warns us of the possibility of occurring again.
- The need for NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) to review the conditions of the development proposal; see attached pages 1-7.

#### **Conclusion: Alternative 4 --no property exchange with the State.**

The State only allows a 65-year lease; CenterCal wants a 99-year lease on this property. It leaves this land exchange vulnerable to whomever CenterCal sells the property (or the Bank/Lender should CenterCal declare bankruptcy, which they are liable to do at their 10% profit requirement). An unknown buyer, not required to be a citizen of the United States, would have an undetermined timeline of control over the land which is integral to the structural integrity of the Waterfront. The Tidelands and Uplands both deserve the protection of the State of California so as to prevent a land exchange detrimental to it.

Mary R. Ewell, 40-year resident  
415 N. Maria Avenue  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Why were strict protections for these lands not addressed in the EIR draft? The taxpayers, property-owning residence, own Basin 3, but their collective wishes, as represented in eight public meetings over a two-year period where they asked for a smaller project than CenterCal demanded., have been ignored. Why was CenterCal's design allowed to move forward without modification? Rather, their design has expanded. Why was a three-dimensional model not provided by CenterCal after formal City Council and citizen request over a two and a half year period?

Mitigation: many residents would support a Bond measure to defray the cost of the parking/infrastructure repairs rather than have two above-ground, two- and three-story parking structures which will 80% of the view and obfuscate the possible ambience of a smaller scale pier/harbor redevelopment that could be agree on.

#### Seaside Lagoon

As Redondo Beach residents are paying for this upgrade (not CenterCal who has been allowed to take credit for it), the safety issue is not addressed sufficiently, if at all. Why was this left out? Reducing the size of Seaside Lagoon to one-third of its original size is not justified by what is claimed to be the benefits. Opening Seaside Lagoon to the ocean brings in water that is substandard in sanitation. What mother/grandmother would prefer that contamination over a chlorinated water supply? Safety issue 2: lack of enclosure leaves the area open to the boaters, all competing for space and gives the sea otters free range to enter the area. No sufficient reason given to reduce the Seaside Lagoon area which serves a minority of our population.

**Conclusion: alternative to no project -- necessary infrastructure improvements only.**

#### 3.9 Land Use and Planning Alternative 2 No Project -- Necessary Infrastructure Improvements

The maintenance of the OVERDEVELOPMENT is not addressed in the EIR draft which harkens back to a lack of responsibility for the infrastructure that caused the City to seek a developer to remedy this neglect. In each case, the City, as lead agency, has the liability for any failures in the project and these are passed on to the tax-paying residents -- a lose-lose outcome. The residents lose their access to beach and recreation and are "stuck with the bill" for failed development. It is sometimes referred to as entropy.

The EIR submitted to the public does not adequately represent the impacts to the Harbor area. The proposed design (i.e. boat ramp, reduced parking adjacent to it, and Seaside Lagoon) are so non-functional as to question the designer's capability to plan such a project. He has never developed a Waterfront project before this one.

The current project represents a significant degradation in the ability of the public to enjoy and utilize these coastal-dependent, recreational, commercial opportunities, and assets. The impact is 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.

#### 3.13 Traffic and Transportation Alternative 2 No Project -- Necessary Infrastructure Improvements

The City has inadvertently demonstrated a conflict of interest regarding providing low-cost senior housing and then stating that there is "no significant environmental impact" to neighboring residences. The Torrance Boulevard of the CenterCal project which is slated to have a 2+ story parking structure will greatly obscure the view of the Casa De Los Amigos residence who have been on waiting lists for such an

Mary R. Ewell, 40-year resident  
 415 N. Maria Avenue  
 Redondo Beach, CA 90277

aesthetic, uplifting view of the ocean. They will also have to deal with a "high-end boutique hotel" just below their building. They will have construction noise for more than two years. This is all the more true for the Salvation Army residents on the corner of Beryl and Catalina. These residents will have a three-story parking structure to block their view and the brunt of the tourist trade traffic.

- No street added below Harbor Drive -- no additional drive-thru traffic.

**Conclusion: alternative to no project -- necessary infrastructure improvements only.**

Applicable Coastal Act sections that may be violated by the CenterCal/Redondo Beach City proposal:

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
30234.5	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

California Environment Quality Act (CEQA)

The following sections may be violated by the project:

15124	Project Description
15125	Environmental Setting

The vagueness of the project and the Developer, Fred Bruning, when interviewed in the last month continues to be vague, raising further concerns that the developer has been given "a blank check" for him to fill in the amount of the project and the collateral damage to the environment.

Applicable City of Redondo Beach Code

Coastal Land use Plan

- 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

Mary R. Ewell, 40-year resident  
415 N. Maria Avenue  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

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 Z 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

PC297-14  
cont'd

# Keep Redondo Sportfishing at the new Waterfront development

Gregory Hoffman <gregthehoffman@yahoo.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 8:30 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

Hi Ms. Owston,

I am 22 years old, an avid fisherman, and a 3rd generation resident of the neighboring community of Manhattan Beach. I am writing to petition on behalf of my family and myself to keep Redondo Sportfishing alive. I grew up fishing the "City of Redondo" and the "Redondo Special" 1/2 day boats with my father and my little brother where we built memories together that will never be forgotten with the friendly crews of Redondo Sportfishing. I worked on "The Tradition" out of Redondo Sportfishing while I was in high school and I consider the experiences I had to be critical in my development as a responsible young man. I still fish with Redondo Sportfishing frequently as I find that it is one of the last family-friendly recreational experiences in the South Bay, a community that has been slowly but surely watered down and disbanded by upscale development that lack any sense of community or tradition. Please keep Redondo Sportfishing in the Marina. It is a business that epitomizes the South Bay's outdoor-loving lifestyle and it deserves to remain in operation.

PC298-1

Sincerely,  
Greg Hoffman  
gregthehoffman@yahoo.com

# Waterfront fiasco

jaysen.surber <jaysen.surber@gmail.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 8:37 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

My name is Jaysen Surber and lived in Redondo 45 years, my family for 73...I am against this plan and center cal being involved.. I am against this huge plan to spend now and wait and see what happens...it did not work when that was the sentiment for the upper pier revitalization... and we are still losing money on that decision...put the emphasis on the water... expand the breakwall to start...let's actually make it King Harbor....

PC299-1

# Keep sport fishing in Redondo

Uhlin, Kevin <kuhlin@ushio.com>

Mon 1/18/2016 8:40 PM

To: Katie Owston <Katie.Owston@redondo.org>;

As a long time so cal resident, I urge you to keep Redondo Sport Fishing in the RB Pier.  
Lots of memories and history there for all of us.  
Thanks

PC300-1

Kevin Uhlin  
Special Markets Sales Manager  
General Lighting Division  
Ushio America Inc  
(M) 239-357-2863

Sent via iPhone

Note: The information contained in the above message including attachments may be privileged and confidential, and for the exclusive use of the intended addressee. If you know that you are not the intended addressee, any disclosure, distribution, other dissemination or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please do not copy or disclose its content, but instead contact the sender immediately. We appreciate your cooperation and are sorry for any inconvenience. Thank you for your assistance.

