

## Response to Comment PC430-1

The notice of availability of a Draft EIR was provided be provided in compliance with Section 15087 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Notices of Availability and DVDs of the Draft EIR were distributed to various government agencies, organizations, interested persons, and a notice was sent to residences City-wide. As detailed in Section 2.1 Chapter 2, Response to Comments of the Final EIR, the public noticing for the Draft EIR exceeded the requirements set forth by CEQA and RBMC. The public review period also exceed minimum CEQA requirements. Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15105, the public review period for a Draft EIR may not be less than 30 days (or 45 days if submitted to the State Clearinghouse for review by state agencies) and should not be longer than 60 days except under unusual circumstances. The review period was extended from the minimum 45 days to 63 days (November 17, 2015 to January 19, 2016).

It should also be noted that prior to the release of the Draft EIR, the public were given opportunities to be informed and provide feedback on the proposed project at a series of eight community meetings held in 2013 and during the EIR scoping period (see Appendix A of the Draft EIR for a complete description of the noticing for the EIR scoping period and the scoping meeting held on July 9, 2014). Additional opportunities for the public to provide input will occur at during the public hearing process for the proposed project. Please also see Final EIR Chapter 2, Section 2.1, which lists the numerous additional public outreach efforts, including but is not limited to publication in several different newspapers, local access cable advertisements, email blasts, bulk mailings, and posted public notices.

## Comment PC430-2

- 2) With regards to the scoring of options given on page ES-80 of the EIR, there is:
  - a. There is insufficient background and information given as to the criteria used in the scoring process. Criteria that would lead toward the acceptance of the proposed development was likely included for evaluation, while criteria that could lead toward the denial of this development may well have been excluded. Such a list of criteria, with associated “weights” needs to be disclosed in order for this process to be transparent and properly and fairly performed.
  - b. The methodology of this analysis/scoring was not disclosed – whether it is some form of Kepner-Tregoe or some other methodology, the methodology, along with the sources, inputs, criteria lists, criteria weighting, criteria judges, and final scoring methodology – should all be disclosed for public review.

*Particular questions include the scoring of “Alternative 1 – No Project – No Build” and “Alternative 7 – Reduced density”. Clear criteria, its weighting, and who was involved in the weighting and criteria for the associated weighting, are all of significant concern.*

## Response to Comment PC430-2

The commenter is referring to information presented in the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR. The Executive Summary presents a brief overview of the information presented in greater detail throughout the Draft EIR. The commenter appears to be referring to Table ES-8, which provides a rank and score for the impacts associated with each alternative as compared to the proposed project. As described on page ES-80, Table ES-8 shows the results of the analysis that was presented in Section 4.5 in Chapter 4, Analysis of Alternatives of the Draft EIR. A more detailed table showing the scoring of each alternative is presented in Section 4.5 beginning on page 4-426 (Table 4-63) along with approximately 432 pages of supporting documentation. As shown in Table 4-63, and described in the accompanying notes and text, the alternatives are ranked relative to the environmental impacts that may occur in comparison to the proposed project. The criteria used are the thresholds analyzed for both the proposed project in Sections 3.1 through 3.14 and the alternatives

in Chapter 4.

### Comment PC430-3

- 3) The waterfront and its parking is commonly referred to by City Staff and Officials as being “underutilized”.

*This runs contrary to the fact that both the parking lot and parking structure are at times indicated as “Lot Full”. This alone is a harbinger that we already don’t have adequate parking capacity with the current commercial-visiting and beach-going public – even if only a few times a year. “Lot Full” situations invite parking creep into the neighborhoods of residents that live within a mile (yes – a mile) of the waterfront.*

### Response to Comment PC430-3

Please refer to Master Response #7: Waterfront Parking regarding the parking at the site.

### Comment PC430-4

- 4) Financing information is needed for public understanding, review, and input.

*If the city needs to promise any kind of guaranteed income to any developer for any length of time, then this is a red flag that: either the development has huge inherent risks for the developer’s consideration of their involvement with such a prime real estate project, and/or this represents an untoward giveaway of precious resources that belong to the public or Redondo Beach – whether unintentionally by way of clever and disingenuous representations of the developer(s), or by willing and/or corrupted behavior by people supposedly responsible to the citizens of Redondo Beach. This is why transparency and public buy-in (not public apathy) is so important with such a project.*

- 5) There is a lot of money involved with this project, a lot of time required for its completion, and huge impacts on the community during and long after this project is done.

*The “Heart of the City” was a mere 14-15 years ago. It was largely private development with some public-related development, but required public approval after the disclosure that it was a real estate goldmine for developers. Similarly, due to the design, components, superficial financing considerations, and impacts that benefit business and hinder the Redondo public, there must be full disclosure to all residents of this city as to the full and actual plan, financials, specific players, and so on.*

- 6) This project, in its current process and form, is another example of how certain City Officials and Staff consider their views, inputs, and priorities to be “more expert” and “above” those of the general population of the City.

*Look to any neighborhood and see what is being developed. Virtually ALL neighborhood multi-unit developments are being proposed, approved, and rammed through contrary to the locals who live in the area. This “divide and conquer” strategy is being repeated here, where the public, at large, is being denied sufficient information (and a vote) to allow their approval or denial of such a project.*

This waterfront is a public resource – and should be accessible to and provide resources for the public. Anything short of this is mismanagement and beyond grounds for dismissal. If city Staff and/or Officials are so certain that such developments are good for the city and its people, then they should not be afraid to accept personal (vs City-shielded) responsibility by way of liabilities and civil actions. If all goes well and right, then you have done what you were supposed to do by running for office, and/working for the city – as that is what is expected of you.

There are many other issues that need to be addressed – including the specifics of using waterfront for residences and offices, along with building height and view considerations, but time and space are limited

for the time being. I look forward to working with the city and staff in the future toward getting an appropriate project targeted once proper notifications, processes, and transparency is established.

#### **Response to Comment PC430-4**

The focus of CEQA, and hence the Draft EIR, are environmental impacts and not economics. The Draft EIR was prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.) and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (State CEQA Guidelines) (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15000 et seq.) by City staff and a team of technical experts in CEQA analysis and documentation. Please refer to a list of the City staff and technical experts in Chapter 7, List of Preparers of the Draft EIR. Regarding the commenter's assertion that they are being "denied sufficient information (and a vote)," the zoning for the project site was put up to a public vote, which was approved by the electorate in 2010 (Measure G). Furthermore, non-legislative permits are an improper subject of an initiative measure, and cannot be placed up to a public vote. Please also see Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development for discussion of "building height and view considerations."

The commenter's opinions are noted and your comments will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

#### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC431**

#### **SIMMONS NORWOOD**

---

##### **Comment PC431-1**

Please do not destroy old Tony's and the Redondo pier. I live in Long Beach and make a pilgrimage to Redondo about once a month even in the winter to hang out on the pier and have mai tais at old Tony's. I live in Long Beach and I never go to the piers here or downtown because of all the crappy chain restaurants. You can clean the place up a little and still keep Redondo unique.

#### **Response to Comment PC431-1**

Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR and Refer to Response to Comment PC312-1 regarding Tony's On The Pier. Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

#### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC432**

#### **MICHAEL STUTZ**

---

##### **Comment PC432-1**

I'm a fan of the Redondo Beach Pier and want to see it a success that people talk about.

Please find a letter attached voicing my concerns for the property at 208-210 Fisherman's Wharf, a historic landmark known well outside of LA and even California. Preserving its authenticity and one-of-a-kind character should be one of the promises and points of any Pier redevelopment project.

#### **Response to Comment PC432-1**

The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

## Comment PC432-2

We've never met, and although my urgent letter concerns Redondo Beach, I'm not even a local---I'm a travel writer and photographer who writes frequently on American landmarks, restaurants, and historic architecture. My work has appeared in books, magazines, Internet and newspapers---including THE AGE, THE NEW YORK TIMES, THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD, WIRED, CIO, and ROLLING STONE.

You should know that just a few weeks ago I flew the 2,400 miles from my home to your city, where I met with two other pro photographers. Our purpose? To document Redondo Beach's notable historic landmarks and architecture. I have five gigabytes of photos from that day---that's pushing 1,000 shots---and I can tell you in two words where the bulk of them were taken: Old Tony's.

I just received word a few hours ago that the city is giving Old Tony's a hard time. This is insane. What exactly is the problem, and how can I help?

Old Tony's is absolutely perfect not only as a photo set and subject of articles, but it's a destination: it's one of those rare landmarks that take you back right to the era it came from, and perfectly so. And it's so fundamental to Redondo Beach (look at the [www.redondo.org](http://www.redondo.org) home page!\*) that I'm having a hard time understanding why the city would possibly act against it.

I take it, of course, that you're been there. I urge you to go back again as soon as possible---right now, actually--and take a hard look at the place. Look at the cushions on the chairs---Mike, do you realize how rare, and also how cool, it is to find a waterfront mid-century modern restaurant that still has a well-kept and original, authentic interior? As they say, "People pay big money for that."

The circular fire pit? It was featured in the classic Sunset lifestyle books of the '60s---look it up---and is the last of its kind in any restaurant. The fisherman's netting on the ceiling? It's half a century old, Mike! Nowhere are you going to get that kind of authentic atmosphere. Stand over by the back-corner booth and feel how the water rushes up right around the tables. Even the old-time autographs going up to Top o' Tony's---they, too, are perfect and irreplaceable. Do you think anyone could ever reproduce something like that again? Don't you see why Old Tony's is such a perfect place, preserved without compromise---a place that makes east coast writers rave crazy over?

From what I've been able to gather in just a few minutes of research, you're not only an intelligent man, but you're also reasonable---so I hope you please consider this plea: I think you should be known not as the man who destroyed the iconic landmark of Redondo Beach, but as the man who saved it. Please do your city, and our nation, justice: help keep Old Tony's safe and preserved just as it is, so that future generations can enjoy this incredible American landmark.

That way travel writers on the other end of the country can relax and look forward to our next visit to Redondo Beach---where we can go back to Old Tony's and recognize it just as we remember it. You've got a treasure there. Please keep it that way!

If I can help you in any way, let me know---

## Response to Comment PC432-2

Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC312-1 regarding Tony's On The Pier. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC433****JENNIFER MARS**

---

**Comment PC433-1**

I would like to commend Polly's as a wonderful 'institution' for those of us far and wide, who have come here for years.

I bring overseas visitors here and they love the rustic beauty of sitting on this little pier. I come here with a group of friends every month and what we particularly like is the service which is superb! The food servers have been there for years and greet us like old friends.

I know of no other place in Redondo where

**Response to Comment PC433-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC434****BARBAR PRITZKAT**

---

**Comment PC434-1**

I am opposed to the changes proposed for the pier. I find the pier area comfortable, accessible, and it meets my needs. I eat at Pollys often, used to go to Golds Gym (I now belong to the Bay Club).

My experience with the changes proposed in the recent past are that they are the result of the partnership of developers, realtors, property managers – people who profit from change and not from the status quo.

Our efforts should go into improving our schools, maintaining our roads, and not into change sake.

I congratulate the city on the biking/running/walking lanes recently added to the drive along the harbor area. It is attractive and innovative, well thought out.

**Response to Comment PC434-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. Your comment will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC435****ALBRO LUNDY**

---

**Comment PC435-1**

Please Please DO NOT REMOVE THE FISHING PIER.

The Pier is UNIQUE in all of southern California. Pollys is a gen, a iconic business of immeasurable worth in its value to the community and the character of Redondo Beach and all the south bay I have been coming to Polly's on a regular basis for over 20 years. It is the BEST place for breakfast in the world. No where else can you find the value, beauty, friendliness and location – it is a landmark. And I have been fishing off the pier since I was a coy. Whenever anyone comes into town or I have a meeting, I recommend Polly's as none compares. And weekend breakfasts

and lunches and incomparable – sitting on the boards looking out on the world, the view, the water, the sea life, the regulars, the friends, the service – it doesn't get any better and anything else would be a lot worse.

The saying the old is new fits perfectly for Polly's – developers are trying to create what Polly's already has – but can't because it takes history and experience, it takes loyal clientele – decades in making, it takes a small old but treasured fishing pier uniquely our own.

New is not better, please keep our pier. Please keep our heritage. Please keep Polly's on the Pier!

### **Response to Comment PC435-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC436**

**MARY WATKINS**

---

#### **Comment PC436-1**

As a Redondo Beach resident since 1963, and owner of the home I grew up in, I have seen many changes in the development of the town. Some changes have been for the better, but not all. Certainly the view-blocking over development of Catalina and the Esplanade with multi story residential units commencing in the 1960's come to mind under "not better".

I have been told by persons and groups opposing the CenterCal development that the project density + height of the buildings would allow for only "corridor" views along a large area of the waterfront. For this reason alone, I, Wholeheartedly oppose the project

2) But wait, there's more! What about the published goal #2? "Reestablish a vibrant waterfront destination that serves the local community and attracts residents and visitors by providing a viable and cohesive mix of ....**amenities** that support and augment a variety of year-round coastal-oriented recreational opportunities". Can anyone explain how the loss of Seaside Lagoon (in effect), fewer boatslips and fewer boat trailer parking spaces would further this goal?

Which, resident-attracting category would a boutique hotel fall under? What coastal-oriented recreational opportunity does a movie theater constitute?

Don't our elected and appointed officials have a duty of care to do what the citizens want, even if it conflicts with the Chamber of Commerce and other business interests?

CenterCal has been presented as a "done deal" It doesn't seem that anyone is interested in working out a compromise or even presenting the facts in a fair light.

Snow jobs don't always work - remember Heart of the City!

Thanks you for your attention.

### **Response to Comment PC436-1**

The modifications to Seaside Lagoon would enhance the usability of this amenity (it has limited use during the

year and the opening would create a year round amenity), and in fact save it from having to close in the future due to water quality permit issues due to its current operating conditions. Please refer to Section 3.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, and Section 3.12, Recreation of the Draft EIR for the detailed analyzes and Master Response #4: Modifications to the Seaside Lagoon. Additionally, one of the project objectives is to reduce seasonality. As discussed in the City Council's April 8, 2008 Administrative Report for the zoning amendments, there is a "need for additional uses that provide enough day-time, year-round population to smooth out the seasonality of use and enhance the viability of shops and restaurants attractive to both residents and visitors...If the Harbor area is to be revitalized as a year-round asset, the uses that will need to be focused on are hotels..." Similarly, the City Council's report state "...that expanded hotel and hospitality uses and offices are an important component of revitalization of the Harbor and Pier area. These uses smooth out the seasonality of activity and provide the day-time and year-round population to help provide for viability of other restaurant, retail and service uses." The mix of uses proposed at the project site would reduce seasonality. Please also see Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development.

The commenter states opinions and a preference relevant to the project. Your comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body

---

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC437****NORM AND MAUREEN REEDER**

---

**Comment PC437-1**

We totally support the efforts to revitalize the Pier Area. However, all of the drawings look like a very non-descript mall – like the Metlox project in Manhattan Beach.

The beauty of Redondo is "Character". We retired from the City of Torrance six years ago and spend every Monday and Friday at Polly's and walking the esplanade. The sportfishing pier and Polly's are your greatest assets. Kids come down after school to fish" families teach their kids; in good weather it is filled with every generation of locals. Vistors from the hotel always comment on the "charm" of the community. We first came because my cousin said she had a friend from Germany who was in the Holiday Inn/Crown Plaza for a week and came to Polly's every day – hating to leave.

Please consider reconstruction this part of your heritage. No one will object to plumbing + electricity brought up to code!

You mention rivaling "The Grove". It has character – albeit artificial. You have authentic character here.

**Response to Comment PC437-1**

To clarify, the proposed redevelopment of the project site is not a 'large scale mall develop' but is categorized as a mixed-use development including office and hotel with a retail, dining, entertainment component that has enhanced public open spaces and recreational opportunities unique to the waterfront. In fact, as analyzed, the project includes more restaurant, including a public market hall, than retail. Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC438****LOREN HEARD**

---

**Comment PC438-1**

The Polly's Pier + the entire Redondo Beach-Pier are historic, yet viable landmarks – not only to long-time residents of Redondo Beach, the entire South Bay, but Los Angeles as a whole and we have tourists and

visitors from every, or almost every country in the world... A Pier by all rights is to be actively connected to the sea, fishing, surfing, wild-life etc... This is a naturally beautiful place and many generations have grown up loving it here. I am a 2nd generation person here, my kids 3rd generation. We have more than enough Malls, fancy eateries and wine-tasting places for the well-heeled crowd... What about poor families on limited income who can afford to come here? The Beach, fishing, the Arcade etc... (There is no other place like it-Santa Monica is fun-but it isn't Red. Bch. Pier. Even wealthy people come-here and have enjoyed it!

We need structural improvements and see general fixing of what needs fixing. Not a glistening mall that doesn't connect folks to the sea and wild life....

What can I say?

All people of different backgrounds come here... I've never had a problem here with anyone... It is not a dangerous place as some of these naysayers and detractors supporting CenterCal have claimed...

Please think before you destroy Peoples business's, dreams, memories, and the ability to pass on a wonderful legacy of Redondo Beach.

Do you really think it will bring in enough money or do you want to be known as a failed endeavor that destroyed a Beautiful land-make that just needs more love and care!?

### **Response to Comment PC438-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC439**

**TOM SCHLEPER**

---

### **Comment PC439-1**

The fishing pier is an outstanding example of the history and true charm of the Redondo Beach area. Polly's is more than a restaurant, it is an institution that describes the true character of Redondo Beach, we have been going to Polly's weekly for 20 years and its character should be preserved.

The update of the pier area and the new hotel's and additions are a good idea but the fishing pier and particularly Polly's should be retained. It could be updated but still preserve its to character as a gathering place that is truly Redondo Beach.

A good example of a big mistake was the destruction of the sister hotel to the Hotel Del in San Diego. Don't make the same mistake and destroy Polly's and the Pier.

### **Response to Comment PC439-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**BRETT HENRY – REDONOD BEACH  
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE & VISITORS  
BUREAU****COMMENT LETTER NO. PC440****Comment PC440-1**

On behalf of the Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce & Visitors Bureau, we would like to take this opportunity to comment on the Waterfront Project EIR. We sincerely appreciate the level of detail included in the EIR, the number of project design features and mitigation measures included in the project and its Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The EIR clearly demonstrates the positive impacts for Redondo Beach residents and confirms that our environment is not adversely affected by this proposed project. Below are some important issues that we want to highlight from our review of the EIR.

**Smaller Development Plan than Voter-Approved Measure B by 18.2%:** Redondo Beach voters approved a net increase of 400,000 square feet (Measure B) for the revitalization of the waterfront. The proposed plan reduces the allowable development by 72,876 square feet or 18.2%. This is an important feature of the proposed plan.

**Less than Significant Impact on Traffic:** Of the 41 key intersections affected by the proposed project only six intersections (14.6%) were identified as having significant impact from the revitalization. The EIR identifies appropriate mitigation steps required which include the addition of one traffic light and several turn lanes at the six affected intersections. By mitigating these few intersections, the EIR concludes that traffic will have a less than significant impact post mitigation. Traffic is always a concern of any community and it is important to emphasize the minor impact this plan has on our streets.

**Improvement in the Stormwater System:** The EIR concludes that the stormwater management approach for the proposed project will have a positive environmental impact on our ocean and community. The new project will have more pervious surface compared to existing conditions. The stormwater plan will ensure that more water is collected in underground storage chambers or in the new landscape, where it can either be filtered safely into the ground (and not into our oceans) or be reused for on-site irrigation. The EIR observes that the proposed project will be more efficient in reducing the flow of both stormwater and pollutants into our oceans and environment compared to the current conditions of the site. This is both great news for our environment and our financial liability as a City.

**Opening of Seaside Lagoon to the Harbor and Ensured Continued Operation:** The project will open the Seaside Lagoon to King Harbor and eliminate the required National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for the facility which has been a substantial financial liability for the City for decades. Since 1999, the City has been fined over \$195,000. During the past few decades, the City had been forced to evaluate (1) closing the facility completely (2) spending significant capital to upgrade the lagoon or (3) working with the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) to modify the existing NPDES Permit to allow increased water discharge limits. Once the Seaside Lagoon is open to the natural ocean water, the City will no longer need the NPDES Permit and therefore the operation of the lagoon will not be forced into closure again. The positive impact of this project on the Seaside Lagoon ensures that the residents of Redondo Beach will continue to enjoy the facility into the foreseeable future and will terminate the financial liability the City has faced over the years.

**Aesthetics and Views**

**Aesthetic Quality:** The proposed project would create a more visually stimulating style that incorporates both similar style and design features through the entire project that it is currently lacking. The design uses a pleasant mixture of stone, tile, non-reflective glass and concrete which provides variation, but is still visually cohesive.

The EIR specifically states *"The design concept is to provide a design that is rooted in the historic beach towns of Southern California and in the history of the City itself, while at the same time presenting a contemporary aesthetic that reinforces the uniqueness of the site and the coastal commercial and recreational character."* The improved landscape from the proposed project is identified as a beneficial upgrade compared to the existing property. The new connection bridge for pedestrians and bicycles will provide additional ways for visitors to enjoy the waterfront. The aesthetics of the proposed project are recognized as beneficial upgrades compared to the current conditions.

**Seven Key Observation Views:** The EIR identifies seven Key Observational Views (Views 1 - 3 from Czuleger Park; Views 4 -5 N. Harbor Drive; View 6 Seaside Lagoon; View 7 from Water to the Project). These views were all studied in detail and will not be adversely affected by the new project. View 5 will provide a previously unavailable view of the water, which is a benefit of the project. The re-connection of Pacific Avenue will also provide residents with a new perspective on the waterfront while traveling around our City.

**Significantly Improved Security at the Waterfront:** The current project has only a police substation without much additional security for visitors. The new project includes a new substation, private security and design strategies to deter criminal behavior (i.e. security lighting, security cameras, lit landscaping, clear sight lines for security personnel and other devices to monitor the project). These improvements will ensure Redondo Beach residents and guests will feel safe to bring their families to the revitalized pier.

The Redondo Beach Chamber of Commerce & Visitors Bureau is very pleased to support the positive conclusions of the draft EIR. It is very important for the stakeholders of Redondo Beach to understand the potential outcomes and effects that this important project will have on our community. We are pleased to support the positive environmental conclusions of the EIR for the waterfront revitalization.

### **Response to Comment PC440-1**

Your comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC441**

**LENNETTE HARTUMIAN**

---

### **Comment PC441-1**

Center Cal Draft EIR

It is a ludicrous to state that an additional 12, 550 daily car trips will have no impact on traffic and congestion in the area. What a ridiculous statement!

This EIR needs to be re-done by an independent entity. It is deeply flawed.

### **Response to Comment PC441-1**

The commenter is incorrect that the Draft EIR states that there would be no impact on traffic and congestion in the area. For a summary of the traffic analysis, please refer to Master Response #6: Summary of Traffic Impacts Associated with the Operation of the Proposed Project. As noted therein, the project determined there would be several significantly impacted intersections, which would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. The commenter's opinion is noted and your comment will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC442****ELIZABETH ZUBIETA SANCHEZ**

---

**Comment PC442-1**

I would like a scaled down version of the proposed project. I don't think a movie theater is economically feasible, my friend lives on Vorhees and she will continue going to the Arclight theater because it's closer. We have 3 theaters within a few miles. The one at the Galeria, The Del Amo 18 theaters, and the theaters, in Rolling Hills 20, in Torrance. I'm opposed to the hotel because of the traffic increase. I also think the Pedestrian Draw Bridge is not a good idea taking into consideration maintenance costs. I don't foresee people in our community coming to the Pies to do their shopping given the internet ease of shopping and the Del Amo Mall proximity. My feeling is if the city can't maintain one parking structure how are they going to maintain all this construction for years to come, specially if the spaces turn out they can't be rented-out.

**Response to Comment PC442-1**

The Draft EIR included analysis of eight alternatives in Draft EIR Chapter 4, including an analysis of a "Reduced-Density" alternative (Alternative 7). Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site for information on the theater (e.g., specialty cinema) and viability of the proposed project. The commenter's opinion is noted and your comment will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC443****DOROTHY (DOTTIE) LEE**

---

**Comment PC443-1**

After seeing drawings on a CD, "EIR-Aesthetics" of what the project will look like, I have these comments:

- 1) I like the walkway. Can more seating be added for views?
- 2) Too many concrete buildings for a waterfront.
- 3) Why is the first building people entering from Beryl will see a huge brick-looking building – like a warehouse, office building, or Barnes + Noble? Can't you have something more "waterfront" friendly?  
A welcoming set of palm trees + grass would be nicer.

**Response to Comment PC443-1**

Seating will be added as appropriate throughout the project site. Landscaping will also be added throughout an along the boundary of the project site as appropriate. The commenter's opinion is noted and your comment will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC444****URBAN GLUE – PLACEMAKER**

---

**Comment PC444-1**

Very few amazing places to eat include quality + tasty food, excellent service and sitting on the edge of the Pacific Ocean. Authentic local institutions need to be retained, foolish development that takes away these icons are a great tragedy to our great place.

I work on master plans for cities + developments around the world! DON'T TAKE POLLY'S ON THE PIER!  
YOU WILL REGRET IT + SO WILL WEE!

**Response to Comment PC444-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is

acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC445****RICHARD LOPEZ**

---

**Comment PC445-1**

I believe that Polly's on the Pier restaurant + the small pier is worth saving or upgrading. Does all progress have to mean tearing down + rebuilding? The simple beauty of seeing + experiencing structure that has been part of a long history of activities, is hard to put a price tag on. There is value in knowing that this restaurant and this pier is the very same as when I was a teenager in the 1970's when I would hitchhike to come fishing here. There is value in explaining to a new generation that this is the very same experience that their elders shared when they were young.

Kids can see pictures of what this pier was like (if torn down) or they can experience it first hand what it is like + keep that lasting impression that will make an impact forever. Some aspect of the past should be preserved.

**Response to Comment PC445-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC446****NICHOLAS PALLADINO**

---

**Comment PC446-1**

I am 37 now, a single father, and love coming here with my family, friends, and people out of town... I think this is sickening that they would ruin all the history, and tradition, for money... I feel it's a very greedy move, and think that this place is a "monument" of sorts for Redondo Beach and the pier. I would be very upset if they take Polly's off the water. With the technology & money RB has, they definitely can derive an alternate solution so it can remain in it's historic home and still add to the ambience of the new construction!

**Response to Comment PC446-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC447****DR. WILL PIH**

---

**Comment PC447-1**

The removal of the "Polly's Pier" will negatively impact the fishing heritage that has been the core of local on-shore Redondo destination sportfishing.

Many children and seniors find their outdoor joy in fishing from this "family-friendly pier. Both the experience and character of the pier and its culture are irreplaceable.

The pier should stay or be moved to a similarly strategic location.

I am a voting resident of Redondo Beach.

**Response to Comment PC447-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC448****NATALIE STORK**

---

**Comment PC448-1**

I have been a resident of the South Bay for over 37 years. Coming down to the Pier and being able to "feel" the "local" cozy atmosphere is something hard to beat. What a view...the water has the calming ability, in sun or shade; watching the sails going by takes me briefly away on vacation; even the smell when I step onto the boards is enticing, calling me to "stay a while, eat here, especially at Polly's! To have a Pier for we "locals", makes us know this is "Our Home!" The customers at Polly's are more "family". A huge loss to "we who live here-if Polly's & the Pier were not here" would be a SLAP in the Face to us.  
SAVE OUR PIER!! – a local

**Response to Comment PC448-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC449****KATHLEEN YINGER**

---

**Comment PC449-1**

Sitting outside, enjoying lunch or breakfast at Polly's is so relaxing because we hear the gentle sound of the waves and watch the fishermen catch their array of sea life. It's always fun to watch the birds and the pelican. The "crustiness" of the pier makes it authentic and an iconic place in Redondo Beach.

When my dad passed away, I had my out of town family stay at the Portofino. I gave them all a \$20.00 and a map and suggested they walk here for breakfast. They loved the ambiance so much they continued to come back over while they were here.

(They could have gone to Baleen's, Ruby's or Joe's Crab Shack or others but chose the fishing pier)

**Response to Comment PC449-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC450****ANNIE LOPEZ**

---

**Comment PC450-1**

I would like to see Polly's & the small pier remain in tack and even refurbished and restored. We need to preserve our historic eateries and quaint landmarks throughout Redondo Beach especially the locations that embody the essence of a sport fishing destination. Polly's is an original eatery that is iconic. A one-of-a-kind

place that not new construction can ever replace. If refurbished, its charm will attract plenty of pier visitors and would be worth keeping. Please keep Pollys + the small pier!!

### **Response to Comment PC450-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC451**

**BLAIR HAIZ**

#### **Comment PC451-1**

My family has been coming to the sportsfishing pier since I was a kid. We bring visitors to the pier to enjoy the sun and sounds of the ocean. We love watching the fishermen and used to fish here as kids...many memories here and a real treasure. There is nothing like sitting here, seeing the water under the pier and enjoying a real part of the city.

### **Response to Comment PC451-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC452**

**TOM & MARY MALONE**

#### **Comment PC452-1**

We are very strong supporters of the sport fishing pier – with Polly's one of my favorite restaurants and the boats available for voyages/whale watching and then just walking the pier. It is a special unique local sport in our wonderful beach area. Of RB, HB and PV I (Tom) + Mary love this place. We have several rental properties in HB and RB and tell our tenants about Polly's and The Pier and everyone we talk to believe this is a very special place in our universe. Keep the Pier!

### **Response to Comment PC452-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC453**

**DEBBIE & DAVID SAWERS**

#### **Comment PC453-1**

Flying for Air Canada we have come to Polly's on every layover + vacation – please don't take it away – it is an institution!!!

### **Response to Comment PC453-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's

decision-making body.

---

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC454****KEVIN SULLIVAN**

---

**Comment PC454-1**

Save the Pier!

Polly's is the best place for breakfast in the world. I always take my out of town guest there/here.

Don't tear it down! We don't need another cheesecake factory or another Shade.

Keep it the way it is!

**Response to Comment PC454-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC455****JOE LAVACHER**

---

**Comment PC455-1**

SAVE THE PIER!!!

Since moving to Inglewood and living there for 20 years I moved to Manhattan Beach than to P.V. in the 70's I have enjoyed Polly's on the Pier since it's inception. There have been many changes in the pier area since the old town is gone, the skating rink upstairs etc. All for what? Money for absentee developers not for the people who live here or near here.

It is a shame on the city council who are so greedy they can't see or haven't seen the fantastic place that they pretend to represent.

SAVE THE PIER AS IT WAS SUPPOSED TO BE!!!

**Response to Comment PC455-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC456****KENT STONES**

---

**Comment PC456-1**

I moved to Redondo Beach from Kansas about four months ago. As part of my excursions to learn my new city, I discovered Polly's. I love Polly's on the Pier. Not just because it's an institution in the area – but because of the wonderful, caring people (and incredible food). In this age of everything being new and trendy, Polly's represents being real and human. It is where I go when I want to feel connected and centered.

I hope you'll let this pier stay. New is fun and good. But mixed with tradition makes it even better.

### **Response to Comment PC456-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC457**

**TODD LANGEMEIER**

---

#### **Comment PC457-1**

Please retain the Redondo Beach Pier, i.e. Polly's, etc. as it is today! Any/ all changes would certainly harm/disrupt the animal/bird life that makes this area its home. Any changes or so named improvements will harm the beauty of this area. If the city moves forward on building hotel(s) a mall, retail shops in place of the existing legacy Businesses, i.e. Polly's my family will no longer visit or patronize any of the proposed future businesses and look for another part of the coast that cares about holding on to the beauty that keeps us coming back. Please – No McDonalds, No hotels, No malls....should replace the views currently enjoyed by so many people through the years as well as future generations... rather – the city of Redondo form a pact to keep future city counsel members from destroying this place we enjoy so much!

### **Response to Comment PC457-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The commenter does not specifically give examples of how the proposed project would harm/disrupt animal/bird life or beauty of the area. The impact of the proposed project on biological resources (found to be less than significant or less than significant with mitigation) is detailed in Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR, while the analysis of aesthetics and visual resources (also found to be less than significant) is in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC458**

**JOAN SCHLEPER**

---

#### **Comment PC458-1**

Our family has been coming to Polly's on the Pier for 20 years. We have our friends Judge Gregory Obrien and his wife, Carolyn coming as "regulars" to Polly's also. Our grandchildren now enjoy coming to Polly's also. We find Polly's very relaxing after a long week, and the food and staff are always wonderful. It is very casual and taking in the seals, birds and "catches" from the fishing boats connects us to the wonderful marine environment; while enjoying a tasty breakfast!

Please consider very seriously keeping this unique landmark on the Redondo Beach Fishing Pier.

### **Response to Comment PC458-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC459****CLAUDIA LANGEMEIER**

---

**Comment PC459-1**

Please do not change the area. Keep the beauty as it is, and do not harm/disrupt the animal/bird life that makes this are its home

**Response to Comment PC459-1**

The commenter does not specifically give examples of how the proposed project would change the beauty or harm/disrupt animal/bird life. The impact of the proposed project on aesthetics and visual resources was detailed in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR. Based on the Section 3.1 analysis, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on designated local valued views. Also, please refer to Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development for information from the Draft EIR analysis regarding visual resources. Section 3.3, Biological Resources of the Draft EIR details the existing wildlife and vegetation (on land as well as in the water) and the impacts of the proposed project on these biological resources. The Draft EIR (as detailed in Section 3.3, Biological Resources) found that a significant impact to special-status species and sensitive habitats could occur during construction (due to the potential for mortality or injury from contact with construction equipment, or behavioral effects and effects on hearing from the noise of pile driving activities if marine mammals are nearby), but with implementation of mitigation measures (MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2), the impacts would be reduced to less than significant. There were no significant impact on wildlife or vegetation during operation of the project. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC460****TENCY JAINES**

---

**Comment PC460-1**

PLEASE DO NOT CHANGE ANYTHING LEAVE THIS BEAUTIFUL AREA AS IT IS. LET HUNDREDS OF PEOPLE ENJOY THIS ARE FOR YEARS TO COME.

**Response to Comment PC460-1**

The impact of the proposed project on aesthetics and visual resources was detailed in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR. Based on the Section 3.1 analysis, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on designated local valued views. Also, please refer to Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development for information from the Draft EIR analysis regarding visual resources. The comment also states "do not change anything." As detailed in Section 3.5, Geology and Soils of the Draft EIR, on page 3.5-20, inspections of the timber portion of the Horseshoe Pier where Tony's stands is from 1928, and although it has had maintenance over the years, this portion of the pier is aged and does not meet the current code requirements. Doing nothing or not changing anything would not be consistent with the project objectives (which as detailed in Section 2.2 of Chapter 2, Project Description of the Draft EIR). As further discussed under Alternative 1 in Section 4.4.1 of the Draft EIR, given the poor condition of the timber portion of the Horseshoe Pier is in very poor condition and that portion of the pier, as well as the buildings, which includes Tony's and its companion structure, would be closed to the public in the future if the necessary structural repairs cannot be made. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC461****ELLIOTT PLEVA**

---

**Comment PC461-1**

THIS IS A TREASURY. A FUNCTIONAL PIER. A LANDMARK. PART OF THE CULTURE OF RENDONDO BEACH

**Response to Comment PC461-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC462****DIANA PLEVA**

---

**Comment PC462-1**

We've been coming to this pier for 30+ years. It would be a real loss to the community to have this historical place torn down. So many great times here where you can eat close to the water and catch a whale watching boat.

**Response to Comment PC462-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC463****GEORGE ALLEN**

---

**Comment PC463-1**

I grew up in RB and the pier has been a huge part of my life for 72 years. It will be a huge loss for me if it is taken away.

**Response to Comment PC463-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC464****KATHIE AUSTIN**

---

**Comment PC464-1**

My husband and I have been coming here to Polly's for a long time, meeting friends, and making friends! We're always greeted by Polly's staff and receive excellent breakfasts with great service.

We've grown up in the Torrance/Redondo area and would hate to see this pier gone. Too much of old Redondo is here no more.

**Response to Comment PC464-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC465****JOE AUSTIN**

---

**Comment PC465-1**

Its old Redondo. Its a historic place, leave it alone. Its also functional for fishing & whale watching

**Response to Comment PC465-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC466****MARK BOUTILIER**

---

**Comment PC466-1**

Time for Government to learn the difference between Progress & greed. Leave the damned Pier alone!

**Response to Comment PC466-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC467****JUDY SHAFFER**

---

**Comment PC467-1**

I am a regular customer of Polly's on the Pier as well as occasionally take out of town visitors for boat cruises from the pier. There is a "down-home" atmosphere of the pier that is wonderful and would be lost if the pier were removed. Not everyone wants a glitzy upscale development.

One of the things I do each week is look for garibaldi: swimming near the pier, which is close enough to the water level to see them – unlike other nearby piers. The location of this pier permits an ever changing scene of paddleboarders, kayakers, sea life and birds.

**Response to Comment PC467-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC468****GERRY SUZUKI**

---

**Comment PC468-1**

I've been coming to the pier at least once a week for more than eighteen years and would like to continue coming and bringing friends and relatives. If the pier is gone, how will I check on the garibaldi?

**Response to Comment PC468-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC469****AMI PEARCE**

---

**Comment PC469-1**

We drive from RPV weekly for breakfast on the pier. It's the ambience, the pier, the birds, the company, as it is, that we enjoy. Yes, it's scruffy but if we wanted the sterility of a mall, we'd go there.

**Response to Comment PC469-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC470****KEVIN RUPP**

---

**Comment PC470-1**

THE REDEVELOPMENT WILL CAUSE THE WATERFRONT TO LOSE ITS CHARM. THE FISHING PIER IS PART OF THE CHARM. SAVE IT.

**Response to Comment PC470-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing and Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC471****JOAN MATURKO**

---

**Comment PC471-1**

I think that the pier with Polly's and the fishing and whale watching boats should be saved. Polly's is a local institution and is loved by many. The pier and buildings should be saved as a cultural heritage site.

**Response to Comment PC471-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC472****STEVE STEPANEK**

---

**Comment PC472-1**

Pollys on the Pier is one of the few original restaurants with a long history in South Bay. This restaurant contributes to the local charm and is a "go to" for out of town restaurants. The whale watching based on the pier generates money for the local business and creates boat traffic.

My wife and I have lived in the area for 35 years and plan to stay into the future. The pier and restaurant contribute to the local quality and should remain that way

**Response to Comment PC472-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing and Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC473****LINDA GRIFFITHS**

---

**Comment PC473-1**

I hope you leave the sportfishing pier-maybe only fix it up a little. It's so charming. And we eat at Polly's all the time and recommend it to friends and visitors all the time. It's what makes this whole area fun. We get so tired of big chains coming in and taking over. Our daughter lives in Ojai and we were just talking about how it's so great there because no chain stores, markets & shops are allowed. It keeps the small town feeling and tourists just love it. We have lived in MB for 35 years so we do know the area well. We also own property in Redondo Beach so are very interested in the future of this area. Please keep the pier & Polly's as is!

**Response to Comment PC473-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC474****MIKE GRIFFITHS**

---

**Comment PC474-1**

I SUPPORT RETENTION OF THE "POLLYS" PIER.

THIS STRUCTURE IS HISTORICAL IN NATURE & DESERVES TO BE PRESERVED.

I APPRECIATE THE OLD STYLE PIER AS OPPOSED TO THE GIGANTIC PIER STRUCTURE TO THE SOUTH

KEEP THE EXISTING PIER

**Response to Comment PC474-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's

decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC475****BRADFORD J. KEENE**

---

**Comment PC475-1**

POLLY'S IS PART OF REDONDO BEACH LORE. IT AND THE PIER IT IS SITUATED ON SHOULD BE PRESERVED AS AN HISTORICAL SITE. I PERSONALLY KNOW PEOPLE ALL AROUND THIS WORLD, WHOM LOOK FORWARD TO RETURNING TO REDONDO AND ENJOYING A NICE LUNCH OVER THE WATER, UNDER THE SUN AT POLLY'S. NONE OF THESE PEOPLE HAVE THE SLIGHTEST IDEA WHAT IS THE "SEASIDE LAGOON". PLEASE PRESERVE SOME "OLD REDONDO", LOVED BY THE LOCALS: POLLY'S ON THE PIER. THIS PIER

**Response to Comment PC475-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC476****TERRESA ZIMMERMAN**

---

**Comment PC476-1**

We love this pier – Polly's is a favorite + the pier its on is a landmark for me, my family + friends. We understand the need to develop the area. However it is equally or even more important to keep the heritage sites. This pier is that – a landmark with history + sentimental value, giving the whole area character you can't pay for.

**Response to Comment PC476-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC477****ADA TE BRINHE**

---

**Comment PC477-1**

My name is Ada. I'm a flight attendant for klm. Every time I fly to LA, I have my breakfast at Polly's on the Pier. The place is authentic and very special. To close a place like this is a big mistake. Places like this become rare. You should cherish it instead of breaking it down. The people are so friendly and dedicated. I love the place.

**Response to Comment PC477-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC478****GARY ANTONUCCI**

---

**Comment PC478-1**

What day is it? Who cares because we are retired! We enjoy Polly's on the Pier once a week and any day we show up we are assured Polly's on the Pier will be here. We totally enjoy the pier vibe: listening to seals, birds, the fisherman (some in silence while others' chat). We have traveled all over the world and it is such a treat for us to return to our holiday townhouse and come to Polly's on the Pier for breakfast! And sitting here with our coffee, sun rising and waves singing; that is what life is all about! Thanks Polly's for being here

**Response to Comment PC478-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC479****ANTOINETTE PHILLIPS**

---

**Comment PC479-1**

Hearing that the sportfishing pier is possibly going to be torn down saddens my heart. I have been going to Polly's for breakfast for 25 years. When family or friends visit me, they always request going to the little pier for the view and breakfast. I have met people all over the world on the little pier. Its always a joy to wath families + friends enjoying being together-

If the Sportfishing pier must be torn down, I hope it can be rebuilt, it is a part of the history of Redondo Beach – Hundreds of people will miss it if it is gone.

**Response to Comment PC479-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC480****JENNIFER LEE**

---

**Comment PC480-1**

We grew up here in RB and now live in Temecula. We come back to visit family often and always come to Polly's on the Pier. We love the atmosphere and staff are wonderful. We cannot fathom going to Polly's in a building and not having breakfast on the Pier. Thanks You!

**Response to Comment PC480-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC481****JULIE SHARP & DAVID MELO**

---

**Comment PC481-1**

PLEASE PLEASE keep some of the charm of what Redondo really is. Seaside, fishing, salty vibe of the Pier. Tony's on the Pier and Pollys are the 2 gems that tell the "Redondo Beach" story. Upgrades = good. Tear-down gentrification = bad. Save Pollys at all cost, save Tonys as all cost. I drive down from Palos Verdes to enjoy the "old seaside vibe." Would hate for it to become Hermosa, or Manhattan Beach.

This gentrification is all well and good for no one. If you take the charm and history of this region, you are shooting yourself in the foot. If people want Hermosa, Laguna, O.C. they go there. The numbers look good for you now, in the end, we all lose.

**Response to Comment PC481-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. Please also see Response to Comment PC312-1 for discussion of Tony's On The Pier. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC482****CINDY ELIAS**

---

**Comment PC482-1**

I have been coming to Pollys for the past 27 years. Not only do they have good food, but, their staff is so friendly and it's a known landmark in Redondo. It draws great crowds of locals and tourists alike. Tearing down Polly's would be such a mistake, disappointment for so many residents of Redondo. You take away this place and I assure you you'll be losing business with a replacement of any kind. We are the ones living here. Let's have some respect for the residents that frequent this great place. Its been here forever and that should be reason enough to salvage it.

**Response to Comment PC482-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC483****MARLENE DUDEK**

---

**Comment PC483-1**

Been coming to Polly's for 27yrs., just love it, Visit my daughter who lives here. Polly's is a must. Love the food!! Like the location on the pier. Polly's is a WINNER!!!

**Response to Comment PC483-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC484****CAROL MILLINDER**

---

**Comment PC484-1**

Quaint, beautiful, hometown feel, these are things that describe Polly's on the Pier. While we are excited about the waterfront development we are saddened by the news that Polly's may have to move. As local residents since 1959 we are respectfully asking that developers would consider keeping this small, beautiful, quaint little location for our enjoyment. Polly's has been a staple for as long as I can remember. The waterfront just won't be the same with out it. Please make this little pier part of the refurbishment. Give it it's own facelift!! Thanks you for your consideration.

**Response to Comment PC484-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC485****DAVID KEMP**

---

**Comment PC485-1**

There is already enough concrete and glass on the waterfront and many empty units. The pier is a big attraction to me and the business associates when I stay at Redondo Beach. We always visit Polly's on the Pier, many times the fishing shop and or the Rocks. These are year-round businesses that bring visitors to spend \$ all thru the year.

**Response to Comment PC485-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing and Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC486****CHRISTMAS COLAZZO III**

---

**Comment PC486-1**

I beg any developers of the Redondo Pier area too NOT move the restaurant "Polly's on the Pier". Also, PLEASE DO NOT TEAR DOWN the small pier that Polly's sits on. This location is the highlight of the entire Southbay area. Polly's is the one place that we ALWAYS bring our visiting out-of-town guests because it's so incredible. All of the people we bring here agree that it's a treasure and can't wait to come back. Also, I frequently bring my local family here because it's one of the last "Mom & Pop" restaurants in the area, And we love the fact that it sit on the pier over the water! PLESE DO NOT MOVE, or REMOVE Polly's!

**Response to Comment PC486-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC487****MARILYN MONTENEGRO**

---

**Comment PC487-1**

The proposed changes will impact the waterfront by decreasing view and access to places like Polly's. Traffic will be increased. Birds will be impeded/eliminated. This (Polly's) is a place that I bring visitors for a non commercial Beach experience. The proposed development will ADD to over crowding, poor air quality + increase commuting times for residents.

My understanding is that the developer will not pay any taxes unless he makes a significant + probably unrealistic profit. In other words this development will have NO benefit to taxpayers on the environment.

**Response to Comment PC487-1**

The commenter has provided general comments on environmental issues that does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. CEQA does not generally require an agency to consider the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project's future users or residents. (*California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* (2015) 62 Cal.A4th 369, 392.) Furthermore, should the Sportfishing Pier not be replaced, the views from the shoreline at that location would remain from the shoreline (i.e., the mouth of the harbor, North Breakwater, Santa Monica Bay and Palos Verdes Peninsula would continue to be visible. Views of bay extending over the water would also continue to be available from the Horseshoe Pier and the Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge. Please see Draft EIR Sections 3.1 for discussion of aesthetics, Section 3.13 for a discussion on traffic, Section 3.3 for biological resources, and Section 3.2 for a discussion of air quality. Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC488****SUSAN SUTTREIBER**

---

**Comment PC488-1**

- 1) Traffic impact horrendous
- 2) Impact on bird & sea life horrific.
- 3) There are hotels in the area.
- 4) Continued growth will not enhance the quality of life of local residents and taxpayers.
- 5) Developer failures always are at the expense of taxpayers when the city baits them out.
- 6) Small businesses like Polly's on the Pier will suffer.

**Response to Comment PC488-1**

The commenter has provided general comments on environmental issues that does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. Please see Draft EIR Sections 3.13 for a discussion on traffic and Section 3.3 for biological resources. Growth was considered related to the project's consistency with the approved 400,000 square feet of net new development cap in the waterfront (under Measure G and the City's certified Local Coastal Plan). Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site regarding the viability of the development proposed at the project site. Also, please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC489****CAPT. MICHAEL MENARG**

---

**Comment PC489-1**

I have been a customer of Polly's for over fifteen years and have always thoroughly enjoyed not only the food and service, but also the location and atmosphere.

The pier & Polly's represents 'old Los Angeles' – a heritage that is rapidly disappearing under a flood of new development. How many malls, theaters, etc. do you really need?

Please reconsider this or when the pier is gone, you have lost yet more of your history and heritage. I have just driven from Long Beach to enjoy the ambience and surroundings of Polly's and the Pier!

**Response to Comment PC489-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC490****TONY MURCIA**

---

**Comment PC490-1**

The old Redondo Beach Pier and Polly's Café on the pier have been part of life since I was a youth. I have spent many weekends during my youth fishing off the pier and enjoying the scenery. I see today that many dads bring their kids to do the same. This old pier and Polly's have held and continue to hold a special place in the hearts of many Redondo citizens and the South Bay community. I respectfully ask you to preserve this special place. Too many of these historical places are being demolished and resulting in the loss of community's identity. Now as an adult, I look forward to having breakfast on weekends at Polly's and spending time on the pier enjoying the scenery.

**Response to Comment PC490-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC491****BARBARA REILLS**

---

**Comment PC491-1**

We love Polly's and want them to be able to afford to stay here. We don't want Manhattan Beach is PV type resrauants here.

**Response to Comment PC491-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC492****AARON WILDER**

---

**Comment PC492-1**

Obviously there will be more traffic, noise + pollution if pier is developed. Unfortunately that won't help with anything other than money in Developers, city members + officials who are pushing this. Polly's + the Pier are priceless memories that can't be replaced by the money + greed. Our children, grandchildren are more important than money. I don't live here in South Bay but visit often + always make time to enjoy Polly's + the pier.

**Response to Comment PC492-1**

The commenter has provided general comments on environmental issues that does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. Please see Draft EIR Sections 3.13 for a discussion on traffic, Section 3.10 regarding noise, and Section 3.2 for a discussion of air quality. Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC493****CJ JOHNSON**

---

**Comment PC493-1**

It would be a shame to tear down the Pier here in Redondo to allow Development. This has historical value that can't be replaced. Development to bring in commercial/ Residential for out of towners who don't live here nor care about the charm is ridiculous the noise, pollution + crime rates will increase. Pollys has been a long time establishment!!!

Don't Ruin Our City for \$ \$

**Response to Comment PC493-1**

It should be clarified that the proposed project does not include residential development. The commenter has provided general comments on environmental issues that does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. Please see Draft EIR Sections 3.10 regarding noise, Section 3.2 for a discussion of air quality, and Section 3.11 for public services (including crime). Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC494****KEN CHEW**

---

**Comment PC494-1**

Do not tear down the Pier – Polly's is a great place to eat & visit with people. Fishing trips are part of Redondo Beach. This area needs historic places like Pollys & fishing boat area. It is ok to do remodeling. Builing on the main pier area but common sense needs to come into play and not how much money the developer can make while destroying areas such as this. Keep this pier & leave it alone the pollution & increase in people will destroy this city.

**Response to Comment PC494-1**

The commenter has provided general comments on environmental issues that does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The results of the 14 resource areas analyzed in the Draft EIR are detailed in Sections 3.1 to 3.14. Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PAMELA KELTERBORN, TYLER WADE,  
PETER BUNCH, MICHAEL CONSTANINO,  
MICHAEL DEANNE, DANIELLE KENNE,  
MONICA TURNER, NATALIE SARGENT  
PLUS KIDS**

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC495**

---

**Comment PC495-1**

Please do not relocate this pier! We as a family have enjoyed this pier for 3 going on 4 generations. The history and charm of such a special place should not be changed... for \$ or visual design ect.

Thank you for listening...

**Response to Comment PC495-1**

The Draft EIR looked at two options for the Sportfishing Pier: Remove or remove and replace. The project did not look at relocating the Sportfishing Pier. Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC496****NICK JOKANOVICH**

---

**Comment PC496-1**

MY WIFE AND I LIVE IN SAN PEDRO WE REGULARLY DRIVE TO REDONDO BEACH TO ENJOY BREAKFAST OR LUNCH AT POLLYS ON THE PEIR. WHILE THERE ARE MANY GOOD PLACES FOR BREAKFAST OR LUNCH IN SAN PEDRO OR ON THE WAY, THERE IS SOMETHING VERY SPECIAL ABOUT DINING ON THE PIER, OVER THE WATER. AFTER DINING, WE ALWAYS TAKE A WALK ALONG THE WATERFRONT AND ON THE OTHER PIERS, PATRONIZING OTHER BUSINESSES IN THE AREA. WE COME FOR POLLYS ON THE PIER. PLEASE FIND A WAY TO MAINTAIN THIS TRADITION

**Response to Comment PC496-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC497****PATRICK MCGEADY**

---

**Comment PC497-1**

I WAS ON MY WAY BACK TO LA FROM SCOTLAND ON AIR NEW ZELAND AND ON THE BACK

OF THE SEAT IN FRONT OF ME ON THE T.V. SET WAS A FEATURE “PLACE’S OF INTREREST TO VISIT IN LA” AND LOW AND BEHOLD THERE ON THE FRONT PAGE THEY RECOMMENDED HIGHLY POLLY’S ON THE PEIR IN REDONDO BEACH. THIS AS YOU KNOW IS A WORLD WIDE AIRLINE AND POLLY’S AND THIS PIER IS KNOWEN WORLD WIDE A LOT OF AIRLINE STAFF STAY AT THE CROWN PLAZA HOTEL ACROSS THE STREET AND EAT AT POLLY’S. WHILE I AM NOT AGAINST RENOVATION YOU SHOULD ALWAYS KEEP A PIECE OF HISTORY AND NOSTALGIA IN YOUR PLANS AND I CANT THINK OF A BETTER EXAMPLE THAN POLLY’S AND THE PIER THAT IT STANDS ON.

### **Response to Comment PC497-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly’s and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC498**

**DONALD PFAFF**

#### **Comment PC498-1**

Tradition is an important part of the draw to the Redondo Pier area. The ability to enjoy the historical atmosphere along the ocean front not only draws local residents on a continual basis but it is also a major tourist attraction. Case in point is Polly’s ‘On’ the Pier. IT offers something unique in comparison to the big commercial restaurants like the Cheesecake Factory. You can find the commercial restaurants all over and there is not incentive to constantly going back because the experience is always the same versus the excitement of visiting a historical pier with its unbelievable ocean views great food and enjoyment of a more restful atmosphere not available on commercial row – Go to Polly’s

### **Response to Comment PC498-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly’s and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC499**

**ADRIENNE SLAUGHTER**

#### **Comment PC499-1**

Please do not tear down this beautiful piece of history – the – OUR little pier! It attracts locals and tourist to our community, and Polly’s is such a special traditional venue! Keep it for the kids, families, whale watching, sportfishing. Keep for us ALL!

### **Response to Comment PC499-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly’s and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC500****PATTY WOODS**

---

**Comment PC500-1**

Being a regular at Polly's Pier means every day, almost every day, since 1980-that's 36 years!!! It's real, on the ocean, every seat with a view, outdoor tables, part of the fishing, can observe the boats, share the company of other regulars, aware of the tides, tugs, pleasure boats, City of Redondo, Sea Spray, Redondo Special, Indian, Voyager, pelicans, herons, night herons, egrets, sea gulls, doves, pigeons, storms, water over the break-wall, Redondo Beach politics, GREAT FOOD, FREIENDLY SERVICE, Christmas Boat parade, fishing needs and equipment – it's a REAL PLACE with hand-put wood plank decking, child-safe railing, bathroom, casual atmosphere for all drivers, bicyclist, walkers, by wheel-chair or Segway, a place to work, fresh air, the BEST SUN RISES, RAINBOWS, SUNSETS, Clouds, storms, wind, rain – it is real, it is NATURE at its best with its best elements of ocean, air, atmosphere, all for a HEALTHY LIFE STYLE. Come here, you will love it, you will return soon. What I have said, is only the beginning.

**Response to Comment PC500-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC501****LOIS PIPER**

---

**Comment PC501-1**

Keep Polly's here

**Response to Comment PC501-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC502****TOM PIPER**

---

**Comment PC502-1**

This should stay as is

**Response to Comment PC502-1**

It is assumed that the commenter is referring to Polly's or the Sportfishing Pier. If so, please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC503****ROLAND BLANCAFLOR**

---

**Comment PC503-1**

Polly's can never be replace. Been coming for 30 years.

**Response to Comment PC503-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC504****EUGENE STREHLER**

---

**Comment PC504-1**

Grew up In Redondo Beach 1965 on now live out of state this old pier draws me here to visit, to be on the water.

**Response to Comment PC504-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC505****KATHRYN ELRAWSTIDGE**

---

**Comment PC505-1**

Please leave polly's on a Pier be here for years an love the atmosphere

**Response to Comment PC505-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC506****ALAN AND KATHY HILBERG**

---

**Comment PC506-1**

We lived in the South Bay some years ago and Polly's on the Pier was one of our regular meal stops. Polly's + the small pier are a wonderful reminder of simpler times and great food + an opportunity to really enjoy the area without all the "worldly spoilers". Keeping at least this one small area small + simple is a gift to the community + really to the whole area – we always gravitate to Polly's when we are back in So. Cal!

**Response to Comment PC506-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC507****MAUREEN BAKER**

---

**Comment PC507-1**

I have been coming to this pier or over 30 years. My family and friends love eating at Polly's and the convenience of the fishing boat. The peace and views of this area is breathtaking. Please do not ruin this pier for future generations to enjoy.

**Response to Comment PC507-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC508****JOE CHAVEZ**

---

**Comment PC508-1**

I have grown up in the south bay for the last sixty four years. Watching the progress of the south bay (Manhattan Hermosa Redondo beach) and it becoming a major hub for people living and visiting our beach community and offering great living, fine dining and top notch social activities it would behoove the city of Redondo to lose sportfishing for its community. The beach cities are known for their water sports and for it to eliminate sportfishing would be taking away one of its attributes that attracts people from not only Los Angeles county but from all over the world.

Thanks you for your consideration on keeping the pier.

**Response to Comment PC508-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC509****TARAS POZNIK**

---

**Comment PC509-1**

I am a fisherman (USCG licensed captain/boat operator). I have been on and around this pier my entire life, it is a figure head of the harbor, period!

**Response to Comment PC509-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC510****LINDA & EDDIE ACOSTA**

---

**Comment PC510-1**

We grew up in this area. Haven't we learned that progress destroys the charm of many areas that have

disappeared? We are against tearing down Paulie's and the pier.

### **Response to Comment PC510-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC511**

**GERALD ORCHOLSKI**

### **Comment PC511-1**

Save the pier, sport fishing pier and the horseshoe pier. Center Cal wants to overdevelop – which I am against. Rehab the existing parking lot. Get rid of the pier plaza building.

### **Response to Comment PC511-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. As with the Sportfishing Pier, the southern/timber portion of the Horseshoe Pier is in poor structural condition. The project proposes to replace the southern/timber portion of the Horseshoe Pier with concrete to match the previously reconstructed portions. For information on parking at the project site, refer to Master Response #7: Waterfront Parking. One of the project elements is to remove the Pier Plaza buildings. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC512**

**JAMES PHILLIPS**

### **Comment PC512-1**

THE WHOLE CENTERCAL DEV. IS OVERKILL

1. SAVE THE PIER.BIG & SPORTFISHING
2. SAVE THE HORSESHOE PIER
3. INSTEAD OF DEMOLISHING EXISTING PARKING LOT, JUST REPAIR & RETROFIT
4. IF YOU WANT TO DEMOLISH SOMETHING, DEMOLISH THE CAPECOD PIER PLAZA BUILDING GHOSTTOWN & PUT IN AN "ART HOUSE" THEATER LIKE THE LAMELLE. MAKE IT IN SPANISH REVIVAL STYLE OF FOX REDONDO.
5. THE OPEN SPACE OF THE HORSESHOE PIER IS BEAUTIFUL
6. WE DON'T NEED A HOTEL, WE DON'T NEED A BACTERIA INFESTED BEACH.
7. WE NEED TO PRESERVE OPEN SPACE!
8. PUT A CAROUSEL IN THE OCTAGANOL OPEN SPACE. STOP OVER DEVELOPMENT. MAKE REDONDO FOR THE CITIZENS, NOT FOR THE DEVELOPERS PROFITS!

### **Response to Comment PC512-1**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. Please also see Response to Comment PC312-1 for discussion of the Horseshoe Pier. Your opinion on the proposed project will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC513****KATHERINE VEZE**

---

**Comment PC513-1**

I'm writing to you to express my concern for the fishing pier which includes Polly's restaurant and the boat rides for whale watching. We've enjoyed many wonderful times there and were shocked to hear, the city of Redondo Beach is hesitating about making the necessary improvements to the pier. It's the best place to watch the boat parade. Polly's has a wonderful breakfast. It's right over the water and during the day we enjoy the friendly birds there. The children love going there too. It's unique and a treasure that should be valued by the city for the many people who go there and bring their friends from out of state there and for all the generations to come. I do hope you'll agree and take good care of the pier.

**Response to Comment PC513-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC514****STEVE BOUCHER**

---

**Comment PC514-1**

The pier is part of Redondo Beach. I've been coming here for the last 10 years. I've come here to eat, enjoy the view but mostly for the authenticity. It's one of the last spot that has been untouched. The pier has been here for 50 years, it is part of Redondo's heritage. Preservation is a better option than destruction. Locals and tourists come here to enjoy the food and the view at Polly's and also board the voyager for whale watching trips. I've done all of this with my family. We come here just to stroll around and enjoy the atmosphere. The pier needs to be saved.

**Response to Comment PC514-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC515****LINDA REILLY**

---

**Comment PC515-1**

We have heard the UGLY rumors of tearing down Polly's Pier! Polly's is an institution! We have been coming here for Polly's since the 80's. We live in Montana and come to So Cal a few times a year and Pollys is a must do! We were stationed in the Army at Moreno Valley and came down several times a month. Polly's is always the destination! We would not come down to R. B. if Polly's were not here. In my opinion – please do not Californiate this beautiful spot with more 5 star crap – there's enough of that on the coast already.

**Response to Comment PC515-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC516****DIANE QUICK**

---

**Comment PC516-1**

My family & I have enjoyed the quiet serenity of Redondo Beach the PIER \_ the ambiance the PEOPLE since 1968 the doggies Pelicans, Seagulls Whales! Dolphins etc

Who BELONG here as it is

NATURE at her Best – undisturbed by HUMAN (“development”)

I am 66 still incredibly fit & refuse to let the MONSTROSITY go any FURTHER!!

**Response to Comment PC516-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly’s and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC517****TERRI RICHARDSON**

---

**Comment PC517-1**

I have been coming to Polly’s for about 35 years. I used to be a resident of Redondo Beach. I now live in Arizona. When I come home to see family at least twice a year. I never miss coming to Polly’s.

I Believe it would be a very bad mistake to Remove a historical monument for mere greed and money. Instead for the pleasure it Brings.

**Response to Comment PC517-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly’s and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC518****LINDA RICHARDSON**

---

**Comment PC518-1**

I have been a resident of the Redond Beach area since 1973. Polly’s on the Pier is a tradition to my family. We eat here twice a week. The food is great + people friendly. My daughter now lives in Arizona + when she visits we always come HERE. We love the way things are here + we don’t need big money projects. Keep us quaint + original

**Response to Comment PC518-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly’s and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC519****CAROLE BAKER**

---

**Comment PC519-1**

Hearing you may tear Down Polly@ the Pier is Horrible.

Polly is a landmark at Redondo Beach. Although I do not live in Calif. I do frequently visit and no trip goes by w/ a visit to “Polly”/

Please consider keeping this landmark many enjoy on a daily basis.

**Response to Comment PC519-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly’s and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC520****TRACI REILLY**

---

**Comment PC520-1**

It is my understanding that another developer wants to provide what he or she consider a “beautifican project”. What does that mean? A place for the locals or a place for the tourist? Tourists will come to the “good” local places, locals support the locals – they are the consistent, steady income for a local area. By allowing an establishment like Pollys who has supported this city and its economy for decades, needs to be an option. I travel from out of state to eat specifically here. I have brought customers to Redondo because of Pollys & Captain Kidds – take either of them away & I won’t be back – as the community previews this project – remember the backbone & what has made this desirable to people in the first place.

**Response to Comment PC520-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly’s and Sportfishing and Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC521****BRIAN REILLY**

---

**Comment PC521-1**

Polly’s on the pier is my favorite place to visit I lived in the area for 11 years and come down regularly. I began coming in 1985 as a visitor from Montana later we moved here and come often. Now I am Snowbird from Montana and make a point of coming to Redondo to visit Pollys. Save this institution from the wrecking ball. Its worth coming to visit.

**Response to Comment PC521-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly’s and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC522****DARREL RIGDON**

---

**Comment PC522-1**

I came here because of the way it is now. A drastic change will assure I find some place else. I'm not local!, so I obviously went way out of my way to get here. There is a ton of modern waterfront places around here I avoid. Please don't give me another place to avoid. Save "Pollys on the Pier"

**Response to Comment PC522-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC523****DENISE & DENNIS GROAT**

---

**Comment PC529-1**

The issue of the location of a public boat ramp for the launching of trailered vessels is one of the subjects presented in this DEIR. Ultimately, this documents presents Mole A as the "environmentally superior location" for this boat ramp. As long-time boaters and users of King Harbor, we were beyond surprised at this conclusion, and ask for responses to each of the following issues.

**Previous Studies:** At least three previous studies addressed the issue of the public boat ramp - The 1989 DMJM study, and two subsequent engineering feasibility studies by Moffat-Nichol. These studies all led to the conclusion that the best location for this ramp is the south turning basin area on Mole C, approximately where the "Joe's Crab Shack" restaurant is currently located. Two subsequent community boat ramp design meetings looked at this issue in great detail and reached the same conclusion. Several design proposals evolved from these processes, with variations on design, and on the size/location/layout of a secondary small, interior breakwall to provide surge protection for the boat ramp. In the two community design meetings, in response to concerns of conflicts between trailer boaters and the users of Seaside Lagoon, the layout of this breakwall was "flipped" to provide a physical barrier between trailer launched boats and the users of the Seaside Lagoon.

The project proposes a two-lane boat ramp with a breakwall at the Mole C location. The DEIR for the Mole C location does not include the above-referenced breakwall, which provides not only a measure of safety and separation, but also a new area of habitat that would likely more than offset the losses of soft bottom under the new breakwall. Additionally, the DEIR acknowledges that in the one lane Mole C option, space for additional boat ramp parking could be provided, and states that the extra area at the Joes' Crab Shack site would be paved over with asphalt. Why was this breakwall excluded from this evaluation, why was the two-lane option at Mole C not included, and why were these exclusions directed by City staff?

**SAFETY:** The DEIR states that it will address safety related to wave action, storms, and surge in the evaluation of the proposed ramp locations, but other than "navigational safety", we cannot find any evaluation of wave, storm, and surge safety at the evaluated locations. Mole A presents significant inherent safety hazards that are not present at the other evaluated sites.

Mole A's location abuts the outer breakwater wall for the entire harbor. In the early 1960's, one of us and a friend were present when a set of rogue waves washed a fisherman we were acquainted with off of this outer breakwall and far into the inner harbor channel. Our screams to him to swim to the relative safety of Mole B apparently could not be heard. He tried desperately to swim back to the outer breakwall, fighting against the unusually large waves that continued to pound over it. These large waves and the tremendous weight of his

wet, heavy clothing soon exhausted him, and we watched helplessly as he quickly became overwhelmed and drowned. A short time later, lifeguard divers located his lifeless body somewhere under the harbor waters. The sight of his lifeless body being unloaded from the swimstep of the lifeguard boat onto a dock at the King Harbor Yacht Club site is something that cannot be erased. The dangers of the outer breakwall continue to this day and into the future. Waves, rogue waves, and whitewater come over this outer breakwall on an unscheduled and not accurately predictable basis. Some recent examples include, but certainly are not limited to: The City was a defendant in a lawsuit that resulted from injuries from waves suddenly coming over the outer breakwall onto Mole A, in the same location where the boat ramp is proposed. This lawsuit resulted in a significant payout from the City to the injured persons. In 2014, members of King Harbor Yacht Club witnessed a man and his dog being washed off of the area of the proposed Mole A ramp into the harbor waters. Almost miraculously, this man and his dog were spared major injuries and survived this incident. El Nino events have also caused serious damage to facilities on Mole A, and often require that the road to Mole A and its facilities be closed. A boat ramp in this area would not only be subject to damage from waves, storms, and rogue waves, but also would be closed for large wave events, and for repairs for damages from these events.

We also have concerns on the information depicted in Figures 4-4, 4-Sa, 4-Sb, and 4- Sc. The DEIR repeatedly states that the existing hoists at King Harbor Yacht Club will remain under all three ramp proposals on Mole A. King harbor Yacht Club has two hoists that are both frequently used, but in Figures 4-Sa, b, and c, only the "eastern-most" of these two hoists is depicted. The existing docks can be seen as white shadowy areas in these figures, and the interference between the use of King Harbor Yacht Club's existing "western" hoist and the hand-launch ramps in the proposals cannot be properly seen. It appears certain that boats hanging from the western King Harbor Yacht Club hoist would pass directly over the proposed hand launch ramp in Figure 4-Sc, and likely would pass over the hand launch ramps in Figures 4-5 a and 4-Sb. This would present an EXTREME safety hazard to anyone on the hand launch ramps, both from swinging boats and from a possible rigging failure on a boat hanging from the hoist. Additionally, the docks required for the use of these hoists has been modified in these Figures, and it appears that there would not be adequate launch docks area for the hoists to be functional. The hand launch ramps also pass obliquely across the hoist launch dock area, likely interfering with the safe use of the hoists and their docks. Figures 4-Sa, 4-Sb, and 4-Sc do not properly depict existing conditions and conditions under the three Mole A proposals as described in the DEIR, and thus present misleading information to the DEIR readers.

We spent many years as trailer boaters in the ocean, and we are not aware of any harbor in Southern California where the boat launch ramp is adjacent to an outer breakwall, or where it would be subject to the wave action that occurs on Mole A in King Harbor. In light of the preceding information under this Safety heading, why was the issue of wave action and safety to humans at the Mole A location not addressed in the DEIR, and why wasn't the relative safety of the alternative locations as compared to Mole A addressed?

**NAVIAGATIONAL SAFETY:** As experienced boaters, the conclusion that the mole a location provides more safety due to the lower amount of boat traffic at this location is troubling. King Harbor hosts not only large medium, and small boats, but also to a variety of dinghies and human-powered craft, including outrigger canoes of various sizes, rowing sculls, kayaks, stand-up paddle boards, rental boats, and rental peddle-powered craft. The harbor area adjacent to Mole A also is the site of many sailing instruction programs for both adults and youths. Rather than being remote and relatively low traffic, the many programs and activities occurring in the vicinity of Mole A cause it to be an extremely active area, and at times perhaps the busiest area of the harbor when one looks at all of the uses that are occurring. The City recently installed an extensive mooring field between the Mole C area and Mole A area. There are also large areas of shoaling adjacent to the outer breakwall on its interior side (both the mooring field and the shoal areas can be seen on DEIR Figure 4-4). Boats using a launch ramp on Mole A would have to transit the entire length of the harbor, and have to contend with all of the traffic and craft in the main channel area, as well as the mooring field and shoal areas. The South Turning Basin area is relatively close to the entrance/exit of the harbor, and does not involve the

mooring field, shoals, and much of the main channel traffic. Why is the relatively remote Mole A location with the above described conditions considered safer for users and for trailer boaters who may be unfamiliar with the harbor than the south turning basin area, where boaters can easily see the proximate entry/exit to the harbor and avoid the mooring fields, shoal areas, and most water users?

**APPENDIX L2:** Appendix L2 includes a section on demand for a ramp for trailered boats, and concludes that the demand for a boat ramp in King Harbor is actually decreasing. The data used to reach this conclusion come from City figures on the use of the two "crane"-type hoists that are in the Mole D basin. As former users of these hoists, we believe that the data obtained from their current use does not in any way accurately depict the demand and needs for an actual boat ramp. As compared to a functional boat ramp, these hoists are costly. The hoists have limited hours of availability, and these hours do not coincide with many small boat uses such as diving, fishing, and transits to and from local islands and recreation areas. They also require an incredible amount of time and effort to use. Trailered boats must be jacked up off of the trailer "beds" on each end consecutively so that the lift straps can be put underneath the boat. If the straps are not properly placed for weight distribution, the process must be repeated. Making special modifications to our trailer lessened the time somewhat, but not to a point where it compared to ramp launching. The net result for the existing crane hoists is a costly, limited access, lengthy, complex operation that causes boaters in line to wait an inordinate amount of time to launch their vessel, as compared to a boat ramp. The parking for the existing crane hoists is also a major problem. Although specific spaces are marked and signed in the parking area as for tow vehicles and trailers only, these spaces are commingled with regular vehicle parking, and often times the trailer spaces are blocked with passenger vehicles using the harbor amenities, making it impossible to park a tow vehicle and trailer in this area after using the crane hoist launch facility. On several occasions we found all of these dedicated spaces unavailable, with passenger vehicles illegally using some of these spaces. When we attempted to have a passenger vehicle moved from one of these tow vehicle and trailer spots so that we could utilize it, no one and no agency was willing to do so. With all of these adversities, we discontinued using these crane hoists and opted to drive to boat launch ramps at Marina Del Rey and Cabrillo Beach instead. The DEIR data also does not seem to include information on the time periods when one or both of these hoist was out of service or unavailable during normal operating hours. Such data seems critical in determining the actual demand for these unique launching services.

Regarding the actual estimated demand for trailered boat launches in King Harbor, it is our recollection that a previous City document (March 2014 Launch Ramp Feasibility Report) estimated that the total launches for trailered boats and vessels in King Harbor "are estimated at up to 16,480", with only two lanes considered for these launches. This seems like important data, and a more realistic assessment of potential demand for a boat ramp in King Harbor

**ACCESS:** The DEIR analyzes basic traffic impacts, but does not adequately examine the roadway conditions necessary for vehicles with trailered boats. The physical ability of a full-size tow vehicle with a large trailered boat to access and depart Mole A appears to be highly difficult, if not impossible, under current conditions. Unlike Moles C, Mole A does not have a direct "in-line" access from a paved street. Mole C can be directly accessed in a straight path from Beryl Street. To access Mole A, vehicles must jog from Anita/Herondo onto Hermosa Avenue/Harbor Drive, or turn right onto Harbor Drive from Beryl Street, then turn onto Yacht Club Way and meander through several turns to the narrow roadway that leads to the end of mole A. With the new Harbor Drive bicycle lanes, the single lane in each direction on Harbor Drive is very narrow. Turning right onto Harbor Drive from westbound Beryl Street while towing a larger trailered boat may not be physically possible. Additionally, turning right onto Harbor Drive when departing Yacht Club Way would be difficult for a right turn, and if a vehicle is cued up to turn left into the AES site from Harbor Drive, seemingly impossible to turn left. The turns required on the existing path of Yacht Club Way would be extremely difficult for someone towing a boat and not extremely familiar with this area. Additionally, the lane widths on Yacht Club Way are extremely narrow, with a sharp "S" turn required to access the western Mole A areas. Trailered boats and their tow vehicles would have significant difficulties passing each other inbound and outbound, and very likely could not safely navigate the "S" turn at the same time. With the minimal sight of the approaches to this turn, a gridlock condition could easily occur, with no forward "escape path"

available. The long backing up that likely would have to occur in these situations would require a degree of skill that is customarily found in professional truck drivers. In our opinion, these conditions demand a detailed analysis of accessibility, widths, and turning radii by a qualified traffic engineer, done with a basis of a full-size tow vehicle towing a full-size trailered boat, rather than for single passenger vehicles.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to submit our comments on this DEIR. We look forward to your responses to our submitted information.

### **Response to Comment PC523-1**

This is a duplicate letter (with signature) of Comment Letter No. PC406; therefore, please see Response to Comment PC406-1. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC524**

### **SAVE THE PIER – PETITION 1**

---

#### **Comment PC524-1**

*[see PDF in Volume II of the Final EIR for petition with 170 signatures]*

### **Response to Comment PC524-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC525**

### **SAVE THE PIER – PETITION 2**

---

#### **Comment PC525-1**

*[see PDF in Volume II of the Final EIR for petition with 26 signatures]*

### **Response to Comment PC525-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC526**

### **LAURA D. ZAHN**

---

#### **Comment PC526-1**

#### WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT

OR

#### WATERFRONT DESTRUCTION

#### 10 DEMANDMENTS

- NO 3-Three story 1.43 Acre Parking Structure
- NO Reduction/Relocation of Seaside Lagoon
- NO "Boutique" Hotel
- NO Vehicle Through-Way
- NO Pedestrian Draw-Bridge

NO Loss of Boat Slips/Boat Trailer Parking  
 NO Movie Theater  
 NO 2-Football Field Sized "Open-air Markets"  
 NO City Funding to Remove Existing Parking Structure  
 NO LAND EXCHANGE

Let's ALL Remember...Redondo Beach's City Motto is

MORE TO SEA NOT MORE TO SHOP!

The Back-Story for any development project is that...City Officials/Staff *want and need* their name on a PLAQUE...They *want and need* their name on a PROJECT. Doing so UP-VALUES their reputation and improves their resume! THEY want to Leave-a-Legacy BECAUSE they can and will LEAVE this CITY...LEAVING US with THEIR development projects (good or bad).

Residents just want to Live-a-Life!

WE can beat them at their own game! WE the residents of Redondo Beach can and MUST say NO!

WE can LIVE our own LEGACY .....

WE can SAVE OUR SEA SOS

*You can tell all you need to about a society...From how it treats animals and beaches* (Joan Unico 1986)

BY "LIVING-A-LEGACY" WE CAN:

SAY YES TO...RIGHTSIZED DEVELOPMENT AND INSO DOING..

./ YES! Live with more OPEN SPACE along our waterfront

./ YES! Reduce the CARBON FOOTPRINT of concrete, cars, congestion

./ YES! Offer more WATERSPORTS activities with easy access

./ YES! Keep our EXISTING boat slips and boat trailer parking

./ YES! Keep more small, INDEPENDENT stores and shops in town

./ YES! Keep the Saltwater Lagoon AFFORDABLE for EVERYONE to enjoy

./ YES! Offer space for MORE Festivals/Fairs/ Food Trucks

(which offer goods and food for far less than a brick-and-mortar store besides EVERYONE young and old enjoys Festivals/Fairs/Food Trucks)

./ YES! Not INDEBT ourselves to the *whims* and *wishes* of:

DEVELOPERS, TOURISTS, or Shopping TRENDS (i.e. instore vs. ON LINE)

./ YES! Keep our City Officials/Staff RESPONSIBLE to US not Tourists/Developers

./ YES! Keep out SEA; Simple, Sporty, Safe and most of all SEEN

### Response to Comment PC526-1

Similar to the commenter's earlier comment submittal (Comment Letter No. PC194), the commenter has

provided general comments that does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR.

### **Comment PC526-2**

#### LAND EXCHANGE OR LAND LOST

The City of Redondo Beach (That's you the taxpaying property owning residents) own Basin 3. This area is considered "Uplands". The city wants to EXCHANGE Mole D ,which is considered "Tidelands" which is owned by the State but Granted to the City of Redondo Beach with certain conditions to the state for Basin 3 . SO ...CENTERCAL can build the Market Square portion of their development in the Tidelands location.

I personally do not feel comfortable with the City EXCHANGING publicly owned land EXPRESSILY for PERSONAL development purposes.

The California State Lands Commission has to find that ALL of 6-conditions are met to approve this "EXCHANGE". 1) It is for ONE or MORE purposes in subdivision (c), 2) It will provide a SIGNIFICANT BENEFIT to the public trust, 3) The exchange does not SUBSTANTIALLY INTERFERE with public rights of navigation and fishing 4) ...5) ... 6) The exchange is in the BEST INTEREST OF THE STATE;NOW 6) (c) criteria ...(a) An exchange shall be for one or more of the follow ing purposes:{ 1) To IMPROVE navigation or waterways ..(2)...(3) To ENHANCE the physical configuration of the shoreline, (4) To ENHANCE PUBLIC ACCESS to or along the water, (5)... (6) To PRESERVE, ENHANCE,OR CREATE WET LANDS, RIPARIAN OR LITIORAL HABITAT OR OPEN SPACE.

The "EXCHANGE" will only provide a SIGNIFICANT BENEFIT to CENTERCAL!

The "EXCHANGE" will SUBSTANTIALLY INTERFERE with public rights of navigation by restricting access into and egress out of Basin 3. BASIN 3- is for Recreational/Commercial/Fishing/ Excursion Vessels.

The "EXCHANGE" is in the BEST INTEREST of CENTERCAL only!

The "EXCHANGE" will not add ANY ADDITIONAL public access to or along the water

The "EXCHANGE" WILL NOT PRESERVE,ENHANCE OR CREATE ANYTHING.OCEAN OR SEALIFE BASED. INFACT...IF this land exchange goes through the public fishing pier know as Polly's which is within the Tidelands/Exchange area could be demolished. Once the Tidelands are no longer under the grant conditions of the state they are open to be reduced/removed/ruined by CENTERCAL. What or who is to say that they do not build a private dock there for a Billionaires mega yacht?

CENTERCAL or whoever they sell the property to FOREIGN or DOMESTIC will have an undetermined time line of control of this land.

TO QUOTE Margaret Mead...

*"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world, indeed, it's the only thing that ever has"*

### **Response to Comment PC526-2**

The comment implies that the proposed development would be inconsistent with the City's Tidelands grant. As discussed in Section 3.9.4.3.2 in Section 3.9, Land Use and Planning, allowable uses in the tidelands include visitor-serving uses such as commercial uses, restaurants, and hotels, which would include a use such as the

proposed market hall. As also discussed on Draft EIR page 3.9-29 (as clarified in the Final EIR Chapter 3, Modifications to the Draft EIR):

The Tidelands Grant to the City of Redondo Beach allows for a number of uses. The Tidelands grant provides for “the establishment, improvement, and conduct of harbors, and for the construction, reconstruction, repair, maintenance, and operation of wharves, docks, piers slips, quays, and all other works, buildings, facilities, utilities, structures, and appliances incidental, necessary, or convenient convenience, for the promotion and accommodation of commerce and navigation...For all marine-oriented commercial and industrial uses and purposes, and the construction, reconstruction, repair, and maintenance of marine-oriented commercial and industrial buildings, plans, and facilities...public parks, public playgrounds, public bathhouses, public bathing facilities, public recreation, snackbars, cafes, cocktail lounges, restaurants, motels, hotels...launching ramps and hoists...” (Tidelands Grant, Senate Bill 1461, Section 2.) The Tidelands Grant also allows the City to “...lease said lands or any part thereof for limited periods, for purposes consistent with the trusts...”

The proposed uses on Tidelands implemented under the proposed project would be consistent with the permissible uses under the City’s Tidelands Grant, however, the applicant has requested a 99-year lease for portions of the site that are currently Tidelands. As discussed in greater detail under Alternative 4, in Chapter 4, Analysis of Alternatives in this Draft EIR, in the event that the Tidelands Exchange is not approved by the CSLC, the uses proposed for the site would still be consistent with the Tidelands Grant, however the lease agreement for the Tidelands identified in the exchange would be limited to 66 years.

Regardless of the uplands or tidelands designation, the City would continue to control the land and CenterCal would be subject to lease terms with the City. The land would continue to be subject to the current City planning documents that govern the uses and the allowed development intensity, including the City’s LCP certified by the California Coastal Commission (see Section 3.9 Land Use and Planning for additional information).

As described in Section 3.9, Land Use and Planning, the proposed exchange of the land would be subject to approval by the State Lands Commission, which, as part of the review process, would review the proposed exchange for consistency with Public Resources Code Sections 6307.

To clarify the commenters remark regarding the Sportfishing (Polly’s) Pier, as shown on Figure 2-23 of the Draft EIR (in Chapter 2, Project Description), the land adjacent to the Sportfishing Pier (i.e., at the very base of the pier but not the rock revetment) is part of the Tidelands/Exchange area, the portion over the water is not.

Your opinion on the proposed project will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC527**

**MARY R. EWELL**

### **Comment PC527-1**

#### **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 #2 -- 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, by the City's standards, the beach and Waterfront, as a way to defend against not providing enough walking park space. To commercialize the waterfront with three high-end "boutique" 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, offered 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 mainly 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. "In addition, public trust lands generally may not be sold into private ownership." It is a form of plundering, which extends to destroying the natural habitat of sea creatures.

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 time line 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 insufficiently addressed in the EIR draft? The taxpayers, property-

owning residents, 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 (the increase in Hotel rooms from the original# quoted, etc). 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 block 80% of the view and obfuscate the possible ambiance of a smaller scale pier/harbor redevelopment that could be agree on. If the repairs of the neglected parking infrastructure were attended to, Center Cal would, reportedly, not have to offset this cost by over development. ALL of us would get behind an aesthetically-planned redevelopment that local merchants could actually afford to occupy.

### Seaside Lagoon

As Redondo Beach residents are paying for this upgrade (not CenterCal who has been allowed to take credit for it and the Boatramp), 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, I believe, gives the sea animals free range to enter the area. No sufficient reason given to reduce the Seaside Lagoon area which serves a minority of our population, our youngsters.

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 Over development 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. ("Entropy is a law of nature in which everything slowly goes into disorder. The entropy of an object is a measure of the amount of information it takes to know the complete state of that object").

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 from 67 spaces to 20), 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. If you were to have a contest among designers who realize what is integral to the structure, you would be flooded with outstanding renditions of what the community is seeking-at NO COST.

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.

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

The City has inadvertently demonstrated a conflict of values regarding providing low- cost senior housing and then stating that there is "no significant environmental impact" to neighboring residences. The Torrance Boulevard side 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 5-7 years for such an 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, reported that it is deliberately vague, raises 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  
Article 5 Parking regulations  
10-2.1706

*[NOAA information was provided and can be found in the PDF of the comment letter in Volume II of the Final EIR]*

Letter to the Editor, partially printed last week

As a chaplain at a local hospital, I am increasingly aware of how people who have suffered disease or loss seek the solace & healing of the Ocean. Also, most of our young people do not look to Churches/"organized religion" to find God. They find their spirituality in nature. The majority of us live in crowded conditions where "the good, the true, and the beautiful" is found at the ocean shore. It should be easily accessible to get there when feeling weak or desolate, and the proposed Center Cal "life style destination" is a mockery to this innate desire to return to nature for refreshment /renewal of spirit. A spiritual assessment would estimate that our "leadership", elected or appointed officials, are out of touch with what is meaningful to folks who have chosen to come live here in the South Bay. The EIR denies this reality of the people by supplanting it with "a tourist attraction".

The Center Cal "project" is, by Developer Fred Bruning's own admission, left vague & open to his legal interpretation (He is an attorney) & our City Council has, as it were, "signed a blank check" for our waterfront access to someone who has historically taken advantage of those who are gullible, or who "want a quick solution", as our Mayor is known for. You, Gentlemen/women, have "thrown pearls before swine" by being seduced by the allure of profits that MAY result from this "selling out" of our water front. If the City Council /administration would put forth a bond measure to repair the infrastructure of our aging underground/out of sight parking structures, from which you have already gained more revenue than AES has ever contributed, you would not be so compromised/ by Center Cal's commercial seduction. Any homeowner takes care to keep their residence in repair, but you have failed to plan/execute that for the Pier infrastructure. Still, most of R.B. residents would accept a bond measure to ensure this repair rather than sell out our waterfront to cement structures of 3+ stories on the Portofino/North end to a 2+ story parking structure on the Torrance Blvd/south side, 70 % blocked views in between. If we citizens were even given the chance to pay for repairing the present parking infrastructure, we would have no need for such OVER development to meet Center Cal's demand for profits of 10%. We would have the possibility of a more modest revitalization of the pier/oceanfront, (actually affordable to local merchants over chain stores) that is aesthetically appealing & representative of the people who have entrusted you with our greatest natural resource.

"Where there is no vision, the people perish". There is no master plan for our City, no vision for an inclusive design to beautify/sustain one of the last remaining coastal shorelines which sadly demonstrates the lack of leadership/vision needed.

*[Beach Bluff Restoration Project information was included and can be found in the PDF of the comment letter in Volume II of the Final EIR]*

## Response to Comment PC527-1

This is a duplicate letter (with signature) of Comment Letter No. PC297; therefore, please see Response to Comments PC297-1 through PC297-14. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### COMMENT LETTER NO. PC528

GREG DIETE

---

#### Comment PC528-1

I do appreciate the opportunity to comment on a small part of this DEIR I was able to review.

Of course, it's ridiculous in this DEIR process to expect the general public, in the time given, to review and comment with questions on the entirety of this 6,800 page document.

Chapter 2 of the DEIR refers to the Pier Plaza Development as a 70,000 SF Office Complex. When Ron Saltern developed the "top deck" in 1979-80 it was "sold" to the city and public as a coastal retail shopping complex with seven restaurants. The demographic and financial studies predictions for its success were all positive.... but the Pier Plaza was not a commercial success. The complex was eventually taken over by government and public offices and municipal court rooms. Originally the California Coastal Commission did not permit this development to be an Office Complex, because business offices are not Coastal dependent. What has changed to make office space Coastal dependent?

I didn't find the total water acreage of the site in the DEIR. Does the 11.6 acres of open space in Chapter 2 Figure 2-7 include any water elements? How many acres of open space in the DEIR Water Front Project site can be attributable to the Horseshoe Pier, Basin 3, New Trailered Boat Launch, Seaside Lagoon and any other water elements in the 36 acre WFP site?

Chapter 2 page 2-29 refers to a 2012 structural study/analysis of the South Pier parking structure that was built in 1973. The DEIR states that the Walker Restoration Consultants did the 2012 report and found that this parking structure had another 15 to 20 years of life, if substantial repairs were done. Did the "Walker" report state the estimated cost of these repairs? I could not find this in the DEIR. I made a Public Records Request for this "Walker" report/analysis on January 13, 2016. I don't know, if the "City" can provide the report in time to provide questions and comments to the DEIR, before the January 19, 2016 dead line for public comment. After January 19, 2016, can the "Walker" report's findings, i.e. estimated cost to repair the parking structures, be a part of the DEIR public record?

Does the DEIR provide an Alternative site development plan that considers the restoration of the 1,018 stall South Pier Parking structure built in 1973, the demolition of the 1960's south parking structure and the demolition of the Pier Plaza 70,000 SF Office Complex, and the construction of the 130 room Boutique Hotel on the demolished 1960's south parking site combined with the demolished "octagon" building site? The 22,000 SF of International Boardwalk tenants could possibly occupy the ocean front ground level of the restored South Pier Parking structure.

Since a new 5 story, 1,157 stall garage is estimated by CenterCal to cost \$50,000,000 plus the million's more the "City" would pay for all of the demolition work and roadway, this "Alternative" should be given serious consideration.

Chapter 3 page 3.0-6 states that the 50 acre AES site is not part of this DEIR, because any future development is considered speculative. This DEIR's simplistic dealing with the coming future development on the AES site is blindly ignoring the reality that the AES site will be developed.

Why is the new 57 room Shade Hotel not part of this DEIR?

Chapter 3.1 page 3.1-1 states there is no substantial adverse effect on local valued views, because of the new Main Street and Pacific Avenue reconnection. How does the reconnection of Pacific Avenue substantially eliminate the adverse effects this development will have on local views?

Chapter 3.1 page 3.1-6 states that views from Czulager Park, Seaside Lagoon, Veterans Park, and bike paths have moderate viewer sensitivity, and that views maybe of secondary importance. Further. .. automobile drivers have low view sensitivity. Did the experts take into consideration that the vehicles passengers might enjoy the ocean views? What's the value of these beautiful ocean views to Redondo residents?

Chapter 3 Fig. 3.1-7 show an ocean view from the high up viewing platform at the eastern end of Czulager Park. These photo's of ocean view's are deceptive, because park visitors and picnickers' are generally found in the middle and lower grassy area's of Czulager park. These middle and lower grassy area's would have significant view blockage from the Water Front Project as it is illustrated in the DEIR?

Chapter 3 Fig. 3.1-5b shows a current ocean view blockage, ii a viewer were to stand directly in front of Captain Kid's fish house on Harbor Drive. The "WFP" DEIR would remove Captain Kid's providing a 120' wide ocean view corridor. The DEIR doesn't point out that the 780 linear feet to the north of Captain Kid's is virtually a solid 30' to 45' wall blocking views along the newly completed bike path.

Looking in a northwesterly direction from Veteran's Park the ocean view blockage is significant. Where in Chapter 3 does the DEIR show the Veteran's Park public views being significantly obstructed?

In Chapter 3 the DEIR's use of low, moderate and high sensitivity viewers ... diminishes the value and importance of the ocean views to the general public.

Unfortunately the Water Front Project DEIR process won't yield the best result for the City of Redondo Beach, because everyone who attended the public hearings conducted by CenterCal at the RB Performing Arts Center were never permitted to publicly comment on the Water Front Project that's going through this DEIR process. Also, the City of Redondo Beach handicapped the process by not maintaining the Pier parking structure for the past 40 years, and the "City" never developed a General Plan for the Pier and King Harbor Marina over the last 40 years.

The only way to get the best possible Water Front Project is by reducing the size of the project, save \$50,000,000 by repairing the Pier Parking structure, and find a way to make the AES site development part of the over all plan for King Harbor.

### **Response to Comment PC528-1**

This is a duplicate letter (without photo) of Comment Letter No. PC243; therefore, please see Response to Comments PC243-1 through PC243-9. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC529**

**SUSAN SCHILLING**

---

### **Comment PC529-1**

I am writing to voice my concern regarding the potential dismantling of the short pier which houses the vintage restaurant, Polly's on the Pier, in Redondo Beach. I started a breakfast club there in 1998, vowing to eat there every Tuesday morning for the rest of my life. My friends, (sometimes 3 or 4, sometimes 12) and I picked this

location because we were at a time in our lives when our children were older and we found ourselves forgetting to find time to enjoy our beautiful ocean and all that it brings to one's life. We realized that it was the only casual breakfast house in the South Bay that sat on the ocean where you could enjoy the views in both directions, the vast variety of sea life and wonderful culture of a seaside city.

Weekly we enjoy seeing the fisherman and whale watch boats and kayakers and sailboats, Catalina Island on the horizon, and waves crashing on and sometimes breaching the breakwater. Anyone who loves the ocean knows its restorative powers and would in turn love Polly's.

After a couple of years of breakfast club I painted the Pier and started a business selling high quality prints of local beach scenes. I was asked to display my work at Polly's and my paintings have hung inside since 2002. I have sold hundreds of my image of Polly's. Tourists and locals alike want to have my painting of Polly's in their home because it is such a beloved spot to so many. For eight years I sold work on Sundays outside of the restaurant and was amazed that people from all over the world had made a special trip to Redondo Beach to eat at Polly's. People would see my work in the restaurant and call me to deliver paintings to them at the local hotels.

Polly's is a jewel worthy of saving and restoring and cherishing. Whatever the plan for this area, I can only hope that this little bit of charm be left as an accessible and affordable destination for locals and tourists who want to experience what's truly the best of Redondo Beach and the South Bay of Los Angeles County.

#### **Response to Comment PC529-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

#### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC530**

**LEN BUCZEK**

#### **Comment PC530-1**

Great times. Introduced my daughter, various friends and their children to fishing via RB Sportfishing. Enjoy the many new friendships. Love the taste of the fish. Also like going to the many restaurants on or near the boardwalk after many of the 1/2-day fishing trips out of RB Sportfishing. If not for RB Sportfishing, I'd likely go to Long Beach.

#### **Response to Comment PC530-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

#### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC531**

**MAURO CIARMOLI**

#### **Comment PC531-1**

Please include Redondo Sportfishing in your new plans. It is an important prt of the community and a great way to get kids into fishing!

**Response to Comment PC531-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC532****DAVID SCOTT**

---

**Comment PC532-1**

I am writing to plead with you not to renovate Old Tony's. I love it just the way it is and it's such a wonderful landmark!!

Please keep Old Tony's the same!

**Response to Comment PC532-1**

Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR regarding historic resources, including Tony's On The Pier. As also detailed in Section 3.5, Geology and Soils of the Draft EIR, on page 3.5-20, inspections of the timber portion of the Horseshoe Pier where Tony's stands is from 1928, and although it has had maintenance over the years, this portion of the pier is aged and does not meet the current code requirements. As further discussed under Alternative 1 in Section 4.4.1 of the Draft EIR, given the poor condition of the timber portion of the Horseshoe Pier is in very poor condition and that portion of the pier, as well as the buildings, which includes Tony's and its companion structure, would be closed to the public in the future if the necessary structural repairs cannot be made. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC533****BECKY**

---

**Comment PC533-1**

I just received notice that Tony's by the Pier is threatened. I hope this is untrue. I was born in Long Beach and have dined there for years. I have brought friends from SF, NY, England and other exotic locales, and all have loved it. I know many, many people who love Tony's, and we would be heartbroken to see such a unique, iconic South Bay beach restaurant be altered IN ANY way. Please do not close or remodel this institution, which gives your town distinction and character. The last thing the world needs is another expensive, generic, gaudy mall.

**Response to Comment PC533-1**

Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR regarding historic resources, including Tony's On The Pier. As detailed in Section 3.5, Geology and Soils of the Draft EIR, on page 3.5-20, inspections of the timber portion of the Horseshoe Pier where Tony's stands is from 1928, and although it has had maintenance over the years, this portion of the pier is aged and does not meet the current code requirements. As further discussed under Alternative 1 in Section 4.4.1 of the Draft EIR, given the poor condition of the timber portion of the Horseshoe Pier is in very poor condition and that portion of the pier, as well as the buildings, which includes Tony's and its companion structure, would be closed to the public in the future if the necessary structural repairs cannot be made. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC534****ANN DALKEY**

---

**Comment PC534-1**

Please include my comments contained within this document in the public comments on the Waterfront Draft EIR. I have reviewed the Executive Summary, Appendix D1 Biological Resources Assessment, Appendix D2 CNNDDB Search Results, and Appendix I2 Water Circulation and Quality Impacts. I also attended the initial workshop held Saturday, November 21, 2015.

I have arranged my comments as follows:

- Forward – This contains a description of my professional background from which I drew upon for generating my comments.
- General comments on the DEIR and conceptual elements of the Waterfront Plan
  - **Note:** Detailed discussion of liquefaction resulting from major earth quake events must be included before adopting the final EIR.
- Appendix D1 Biological Resources Assessment
  - I concur with the assessment and have provided two additional examples of quick recoveries of the soft bottom benthic community.
- Appendix D2 CNDDDB Search Results
  - This is a reasonable list, but must be used when planning the landscaping.
  - **Note:** Detailed discussion of using native plants, including elements of the southern *coastal bluff scrub and the special status species it supports, including the endangered El Segundo blue butterfly.*
- Appendix I2 Water Circulation and Quality Impacts
  - I find the water circulation assessment over optimistic due to an insufficient analysis
  - The model failed to consider that the breakwater is porous, which can bring contaminants into the harbor, especially bacterial contamination.
  - The model failed to consider any gyres that can set-up in the harbor.
  - The model failed to consider the configuration of the entrance to the Seaside Lagoon along with the proposed boat ramp that will render the lagoon as essentially a closed embayment.
    - The potential for bacterial contamination can occur from infiltrating water through the breakwater, inputs from birds in the vicinity of the lagoon, and runoff impacts from the adjacent parking lots exists. The potential for unacceptably high levels of bacterial contamination exists.
    - **Recommendation:** *Redo the Water Circulation and Quality Impacts appendix with a more sophisticated analysis that includes quantified bacterial measurements adjacent to the breakwater, transport through the breakwater, and impacts on water transport in the vicinity of the Seaside Lagoon, proposed boat ramp, and Basin 3.*
- Appendix I2 Water Circulation and Quality Impacts
  - **Recommendation:** *A more aggressive value for predicted sea level rise should be included before adoption of the final EIR.*
  - A modest measure of 1.1 ft of sea level rise is utilized, leaving no room for error in this difficult to assess reality that we are facing.
  - Considering the amount of infrastructure being installed and duration that it will be expected to last, it is important to be more cautious in the buildout to save money later if and when damage occurs from sea level rise.

### **Response to Comment PC534-1**

The environmental issues raised in this comment letter, as outlined, are addressed in Response to Comments PC534-3 through PC534-9 below.

### **Comment PC534-2**

I strongly prefer Alternative 7 for technical reasons as shown above and detailed in the following pages. In these comments are intended to provide positive critiques for obtaining better outcomes on the Water Front project. There is no doubt that the waterfront area needs improvements. Let's do it smartly with the long-term in the forefront of our planning.

### **Response to Comment PC534-2**

The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### **Comment PC534-3**

#### **FORWARD**

In reviewing the DEIR, I bring to the conversation an experienced background, including:

- Experience as a co-owner of a small business that generated over \$1.25 million in annual gross sales from 1982 through 1986. I understand the concerns of a small business owner.
- Over 32 years as a working marine biologist where I:
  - Spent hundreds of days at sea during this time in vessels that deployed and returned daily from harbors. This gave me insight into the difference between casual boaters and experienced ones, especially from the 200-ton licensed crew on the vessels that I worked on. It is nerve-racking to be in a large vessel navigating on a weekend when numerous casual boaters are out and about, with unpredictable navigation and little in the way of boat handling skills.
  - Investigated soft bottom sediment marine organisms for impacts resulting from increased disturbance and also loss of disturbance.
  - Significant work with water quality issues, specifically with wastewater plume transport and water movement within the Los Angeles Harbor near Piers 300 and 400.
  - Supervised the Los Angeles City's microbiology laboratory for three years, the same group that samples in Redondo Beach where results get routed through the LA County Department of Health and to Heal the Bay for use in its Beach Report Card.
  - Was instrumental in connecting the City of Redondo Beach with the USC researchers through Chris Cagle.
- During the past ten years I've worked on the land side where I've worked with special status species and gained familiarity with such species and their habitat requirements.

### **Response to Comment PC534-3**

The commenter background will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### **Comment PC534-4**

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS**

**I strongly support Option 7, with justifications included in my discussion below.**

I agree that the area is in need of improvements and support the idea of revitalizing the area. However, I am concerned that the large amount of construction to the water's edge will not engender the anticipated ambience for visitors (local and tourists) who expect to experience a marine setting. Because this is located within the coastal zone, this development runs counter to expectations considered in passing the proposition that led to the creation of the Coastal Commission. Additionally, I am concerned about competing interests with the Riviera Village. Perhaps a continuously running shuttle between the two areas will mitigate this (using electric vehicles!).

**Visibility and Access** – In consideration that most successful venues are highly visible from the main roads, the proposed project suffers from a lack of visibility. Due to unfortunate geography, the Redondo Beach waterfront area is below the grade of the most traveled local artery, Pacific Coast Highway. This setting precludes opportunistic visits.

Navigation by street to the waterfront area is constrained, with only two major access points, 190<sup>th</sup> Street and Torrance Boulevard. This fact will deter all but the visitors who intend to visit the area. As a result, visitors must be enticed to visit, such as by the inclusion of hotels and large scale facilities, such as wedding venues and banquet/conference facilities.

Recommendation: The entire area, from the water's edge to Pacific Coast Highway should be addressed in the entirety. This is the only way to obtain a cohesive and world class development. Emphasis should be placed on moving structures higher on the hill to reduce their vulnerability to the elements and more open space below that can better withstand and absorb damaging storm water surges.

**Response to Comment PC534-4**

The commenter is expressing an opinion in support of Alternative 7. Your opinion will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

The commenter's reference to "the competing interests of the Riviera Village" is unclear. Regarding the commenters suggestion to provide a shuttle between the project site and Riviera Village, as noted, in Draft EIR Section 3.13.2.3.4 (in Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation), the project site is well served by transit service under existing conditions. Please also be aware, it is not feasible to provide a transit stop at every location in the City. However, transit operators routinely assess the need for transit demand, service, and additional stops as part of their routine function. As discussed in Draft EIR Section 3.13.2.3.4, transit service is provided by several entities including LA County Metro, which has adopted an alternative vehicle bus fleet since 2011.<sup>74</sup> While the commenter references utilizing "electric vehicles," the City of Redondo Beach does not have control over another agency's vehicle fleet. As also outlined in Draft EIR Section 2.4.1.5 in Chapter 2, Project Description and page 3.13-81 in Section 3.13, the project includes a number of pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements that would connect areas of coastal Redondo Beach. Your suggestions are noted and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

Regarding economic viability of the proposed project, see Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site, regarding planning for a larger area, refer to Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site; please also see Draft EIR Section 4.2.3 for discussion of alternative locations. For discussion of trip distribution, please see Draft EIR Section 3.13. Regarding stormwater surges, see Impact

---

<sup>74</sup> [https://www.metro.net/news/simple\\_pr/metro-retires-last-diesel-bus/](https://www.metro.net/news/simple_pr/metro-retires-last-diesel-bus/)

HWQ-5 in Section 3.8, Hydrology and Water Quality in the Draft EIR, which addresses wave uprush at the project site.

### Comment PC534-5

**Earthquake and Associated Liquefaction** – The Redondo Beach harbor area has suffered from liquefaction caused by earthquakes in recent years (1987 and 1994). The Draft EIR states that “... Liquefaction; would not result in substantial soil erosion....., subsidence, liquefaction, corrosiveness, or collapse....., and, would not create substantial risks to life or property...”. And yet, we’ve seen liquefaction occur in Redondo Beach.

### Response to Comment PC534-5

The commenter has selectively chosen text from throughout Section 3.5 to form the statement presented in the comment as a quote from the Draft EIR. The statement below from page ES-30 provides a summary of the detailed Geology analysis contained in Draft EIR Section 3.5:

**Geology and Soils GEO-1 through GEO—4.** The proposed project: would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects including the risks of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area based on other substantial evidence of a known fault, strong seismic ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; would not result in a significant impact due to on-site or off-site lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, corrosiveness, or collapse due to being located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project; and, would not create substantial risks to life or property due to the presence of expansive soil, as defined in the California Building Code.

The commenter implies this language from the Executive Summary is incorrect, because “we’ve seen liquefaction occur in Redondo Beach.” It is not the purpose of CEQA to disclose a significant impact based upon pre-existing conditions. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a); *Watsonville Pilots Association v. City of Watsonville* (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 1059, 1094 [“The FEIR was not required to resolve the [existing] overdraft problem, a feat that was far beyond its scope”].) The purpose of the EIR is to analyze impacts caused by project on the existing environment. Furthermore, CEQA does not generally require an agency to consider the effects of existing environmental conditions on a proposed project’s future users or residents. (*California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* (2015) 62 Cal.A4th 369, 392.) As detailed in the Geology methodology discussion in Draft EIR Section 3.5.4.1:

The analysis addresses the potential for construction and operation of the proposed project *to increase the consequences of adverse geologic conditions and hazards* including earthquake-induced ground shaking, earthquake fault surface rupture, earthquake-induced liquefaction, erosion, and unstable, expansive, and corrosive soils...To assess whether a given geologic hazard would result in a significant impact, the major components of the proposed project *are reviewed and compared with the potential geologic hazards identified and the conditions of the existing buildings/structures*. Based on this review, the potential for individual project components to cause new geologic hazards or accelerate existing ones are evaluated.

It should be noted, as discussed on page 3.5-7, soil liquefaction is a phenomenon in which saturated soils experience a sudden and nearly complete loss of strength during seismic events and while it may be related to subsidence or collapse, it is not associated with soil erosion or corrosiveness.

Nevertheless, as discussed on page 3.5-17 and shown on Figure 3.5-5 in Section 3.5, Geology and Soils of the Draft EIR, a majority of the project site is located within a liquefaction hazard zone. As discussed under Impact GEO-3 in Section 3.5, “existing buildings/structures at the project site are already subject to potential risk of

liquefaction/ground settlement/lateral spreading...the project would result in new buildings/structures on the project site, which would provide safety improvements in comparison to the existing conditions...” While impacts were determined to be less than significant, the City is requiring the project to comply with a geological conditions of approval outlined on Draft EIR page 3.5-2.

### **Comment PC534-6**

#### **APPENDIX D1 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT**

I fully concur with the assessments made in this report.

The recovery of the soft bottom benthic communities is very quick. These organisms reproduce predominantly via larvae that are distributed in the water column. In addition to the San Diego example, other events have been documented:

- Recovery of the benthic community to background levels occurred within a year (J.H. Baker doctoral dissertation). This took place at Huntington Beach when Orange County Sanitation Districts changed their wastewater discharge from the 1-mile outfall to the 5-mile outfall.
- Also, when the City of Los Angeles upgraded their effluent to 100% secondary (November 1987), the benthic community at the 5-mile outfall responded positively within six months of the change. Also, the termination of the sludge discharge at the 7-mile outfall quickly changed from nearly azoic to one much closer to normal.

Impacts to the construction should be expected to follow this quick recovery pattern as seen elsewhere. Because the benthic community serves as “fish food” in the ecosystem, prey organisms will respond accordingly. Additionally, fish and large invertebrates have the ability to move away from construction disturbances and return upon termination of the disturbance.

#### **APPENDIX D2 CNDDDB SEARCH RESULTS**

This is a reasonable list of species that have been observed in the general area in over 100 years. The current state of development in the area, with concurrent habitat loss, precludes expectations that many of these species will never be seen in the area again.

The Waterfront project provides Redondo Beach the opportunity to return some of the species in its landscaping:

1. By using native plants that are adapted to the difficult environment at the beach, e.g. low precipitation, salty air, sandy soil, and high wind stress, benefits can be gained. Foremost will be the plants need for little irrigation, an important fact due to the problems California is experiencing and will continue to experience with its water availability.
2. Also, an increased variety of insects and birds will occur, providing an enhanced visitor experienced and educational opportunities.
3. Lastly, the ability to increase habitat for the El Segundo blue butterfly exists. This can be easily achieved by planting the appropriate plants throughout the entire development.

There is a difference between wild habitat and using native plants in a landscaped setting. The final EIR should include the following considerations for including landscaped native plants in the appropriate location:

4. Specify locations that will support native plants throughout the project area, from the furthest northern boundary to the furthest southern boundary.
5. Provide a plant pallet of the viable local native species (I can help).
6. Specify that the landscape architects include local known authorities in developing their landscaping plans.

- o For example, Tony Baker does excellent work by incorporating local native plants within a landscaped setting.
7. Specify that landscape installers be familiar with native plants.
  8. Specify that the landscape maintenance staff, in particular management, be trained in how to manage native plants.

### Response to Comment PC534-6

Your opinion will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body. The plants incorporated into the landscape design (landscape palette) will be reviewed and approved by the City as part of the design review process. The plant palette will include a variety of plants suitable for a coastal Mediterranean climate, including plants with low water needs (the project site is comprised of fill dirt and does not have sandy soils).

Regarding the suggestion that the project site is an opportunity to increase habitat for the El Segundo blue butterfly, the El Segundo blue butterfly (*Euphilotes battoides ailyni*) is a federally listed endangered species that occupies dune habitat with a high sand content. Existing known populations are located in managed preserves such as the El Segundo Dunes and the Chevron Butterfly Preserve. The project site is a developed active commercial and recreation site with no existing native habitat on-site. Even if the requisite plant (coast buckwheat [*Eriogonum parvifolium*]) is included in the site's landscape design, the presence of this plant alone would not provide viable habitat to support the El Segundo blue butterfly.

Regarding the suggestions for the Final EIR relative to native plants, the commenter does not identify a significant impact associated with the use of non-native plants. Consistent with the City's existing certified Coastal Zoning, the project will be required to comply with the City's landscape regulations, which provide for the use of drought tolerant plants and non-invasive species. (RBMC Section 10-5.1900(h).)<sup>75</sup> As outlined in the document in the footnote, there are a number of factors the City and developer consider when selecting the plant palette. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### Comment PC534-7

#### APPENDIX I2 WATER CIRCULATION AND QUALITY IMPACTS

This is an area that I am most concerned about. I believe that the conclusions reached in this appendix are overly optimistic due to an insufficient analysis. The analysis fails to consider that the proposed configuration around Seaside Lagoon is essentially a closed embayment.

As a result, the water movement scenarios indicate greater water circulation than what I believe will occur, but only as an inflow/outflow basis. For example, Figure 26 on Page 36 depicts straight forward water transport into all regions of the harbor. Subsequent illustrations show the outflow to be similar, and distribution of water quality impacts to occur in a relatively even gradient across the harbor, with lesser dilution in Basin 3.

#### *Breakwater impacts*

The model fails to consider that water will be transported through the breakwater. While it will move slower, the transport will occur because the breakwater is built of rip rap. In my work with a CTD in Los

---

<sup>75</sup> City of Redondo Beach List of Recommended Trees and Water Conserving Plants:  
<http://www.redondo.org/civica/filebank/blobload.asp?BlobID=4979>

Angeles Harbor, I saw many instances of water penetrating through the breakwater. Concurrent with water moving through the breakwater, chances of transporting bacteria (e.g. total coliform, fecal coliform, and enterococcus) associated with bird life utilizing the breakwater exists.

*Water movement is complex*

The water transport model is highly simplified and fails to include gyres (eddies) that can occur, that are likely to occur, and probably currently exist within the harbor. Most notably is the configuration of the Seaside Lagoon which has a tightly constrained entrance making it a fairly closed embayment. The boat launch construction combined with the existing mole pose additional constrictions to water movement. A gyre will likely set-up in the area between the entrance to the boat/lagoon area and to Basin 3. Depending upon tides, it can be either clockwise or counter clockwise. Regardless of direction, water transport in and out of the Seaside Lagoon will be muted as the gyre's energy will circle water around at the expense of water exchange in the area. In this scenario, a 60% constituent concentration as depicted in Figure 34 Page 44 is overly optimistic.

*Implications of incomplete flushing of the Seaside Lagoon*

Through bacterial contamination transport through the breakwater, bird deposition in the Seaside Lagoon area, and parking lot flows into the lagoon (unless designed correctly), the reduced flushing means that bacterial contamination represents a real concern. Instead of dealing with the elevated solids that currently exists, the City will be replacing its headaches with elevated bacterial contamination. The design elements make this an intractable problem.

## **Response to Comment PC534-7**

As discussed in Response to Comment PC534-5, the purpose of the EIR's analysis is to determine the impacts of the proposed project on the existing environment, not to fix existing environmental conditions and not to analyze the impacts of the existing environment on the project. As also noted under CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a)(1) the EIR "an EIR should not discuss impacts which do not result in part from the project evaluated in the EIR."

As discussed on Draft EIR page 3.8-58, the proposed project includes a number of operational water quality improvements in comparison to existing conditions, which include a reduction in impervious surfaces on the project site and an increase in stormwater capture facilities which reduce the amount of polluted run-off which flows into the Harbor under existing conditions. As further discussed on Draft EIR pages 3.8-62 through 63 the proposed project is not anticipated to change the water circulation in King Harbor in comparison to existing conditions. This information was sufficient to determine that the proposed project would not cause a significant impact associated with operational water quality. The commenter also implies that there will be bird deposition associated with the Seaside Lagoon. The proposed project reduces the amount of breakwater adjacent to the lagoon, as can be seen by comparing Figures 2-3 (existing conditions), and Figure 2-8 (proposed project conditions, which include removing part of the breakwater to open Seaside Lagoon to the ocean).

The other potential marine sources of pollution suggested by the commenter, including bacteria input from bird roost areas on the outer harbor breakwater are not caused by the proposed project and occur under existing conditions. Furthermore, water circulation in King Harbor is mainly driven by tidal dynamics. Any wave-induced currents through the breakwater that might occur as suggested by the commenter are estimated to quickly dissipate within a short distance from the armor stone face in turbulent jet flow. Any residual cross current momentum adjacent to the breakwater that might persist is therefore estimated to be relatively weak and be quickly consumed by and converted into the predominate tidal flows and mixing within the outer harbor area that was modeled. Such factors would not affect the conclusions of the water circulation analysis.

To assess the water circulation of the study area, a comparative evaluation was made by modeling the existing water circulation and water quality indicators for the with and without project conditions and reviewing results throughout the different open water areas and basins of King Harbor. The analysis was conducted using sophisticated two-dimensional numerical water circulation (which accounts for the physical “configuration around Seaside Lagoon” as well as gyres’) and water quality models that are well recognized and proven for their application and technical performance. The model has also been validated to provide accurate information in comparison to real world conditions. The models that were used do replicate the hydrodynamics of horizontal gyre motion, and this flow dynamic was captured by the analysis that was performed contrary to the assertions in the comment.

Compared to other basins in King Harbor, the proposed Seaside Lagoon is a fairly open water body that is controlled by the water circulation and tidal exchange within the adjacent Turning Basin and outer harbor Main Channel. This can be verified with the computed water exchange time (Table 3, Page 8 of Appendix I2 of the Draft EIR). The water exchange time is defined as the ratio of the embayment storage volume at the Mean High Water (MHW) to the average water exchange rate between the ocean and the embayment. As listed in Table 3, the water exchange time is about 20 hours for Seaside Lagoon, while it is approximately 60 to 70 hours for the other basins. This daily exchange rate and mixing with adjacent open ocean water that will occur indicates that the water quality of the outer harbor and Seaside Lagoon area will be similar to that of the ambient water outside of the Harbor (see page 3.8-11 of Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR). This finding should not be surprising given the relatively small size of King Harbor, and the fact that it was built directly into deep ocean waters within close proximity to the Redondo Submarine Canyon. Due to the shallow water depth of the Seaside Lagoon area, its faster water exchange time, and its close proximity to the harbor entrance, the overall water quality in the proposed Seaside Lagoon will be consistently better than most other areas of King Harbor. Furthermore, the with and without project analysis that was performed demonstrated that the proposed improvement will not result in any degradation of the existing ambient circulation conditions, and the on-site stormwater improvements will improve the Harbor water quality.

### **Comment PC534-8**

#### *How to mitigate this problem?*

Use Alternative 7. This alternative places the boat launch at the end of Mole A with the following benefits:

- This is the safest alternative for boat launching, for people deploying their boats using the ramps can lose control of their vessel (expect inexperienced users to be doing this and having problems!).
- This option eliminates the need for the subsurface construction off Mole C. Water transport will then be better in the vicinity of the Seaside Lagoon.
- A popular pier will be retained.
- The development will be reduced making the entire project more palatable to the general public.

Caution: I doubt that Alternative 7 will fully eliminate the potential for bacterial contamination. A more thorough water movement analysis is needed that includes a porous breakwater and also considers water movement in the tight areas that exist in the harbor. Modelling has come a long way since oceanographers first developed models for gyres along complicated landforms in the early to mid-1990’s.

### **Response to Comment PC534-8**

Alternative 7 – Reduced Density, described beginning on page 4-244 in Chapter 4, Analysis of Alternatives of the Draft EIR, includes a boat launch ramp at Mole C, which is the same as the proposed project. Alternative 8 – Alternative Small Craft Boat Launch Ramp Facilities Within King Harbor, described beginning on page 4-295, includes several alternative locations and configurations for the boat launch ramp, including Mole A, which could be chosen as the boat ramp location under the proposed project or another alternative (i.e., Alternative 7).

Regarding the safety associated with the boat ramp launch locations, see Master Response #8: Boat Ramp in King Harbor. Regarding subsurface construction, see Response to Comment AL001-7. Regarding water transport if there is no breakwater at Mole C, the water circulation and water quality might be slightly improved by eliminating the proposed boat launch ramp at Mole C; however, this improvement will likely be marginal.

Regarding the comment regarding retaining a popular pier, it is assumed the commenter is referring to the Sportfishing Pier. As with the proposed project, Alternative 7 analyzes demolition and possible replacement of the pier. See Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. Regarding reduced development under Alternative 7, your opinion will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

Regarding bacterial contamination, see Response to Comment PC534-7 above.

### **Comment PC534-9**

#### **APPENDIX I2 WATER CIRCULATION AND QUALITY IMPACTS**

**Sea Level Rise** – There was not a detailed discussion of sea level rise only a short discussion on page 2 and a graph and tables on page 3 in this section and nominal mention in the various alternative tables. Most significant is the amount of sea level rise accepted in this analysis. As shown on Page 9 (Page 3.8-3 in the main Draft EIR), the authors utilized a projected a sea level rise of 1.1 ft .

In recent years the standard prediction has been 1 meter increase by 2100. Recent work by scientists have revealed that sea level rise is accelerating, but scientific work on this premise is in progress has not been widely provided for public consideration. A discussion can be found on this webpage of The Guardian: <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/sea-level>.

When cars, aircraft, buildings, and other large infrastructure are engineered, provisions for catastrophic events are included in the design. This should be the case for the Waterfront Project. Look for a lifespan of the major buildings to be greater than 30 years. It makes sense to plan for more sea level rise for the safety of the infrastructure and for the future Redondo Beach residents.

By considering a larger degree of sea level rise, there will be greater resiliency conferred on the developments when storms arise with associated storm surges and large waves. During El Niño events, the sea level becomes higher due to the water's increased temperature. For example, with our current El Niño the sea level is 0.7 ft (0.21 m) higher than normal. And, we all remember damaging water surges and waves, with notable events like the rescue of hotel occupants via helicopter in the late 1980's.

### **Response to Comment PC534-9**

The commenter is referring to Appendix I3, Sea Level Rise and Wave Uprush Appendix of the Draft EIR (not Appendix I2 as identified in the header).

As described of Page 2 of Appendix I3, the sea level rise projections used in the analysis of the proposed project is a range of projections recommended by the California Ocean Protection Council over time (from 2000 to 2100). The projected sea level rise of 1.1 feet referenced by the commenter, is the high estimate for the amount of sea level rise at the project site in the year 2040. As stated in the same sentence on page 3.8-3 in the Draft EIR that cites a projected rise of 1.1 feet in 2040, the Draft EIR states that the projected rise in 2090 at the project site is from 0.99 feet to 4.5 feet. When covered to metric units, this is projected rise of 0.30 meters to 1.37 meters in 2090. This is consistent with the "standard prediction" of a one-meter increase by 2100 cited by

the commenter. As shown on Table 3.8-11, wave run-up estimates at the project site were analyzed based different sea level rise scenarios, including a potential rise of over one meter in 100 years. This was considered in the analysis of potential sea level rise impacts beginning on page 3.8-75 of the Draft EIR. As described therein, there is high degree of uncertainty associated with future sea level rise, and while sea level rise would not be affected by the proposed project, and project features, such as raising the northern portion of the project site would reduce the impacts, the impacts are considered significant. Mitigation measure MM HWQ-3: Sea Level Rise Adaption Plan, which requires the City to implementation adaptations as deemed necessary to address rising sea levels, would reduce impacts to less than significant. This approach is considered conservative, as the Court of Appeal has determined the CEQA analysis of the Playa Vista project near Venice did not have to include an analysis of sea-level rise, because sea-level rise isn't caused by the project. (*Ballona Wetlands Land Trust v. City of Los Angeles* (2011) 201 Cal.App.th 455 [“The Revised EIR Was Not Required to Discuss the Impact of Sea Level Rise on the Project.”].)

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC535****JIM VAUGHAN**

---

I don't want this massive development. Worst thing is how few people understand what is going to be built.

It's a disgusting to see a city abandon its responsibility to manage development. The city of Redondo Beach should be ashamed of itself.

**Response to Comment PC535-1**

The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC536****SOUTH BAY ASSOCIATION OF  
CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE**

---

**Comment PC536-1**

I hope this note finds you well. I am sure you have received quite a few emails over the past few weeks but I am just confirming the support letter from the South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce. I have reattached the letter for your records.

Thank you for all your time and attention.

I am writing you on behalf of the South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce (SBACC). The SBACC is a regional association of local chambers dedicated to regional issue advocacy in the South Bay of Los Angeles County. The SBACC represents seventeen chambers of commerce from Long Beach north to Westchester. Together, the members of the SBACC provide the leading advocacy voice for the regional business community of one of the most economically prosperous and culturally diverse regions in the entire nation.

The SBACC is in full support of revitalizing the Redondo Beach Waterfront. The Waterfront is intended, first and foremost, to benefit the surrounding community, including its local businesses. The current infrastructure at the waterfront, based on a recent study released by the Redondo Beach City Council, is old and in critical need of repair. According to the study, the cost of fixing this infrastructure could be more than \$100 million. The parking structures are only expected to survive with substantial investment another five to 10 years. With no investment they may need to be closed in the near future.

This vital project will create construction related jobs and an estimated 2,500 permanent jobs and additional employment through its indirect economic impact on surrounding local businesses, which are essential to the

livelihood of the Redondo Beach community. The project's design will increase local business sales and property values by providing residents and visitors with an attractive reason to eat, shop, and dine at the restaurants and local shops in Redondo Beach.

Thank you for all of your time and consideration on this matter.

### **Response to Comment PC536-1**

The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC537**

**DAWN LAMBERT**

---

#### **Comment PC537-1**

Sorry you are getting this email past the 5:30 p.m., January 19th deadline, however, I a.m. just now finding out about this. I do hope you will extend the deadline for hearing/reading and taking the communities comments under advisement.

Please leave the Redondo Beach Pier/Fisherman's Wharf and surrounding properties alone. They are part of our fair city's rich heritage and history. It's a very nostalgic place for 100s of thousands of people.

Tony's has been around for 64 years. It's basically a historical landmark.

Wildlife have come to depend on what the pier and wharf have to offer them and their survival. There are always a lot of people walking along the pier each and every day & night. Residents and tourists a like.

You can always find men, women and children of all ages casting their lines out and fishing off the pier.

The restaurants, especially Tony's, are always hustling and bustling with lots of customers.

A lot of people come down to the pier to catch the sun setting in the ocean, taking pictures and videotaping it as it goes down.

There are a lot of individuals who are employed by all the different vendors there who depend on their jobs to support their families.

The parking garage is always full. Which is a good source of revenue for the city or the vendors on the pier.

Each city should be allowed to have its own special charm and unique pier design that represents the city in which it is located. No two piers should ever look exactly alike.

Instead of destroying Redondo Beach Pier/Fisherman's Wharf and surrounding areas, help them to be maintained and kept safe for people to continue to come to and enjoy.

Thank you, in advance, for your help with this most important matter.

### **Response to Comment PC537-1**

Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC312-1 regarding Tony's On The Pier. The proposed project includes most or more of what the current site has to offer; including

coastal recreation (including fishing, boating, swimming, etc.), with people strolling the boardwalks and enjoying the sites amenities. Please see Draft EIR Section 3.3 for discussion of biological resources. As for businesses at the proposed project, refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. Please also see Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing for discussion of fishing opportunities in the Redondo Harbor after implementation of the proposed project. The commenter asserts that the parking garage is always full; the commenter is incorrect. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC538****DEEEE85**

---

**Comment PC538-1**

We need fishing to remain in the area i learnd there my children learned there and i want my grandchildren to learn there...its not all about technology. Children need the outdoors...

**Response to Comment PC538-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC539****JORDAN LATOUR**

---

**Comment PC539-1**

Redondo sportfishing is a back bone in the history of the city of redondo. It is one of the premier sportfishing landings in the United States and only brings a positive influence to the waterfront. What you may find unappealing to your eye a majority of people look at the large vessels of the waterfront with admiration and wonder improving their mood as they spend time at shopping, eating or just jogging through. Please leave redondo sportfishing alone so I may continue to support the landing and businesses in the City of Redondo Beach.

**Response to Comment PC539-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC540****TRAVIS PHELPS**

---

**Comment PC540-1**

Don't you dare let anything happen to Old Tony's. New shops etc. are good for growth, but there are other places. Gentrify elsewhere, please.

If we lose this part of the local culture, we lose a part of ourselves both personally and as a community.

My grandparents frequented Tony's. My parents met at Tony's.

It's where I would go for special occasions for dinner when I was younger. I had a steak at Tony's after

graduating high school.

Tony's is where I had my first drink on my 21st birthday, and where my friends and I meet when they're back in town, and where I take dates because there's something special about it.

Remodeling is great and all, but not when it threatens landmarks that should remain.

Do right by the city, develop things further, but don't cock-up the few good parts that still stand.

### **Response to Comment PC540-1**

Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC312-1 regarding Tony's On The Pier. As also detailed in Section 3.5, Geology and Soils of the Draft EIR, on page 3.5-20, inspections of the timber portion of the Horseshoe Pier where Tony's stands is from 1928, and although it has had maintenance over the years, this portion of the pier is aged and does not meet the current code requirements. As further discussed under Alternative 1 in Section 4.4.1 of the Draft EIR, given the poor condition of the timber portion of the Horseshoe Pier is in very poor condition and that portion of the pier, as well as the buildings, which includes Tony's and its companion structure, would be closed to the public in the future if the necessary structural repairs cannot be made. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC541**

**MRS FSHNADX**

---

#### **Comment PC541-1**

Sportfishing has a place on the new waterfront and should continue to be there. In my case if it wasn't for Sportfishing I would never visit the waterfront but always stay following a trip

### **Response to Comment PC541-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC542**

**JACOB H. BRAND**

---

#### **Comment PC542-1**

SPORTS FISHING OUT OF REDONDO BEACH HAS BEEN PART OF THE SOUTH BAYS HISTORY. REDONDO IS MUCH CLOSER TO THE GOOD FISHING OF THE AREA AROUND ROCKY POINT THAN IS MARINA DEL REY. THE LONGER RIDE AND THE UNCOMFORTABLE RETURN TRIP IN THE AFTERNOON ARE ELIMINATED WHEN YOU FISH OUT OF REDONDO.

PLEASE KEEP REDONDO OPEN TO SPORTS FISHING.

IT IS SOMETHING WE CAN ALL ENJOY.

### **Response to Comment PC542-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is

acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC542****JOHN & CYNTHIA REEDER****Comment PC543-1**

AS MEMBERS OF THE WATERFRONT COMMUNITY (THE VILLAGE AND SEASCAPES 1 & II ) WE WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT THERE IS ALREADY FAR TOO MUCH NOISE & TRAFFIC ON OCEAN, PACIFIC & CATALINA AVE'NUE'S.(ON WEEKENDS IT COULD BE NEW YORK CITY!)

THE PURPOSED NEW DEVELOPMENT WILL ADD MUCH UNWANTED VEHICULAR CONJESTION. TO THIS SMALL AREA JUST BELOW US.

THE SO CALLED REVITALIZATION ALSO THREATENS OUR HIGHLY PRIZED OCEAN VIEWS, NOT TO MENTION THE NOISE OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT.

OUR AIR QUALITY IS ALREADY EFFECTED BY THE AES PLANTS EYE SMARTING AND THROUT IRRITATING STEAM VENTING, AND ANY NEW TRAFFIC WILL JUST MAKE THE SITUATION WORSE, EVEN IF THE POWER PLANT IS REMOVED. MANY OF US FEEL THAT THE PERPOSED UPGRADE, MODIFICATION OR IN SOME CASES CLOSING OF SOME OF THE SMALL BUSINESSES ON AND AROUND THE PIER IS UNWARRENTED AND JUST A POOR IDEA.

NOTE THE FAILURE OF THE NOW INFAMOUS "SEAPORT VILLAGE" A TOP THE PIER PARKING STRUCTURE. BOTTOM LINE!

1. NO MALL NO MATTER HOW BIG OF SMALL
2. LIMIT HEIGHT OF ANY NEW BUILDINGS AS TO PERSERVE OCEAN VIEWS OF VILLAGE CONDOMINIUMS.
3. NO NEW OIL OR GAS DRILLING OF ANY KIND TO BE ALLOWED.
4. PRIVATE FUNDING OF ANY FUTURE CONSTRUCTION.
5. NO FAST FOOD, OR NEW LARGE CHAIN RESTAURANTS ALLOWED IN PIER AREA.
6. IMPROVE AIR AND WATER QUALITY IN PIER & BEACH AREA, FINE POLUTERS.
7. KEEP NEWLY FINISHED BIKE LANE ALONG OCEAN AVE. FOR BIKES, NOT THOUSANDS OF NEW TOURISTS.
8. SAVE "POLLY'S RESTAURANT AND OLD WOODEN PIER, REPAIR & STRENGHEN AS NECESSARY.

**Response to Comment PC543-1**

The commenter has provided general comments on environmental issues that does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. Noise is analyzed in Section 3.10 of the Draft EIR, which concluded that of the seven roadway segments evaluated; only the operational roadway noise increase on Torrance Boulevard between the Project site and Catalina Avenue was found to be a significant and unavoidable impact. The changes in noise levels along the other six roadway segments were found to be less than significant. Although a temporary annoyance, the Draft EIR did find noise during construction to be significant and unavoidable even with mitigation. Regarding general concerns regarding traffic associated with the proposed project, which was found to be less than significant, refer to Section 3.13 of the Draft EIR and Master Response #6: Summary of Traffic Impacts Associated with the Operation of the Proposed Project within this Final EIR.

Refer to Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development regarding the scale of development, as well as

Section 3.1 for aesthetics analysis and Section 3.9 for the projects consistency with approved heights at the site.

Refer to the Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site regarding the future development of the AES Power Plant site.

Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site regarding the viability of the development proposed at the project site, as well as appropriateness of land uses proposed at the site.

The proposed project is specifically designed as a new waterfront village, which would provide a distinctive high quality mixed-use environment to support the City's ongoing economic and recreational revitalization of the Waterfront, reducing seasonality, and renewing a source of pride for the community that honors Redondo Beach's rich history and family-friendly beach culture. Specifically, the proposed development would be mostly restaurant (35 percent), with 20 percent retail, 12 percent office, 24 percent boutique hotel and nine percent specialty cinema, which is not characteristic of 'a mall.' The proposed project would be consistent with approved growth, such as the approved 400,000 square feet of net new development cap in the waterfront (under Measure G and the City's certified Local Coastal Program).

There is no oil or gas drilling at the site and none is being proposed.

As detailed in Section 3.2, Air Quality in the Draft EIR, air pollutant emissions associated with the operation of the proposed project, including traffic, were analyzed for the proposed project. While there would be some significant short-term air quality construction impacts, the analysis found that operation of the proposed project would not exceed the regional thresholds established for the operational emissions of criteria air pollutants within the air district at either the project or cumulative level. In addition, the analysis determined that during operation the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to significant localized concentrations of criteria pollutants, nor would the proposed project expose sensitive receptors to objectionable odors or to localized significant pollutant concentrations with respect to traffic emissions and toxic air contaminants.

Regarding the bicycle lane, it is not clear to what the commenter is referring, although it may be the newly completed Herondo Gateway cycle track along Harbor Drive. Under the proposed project, the function of the Herondo Gateway cycle track would not be altered; however, ingress and egress to the project site (e.g., driveways) would be provided along the cycle track, as necessary. It would continue to be designed for bicycle use. The sidewalks along Harbor Drive, which would remain under the proposed project, are for use by pedestrians. In addition, the cycle track would be extended with the implementation of the proposed project (via the Pacific Avenue Reconnection).

Regarding Polly's and the Sportfishing Pier, please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing.

The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC544**

**CHERYL MUNDER**

---

**Comment PC544-1**

We hope the aesthetics are saved.....including Tony's. Let it remain a pier, not a mall.

**Response to Comment PC544-1**

Refer to Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development regarding the scale of development, as well as Section 3.1 for aesthetics analysis. Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC312-1 regarding Tony's On The Pier. Regarding the Sportfishing Pier, please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC545****ORPHA DESS WILSON**

---

**Comment PC545-1**

Reference 208210 Fisherman's Wharf which also includes Tony's Hats N' Things that leads into Old Tony's.

I don't like what I have heard the redevelopment plans are for the pier

Tony's is an Icon and should NEVER be changed, including their little shop~

I am against anything to do with changing Tony's on the Pier~ It has the best food anywhere and always has

**Response to Comment PC545-1**

Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC312-1 regarding Tony's On The Pier. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC546****CORI GRAHAM**

---

**Comment PC546-1**

I was disappointed to read on Facebook today that Old Tony's is up for discussion to be rehashed and, essentially, destroyed.

I am a 28 year old female who grew up in Redondo Beach and lived there 23 years. I am now a native and a tourist, living in Irvine, and I bring my friends/coworkers to the Redondo Pier all the time.

Why? Old Tony's.

We have Barney's Beanery and El Torito elsewhere in Southern California.

I live in a Master Planned Community... Irvine is the quintessential cookie-cutter city made of identical-looking strip malls and shopping complexes. Did you know Irvine has three CPK's? The monotony is the reason my friends and I make the journey to Redondo Beach frequently. To escape from the boring Subways and Cheesecake Factories and bask in the glory of live music and a Fire Chief in a Souvenir glass.

Part of what makes a beach city unique is its seaside attractions. When expensive malls line the beaches of California, all the charm of a city like Redondo that has been around for 125 years slowly slips into Buzzfeed articles about the "good old days" and Historical Society publications.

Please reconsider dramatically changing the Redondo Beach Pier and look into turning Old Tony's into a historical landmark. The iconic crow's nest is the centerpoint of the pier skyline and is arguably as well-

recognized as the King Harbor Sign.

### **Response to Comment PC546-1**

Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC312-1 regarding Tony's On The Pier. Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site regarding the development proposed at the project site. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC547**

**STEPHANY DEBSKI**

#### **Comment PC547-1**

Tony's on the Pier is a cultural landmark in the South Bay that is as iconic as the shoreline that borders the city. It has been the site of irreplaceable memories and moments for myself and thousands of other patrons for over 50 years. Removing Tony's would be a mistake. It serves as a gathering point for residents all over Los Angeles as a comfortable place to meet and enjoy the locale. No other establishment in the area exudes the welcoming atmosphere that Tony's does with its kitschy decor; my friends and I never consider any other restaurant on the Redondo Beach Pier. We always default to Tony's. Why change a good thing?

Please do not throw away a cultural gift that few cities are blessed to have. Please ensure a long and enjoyable future for the many people who enjoy and have yet to discover Tony's on the Pier.

### **Response to Comment PC547-1**

Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC312-1 regarding Tony's On The Pier. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC548**

**PAT ROSS**

#### **Comment PC548-1**

Please keep sportfishing at Redondo. Me and my 3 sons love to fish there. Please don't take that away from us. Thanks!

### **Response to Comment PC548-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC549**

**MATTHEW GRAY**

#### **Comment PC549-1**

Keep Tony's as it is!!!! Save Redondo Pier from gentrification. This is a local spot, for locals that grew up here, and for visitors looking for a local hot spot. This is not a commodity to be used as an exclusive urban resort for a generation of affluent new arrivals.

**Response to Comment PC549-1**

Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC312-1 regarding Tony's On The Pier. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC550****MATT PARKER**

---

**Comment PC550-1**

I writing to plead to you not to tear down Tony's. As a fourth generation Hermosa Beachian, the Redondo Pier has been a staple in my families lives. I understand that the South Bay is always evolving, and that gentrification is inevitable, but lets not erase what makes the Redondo Pier great, and that is institutions lake Tonys. It is a landmark, and should be protected and treated as such. Not torn down to make way for a massive chain with out any character.

**Response to Comment PC550-1**

Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC312-1 regarding Tony's On The Pier. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC551****ANN COOPER**

---

**Comment PC551-1**

I am a 50+ year resident of Redondo Beach and have worked in Redondo for almost 40 years. My husband and I enjoy Redondo and frequent the piers and waterfront often.

We are very enthused with the City's proposal to re-vitalize the waterfront and have attended the meetings to become informed with the EIR and hear the City and developers plans, and look forward to the facelift and infrastructure changes. There will undoubtedly be many things come up to be fine tuned and worked out, but we would ask our city planners to look hard at re- storing the Little Pier and saving it for future residents and visitors alike.

What it brings to the waterfront are what all the other beach cities from Palos Verdes to Malibu wish they still had! Access to boat rides, pier fishing nature and dining that our little pier holds along with the nostalgic aspect that holds so many memories for residents and visitors.

Please consider saving the Little Pier, sportfishing, whale watching and Polly's.

**Response to Comment PC551-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC552****SUSAN & DAVID UDEWITZ**

---

**Comment PC552-1**

My husband and I are very concerned about the extensive project you are planning. David and I have attended

several community meetings where we have voiced our concerns. We have also spoken individually with several of your representatives that were at these meetings. About 1 1/2 years ago we met Fred Bruning, CEO CenterCal Properties at their El Segundo facility.

We have looked carefully at the pictures showing us what the project will look like. The developer's representatives, have told us that they were taking our views under consideration and that they would adhere to the 2 story height limit.

They told us that they would not have parking on top of the second story, because it would be equal to a third story. The view corridor pictures of the condos in the 130 second floor building actually show a 3rd story view instead of a second story view. This was misleading because they have a 2 story underground parking structure. This was deceptive and intentionality sought to hide the most realistic view of the corridors (see photos below). It is clear to us that your height restrictions are not being enforced and that no consideration is being given to retaining our view corridor.

Currently, we have a view of the bay and breakwater. Your plan eliminates our view. A loss of the bay view will decrease the value of our property. At all costs, we want to avoid this problem. (see photos below)

We are located in Seascape II just across the street from Captain Kids Restaurant. (Pacific Ave and Harbor Drive). At the December meeting we saw your latest pictures that showed the corridor where you have shops, walkways, and a theater (on south side). Your planned corridor is taking away all of our water/rock views. In addition, the signage of the theater is higher than 2 stories which obstruct our views.

### **Response to Comment PC552-1**

As a point of clarification, the portions of the comment appear to be directed to the project applicant and some to the City. The comment does not introduce new environmental information, nor does it directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. It should be further noted that the City was not a participant in the meeting with CenterCal referenced by the commenter.

It is not clear to what view corridor pictures the commenters are referencing, but based on the description, it does not appear to match any figures provided in the Draft EIR. Regarding enforcement of the height restrictions, as discussed in Section 3.9, Land Use and Planning of the Draft EIR, the proposed project is consistent with the height limits allowed under the Coastal Zoning, which includes building up to three stories in the northeastern portion of the project site. See also Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development for more information and a figure showing the height limits throughout the project site.

The Draft EIR provides an analysis of public views in Section 3.1 under the threshold AES-1 addressing "local valued view available to the general public." However, private views are not considered a local valued view available to the general public. Your opinion on the proposed project is noted and your comment will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

### **Comment PC552-2**

We want to know what you are going to do about noise pollution, car pollution, lighting, flashing lights, delivery truck noise at all hours, congestion, fighting (look at Police response reports for an entire year in this area by Sombas and Captain Kids), and the bike lane and backed up traffic all the way past PCH and 190th.

We hope that sound proofing all the condominiums from Seascape condos will be at the builder's cost since the construction will be over several years and the noise from this development will be attenuated.

Our concerns are:

Our Ocean Bay view

Noise pollution

Two story adherence

Enclosed, please find pictures of our present view corridor.

*[A duplicate of this comment letter followed, as well as photos, which can be viewed in the PDF of the comment letter in Volume II of the Final EIR]*

### **Response to Comment PC552-2**

This comment raises general environment issues, which are addressed in the Draft EIR as follows: Noise is addressed in Section 3.10, Noise (see Section 3.10.4), of the Draft EIR; air quality (i.e., pollution from vehicles) is addressed in Section 3.2, Air Quality (see Section 3.2.4); lighting is addressed in Section 3.1, Aesthetics and Visual Resources (see Impact AES-3 in Section 3.1.4); delivery truck noise is addressed in Section 3.10, Noise (see Impact NOI-1 in Section 3.10.4), as well as Response to Comments PC039-4 and PC080-2; congestion is addressed in Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation (see Section 3.13.4), as well as Master Response #6: Summary of Traffic Impacts Associated with the Operation of the Proposed Project; public safety is address in Section 3.11, Public Services (see Impact PBS-2 in Section 3.12.4); views are addressed in Section 3.1, Aesthetics and Visual Resources (see Impact AES-1 in Section 3.1.4), as well as Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development; and compliance with height requirements in address in Section 3.9, Land Use and Planning (see Impact LUP-1 in Section 3.9-4).

Regarding soundproofing, please see Response to Comments PC020-3 and PC039-7 for discussion of noise impacts and mitigation. As discussed in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project is required to comply with the Redondo Beach Municipal Code, which includes restrictions on lighting, which include the provision that light sources associated shall not be visible from the street or surrounding residential properties and the lighting shall be reflected aware from adjacent residential premises. (RBMC Section 10-5.1706(c)(10).)

The Draft EIR provides an analysis of public views in Section 3.1 under the threshold AES-1 addressing “local valued view available to the general public.” Thank you for the photographs, however, private views are not considered a local valued view available to the general public.

Your opinion on the proposed project is noted and your comment will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC553**

**CAITLYN HUTTINGER**

---

### **Comment PC553-1**

I was born and raised in the South Bay and the redondo pier and Tony's are some of the only parts of the South Bay that remain the same! Please don't get rid of the history here!!!! It's what makes where we live so unique!

Reference 208210 Fisherman's Wharf which also includes Tony's Hats N' Things that leads into Old Tony's.  
<http://redondo.org/news/displaynews.asp?NewsID=2620&TargetID>

*[The webpage referenced has been download and is included in the PDF of the comment letter in Volume II of the Final EIR]*

### **Response to Comment PC553-1**

Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC312-1 regarding Tony's On The Pier. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC554**

**SUZANNE CARLSON**

#### **Comment PC554-1**

I have been informed that there are some possible changes coming to the pier. I am really hoping that the pier stays intact and the business continue to thrive. Those long term businesses are more important then you know. We are from the Midwest and have been visiting twice, but each of those visits yielded several stops to the pier. I am an anxious to get back there soon.

### **Response to Comment PC554-1**

It is unclear as to which pier the commenter is referring to. Please refer to Section 3.4 Cultural Resources of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC312-1 regarding Tony's On The Pier. Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC555**

**LUKE HUMPHREY**

#### **Comment PC555-1**

Please keep redondo sportfishing alive I caught my first yellows on the Indian and had the best times of my life on that boat and would hate to see it leave.

### **Response to Comment PC555-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC556**

**JIM KANEMAKI**

#### **Comment PC556-1**

I am writing to you in regards to the possible closure of the Sportfishing Landing.

There are a number of us Locals which fish these waters for recreation. It's our sanctuary.

I view tearing down the sportfishing landings would create new small businesses turn out to look like vacant "Ports of Call" of San Pedro. Many of these San Pedro small businesses have gone under which makes "Ports of Call" look like the "twilight zone". By keeping the sportfishing operations going, it allows our harbor to maintain its Old World charm ie...San Francisco. Of course, the City of Redondo can still construct ie.."clothing outlet" which will bring in business, but why not compromise to maintain the charm of Old Redondo for people

who live here? Sportfishing is becoming an "in thing" for us professionals along with blue-collar workers who live in the South Bay.

Please keep me informed of our city's decision

### **Response to Comment PC556-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC557**

**AGNES M MORSE**

---

#### **Comment PC557-1**

I often visit Redondo Beach and was deeply disturbed when I found out that there is the possibility that the Pier may be closed, or worse destroyed. There is so much culture and history to the area, the pier and the restaurants that it would be a SHAME if this area we to be closed.

Too often in California we replace the old with the new and many, many times it is not for the better. I get it everyone wants the shiny new penny BUT at some point we need to stop behaving like spoiled children and recognize the value and importance of what once was and respect it as it should be and certainly has earned the right to be.

It for the most part boils down to money so I guess I must add that should the city close/remove The Waterfront and it's businesses I will take my business else where were the people respect the culture.

I hope my opinion matters!!!

### **Response to Comment PC557-1**

It is assumed that the commenter is referring to the Sportfishing Pier. Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. To the extent the commenter is referencing the Horseshoe Pier, please see Response to Comment PC312-1. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

### **COMMENT LETTER NO. PC558**

**MARK**

---

#### **Comment PC558-1**

May this msg serve as a petition of one of the many who oppose the so called "upgrade" of tearing down the little pier, tackle shops, restaurants and all business around redondo beach landing. Pls save redondo beach landing and all businesses round it.

### **Response to Comment PC558-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC559****DEBBY MCCURDY**

---

**Comment PC559-1**

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the DEIR Environmental Impact Report. I realize this is after the deadline, but was out of town. I have several concerns about the proposed projects.

The main one is that it changes the cultural setting of the beach area. Currently Redondo Beach has a lovely beach front that allows the occupants and visitors the calming effects of a beach community. One can stand on the pier and smell the sea, hear the seals bark and see the pelicans fly overhead. It is a compromise between nature and man. There are many species that live in the Redondo Beach area that may be harmed by the increased crowds and pollution of the proposed "mall" with the hopes of making Redondo Beach a mob scene of shoppers. Are there protective features in place to ensure that the sea life and the birds and animals that depend on the sea for survival are not impacted by living in a crowded shopping area rather than a beach community with the restrictions that promote the health and survival of our beaches? Is there well being ensured with the current proposals?

One of the joys for many of the residents of inner city Los Angeles, is that there is transportation to a beach. How will this impact these people who come for a beach experience. In a busy commercial setting, the quietude of the beach is lost and there is not the mental and health benefits for so many LA residents. My impression is that the hope is to make Redondo Beach more like Manhattan Beach to draw a wealthier clientele. I suppose this is the natural approach for a businessman, but a sad reflection that it is not important for all aspects of our society to experience a natural setting on a day of rest.

The proposal will make the beach a regular "mall". The sensation of the beach community will be lost and there will be traffic, smog, and not enough parking spaces. Why would the city want this at a beautiful beach area? We have enough areas inland that are not impacted by this loss of beauty for economic gain. Is there a plan in place for the area to retain its natural beauty and keep the vistas open. I do hope so, as our country seems to be intent on become one large unimpressive mall with all areas having the same look. I recall going to Palo Alto and being disappointed to see no distinction between that area and SoCal- strip mall after strip mall beading the roadway. Is there no uniqueness to our communities in the present age? At least now, Redondo Beach looks unique, but the proposal will certainly destroy that and propose it become a common mall scene. What will happen if it is not a financial success? Are there plans for it to be a weekend only shopping mall, since for many, it is hard to get to the beach area on a busy work day. If it does not survive, will it become like the sad surroundings at the Ports of Call? It always reminds me of a ghost town and the buildings are slowly and sadly deteriorating.

**Response to Comment PC559-1**

The commenter does not specify in what ways the project would harm the species that live in the Redondo Beach area. Regarding natural resources at the waterfront (existing and with the project), refer to Section 3.3, Biological Resources of the Draft EIR, which details wildlife and vegetation (on land as well as in the water) and provides implementation of mitigation measures that would reduce impacts to less than significant. Please also see Draft EIR Section 3.4 for discussion of Cultural Resources, Section 3.2 for discussion of Air Quality, Section 3.1 for discussion of Aesthetics, and Chapter 5 for discussion of Urban Decay.

Regarding how the project will impact ability for residents of the inner city to enjoy the beach, as noted, in Draft EIR Section 3.13.2.3.4 (in Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation), the project site is well served by transit service under existing conditions and this will not change under the proposed project. As for the types of businesses associated with the proposed project, see Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site.

The proposed project is specifically designed as a new waterfront village, which would provide a distinctive high quality mixed-use environment to support the City's ongoing economic and recreational revitalization of the Waterfront, reducing seasonality, and renewing a source of pride for the community that honors Redondo Beach's rich history and family-friendly beach culture. Specifically, the proposed development would be mostly restaurant (35 percent), with 20 percent retail, 12 percent office, 24 percent boutique hotel and nine percent specialty cinema, which is not characteristic of 'a mall.'

The comment states an opinion but does not introduce new environmental information. Your comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC560****GREGORY GORDON HOWLIND**

---

**Comment PC560-1**

My family and I have been coming to Polly's on the Pier since the early 1970's. The maintenance/upkeep required to sustain its operation, not to mention the fishing boat ops, seems a small price to pay/absorb to protect one of our landmark heritage sites. It may be one of the last remaining 20th century-era coffee shops and meeting places that define Redondo Beach as a long-gone escape from the hustle-bustle of the concrete-city-scape. Don' tear it down! Don't move it to an out-of-the-way parking lot :)

**Response to Comment PC560-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**COMMENT LETTER NO. PC561****WENDY CIRELLI**

---

**Comment PC561-1**

Hello My name is Wendy I was at the oier just the other day I saw all the flyers on save the pier. I understand that from speaking to the sports fishing personnel that the city wants to knock all these places and renovate the whole area by on the rocks pollys and other surroundings. That is a very bad idea There are a ton of people that love pollys that fish on pier and also go on 1/2 day fishing boats also use that concrete road to bike ride and walk. Also if this took place I beige that in the long run no one will be able to afford rents and shopping it will end up empty businesses. Now im all 4 fixing up what is there now its pretty darn old can really use a big face lift but not to do what is being talked about and trying to vote yes. I say NO! Bad idea.

**Response to Comment PC561-1**

Please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comment is acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR and presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

## **2.3.6 Draft EIR Public Meetings Transcripts**

For the oral comments, a copy of the transcript from each of the three public meetings is provided, and responses to each comment as bracketed follow: Where commenters also submitted written correspondence, the responses below should be read in conjunction with responses to their written comments.

PM1

CERTIFIED COPY

THE WATERFRONT PROJECT  
 DRAFT EIR PUBLIC MEETING  
 REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

November 21, 2015

Vivian C. Lane, CSR No. 11339

SINCE 1972 **400493** 

**BARKLEY**  
 CONFERENCE  
 barkley.com

(310) 207-8000 Los Angeles  
 (310) 207-8000 Century City  
 (916) 922-5777 Sacramento  
 (951) 686-0900 Riverside  
 (212) 828-8500 New York City  
 (312) 979-5566 Chicago

(415) 423-5777 San Francisco  
 (202) 895-0650 San Jose  
 (800) 222-1231 Martinez  
 (818) 702-0202 Woodland Hills  
 (347) 821-4611 Brooklyn  
 0011600 222 1231 Paris

(949) 955-0400 Irvine  
 (780) 322-8200 Palm Springs  
 (702) 365-0500 Las Vegas  
 (702) 365-0500 Henderson  
 (516) 600-1010 Albany  
 0011600 222 1231 Dubai

(659) 455-5444 San Diego  
 (800) 222-1231 Carlsbad  
 (800) 222-1231 Manteca  
 (516) 277-9494 Garden City  
 (814) 610-9110 White Plains  
 (001) 11800 222 1231 Hong Kong

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 THE WATERFRONT PROJECT  
10 DRAFT EIR PUBLIC MEETING  
11 REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA  
12 SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2015  
13 9:13 A.M.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
20 WATERFRONT PROJECT, DRAFT EIR PUBLIC MEETING  
21 at The Crowne Plaza, 300 North Harbor Drive,  
22 Redondo Beach, California, on Saturday,  
23 November 21, 2015 at 9:13 a.m. before  
24 Vivian C. Lane, Certified Shorthand Reporter  
25 No. 11339.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES OF PRESENTERS:

DOROTHY MEYER  
Principal Planner  
CDM SMITH  
111 Academy Way  
Suite 150  
Irvine, California 92617  
(949)930-7259  
meyerdl@cdmsmith.com

AARON S. JONES  
Community Development Director  
REDONDO BEACH  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
415 Diamond Street  
Redondo Beach, California 90277  
(310)318-0537 x1-2200  
aaron.jones@redondo.org



1 REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2015

2 9:13 A.M.

3

4 MS. MEYER: Good morning, everybody. I just wanted  
5 to say good morning and welcome. And I just wanted to  
6 let you know that the presentation is going to start in  
7 about five minutes, and then following the presentation,  
8 we'll be opening up for public comments.

9 So if you haven't given a speaker card yet --  
10 it's one of these -- please feel free to fill one out.  
11 There's some in the back of the room and also in the  
12 little alcove, and you can give it to myself or any other  
13 staff person or anyone with a lanyard.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. JONES: Just a quick announcement. We're going  
16 to begin in about two minutes. So anybody that's out in  
17 the lobby, please come on in if you want to hear the  
18 introduction.

19 All right. Good morning, everyone. Thank you,  
20 and welcome to the first of three public workshops on the  
21 Waterfront Draft Environmental Impact Report. I  
22 especially appreciate everyone taking time out of their  
23 busy Saturday. Coming to a meeting like this on a  
24 Saturday morning shows that you care about the community,  
25 and we appreciate you coming. The most important purpose

1 of today's meeting is to hear from you. The intent is to  
2 receive comments on the Draft Waterfront Environmental  
3 Impact Report.

4 A little bit of background: On Tuesday night  
5 the Mayor and Council began the public review process by  
6 receiving and filing the Draft EIR. This is a very  
7 important step and milestone in the process. It is, in  
8 fact, the launch of the review period for receiving  
9 public comments on this Draft.

10 Prior to Tuesday night's action, on  
11 November 3rd, the City Council received the report and  
12 approved the outreach and public input process for the  
13 EIR. The City Council approved our staff recommendation  
14 that the public review period actually be extended for  
15 this project to 63 days rather than a traditional 45-day  
16 period. This was due to the holidays as well as due to  
17 the complexity of this project.

18 So Council also directed that we perform a  
19 citywide mailing, and we mailed over 30,000 specific  
20 letters to every resident in the community for this  
21 project. In addition, in terms of outreach and noticing,  
22 the city posted over 70 signs around the project area.  
23 Hopefully, you've seen those. We've placed two large  
24 display format ads in the newspaper. We utilized the  
25 local cable access channel to provide information to the

1 community; we issued press releases; we placed an article  
2 in the City's recreation newsletter that you'll see that  
3 comes out very shortly; and we issued an email blast to  
4 everyone that has commented on or expressed an interest  
5 in this project. And as I can see from today's  
6 attendance, it worked, which is good.

7 Now, back to the EIR, the Draft EIR that you're  
8 reviewing at this time is without a doubt the most  
9 complete and comprehensive EIR that the City has ever  
10 produced. It's the result of a lot of hard work, a lot  
11 of hard work by experts and our staff and has taken over  
12 18 months to complete. We, in preparing the document,  
13 utilized no fewer than 14 specific experts in their field  
14 to prepare the analysis. Most importantly, the experts  
15 provided us with not only the disclosure information  
16 about potential impacts of this project, but they also  
17 identified mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate the  
18 impacts that were identified.

19 The identification of impacts of this project  
20 and identification of mitigation measures is really the  
21 core purpose of the Environmental Impact Report. The  
22 Waterfront Draft Environmental Impact Report is highly  
23 technical, and we're going to do our best to explain that  
24 in plain English to you. If anybody has questions, raise  
25 your hand because we need to know if you're understanding

1 the language that we're using. I encourage each of you  
2 to read the Draft Environmental Impact Report and provide  
3 us with your comments on the document. There will be  
4 many ways to express your opinions. That will be  
5 explained by Dorothy in her presentation, and again, the  
6 purpose of today's presentation is not to tell you about  
7 the project but to hear from you about your interest,  
8 concerns and comments.

9 So with that, I'd like to turn it over to  
10 Dorothy, and she'll get right into it.

11 MS. MEYER: Thank you, Aaron.

12 Good morning. So the purpose of the meeting  
13 today is to give you at least a summary of the proposed  
14 project, tell you the areas studied in the Draft EIR,  
15 talk about the impact conclusions of the Draft EIR, and  
16 as Aaron said, mitigation measures that we determined  
17 would reduce the impacts as well as how tonight [sic.]  
18 you can provide input into the process as well as during  
19 the 63-day review period.

20 So here is the boundary of the project. The  
21 waterfront that we're proposing to revitalize is  
22 36 acres, and that's land and water acreage, and it's  
23 part of the city's 150 acre waterfront. As you can see,  
24 it's in the south from about Torrance Circle and the  
25 Horseshoe Pier, or Municipal Pier, and it goes all the

1 way up to Portofino Way and Harbor Drive.

2 The Waterfront Project would remove the Pier  
3 parking structure as well as 219,881 square feet of  
4 existing structures. Pretty much all the structures on  
5 the site would be removed with the exception of  
6 Kincaid's, a restroom facility at Seaside Lagoon, and we  
7 would do minor modifications to the Plaza parking  
8 structure.

9 So the project would develop 523,939 square  
10 feet of development, but of that, only 304,058 would be  
11 net new development. Two sets of numbers are used  
12 throughout the environmental document. For the purposes  
13 of CEQA, the net new square footage is the 304,058 square  
14 feet net new development. For purposes of the allowable  
15 development within the harbor area under the local  
16 coastal plan, the net new development is 290,113. This  
17 is because the CEQA net new square footage is based on  
18 the development at the site when we went out with our  
19 Notice of Preparation in 2014, while the allowable harbor  
20 square footage for the net new development is based on  
21 what was on the site in 2008. So the difference is about  
22 14,000 square feet, and it's because of the Octagon  
23 Building. The Octagon Building existed in 2008, and it  
24 was demolished in 2013, so it wasn't on site when we did  
25 our CEQA baseline, which was 2014.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me. What's the square  
2 footage of the new parking garage, and that's not in that  
3 square footage, correct?

4 MS. MEYER: Correct, it's not.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So what's the square  
6 footage --

7 MS. MEYER: Could we hold the comments to the  
8 room and the -- so that we can get everybody's comments  
9 first --

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. So we're not supposed  
11 to raise hands?

12 MS. MEYER: I would appreciate it if we just get  
13 through the presentation, we'll listen to everybody's  
14 comments, and then we have staff available to take  
15 questions, okay? Thank you.

16 Okay. The proposed project is intended to  
17 revitalize a portion of the City's Waterfront by  
18 redeveloping and expanding local- and visitor-serving  
19 commercial uses, enhancing public access and coastal  
20 recreational opportunities and improving the aging  
21 support infrastructure at the site. The project also  
22 proposes improvements in site connectivity, public access  
23 and open space along the waterfront. It's designed as a  
24 new waterfront village that seeks to integrate the best  
25 of the public and private needs and interests in a

1 revitalized village that would provide broad coastal  
2 access and interest and enjoyment.

3 The proposed Waterfront Village concept  
4 analyzed in the Draft EIR was based on approximately  
5 12 percent office, 20 percent retail, 35 percent  
6 restaurant, 24 percent boutique hotel and 9 percent  
7 related to the specialty theater. All of these are  
8 consistent with the goals and objectives of the City's  
9 local coastal program.

10 So the project site is defined in terms of  
11 three areas, three geographical areas in the  
12 environmental document. So the northern portion is the  
13 yellow. It's about 19.5 acres, and then the southern  
14 portion is about 13 acres, and that's kind of like a  
15 peachy-orange color there. And then Basin 3 is about  
16 3.5 acres of water area.

17 As you can also -- you can't really see this,  
18 but it's on every graphic in the EIR. We do have a small  
19 little dashed area next to the boat ramp, proposed boat  
20 ramp location, and that denotes the underwater footprint  
21 for the breakwater that's being proposed at that boat  
22 ramp location.

23 Based on the three geographical areas, in the  
24 northern portion of the project site, all the structures  
25 except for the Plaza parking structure and the restroom

1 building at Seaside Lagoon would be removed. The Draft  
2 EIR also analyzed the removal of the Sports Fishing Pier  
3 and two options: One is putting back the Sports Fishing  
4 Pier as a concrete pier with some retail or restaurant on  
5 top of it or not putting it back at all. So the EIR  
6 looked at both of those options. There's a proposed new  
7 parking structure at the northeastern portion of the  
8 project, and then there's a market hall, which is the  
9 part by Basin 3, and also a specialty theater would be on  
10 the northern portion of the site.

11 Public recreation in this area would include  
12 enhanced public open space and pedestrian and bicycle  
13 pathways.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you have a pointer so when  
15 you're talking about an area --

16 MS. MEYER: I'm afraid I don't, but I can go up  
17 there.

18 Okay. So one of the other things in the  
19 northern portion is the opening of the Seaside Lagoon.

20 Right here (indicating).

21 And the replacement of the boat hoist in  
22 Basin 3. And with the boat hoists, after they remove  
23 them, they would put in the proposed small craft boat  
24 launch facility. That's where currently Joe's Crab Shack  
25 is. Also, there would be enhanced boardwalks in that

1 southern area along where Joe's Crab Shack is and also  
2 other enhanced site connectivities by a small main street  
3 that would go through the center of the northern part of  
4 the project.

5 In the southern portion of the project, the  
6 Pier parking structure and Pier Plaza would be removed  
7 and a new Pier Plaza structure would be built along with  
8 a boutique hotel with new commercial businesses below.  
9 The new parking structure would be in the layout that  
10 would be different than today cause right now bicyclists  
11 and pedestrians have to navigate through the parking  
12 structure; so that would be eliminated through  
13 development of this project.

14 The southern part of the Horseshoe Pier where  
15 Tony's is is the only remaining original portion of the  
16 Pier that wasn't destroyed by fire in '88, and that  
17 portion of the Pier would be demolished but rebuilt as a  
18 concrete pier to match the remaining portion of the  
19 Horseshoe Pier. And once it's rebuilt, there would be  
20 new retail and restaurants on top of the Pier.

21 Basin 3 would -- there would be the removal of  
22 the International Boardwalk and that elevated walkway to  
23 make room for a -- the reconnection of Pacific Avenue.  
24 There would also be a pedestrian bridge that would  
25 span -- and it would be a drawbridge, and it would span

1 the entrance to Basin 3 and it would be for bicyclists  
2 and pedestrians. And then we would also, as part of a  
3 project, repair the bulkhead and cap in Basin 3 and also  
4 replace all the vessel slips with concrete. They're  
5 currently wood, and they would replace the vessel slips  
6 in the Redondo Beach Marina.

7 So other improvements, which I kind of hinted  
8 to was the demolition or removal of the International  
9 Boardwalk and that elevator walkway. There would be a  
10 new roadway called the Pacific Avenue Reconnection, and  
11 that would connect the northern and the southern portions  
12 of the site. There would also be new bicycle and  
13 pedestrian pathways that would be a part of the Pacific  
14 Avenue Reconnection. And also other things that are  
15 occurring on site would be updating aging infrastructure,  
16 storm drains, sewers. And also in the northern  
17 particularly, they're going to elevate the site and that  
18 would help with regards to future sea level rise.

19 Also a part of the project is to create more  
20 high quality public open space and gathering spaces  
21 where, you know, there'd be more public seating,  
22 gathering areas and pathways.

23 As a reminder of how we got to the Draft EIR,  
24 back in June of last year 2014, we went out with a Notice  
25 of Preparation of the Environmental Impact Report, and as

1 part of that, we had an open house where a lot  
2 of -- maybe a lot of you attended. It was quite -- quite  
3 widely attended. We received about 90-plus comments that  
4 evening and that was a 30-day review period and we  
5 received 260 comments on the environmental document and  
6 the project from y'all, and that helped us in doing the  
7 analysis that you see out there.

8           So the purpose of the Draft EIR is to disclose  
9 to the public and the decision makers the potential  
10 environmental consequences from construction and  
11 operation of the proposed project. Impacts associated  
12 with the project are identified in the environmental  
13 document as either being no impact; a less than  
14 significant impact, which means that there would be no  
15 substantial adverse change in the environment because of  
16 the project; or less than significant with mitigation;  
17 that is, if we did find that there was a potential for  
18 there to be a substantial adverse change, could we do  
19 something to the project or make the project -- another  
20 element on the project that would reduce that and that's  
21 less than significant with mitigation. And if we can't,  
22 then we would have a significant and unavoidable adverse  
23 impact.

24           So the Draft EIR that's out there and that  
25 you're reviewing has an Executive Summary, it has a

1 detailed project description; so it's Chapter 2. So I  
2 definitely recommend that you look at Chapter 2 because  
3 this is only a brief summary and a lot of the details  
4 that you would want are in Chapter 2. And then we  
5 describe existing conditions and environmental impacts  
6 related to 14 environmental resource areas. And as you  
7 can see them up here -- and under each one of them,  
8 there's at least a couple of different impacts that we  
9 looked at, and we'll go through those as we talk about  
10 the impacts that we studied and our findings. So we did  
11 this for the proposed project and we also looked at each  
12 one of these resource areas for the alternatives  
13 analysis. And we'll talk about the alternatives towards  
14 the end of this presentation.

15           So the findings of the Environmental Impact  
16 Report: So we did find one finding of no impact related  
17 to recreation. It was that the proposed project would  
18 not include a recreation facility or require the  
19 construction or expansion of a recreational facility that  
20 would have an adverse effect on the environment not  
21 already addressed as part of the project. For less than  
22 significant impacts, for aesthetics we looked at  
23 designated local views, visual character, light and  
24 glare, air quality. We looked at operational emissions  
25 being less than significant as well as odors for

1 construction and operation.

2 For biological resources, we found that the  
3 project wouldn't have an impact on riparian or sensitive  
4 natural communities and we would not conflict with any of  
5 the policies or ordinances protecting biological  
6 resources.

7 For geology and soils, in compliance with  
8 building codes, there would be no adverse impact related  
9 to seismic or any other seismic related issues or  
10 substantial soil erosion.

11 For greenhouse gas, the impact was less than  
12 significant because we would not create substantial  
13 greenhouse gas emissions nor would we conflict with any  
14 policies with regards to reduction of greenhouse gas.

15 For hazards and hazardous materials, the  
16 project itself would not create a hazard or risk of upset  
17 and we would not interfere with emergency evacuation or  
18 emergency response plans.

19 For hydrology water quality, we would not  
20 violate any water quality standards and we would not  
21 substantially change the drainage of the site or cause  
22 flooding.

23 For land use, it was less than significant  
24 because we would not conflict with any applicable plans  
25 and policies.

1 For noise, we would not expose sensitive  
2 receptors to noise levels above the City's standards.

3 For public services, we would not require the  
4 need for more police or fire facilities to maintain  
5 services; and as a note for police, we will be continuing  
6 to have on the site the police substation. It will be  
7 moved somewhere else on the site, but that facility will  
8 remain as part of this project.

9 For recreation, the project would not increase  
10 the use of existing neighborhood facilities that would  
11 cause a deterioration of those facilities and it would  
12 not cause a need to construct other new recreational  
13 facilities that are not a part of our project already.

14 For traffic, we would not conflict with congestion  
15 management program, and for utilities we would not exceed  
16 existing water, wastewater, solid waste, electricity or  
17 natural gas supplies.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That doesn't make sense.

19 MS. MEYER: So the less than significant with  
20 mitigation. As I mentioned earlier, that means that we  
21 could have had a substantial adverse effect. However, we  
22 were able to put mitigation on the project that would  
23 reduce that level of significance to less than  
24 significant. And so we have that for biological  
25 resources, for construction and operation, and it was

1 related to possible nuisance during construction to  
2 marine mammals as well as the California grunion, should  
3 they run during the time of construction

4 And for cultural resources it was for  
5 construction and was related to if we were to have --  
6 accidentally find an archeological or something  
7 paleontological, either one of those, that we were able  
8 to mitigate as well.

9 For operation for -- well, for hydrology and  
10 water quality, it was mitigation related to a wave uprush  
11 and future effects of sea level rise. We were able to  
12 mitigate that.

13 And for traffic and transportation, we were  
14 able to mitigate six existing intersections that we would  
15 potentially affect during operation and -- well, during  
16 construction. And parking management, there was a  
17 parking management plan as part of dealing with parking  
18 on the site and mitigation to lessen any safety conflicts  
19 between the new boat ramp facility and the open Seaside  
20 Lagoon.

21 Actually, go back one. I'm sorry.

22 So significant and unavoidable; These are the  
23 ones where we either added mitigation and it still was  
24 significant or there wasn't mitigation available so that  
25 we could reduce the impacts. So during construction,

1 which is short term, we found that air quality -- there  
2 were six different emission -- pollutant emissions that  
3 we looked at, and of the six, two of them we could not  
4 reduce to less than significant, and that's nitrogen  
5 oxide and carbon monoxide.

6 For cultural resources, historical resources:  
7 So we found that those potentially historic were the  
8 Horseshoe Pier, Tony's on the Pier and its assessed  
9 rebuilding, a Sports Fishing Pier; that those  
10 were -- those were potentially historic and because they  
11 would be demolished, we couldn't mitigate that. How can  
12 you -- we did mitigate, but we could not fully mitigate  
13 it.

14 And for noise: During construction, there  
15 would be vibration and an increase in ambient levels, and  
16 with that, even though we could reduce the impacts, we  
17 couldn't completely eliminate it, and particularly the  
18 nuisance of construction.

19 During operation, which is long-term, we have  
20 hydrology and water quality, and that is the impact of a  
21 tsunami. Although, it's a very rare occurrence, it is  
22 always a possibility. And so we would be putting more  
23 structures down at the project site. And so you would  
24 still have an impact from tsunamis, as you do now.

25 And then noise: There was an increase in

1 ambient levels at Torrance Circle, and because of where  
2 the condominiums are, there's just no way of mitigating  
3 that type of noise.

4           So the mitigation measures that we provided in  
5 the document and put on the project include modernization  
6 of the fleet, low VOC coatings and paintings, and these  
7 were meant to reduce impacts to reactive organic gases as  
8 well as nitrogen oxide and carbon monoxide and it was  
9 able to bring down the reactive organic gases but didn't  
10 finish reducing NOx or CO.

11           In terms of the biological resources, the  
12 marine mammal protection, again it was about pile driving  
13 and making sure that the marine mammals were out of the  
14 area or a safe distance during construction in the water.  
15 If the California grunion were to run during  
16 construction, we have a mitigation for that, also, if,  
17 you know, putting in a breakwater and opening up the  
18 Lagoon, there's a balance between surface coverage and  
19 also fill for waters of the U.S.; so we had mitigation  
20 for that.

21           Cultural resources: Like I said, once you've  
22 taken and reduced those structures, you can't mitigate  
23 them fully. However, we would record the structures and  
24 make sure that that got to the Department of Interior's  
25 hands so that they would have it all recorded. We would

1 have an interpreted program. We would also protect the  
2 Monstad Pier. He's one of the older piers as well. We  
3 would protect him during construction. And the Phase I  
4 archeological work and paleontological monitoring would  
5 help us should there be something of archeological or  
6 paleontological significance at the site during  
7 construction.

8           Hydro water quality: The tsunami/seiche  
9 awareness modification program would occur on the site  
10 for operation, and that would be a method of getting  
11 people out of the area should there be one of those types  
12 of natural occurrences. And wave uprush protection, we  
13 have splash walls and ways of protecting the southern  
14 part of the project should sea level rise and waves  
15 occur. And also, again, the sea level rise adaptation  
16 plan, how the City is going to manage the waterfront in  
17 the future, and we're talking 40-plus years from now.

18           For noise, these are construction mitigation:  
19 File driving migration, putting mufflers on equipment,  
20 doing things for stationary equipment so that they would  
21 be either protected -- so that people wouldn't have to  
22 hear them as much, and, let's see, staging areas would be  
23 away from residences; electrically powered tools and  
24 facilities would be used and sound barriers would be used  
25 as appropriate to protect anybody from noise from.

1 offsite.

2 Traffic and transportation: Again, I mentioned  
3 parking management, boat ramp and personal watercraft  
4 interference management. That's to help reduce any  
5 impacts or conflicts between the new boat ramp and the  
6 opening of Seaside Lagoon. And then, as I mentioned, we  
7 have six intersections where there might be operational  
8 impacts, but we were able to either put in a signal or  
9 add lanes to reduce that impact to less than significant.

10 And here are the different intersections: The  
11 first one in Hermosa Beach is a signal. And then this  
12 board that you're going to see is actually out on this  
13 side of the lobby, and it has the locations of the other  
14 five. And also, the sixth one is a little stark at the  
15 top, but the other five intersections where there would  
16 be sort of physical change to that intersection to  
17 mitigate that impact.

18 So an Environmental Impact Report must consider  
19 a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives  
20 that would reduce at least one of the significant  
21 environmental impacts of the proposed project, and it  
22 also must meet most of the proposed project objectives.  
23 So we have seven true mitigation -- I mean, true  
24 alternatives that we looked at. Alternative 1 is no  
25 project, no build. That means nothing would happen at

1 the site. There would be continued growth still in the  
2 area, but we wouldn't do anything at the site.  
3 Alternative 2 is also a no project, but it also would --  
4 you know, the Pier parking structure is falling apart; so  
5 you can't leave that like that forever. So you'd have to  
6 do something with that. There would have to be something  
7 done with the Sports Fishing Pier because it's also  
8 deteriorating. You would have to do something with the  
9 Horseshoe Pier because it has problems. So there are  
10 things that you would have to do, the City would have to  
11 do, to make the -- keep the place running. And so that's  
12 Alternative 2.

13           Alternative 3 is what we call the "Landside  
14 Development Only," and it's the No Federal Action  
15 Alternative. That means anything that would have  
16 anything to do with the water or would need a federal  
17 permit, like from the Army Corp of Engineers, this  
18 alternative means that we wouldn't get a permit at all.  
19 We would just do whatever is on the land and -- so we  
20 wouldn't have any federal permits.

21           Alternative 4 is the "No Property Exchange with  
22 the State." There's several graphics in the  
23 environmental document that shows that there's a portion  
24 of our project that's in the tidelands and a portion  
25 that's in the uplands, and we are asking the State to

1 split the designated areas. And if that doesn't occur,  
2 what would the project look like? That's Alternative 4.

3 Alternative 5 is basically the proposed project  
4 without the reconnection of Pacific Avenue, and that  
5 would leave up the International Boardwalk and the  
6 elevated walkway. So what would the project look like  
7 for that?

8 And Alternative 6 is an alternative  
9 construction phasing. So if you can't go and construct  
10 everything at once, which is the proposed project, would  
11 have us, you know, moving all the vessels out of Basin 3  
12 and taking most of the buildings down and leaving up  
13 Kincaid's and the restroom facility, how would you  
14 construct this? Would you do the north first? How long  
15 would that take? What would the impacts be of extending  
16 the construction schedule.

17 And then Alternative 7 is reduced density, and  
18 the reduced density is the proposed project but a little  
19 less of the proposed project.

20 We do have an Alternative 8, and Alternative 8  
21 is basically with regards to the boat ramp. So the City  
22 throughout the years has been looking at where would be  
23 the best place for a boat ramp facility, and  
24 no -- there's never been a perfect place for it. So as  
25 part of this project we looked at -- well, if we did the

1 development and we have to have a boat ramp facility  
2 based on the Coastal Commission's Coastal Program, where  
3 would we put a ramp if not at Joe's Crab Shack, or would  
4 we put it somewhere else? And so this was an opportunity  
5 for us to look at what the proposed project and these  
6 different locations for the boat ramp and different size  
7 of the boat ramps would look like. So that's purely  
8 Alternative 8. We also have a board that's this exact  
9 slide, and it's actually out there as well next to the  
10 traffic slides.

11 All right. So the review period, as Aaron  
12 said, is 63 days, which is longer than the normal period.  
13 It does end at 5:30 p.m. on January 19th, and you can --  
14 the best way to get us any type of comments on the  
15 environmental document and the process and the analyses  
16 that you see out there is to either email or send us a  
17 letter. And here's the information with regards to  
18 that -- and we have handouts in the lobby that you can  
19 take with you so you can remember.

20 Also, this is the first of three public  
21 meetings, and we have various comment sheets throughout  
22 the venue. So feel free to write on this. You can take  
23 it with you and then mail it in; you can slip it in one  
24 of the boxes that says "Comment Box." So feel free to  
25 either do that now or send it in before 5:30 on

1 January 19th.

2 And also, one of the bigger things about having  
3 these public meetings is we're going to take verbal  
4 comment. And the way it works is you need to sign up on  
5 one of these speaker cards. If you haven't already done  
6 so, we have extra.

7 Juan, do you have --

8 Does anybody need one of these?

9 So what we're going to do is we're just going  
10 to take your public comment. We're not going to answer  
11 questions. We're going to take comments. We have a  
12 court reporter because we want this to be part of the  
13 public record for the Draft Environmental Impact Report,  
14 and then we're going to give three minutes per person to  
15 speak -- and let's see

16 Does anybody need one of these?

17 And, of course, if you have any questions, feel  
18 free to give that number a call, and somebody will call  
19 you back.

20 And, Juan, could you turn to the next slide,  
21 please.

22 So there are also different places that you can  
23 see the environmental document. As you can see, we have  
24 two copies of the Draft EIR, and then we have one full  
25 appendices set. And you can look at those obviously

1 here. If you want to look at it at your leisure, we do  
2 have it at several places in the City: Two libraries,  
3 the City Clerk counter as well as the Community  
4 Development Department and online. You know, there is a  
5 link for it, so you can download it online.

6 So at this time, anybody else want to hand me  
7 their --

8 So the way I'm going to do this is is, like I  
9 said, you're going to get three minutes each. And I'll  
10 call the first three names.

11 And, you know, you can keep filling these out  
12 while we're here. I'll just take these fourteen first.  
13 What I'll do is I'll call three names, and if the first  
14 person could come up to the microphone and the other two  
15 just get ready, we'll keep this moving. And if anybody  
16 wants to fill out one of these cards in the meantime, you  
17 can feel free to do so. And I apologize in advance. I'm  
18 not very good with names. So I'll probably not say your  
19 last name right. So I apologize in advance.

20 So the first person is Bruce Szeles; second is  
21 Ross Yosnow; and the third is Adrainne Taufa. And then  
22 we're going to put on a little timer for three minutes,  
23 and it's all yours.

24 Thanks, Bruce.

25 MR. SZELES: Thank you.

PM101

1           In general, I -- I saw this document and I  
2 thought, "This is the Affordable Care Act times two."  
3 But I'd like to -- I mean, I'd like to speak on one  
4 particular issue, which is the Seaside Lagoon. I spent a  
5 lot of time down there when my kids were little, and the  
6 proposing changing for the Seaside Lagoon is a train  
7 wreck because it needs to stay closed off to the open  
8 ocean. There are so many things with the changes that --  
9 that are packed into that Seaside Lagoon that no young  
10 family is going want to have their kids swim in that  
11 water.

PM1-01  
con'd

12           So this is one of the crown jewels of Redondo  
13 Beach that's going to be totally obliterated. Keep the  
14 Seaside Lagoon sealed off, make it a closed, filtered,  
15 whatever you have to do -- not pump the water out into  
16 the ocean so we have -- so we have fines to deal with,  
17 but use it, pump -- pipe it back into watering  
18 recreational grasses or some other use for that water,  
19 but please do not touch the Seaside Lagoon with what you  
20 have proposed.

21           Thank you.

22           MS. MEYER: Thank you.

23           Ross?

24           MR. YOSNOW: All right. Ross Yosnow of Redondo  
25 Beach. I haven't been here as long as a lot of you, but

PM1-02

1 I've been here about 30 years. I was Editor of the  
2 Redondo Beach News for a few years. I was the Chairman of  
3 the Library Commission when the library was built. And  
4 I'm not antigrowth. I voted for the Shade Hotel, and I  
5 still think it's a good idea.

6       But I think the movie theater is a terrible  
7 idea. Like millions and millions of people, I used to go  
8 to the movies a lot. I submitted a list to Kate Owston  
9 of the ten theaters or theater complexes that have closed  
10 here in the last couple of the decades. Meanwhile, one  
11 theater has opened here in the last decade, the AMCs over  
12 in Del Amo and they just replaced the United Artists over  
13 in Del Amo.

14       Just a quick example -- I'm not going to list  
15 all ten -- but there used to be the theaters right over  
16 here in Catalina and Torrance. They're condos now. The  
17 Mann's Old Town Theaters -- they had two big theaters and  
18 four small ones. They sold them, and now I think now  
19 they're a gym.

20       There were great theaters right over in  
21 Torrance across the street from the Target and the  
22 Ralphs. They had two great stadium seating theaters.  
23 They are a HomeTown Buffet now, okay? The Mann's over in  
24 Manhattan Beach at Rosecrans and Sepulveda, they are  
25 sitting empty. There used to be six theaters in three

PM1-02  
cont'd

1 buildings, the GCC just north of The Galleria. They're  
2 now a Target, they're a Sprouts, they're a Nordstrom  
3 Rack.

4 So these all closed just in the last -- less  
5 than two decades. In the three big cities in Torrance,  
6 one is open.

7 So who -- who thinks this is going to be a  
8 success? Just a couple of years ago -- last July 4th --  
9 last July 4th weekend, the theater owners in the United  
10 States said it was the worst attendance in 25 years, and  
11 if I didn't know any better, I'd think, "Okay. Well,  
12 maybe there's fewer people here." But we know there's  
13 not. There's more people in the three beach cities and  
14 Torrance. And a lot of you don't go. Why? Because of  
15 3-D, because of the 80-inch screen, because of Netflix  
16 coming into your house, because of how expensive it is to  
17 go out and get a babysitter.

18 That's not going to change. This theater is  
19 not going to be built for the next 5 years. What's going  
20 to happen in the next 5 years, 10 years that's going to  
21 drag -- further drag people out to the theaters? And  
22 we're talking about building something for 40 years.  
23 What is this going to be when it closes?

24 Let's say it has a good 10-year run. What's it  
25 going to be the last 30, 40 years. I mean, I hope

PM1-02  
cont'd

1 there's some plan for that because otherwise we are going  
2 to get stuck with this boondoggle and we're not going  
3 know what to do with it and we're going to be selling  
4 T-shirts out of it.

5 One last thing: Some of you have been here a  
6 long time. The place we're standing on used to sell  
7 trinkets and toe rings and there's all these great little  
8 beachy shops. We don't want that again. Let's -- I hope  
9 you give this theater a real good thought because it's a  
10 terrible idea.

11 Thank you.

12 MS. MEYER: Adrienne. And after Adrienne, Al West  
13 and Beth Mineau.

14 MS. TAUFA: My name is Adrienne Taufa. I was born  
15 in Redondo Beach. Some of my happiest childhood memories  
16 are on the Pier. After my divorce, I came to the Pier to  
17 relive my happy memories, and I walked into a beautiful  
18 little shop. I met a man with the most amazing smile. I  
19 worked up the courage, and three weeks later I returned  
20 to ask him out to dinner. We've been married for 14  
21 years.

22 My husband and I currently run T's Toe Rings &  
23 Gifts established 21 years ago. We're now serving our  
24 third generation of customers. For those who don't know  
25 us by name, we have a tiki shop across from Tony's, and I

1 pride myself by saying it's the nicest shop on the Pier.

2 My husband and I are concerned about three key  
3 issues. We would like to ask for a temporary venue  
4 during construction. I have customers who would be  
5 traumatized by the lack of toe rings. It would also  
6 cause us hardship.

7 We also are asking that the existing businesses  
8 get first choice on the new Pier shops. And lastly,  
9 there's been a great deal of discussion about the need to  
10 upscale the area. However, many of the existing PM1-03  
cont'd  
11 businesses are not large corporations. We would ask that  
12 our base rent remain comparable to our current rent but  
13 we would continue to give a percentage of our income as  
14 it fluctuates with summer seasons. During the summer, we  
15 make the most of our income. During the winter, we live  
16 off of our savings. Being able to pay a percentage would  
17 cause us the least amount of hardship and an increased  
18 percentage.

19 Thank you for the time and the opportunity to  
20 speak.

21 MS. MEYER: Al West and then Beth.

22 MR. WEST: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My  
23 name is Al West. I'm a local practicing attorney. I've PM1-04  
24 been on the Pier for 37 years. I just recently left. I  
25 was on the Pier on the west side where the courthouses

1 were across from the catwalk. So if anybody has got  
2 their finger on the pulse about this Waterfront Project,  
3 I do. And I would like to address or bring up two  
4 salient points, one practical and one legal.

5 I think we all are in agreement that this place  
6 needs a facelift; in fact, probably more, more like  
7 orthopedic surgery. The concrete -- you know, the steps  
8 are falling in. There was a huge structure that caved in  
9 near the parking lot where my offices are a few years  
10 ago. So I think we're all in need of a revitalization.

11 The first point I bring up is a practical point  
12 of view. I think all of the waterfront Redondo Beach  
13 beachcombers, a lot of the beautiful access that we  
14 have -- wherever you might be around the Waterfront  
15 Project, you can see the ocean, you can see the boats,  
16 palm trees, sunsets from anywhere you're at. If this  
17 project goes through, the height limitations, we have a  
18 mega mall on the water, you will not see. In fact, the  
19 second presentation up here that had to do with a project  
20 overview said there would be better views, public access  
21 and connectivity, which is a farce. We have a mega mall  
22 now, it looks like, that will be put in...The Waterfront  
23 Project.

24 From a legal point of view, I don't know if you  
25 all know, but the developer has been given an

PM1-04  
cont'd

1 arrangement, as they will be the master leasehold after  
2 the project is done, they will be the landlord. So their  
3 objective in designing this project was not with the  
4 community people in mind, with access. It's with  
5 maximizing profits and revenue. So they've designed this  
6 mega mall similar to Long Beach. Go to Long Beach. See  
7 if you have access. The only people that have access are  
8 the ones that are walking on the boardwalk paying \$20.00  
9 a day for parking. Nobody's got access like we do now.  
10 You could ride at the beach and walk right into the sand  
11 right now. You won't be able to do it with this mega  
12 mall.

PM1-04  
conf'd

13 So from a legal point of view, I can understand  
14 as an organization, like CenterCal is, you want to  
15 maximize profits. You're not going to do what the  
16 community wants. And this input, even though it might be  
17 specific to each and everybody, sounds good, but the  
18 bottom line is as a landlord, you're going to maximize  
19 your profits; so the mega mall is going to be there. You  
20 are not going to have the access, you are not going to  
21 have the views of the palm trees, the ocean at all  
22 anymore unless you pay \$20.00 a day and sit on the  
23 boardwalk.

24 So it's unfortunate that the project has gotten  
25 to this point, but nonetheless, I don't think that's ever

1 been mentioned. Nothing has ever been addressed about  
2 the objectives of this project. We all have our  
3 individual issues. Why this is there an alternative aid  
4 with regard to the boat launch? That's an issue that not  
5 really cared too much about. But what about the heights  
6 of the buildings? What about the mega mall that's going  
7 to be blocking everything? What about the roadway? All  
8 these condo owners above the Pier, imagine the fumes, PM1-04  
9 imagine the noise, you know, but there's no alternative cont'd  
10 regarding that.

11 So anyway, I'd just like to bring up those  
12 points and hope everybody understands what we're getting  
13 into.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

15 MS. MEYER: Beth. And then after Beth, Dick  
16 Schlaney (phonetic), Maryann Gunthrie, Penny Wirsing.

17 MS. MINEAU: I'm Beth Mineau. I live on Catalina.  
18 I've lived here for over 11 years; so, again, not as long  
19 as some of you, but I think this is much needed. I think  
20 the video is beautiful. I think the plans are PM1-05  
21 outstanding and to get us to the level where we can get  
22 the tax income, the commercial tax income that's super  
23 above where we're at to be compared with from a  
24 commercial tabs base is really kind of sad when we have a  
25 waterfront back that would be a big addition to the

1 beautification of our City.

2 I think there is going to be an impact from the  
3 construction. I work in Downtown L.A. When I moved out  
4 here 11 years ago, the homeless situation in downtown  
5 L.A. -- I mean, I lived in Chicago all my life prior to  
6 this. I never was afraid of walking to the train.  
7 Walking to the parking garage in Los Angeles at that time  
8 was a scary situation. Now that we've gone through a lot  
9 of construction -- and you get through it, but  
10 beautification of downtown L.A., while on a totally  
11 different scale, it's amazing, and it's really a City  
12 that you can feel proud to work in and I'd like Redondo  
13 to be a city that I feel very proud to bring my  
14 grandchildren to and my neighbors' children. I think  
15 it's a beautiful situation.

16 Thank you very much for the opportunity.

17 MS. MEYER: Dick Schlaney, Maryann Guthrie and  
18 penny.

19 MS. GUTHRIE: Good morning. My name is Maryann  
20 Guthrie. I've worked at King Harbor Marina for almost 40  
21 years. In November of 2010, the voters of Redondo passed  
22 Measure G, which encouraged development in our aging King  
23 Harbor and the Pier but without any controls as to what  
24 was going to be built. And today we are reviewing the  
25 new waterfront. I mean, I think we can all agree that

PM1-05  
cont'd

PM1-06

1 our City's most valuable asset is underperforming and  
2 underutilized. The lack of funding to properly maintain  
3 the Pier infrastructure, the parking structure, seriously  
4 jeopardizes the safety of these buildings.

5 I think CenterCal has submitted a project that  
6 conforms to the tenants of Measure G, and I think it's a  
7 lot more than we could ever ask for --

8 (Applause.)

9 MS. GUTHRIE: -- in terms of amenities,  
10 entertainment and walkability. It's a beautiful  
11 well-executed plan, and I think that, once again, it will  
12 unite our residents with our waterfront.

PM1-06  
conf

13 You know, when we look at historic photos of  
14 Redondo Beach, you know, what do we see? You know, we  
15 see The Plunge, we see the Old Box Movie Theater, we see  
16 a waterfront that's teeming with people, residents  
17 enjoying the beach and enjoying the Pier. The  
18 centerpiece of the CenterCal project is this public  
19 marketplace. Now, can you imagine how much fun it's  
20 going to be to have something like that within our own  
21 City? When San Francisco revitalized their waterfront  
22 they took a hard look at the historic ferry building  
23 project, and for those of us that have had the privilege  
24 and the opportunity of visiting San Francisco and going  
25 to the ferry building, you know what I'm talking about.

1 There's a beautiful farmers market, there are beautiful  
2 cafes and shops, there are small business owners, there's  
3 cheese shops, restaurants and there's just people walking  
4 around sitting on benches having a cup of coffee and  
5 looking at the ocean. I would love, love to be able to  
6 get on my bicycle and come down and enjoy that on a daily  
7 basis. It's something that we need, we deserve in our  
8 City.

PM1-06  
cont'd

9 I think we need to support the CenterCal  
10 project. I think we have to uphold the sanctity of the  
11 Measure G vote that passed in our City, and I think that  
12 if we're not changing and growing, we're dying.

13 That's what I have to say. Thank you.

14 (Applause.)

15 MS. MEYER: So next is Penny, and then after Penny,  
16 Barbara Epstein, Matthew Udewitz and Gary Ohst.

17 MS. WIRSING: Hi there. My name is Penny Wirsing,  
18 I've been a resident of Redondo Beach for 13 years now in  
19 District 2, and my husband and I love to walk to dinner,  
20 we love to go to ---

21 We love to drop things.

PM1-07

22 (Laughter.)

23 MS. WIRSING: We've really done a lot of work to  
24 understand what this is. We've gone to a number of  
25 public meetings. We really want to know what this is all

1 about, and from what we've seen so far, we're really  
 2 excited about it. I personally visited a CenterCal site  
 3 when I was in Boise, Idaho a couple of months ago just to  
 4 see what it looks like in action, and I was really  
 5 impressed with that. It wasn't a mall. There were  
 6 shops, there were restaurants, there were open areas and  
 7 it was really being well used and you could tell that the  
 8 families were really enjoying it. So I was very  
 9 impressed with that.

PM1-07  
 confd.

10 Contrary to what some people say, it is not a  
 11 mall by the sea as you can tell by the -- the various  
 12 percentages of, you know, restaurants, public areas,  
 13 those sorts of things. So I'm -- my husband and I are  
 14 both engineers. We're looking forward to digging into  
 15 the details of this voluminous EIR and starting to come  
 16 in on the technical aspects, but for now, I just wanted  
 17 to comment on the general aspects.

18 MS. MEYER: Barbara, Matthew and Gary.

19 MS. EPSTEIN: Hello. My name is Barbara Epstein. I  
 20 oppose this project. When we sold our house in Palos  
 21 Verdes --

PM1-08

22 THE REPORTER: Will you put the microphone closer to  
 23 your mouth, please?

24 MS. EPSTEIN: Okay. I'll just hold it.

25 We wanted to move to Redonda Beach in order to

1 enjoy the waterfront. We've been driving down here to do  
2 our walking for years and appreciated the improvements  
3 that were taking place along the Esplanade and on the  
4 Pier and thought the rest of the waterfront would be  
5 upgraded as well. We still walk to the Pier and around  
6 the waterfront almost daily, not just for the vital  
7 physical exercise, but also for the general enjoyment of  
8 being in the fresh air and watching the sky, the  
9 fishermen and checking the wildlife.

10 We eagerly joined the series of public  
11 workshops that took place that year thinking our ideas  
12 were honestly wanted and would play a part in the future  
13 of the waterfront. We were happy to put in the time and  
14 the effort to stop what we were doing and run to these  
15 meetings. It seemed like such an important contribution  
16 that we could make to our new city.

PM1-08  
cont'd

17 The result of the workshops was pretty much a  
18 consensus that most of us citizen planners envisioned  
19 recreational paradise for boating, bicycling, skating,  
20 rollerblading, fishing, paddle boarding, walking and  
21 diving along with passive enjoyment of views, fresh air  
22 and just relaxing in open spaces. That was the  
23 centerpiece of our thinking.

24 The participants at the workshops expressed  
25 their wishes for better little boutique restaurants with

1 healthier menus, a public market, like Pike Place in  
2 Seattle, and a bridge to connect the two ends of the  
3 waterfront. The citizen planners made it very clear and  
4 were strongly adamant that there would be no connecting  
5 street in the area of the International Boardwalk and no  
6 public car traffic but would be fine with an  
7 old-fashioned electric trolley connecting the two ends of  
8 the little harbor. A small business service road under  
9 the parking structure seemed acceptable. The planners  
10 seemed pretty satisfied with the boutique hotel's  
11 original design. I asked for a carousel to be included  
12 somewhere in the plan.

PM1.08  
confd

13 Most people saw no value in a movie theater,  
14 considering it inappropriate at the waterfront. I heard  
15 no one say they favored a high parking structure at the  
16 site. They voiced opposition to that. The people at  
17 these meetings made it clear that they did not want the  
18 site crowded with a lot of buildings but valued a lot of  
19 open space.

20 When this project came before the Council for  
21 the vote to enter into the MOU, the citizen planners were  
22 blindsided by the dramatic changes that they saw in the  
23 new plan. Everything they said they did not want was  
24 suddenly and without notice changed, included and quickly  
25 voted on.

1 I just have another minute.

2 MS. MEYER: Okay. Thank you.

3 MS. EPSTEIN: The result left many residents in  
4 shock. The citizen planners suddenly realized they had  
5 been manipulated by their own city government to  
6 collaborate with a corporation that sought to privatize  
7 our valuable public land for their own profit, failed to  
8 produce three-dimensional models as promised in public  
9 meetings, and engaged in predatory business practices  
10 through fraud and deception.

11 The people of Redondo Beach deserve better  
12 representation by their elected officials. The wishes of  
13 the business community are important but not to the  
14 exclusion of common sense and common decency. Redondo  
15 Beach has other options. Gifting away our waterfront to  
16 a private business for 99 years is not one of them. We  
17 can consult many land conservancies to help us preserve  
18 and improve our public plan for the public, not for  
19 private profit.

20 I recommend alternatives 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8.

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. MEYER: Matthew is next, and then after Matthew  
23 is Gary. And then Gina DiPietro, you'll be after Gary.

24 MR. UDEWITZ: Greetings. Matthew Udewitz, MBA from  
25 University of California, Evaluation Specialist.

PM1-09  
cont'd

PM1-09

1 Commercial Real Estate, Keller Williams of Brentwood,  
2 formerly Coldwell Banker Commercial of La Jolla.

3 I think that the group that was in charge of  
4 this did an excellent job in responding to a lot of my  
5 comments. I live -- my parents -- I live with my parents  
6 currently at 140 The Village where we have views of the  
7 rocks, and we have views of the Lagoon. We want these  
8 views conserved. We're also very concerned with the  
9 noise. We agree with everything that has been said up  
10 here today. The one thing I don't agree with is I do  
11 feel that the -- the movie theater is a great idea and  
12 that goes along with -- this is a really good  
13 presentation that I saw on the video. The video really  
14 speaks for itself because it looks like the video -- I  
15 love living here, but two -- the concerns I have are the  
16 noise. I think it should be mitigated like they did in  
17 San Diego with the airport and give all residents at The  
18 Village in all buildings soundproof windows at the  
19 expense of the developers. That's a common expense in  
20 development. They should also be consulting with The  
21 Irvine Company, who's developing the coast of San --  
22 Downtown San Diego and would definitely be a player to  
23 owning this property. Irvine Company would probably go  
24 half with the City for ownership. I don't see why not.  
25 The value is there.

PM1-09  
cont'd

1 They did a very good job of presenting -- the  
2 pictures look like Silicone Beach South Bay. Silicone  
3 Beach is right now inflating the whole L.A. area, and I  
4 can't wait until we have a Silicone Beach in the South  
5 Bay. I think the Lagoon should stay closed off. If it's  
6 not closed off, I think you have an issue with permits  
7 for use of kayaks and commercial -- commercial user  
8 kayaks and commercial user paddle boarding like they have  
9 an issue in La Jolla. We don't need that issue, and if  
10 you close it off, you also preserve it for our kids. If  
11 you open that up and it's that close to the boats, it's  
12 not going to be pleasant for anybody.

PM1-09  
cont'd

13 The picture I saw back there of Tony's, it  
14 looks like they redid it. In the original plan I had  
15 seen a year ago, they said they weren't touching anything  
16 there. I think it looks great.

17 Are they rebuilding Tony's in that structure,  
18 or are they leaving it the same? That picture is not the  
19 old Tony's.

20 MS. MEYER: I believe the idea is to let some of the  
21 tenants back in, like Tony's, but as to whether it will  
22 be right there or not, I don't know.

23 MR. UDEWITZ: I think the pictures look great. I  
24 think I said Silicone Beach, South Bay. I want to live  
25 here. All our values will go through the roof. But they

1 won't go through the roof if you have too much noise.  
2 And they won't go through the roof if you don't preserve  
3 the views.

4 I think the idea of the trolley instead of that  
5 street is an excellent idea. That street would go right  
6 by my house where I live in my condo, and it would be  
7 horrible traffic that's not there currently. There is  
8 currently traffic there, but it's not like it's going to  
9 be. So that -- the trolley I had never thought of, and  
10 that was the most excellent idea I heard of in a long  
11 time. So I'd love to see a proposal with that as the  
12 trolley. Also, when you presented the Environmental  
13 Impact Report, in my analysis you said there was no way  
14 to mitigate the noise. Yes, there is a way to mitigate  
15 the noise. Give us windows, soundproof windows.

16 Does anybody agree with me?

PM1-09  
cont'd

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Absolutely.

19 MR. UDEWITZ: Paid for by the developers. That's  
20 all we want and protection of our views. And the large  
21 structures on the outside of the -- from my analysis from  
22 a real estate perspective are too large. Those should be  
23 owned by the City. The movie theater should be owned by  
24 the City so they get the revenues and make it smaller so  
25 there's no issue with having to generate revenue there

1 and it's just fun and make it nice and pleasant like they  
2 did in Del Mar because Silicone Beach is going to come  
3 and go. That will -- the cineplex is going to bring  
4 people down here from Beverly Hills.

PM1-09  
CONF

5 The idea that I heard them project at the very  
6 beginning was how to get people from where I work here to  
7 spend money. That's what the City wants. That's -- I  
8 think it's a great idea, Silicone Beach, South Bay.

9 MS. MEYER: Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MS. MEYER: So Gary is up next and then Gina and  
12 then Tal Finney. I do have two people who wanted their  
13 names mentioned but they're not going to speak today.  
14 One is Thomas -- I think it's Gary and Beth Metzger.  
15 They both support the project, and they've got to leave.  
16 So that's -- so Gary is next.

17 MR. OHST: Hi folks. My name is Gary Ohst. I was  
18 on the Budget and Finance Commission for four years, for  
19 a while. I was involved in trying to get this waterfront  
20 scraped out since the hard part, the mixed use plan and  
21 the Village plan were put together. (Unintelligible)  
22 worked on the mixed use plan. So no one in this room can  
23 say I'm not -- antidevelopment. But I will say this:  
24 This EIR has some significant flaws in it that I don't  
25 think you're going to be able to wordsmith around.

PM1-10

1 One of the one that was on your list, land use  
2 and planning, no significant impacts. I was on the  
3 Growth Management Task Force when we studied all the  
4 intersections and came up with the conclusion, the  
5 City-wide conclusion adopted by the City Council, that  
6 there was 400,000 square feet of development that would  
7 probably go in the harbor before -- through all the  
8 intersections past D towards F. This project alone is  
9 adding 300,000 of that 400,000. That's only crammed on  
10 15 acres. Well, I hate to say it, but right across the  
11 street there's 50 acres at the AES site that's going to  
12 be next out of the shoe. How can you say that this  
13 project taking that much density is not a land-planning  
14 disaster? We have been after a waterfront-wide master  
15 plan for years, and the City Council continues to  
16 stonewall us because they favor this piecemeal  
17 development which is a road to disaster, though nobody is  
18 going to say that this EIR is legal if you don't address  
19 the fact that once all the density is going to pile on  
20 the AES site; you got a waterfront-wide master plan to a  
21 real waterfront and not a high density disaster all piled  
22 and squeezed onto 15 acres. It looks bad because it is  
23 bad.

24 One of the reasons why there's all this density  
25 thing pushed by the City is because they mismanaged the

PM1-10  
cont'd

1 harbor funds. I got on the Budget and Finance Commission  
2 cause I wanted to know why we're not maintaining the  
3 infrastructure when Redondo Beach conjured up in 2003  
4 this concept called "internal service funds" where they  
5 basically have been pulling out \$1 million out of the  
6 harbor every year and sending it off to cover overhead.  
7 No other small boat harbor in Southern California pulls  
8 that much money out of the harbor, okay?

9           So when you say it's not going to impact police  
10 and fire, when you say it's not going to impact services,  
11 how are we going to pay for this? CenterCal's lease  
12 proposal that's on the table today has a guaranty that if  
13 they don't make 10 percent on their capital, they don't  
14 pay any ground rent. The last time the City released PM1-10  
cont'd  
15 financials on this when Pete Carmichael was the Harbor  
16 Director, it was showing negative cash flow in here. You  
17 are going to ask, "How are you going to cover that?"

18           "Oh, it's we're going to take some of the tax  
19 increments it generates or the sales tax and property tax  
20 revenue and backfill it."

21           Well, this doesn't make any sense to me. This  
22 isn't a sustainable project. So there's serious problems  
23 with it. I know the RIR doesn't address financial  
24 feasibility and how we're going to pay the bills, but it  
25 should because how can you say that services aren't going

1 to be impacted if there's no money to pay for them?

2           And the last thing that I kind of want to touch  
3 on briefly is that the parking structure is owned by the  
4 public, it generates over a million-and-a-half dollars a  
5 year in revenue. We shouldn't let the developer build a  
6 new one. We should get a revenue bond and build it.  
7 After the bond is paid off in 25 years, guess who gets to  
8 keep that revenue? The citizens do. We're turning over  
9 our future, we're mortgaging the next generation's future  
10 by giving away the Pier to the developer.

11           (Applause.)

PM1-10  
cont'd

12           MR. OHST: It's a nice slick video that's out. I  
13 mean, I like that. I've looked at hotel brochures and  
14 gone to resorts and they look great in the pictures but  
15 when I got to my room, there was a flickering light and a  
16 noisy Coke machine and when I opened the curtains, there  
17 was a view of the back side of a commercial building. So  
18 don't always go by the videos.

19           But one last thing I want to comment on is the  
20 developer is proposing that the Seaside Lagoon is going  
21 to be remodeled as part of his project, this bridge is  
22 going to be built, Basin 2, all this work is going to be  
23 done. He's not paying for that. A lot of that stuff has  
24 to be paid for by the citizens of Redondo Beach. So I  
25 want one of those lower density alternatives seriously

1 explored seriously and I want it clarified who's paying  
2 for what and if we're going to have to pay for half of  
3 that infrastructure anyway, why do we have to put up with  
4 all this density blocked views and traffic on the road.

PM1-10  
cont'd

5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. MEYER: So Gina and Tal Finney, and then after  
8 Tal is Jim Light.

9 MS. DIPIETRO: Hi. Good morning, everyone. My name  
10 is Gina DiPietro, and I've lived in Redondo Beach for  
11 over four years and I'm from Palos Verdes and I used to  
12 go to the Seaside Lagoon as a child and drink ICEE's and  
13 eat ice cream sandwiches and I'm very nostalgic, if you  
14 will, about the Seaside Lagoon. I think it's a wonderful  
15 area for recreation, and I'm just -- I'm baffled how they  
16 can say there's no impact on recreation when they take  
17 away the Seaside Lagoon. Also, I played hooky from work  
18 once back in 2007, and that day back in 2007, I went out  
19 to the water cause it was going to be really warm that  
20 day, abnormally warm, and I needed a day off and I went  
21 for a swim and a sea lion came up and swam right by my  
22 feet, just a few feet away from my feet, and that's never  
23 happened to me before and I thought it was this  
24 miraculous moment from God.

PM1-11

25 You know, I don't think that sea lion is

1 interested in shopping at Pottery Barn or Williams and  
2 Sonoma [sic.] or whatever they're going to put at that  
3 mall. That sea lion is not interested in shopping there  
4 and neither are the great blue parrots who are -- they  
5 have an estuary right there in the harbor full of great  
6 blue parrots. They are very, very special creatures. I  
7 haven't heard anything, not one word about birds, about  
8 sea lions, about wildlife. We're not talking about them,  
9 and that also absolutely baffles me.

10 And here's another thing about me: I love to  
11 shop. I mean, I seriously love to shop. And Del Amo  
12 just sunk \$300 million into building one of the nicest  
13 retail malls in all of America, and I love it. That mall  
14 is outstanding, and I love it that it's inland and I can  
15 go to the mall inland. PM1-11  
conf'd

16 If they put a giant mall in the waterfront, how  
17 are they going to get those same stores to build again  
18 five, ten minutes away right here? It just doesn't make  
19 any sense. We have to have some sort of -- you know, are  
20 you going to talk to them? Where are these stores that  
21 are willing to build another establishment just a few  
22 minutes away from where they just built a new one at Del  
23 Amo Mall, which is beautiful?

24 And I would like to thank you for your time.  
25 Please take the wildlife of Redondo Beach into

1 consideration and know that if we do alter this  
2 waterfront, it may be gone forever. Think about how  
3 beautiful it is. Think about God's gift to us, and do we  
4 want to put a whole bunch of cement in it?

PM-11  
cont'd

5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. MEYER: So Tal Finney, Jim Light and then Steve  
8 Rasak.

9 MR. FINNEY: Hi. I'm Tal, and I'm a resident for  
10 going on 14 years now. And I served in government at the  
11 State level. I worked for the Governor's office, and I  
12 was the OPR Director, which is kind of like the State's  
13 chief planner. I was responsible for CEQA, the state  
14 clearing house. I also got the good fortune of serving  
15 in government during the energy crisis. So I sat on the  
16 California Independent System Operator, which runs the  
17 grids and markets for electricity for the State, as well  
18 as the California Public Utilities Commission. And I've  
19 also sat on the Coastal Commission as a delegate for two  
20 different constitutional officers.

PM-12

21 I'm local. And I've been going back and forth  
22 to this Redondo Beach Pier for many, many years since I  
23 got here. I take the kids there. I think it's the  
24 coolest thing on the planet, but since I've been going  
25 there and given my training now -- not just the training

1 now, but I've been in private practice for about 13  
2 years -- I was one of the attorneys that was responsible  
3 for the development of the Pike in Long Beach. And so  
4 after 12 years of working on that project and the State  
5 Lands Commission, the Coastal Commission for the City of  
6 Long Beach, I have a pretty strong working knowledge of  
7 the land use and planning misuse associated with  
8 development of whether they're mixed use or malls or  
9 whatever they are. And as I was kind of moving around  
10 this area looking at all the different aspects of it over  
11 the years, I've noticed that there are very, very serious  
12 infrastructure concerns in this area, like serious ones:  
13 like, I was also part of the retrofit program for the  
14 entire state for all the hospitals and everything else  
15 and sat on the California Public Earthquake Authority,  
16 which is the largest public catastrophic insurer in the  
17 world, okay? And so I've been looking at all this stuff  
18 over the years and because I'm newer, because I'm moving  
19 around all the time for my work, I didn't realize how far  
20 things had kind of come along. And then I went to a  
21 couple of these coffees and community meetings, and I was  
22 very, very excited about what I saw and so I made a  
23 couple of notes.

24 So I wanted to point out first and foremost,  
25 from what I understand, CenterCal is going to be dropping

PM1-12  
cont'd

1 close to \$400 million on infrastructure for the City of  
2 Redondo Beach, and I've just got to say, having worked at  
3 the state level and dealt with almost every city in the  
4 state at some point or another, that is unheard of and to  
5 turn away from that would be crazy. That's number one.

6 I mean, the infrastructure problems of this  
7 state are really serious, and this city is going to have  
8 a serious windfall and a wonderful thing by a project  
9 like this if the developer's committed to that, putting  
10 that kind of money into it, the parking structure as one  
11 example. I mean, let's just pray there's not a serious  
12 shaker here in California in our area because that's  
13 going to have serious problems. And they are a great  
14 source of revenue and that's one thing that can help get  
15 this project off the ground because ultimately, the  
16 revenue that will come from the project that will  
17 seriously enhance the City's coffers are going to come  
18 from various shops and whatnot that are located at this  
19 structure.

20 The Pier is also in serious condition. It  
21 needs serious rework, and based on the events and the  
22 meetings I've attended, there's a strong commitment to  
23 upgrading the infrastructure there. And then the Seaside  
24 Lagoon -- I'm an environmental attorney, I'm an energy  
25 lawyer, and I'm a land use lawyer -- and that is a

PM1-12  
cont'd

1 disaster right now. It's a serious problem. I was  
2 responsible on the Cal ISO and the CPUC for affluents  
3 coming out of power plants. There needs to be something  
4 done there. From what I can tell from what CenterCal is  
5 proposing, they have a great idea, they're on the way to  
6 a great idea, and I think that they're going in the right  
7 direction for that. It will also provide wonderful  
8 recreational use for this area right there because a lot  
9 more people will want to use it because they're not  
10 putting their children into an environmental hazard.

11           Okay. Regulatory statutory protections.  
12 Please know that your state is with you. The California  
13 Coastal Act is alive and well, and it's very powerful. PM1-12  
14 It looks over everything: Parking meters, view cont'd  
15 corridors, everything and anything you can imagine. It  
16 doesn't just cover it. But the staff who work there have  
17 been there so long that they don't care what the elected  
18 commissioners -- appointed commissioners say half the  
19 time. They're totally committed to the coast and you  
20 have wonderful people. They're not bureaucrats. They're  
21 hard working people who get a lot less pay than a lot of  
22 us to protect the coast for you.

23           So please know that no developer, CenterCal or  
24 anybody else, is going to pull the wool over the eyes of  
25 the California Coastal Commission and their staff. So

1 please know your view corridors are going to be protected  
2 and every aspect of this project will be touched upon and  
3 protected by the California Coastal Act and Commission  
4 and their staff.

5 CEQA, everybody's favorite law -- I'm almost  
6 done. Just 30 more seconds here.

7 California Environmental Quality Act is what I  
8 used to administer for the State. I used to run the  
9 State clearing house, which issues all the negative decs.  
10 and mitigated negative decs., and I think the City has  
11 done a fine job on this. I'm planning on reading the  
12 entire document for pleasure. So that's their  
13 protection. Finally, there's the fact that public has a  
14 trust option, which is what the State Lands Commission  
15 administers, and that's another protection for you.

PM1-12  
cont'd

16 So the last thing I want to say is having been  
17 the attorney, the land use attorney on the Pike, that is  
18 indeed a mall by the sea. Not only did we make a mall by  
19 the sea, but we also turned it into an outlet mall by the  
20 sea. There you go.

21 But they're not proposing that here, guys.  
22 This is a completely different project.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Dream on. Dream on.

24 MR. FINNEY: Say what you want. We all are entitled  
25 to our opinions.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Dream on.

2 MR. FINNEY: I finished my point. Thank you for  
3 your time.

PM1-12  
cont'd

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. MEYER: The next speaker is Jim Light and then  
6 Steve Rasak and then Surjit Mora.

7 MR. LIGHT: Hi. Jim Light. I've been here for a  
8 number of years, and I think you've heard other people  
9 say this whole -- this whole travesty is from deception  
10 of the public from the very start. When we voted on  
11 Measure G, what they told us was they would only put a  
12 maximum of 400,000 square feet across 155 acres of our  
13 harbor, and now they're concentrating over 800,000 square  
14 feet in a very small area and they're deceiving you on  
15 the land area by adding some other stuff to it like  
16 water. But we were deceived from the very start. There  
17 was nothing in anything we voted on that said a new  
18 parking garage would be excluded from that development  
19 square footage.

PM1-13

20 So they haven't answered my question yet, but  
21 just rough calculations show that that parking garage to  
22 be about 300,000 square feet. You add that to the  
23 524,000 square feet, we're getting 824,000 square feet  
24 built in our little south end of our harbor and it's  
25 appalling and now the deception continues with this EIR.

1 When you read that there's no significant visual impact  
2 from this development and you look at the wall of  
3 development along Harbor Drive, that is not even a  
4 credible statement. Anybody can look at that and say  
5 there's a significant impact. We can see -- if you go  
6 out there, you can see the waterfront anywhere along  
7 Harbor Drive. You can see boats, you can see the  
8 breakwater, you can see the cliffs of P.V. Now they're  
9 going to have two tiny slivers, and conveniently in the  
10 EIR, the only two views they examine along Harbor Drive  
11 happen to coincide exactly with those two slivers and  
12 they only look directly in the direction that their  
13 slivers are going to face. So it's deceptive from the  
14 start.

PM1-13  
cont'd

15 The second thing is recreation. They estimate  
16 that about 50 people per day on a weekend use the small  
17 hand launch boat ramp, and they didn't put how many  
18 people use the Seaside Lagoon during the summer. There  
19 is no way that is going to accommodate the number of  
20 people that use that area today as parkland. They pay  
21 over a third of it for roadway and for five concessions.  
22 They're going to put shops even on our public park and  
23 it's zoned "public park" even in the new zoning.

24 So they're not satisfied with eating out the  
25 whole harbor. Now they're taking the only park in this

1 thing and they're taking up a third of it for their thing  
2 and they're telling us it's great for us and it's better  
3 recreation. The EIR is just unbelievable because it is  
4 so biased in neighborhood development.

5 So I recommend all residents turn up today on  
6 turning in any comments to this. The Coastal Commission  
7 will not weigh in on most of this unless we appeal it to  
8 them because they gave development rights to the City  
9 when we signed our local coastal plan. So we've got to  
10 elevate this, we've got to get all our comments written  
11 down on how it violates CEQA, not that just we don't like  
12 the density. And then on top of that, when this gets PM1-13  
conf'd  
13 railroaded through, which I can imagine it's going to,  
14 we're going to have to resort back to our old tactics  
15 cause the City never listens to us. And you heard  
16 testimony to that, that we're going to have to resort  
17 back to referendum, initiatives and lawsuits to correct  
18 this, and I think that's a travesty because we've been  
19 trying to -- everybody here wants to revitalize the  
20 harbor. It's just they refuse to listen to what people  
21 are willing to accept and they's push towards  
22 overdevelopment.

23 Thank you very much.

24 (Applause.)

25 MS. MEYER: Steve Rasak, Surjit Hora and then Pat

1 Aust.

2 MR. RASAK: Good morning. I've been hearing a lot  
3 of discussion about the land aspects, but I'm a boater  
4 and I'm concerned about how this project impacts the  
5 harbor. And my main concern what I wanted to address  
6 this morning is the boat ramp. Way back when when the  
7 Boater Advisory Group met with the developers and there  
8 was a report done by Moffatt, it was clearly stated that  
9 the turning basin, Mole C, was the preferred location for  
10 many, many reasons, including safety, for the boat ramp.  
11 Now the current EIR makes alternative recommendations in  
12 Section 8. PM1-14

13 My concern is that it's sort of been less than  
14 thoroughly studied in terms of not only how it impacts on  
15 the water, but how is access going to be given to the  
16 boat ramp? For instance, on Mole A, when you look at the  
17 access road, Yacht Club Way, it's a very narrow road and  
18 there's absolutely no way that you could have two-way  
19 traffic with a boat being pulled and a trailer by a  
20 vehicle. So I would encourage further study on that  
21 issue and further clarification because I don't think  
22 it's very clear where the safest location should be for  
23 the boat ramp.

24 MS. MEYER: Surjit, then Pat Aust and then Reggie  
25 Thomas.

1 MR. HORA: My name is Surgit Hora. I live right  
2 across from the crossing of Diamond and Catalina in one  
3 of the condominiums. I have spent tons of money to have  
4 a beautiful view from my bedroom, from the kitchen, from  
5 the balcony, and I want the Mayor of Redondo Beach to  
6 certify that my view will not be spoiled. And I love all  
7 these things what I'm listening right now. PM1-15

8 The first thing is the view will be gone.  
9 Second thing is noise. He has to certify me that for the  
10 next two years, I don't have to wear earplugs to hear the  
11 noise from these things. Third thing is the traffic.  
12 Fourth, the theater here, this idea is completely bogus.  
13 It will not work. And the last one is the mall. We  
14 don't need the mall over here.

15 Thank you.

16 MS. MEYER: Pat Aust, Reggie Thomas and then Joanne  
17 Galin.

18 MR. AUST: Good morning. I'm Pat Aust. A lot of  
19 you know who I am. I'm the retired Fire Chief, former  
20 City Councilman. I've been here for 67 years. My family  
21 has been here for 118 years. So I do know the area, I do  
22 know some things. I went to work for the City in 1969, PM1-16  
23 and one of my first jobs was taking out Pacific Avenue.  
24 I was a traffic signal and lighting electrician for the  
25 City and took out all the traffic signals and street

1 lights to take out Pacific Avenue so we could build the  
2 condos for all the people that live in there now. It was  
3 all money that we got from the federal government on very  
4 low interest redevelopment money. We built it. We took  
5 away our downtown. We cut out the heart of our city, and  
6 we lost it. It's gone.

7           And now the President of the Redondo Beach  
8 Historical Society has been involved in it since the  
9 early '80s, and when you learn the history and when you  
10 learn how our city came to be, we were going to be the  
11 deep port for L.A. Well, that didn't work out because we  
12 were too deep and they moved to L.A. and they moved to  
13 San Pedro and then incorporated that into L.A. PM-16  
and

14           Well, today we're a tourist-serving community.  
15 Our largest industry is what we make off of people that  
16 come here to visit. We have Northrop Grumman, we have  
17 the South Bay Galleria, but if we lose what we have out  
18 here -- if we plow it down and make it a park, which some  
19 people think is a wonderful idea, we can just close down  
20 and call the County and tell them to take over because we  
21 can't afford to be a city without what we do over here.

22           (Applause,)

23           MR. AUST: That's the reality of it. That's the  
24 part I couldn't say when I was up on the dais. And I  
25 will say now we need to wake up and understand how this

1 City works. Everybody said, "I pay my sales tax." Sales  
2 tax gets paid to the City. Where we've got \$100 million  
3 a year budget, sales tax is one-fifth of that,  
4 20 percent. That's what we make in sales tax,  
5 \$20 million a year. That \$20 million pays for one half  
6 of our police department.

7 How do we pay for rest of it? By doing the  
8 entrepreneurial things that we do and all the money that  
9 goes for leases on over here goes right back into the  
10 tidelands fund and the uplands fund and it's monitored by  
11 the State of California. It has to be spent here. But  
12 all the sales tax and all the other revenues that come  
13 off of people coming here to visit is what we live on.  
14 So it's not a nice thing and we're park poor and, boy,  
15 let's build parks. Parks are wonderful.

PMI-16  
confid

16 How many people in this room use a Redondo  
17 Beach city park on a regular basis? Yeah, let's build a  
18 lot more of those; yeah, cause then those people who come  
19 use them. You know, that's what I hear people say. I  
20 don't say it, but that's what people say, "Well, I don't  
21 want those people coming." No. Let's build a community  
22 for ourselves for the people that live and work here.  
23 I've lived and worked here my entire life, and I know how  
24 it operates and we have to have this infusion. We have  
25 to bring it back. What we lost in the early '70s, we

1 need to have come back so we can be the city and not have  
2 people say why aren't we like El Segundo and Manhattan  
3 Beach and all these other places. We need to be the  
4 Redondo we used to be.

FM1-16  
cont'd

5 We're the eighth oldest city in Los Angeles.  
6 We were incorporated in 1892. 2017 when they start this  
7 construction, will be our 125th birthday.

8 Thank you.

9 (Applause.)

10 MS. MEYER: Reggie Thomas, Joanne Galin and then  
11 Yvonne Vich.

12 MR. THOMAS: Good morning. Thank you for letting me  
13 come behind that guy. I appreciate that.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. THOMAS: I'm a Redondo Beach resident. I'm also  
16 on the -- I'm a Commissioner, City Commissioner, and I  
17 manage Kincaid's. My comment is brief in that with -- we  
18 have Thanksgiving coming up next week. Every holiday we  
19 run into a problem of parking spaces. So parking is the  
20 beginning and end of this for me as a citizen, for me as  
21 a business owner, and that we have to come up with a  
22 system that is going to address that. And while  
23 CenterCal's plan is very broad and spread out, it does  
24 address that

PM1-17

25 So I am in support of that. The businesses of

1 the Pier -- I don't have an exact number -- but I would  
2 say we probably provide about 500 or so jobs, and we have  
3 a chance to, not only provide more jobs, but also, you  
4 know, in looking at the parking, we have to be able to  
5 acknowledge that more people are coming to our Pier. I  
6 lose money on holidays because many of you that come to  
7 Kincaid's, you make a reservation at 3:00 o'clock in the  
8 afternoon and you can't get to me because there are so  
9 many people that have come down to the Pier. And that's  
10 great and beautiful, but some of us lose money because we  
11 are so popular. So we need more parking in order to be  
12 able to accommodate the business -- to continue to grow  
13 to be able to allow Southern California people continue  
14 to enjoy Redondo Beach.

15 Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MS. MEYER: Joanne, Yvonne Vich and then Chris  
18 Voisoy.

19 MS. GALIN: Hi. Good morning. My name is Joanne  
20 Galin, and I am not a public speaker like a lot of these  
21 people here. I'm just a resident. I've been in Southern  
22 California since 1982 and in Redondo Beach since 2010.  
23 And I go out a lot, but I have to be honest. I spend  
24 more time in Manhattan Beach and Hermosa Beach. When I  
25 have friends that come into town, it's just not the same.

1           And I love Redondo, I love the people that run  
2 Redondo. I want to make it wonderful. I honestly in the  
3 bottom of my heart do not believe this is a mall that  
4 they're putting in. I've gone to CenterCal and asked  
5 them to explain everything to me because I really want to  
6 see what it's like.

PM1-19  
cont'd

7           I think a lot of people that are against  
8 everything, they just want to fight everything. If you  
9 say it's sunny out, they are going to find a reason to  
10 tell you why it's not sunny out. I just wish we could  
11 all work together, if we could move on and let's make  
12 Redondo the wonderful, wonderful place it should be.

13           Thank you.

14           (Applause.)

15           MS. MEYER: Yvonne, then Chris Voisoy and then Joan  
16 Irving -- Irvine,

17           Yvonne?

18           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's your turn.

19           MS. VICH: It's my turn?

20           My name is Yvonne Vich.

21           Can you hear me?

22           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

PM1-19

23           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Closer.

24           MS. VICH: You'd think I'd know how to use this  
25 because my work is as an international management

1 consultant and I work with organizations and companies  
2 worldwide that are experiencing massive changes and what  
3 I do is help them get through this change and it's very  
4 interesting in seeing what they go through and seeing  
5 what we're going through right now and how we are  
6 handling change.

7           Resistance looks like a lot of different  
8 things, and you can see some of that. I really agree  
9 with those who have said we are not -- if we're not going  
10 to grow and change, we are dying.

11           I think she said that. Yeah.

12           And then we need to unite our residents with  
13 the waterfront, have a community here. And I know I  
14 don't go down there. I'm like the last speaker. I go to  
15 Manhattan Beach and Hermosa. I Uber up there instead of  
16 coming down to the Pier because it's more fun up there.  
17 There's no energy here.

18           And in short, we cannot continue doing nothing.  
19 We have to change. We have to do something. And I  
20 appreciate the enormous task and the amount of  
21 accomplishment that was done by this small group of  
22 people in producing this EIR, looking at all these  
23 different possibilities.

24           Certainly, people, we can come up with an  
25 agreement on one. It may not be exactly what they said

PM1-19  
confd

1 and have illustrated, but it's going to be something. I  
2 agree with some of these suggestions about some of the  
3 modifications, and I think that the -- hopefully the City  
4 and CenterCal is open to those modifications. But we  
5 cannot not change. We have to move forward. I  
6 advocate -- I really advocate for some of these  
7 modifications and that we consider them and see how they  
8 might work. Who knows? It takes a village.

PM1-19  
cont'd

9 I support the CenterCal financing of the  
10 parking structure the way it's planned right now, and I  
11 oppose any alternative financing with use of bonds  
12 because I'm going to pay those for 25 years and I'll be  
13 dead in 25 years.

14 And that's all. Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MS. MEYER: Chris, Joan and then Mickey Turner.

17 MR. VOISOY: Hey. Good morning. My name is Chris  
18 Voisoy. A number of you may have heard my name. I've  
19 had all kinds of things thrown at me questioning who I  
20 am, what I am all about and why I care about this  
21 waterfront. My first and foremost thing I'll say is I  
22 have nothing to do with the project itself. I am a  
23 resident here. I am resident that actually was looking  
24 for answers. I went around and started to talk to  
25 people. I actually attended both sides of the meetings

PM1-20

1 trying to figure out what's going on. What I saw on one  
2 side was a lot of propaganda, a lot of things -- "let's  
3 call it a mall," let's throw these things out there that  
4 actually don't depict what is going on here.

5 Then I met this other group of people. They  
6 said, "Hey, we want to find out the real answers to  
7 things." So we actually went and started to meet with  
8 CenterCal, we met with City people. We actually talked  
9 to different people. We actually did a trip to different  
10 farmers markets to see how they're run...fascinating,  
11 really cool.

12 But really at the end of the day what we looked  
13 at was what was happening with this waterfront and moving  
14 it forward. I have a seven-year-old daughter. I look at  
15 what she wants. She is in the video. Those words were  
16 not fed to her. None of the words were fed to us in the  
17 video. We are residents. We are looking for something  
18 to do. We did look at the whole concern of, is this  
19 going to be a mall? Are there going to be the big box  
20 stores and those names, Crate and Barrel, Best Buy?

21 They don't fit. They wouldn't even fit the  
22 height restrictions to go in there. That doesn't make  
23 any sense.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. VOISCOY: What do we have to look for, though?

1 We do have to look for and make sure that we do protect  
2 the area. We do want to have these boutique shops. We  
3 do want to have all these things that are down there that  
4 we will go down to. CenterCal knows that the success for  
5 the development is actually based on us going down there.  
6 It is not in their best interests to go in and pull the  
7 wool over our eyes, try to make up these things, shove a  
8 Best Buy in between Catalina Coffee and, you know, a new  
9 Simmy's location. I don't even know how you get a  
10 freight to cross that area. That doesn't even make sense  
11 either. But the important thing is that there are a lot  
12 of people in the City that did want this project, that  
13 have provided the feedback, that we saw them listening.

14 The theater is something else. I actually want  
15 to say that it is small. It is specialty. I do  
16 presentations for folks sometimes -- I know it doesn't  
17 look like it right now, but we actually look for venues  
18 where we can do things during the day, small audiences  
19 and this is what could bring people down during the day  
20 to the waterfront to expand the use of that area.  
21 Conferences that are going to talk about product  
22 launches, things like that that can go on down there that  
23 I attend all the time and they're -- I've gone to Pomona,  
24 I've gone all over the place inland because we don't have  
25 anything like that here. This is a small boutique

PM 20  
cont'd

1 theater. I agree with you guys. Let's definitely not  
2 have a big stadium theater in here. I'll help you fight  
3 against that one. But that's not we're hearing. We went  
4 to the source. We asked the questions.

PM1-20  
cont'd

5 I and my family are all for this moving  
6 forward.

7 (Applause.)

8 MS. MEYER: Joan Irvine, Mickey Turner and then  
9 Janet Griswold.

10 MS. IRVINE: Boy, this does come out in your hand,

11 Hi. I'm Joan Irvine. I am a resident of  
12 Redondo Beach. And I'm going to say a few things that I  
13 said before in some of these meetings.

14 First of all, I support the mall -- I mean,  
15 excuse me. I'm saying mall, the project, and it's not  
16 going to be a mall. And guess what? There probably will  
17 be some changes. I mean, that's why they're having these  
18 meetings. So there will some changes as we go forward. PM1-20

19 One of the things I found is when -- I'm going  
20 to repeat what people have said -- when I've had people  
21 come to town, I don't take them down there. And also  
22 I've had friends who have gone down there, and one friend  
23 was like, six foot, four, big guy and he was staying at  
24 The Portofino. He went there, and he said coming back,  
25 he did not feel safe. You know, this is a big guy, and

1 he didn't feel safe; so you can imagine what somebody  
2 like me, you know, would feel walking around there. I  
3 don't go down there at night.

4 Then second, somebody mentioned the word  
5 "travesty." I think that the travesty is that a small  
6 group of people have been stopping the development of a  
7 beautiful mall downtown for over 25 years. That is the  
8 travesty.

9 (Applause.)

10 MS. IRVINE: And also because of that, I have a  
11 friend who does developments all over the world and I  
12 asked him why he did not respond to the RFP. And he said  
13 because it was Redondo Beach and so many developments  
14 have been shut down because of the people who are doing  
15 this. And he said that if this one gets shut down, no  
16 decent developer will ever come to Redondo Beach, at  
17 least for the next number of decades.

PM1-21  
cont'd

18 Yeah. And so you think it's great. But to me  
19 if we don't do something and we don't do something good,  
20 we are going to die, as a number of other people have  
21 said. So please just work together. Come up with things  
22 that we're -- take a look at things. Don't just  
23 criticize. I mean, I would like to find out -- you know,  
24 for myself, I took a look at that bridge -- I'm a  
25 cyclist -- you know, how long is that bridge going to be

1 up? How long is it going to be blocking traffic?  
2 There's going to be questions, legitimate questions that  
3 we need to have answers to, and that's the purpose of all  
4 of this.

PM1-21  
cont'd

5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. MEYER: Mickey Turner, Janet Griswold and then  
8 Joanne Galin.

9 MR. TURNER: I'm Mickey Turner. I'm a realtor with  
10 Remax. I've been with them 31 years. My office is in  
11 Rivera Village. I've been coming to Redondo since 1951.  
12 I was a paper boy, and the gal that I delivered to owned  
13 the barge out there. Her name was Essie. I fished from  
14 that. I owned property here at Torrance and Catalina,  
15 had that for years. I've lived in Redondo full time,  
16 because I was an entertainer before and I traveled, but  
17 I've been here since 1975.

PM1-22

18 Millie Riera's...Millie is my mother-in-law; so  
19 I know all about Redondo Beach and love Redondo Beach.  
20 And I just want to say as a realtor, when I'm selling --  
21 and I sell in the Esplanade and all down here -- the Pier  
22 is not a selling point. This area is not -- it just  
23 pulls us down. I'd like to say, "Gosh, and you got this  
24 over here," and I really can't. And I can tell you that  
25 the people end up going to Manhattan Beach, they go other

1 places because there's nothing here for them. And I'm in  
2 full support of this going forward. I'd love to come to  
3 a little movie theater down here. We don't come to the Pier anymore. At night, I would never bring my wife down  
4 here. It is just not a place where you feel comfortable,  
5 and it should be a place that we all come to and feel  
6 well about it.

PM1-22  
cont'd

8 Thank you.

9 MS. MEYER: Janet, Joanne and then Patrick Webb.

10 MS. GRISWOLD: I'm a resident since 1975. This is a  
11 development that's going to happen. So we have to accept  
12 it, but we don't have to accept it the way it is shown to  
13 us at the moment.

14 (Applause.)

15 MS. GRISWOLD: My -- first of all, the first  
16 gentleman who spoke about the Seaside Lagoon articulated  
17 that perfectly, and I support him 100 percent. I'm  
18 concerned about the connection that moves traffic from  
19 the north end to the south end behind the hotel at  
20 Torrance Boulevard and the Pier. That's going to be a  
21 three-story wall and it looks like it's a street with one  
22 lane going south and one lane going north and that is  
23 not -- not enough. The first car that stalls, it's going  
24 to be a nightmare, particularly on weekends, every  
25 weekend, and particularly at the peak hours for going to

PM1-23

1 the restaurants and leaving the restaurants.

2 The noise that can't -- it's going to go  
3 eastward, and it's going to go right up to the  
4 condominiums. So the gentleman who suggested that  
5 CenterCal provide the windows to abate the noise should  
6 be listened to if that street is going to go through.  
7 Also, obviously that's carbon monoxide, and it's got no  
8 place to go but east to the condominiums; so I think this  
9 really needs to be looked at.

10 The wisdom of having the street for traffic,  
11 I'm very concerned about all of these restaurants and all  
12 of the shops have to have delivery trucks. Where are  
13 these delivery trucks going to access the people that  
14 they serve, the stores that they serve? Where are they  
15 going to park, and are they going to use this street with  
16 one direction going one way, one direction going the  
17 other? Some of these big beer trucks are huge, and I  
18 just don't get that street at all.

19 I understand the connection is needed, but it  
20 has to be improved from the way it looks now. And there  
21 has to be designated parking areas for these trucks to  
22 service the businesses.

23 Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MS. MEYER: Joanne, Patrick and then Dale Petruvia.

PM1-23  
cont'd

1 Thank you.

2 MR. WEBB: First of all, let's rearrange this --

3 MS. MEYER: Joanne? Do we have a Joanne?

4 MR. WEBB: Are you Joanne?

5 Oh. Sorry, guys. I am Patrick, resident of  
6 Redondo, resident of The Village actually. Thank you all  
7 for taking time out of your Saturday to be here. I  
8 recognize a lot of you in the crowd are neighbors. You  
9 know, when we first got our condo here, we paid 600,000  
10 for it. We just had it appraised for a little under 500.  
11 So I'm not too much worried about my view. I'm more  
12 worried about the property value more than anything. PM1-24

13 Another thing is as a business owner, the last  
14 meeting I attended was with the Police Department, a few  
15 people at the City, and what we talked about was the  
16 increase of transients that would be coming within the  
17 next year from L.A., Santa Monica. We'll be -- right now  
18 we have -- I think they said about 50. In 12 months  
19 we're going to have about 200. So something has to be  
20 done about this. We have to improve this, we have to  
21 improve what we have, or it is only going to get a lot  
22 worse.

23 Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MS. MEYER: So Dale and then Rolf Strutzenberg.

1 MR. STRUTZENBERG: Very good.

2 MS. MEYER: Thank you.

3 MS. PETRULIS: I'm Dale Petrulis, and I am a 16-year  
4 resident of Redondo Beach. But I was a principal and  
5 educator in Palos Verdes for another 13 years. So I have  
6 been committed to the South Bay for another 29 years. I  
7 also lived in West L.A. prior to Redondo, and we made a  
8 choice. After we paid for college for our kids, we  
9 wanted to move back to the beach and we chose Redondo  
10 Beach but -- and we're fortunate enough to have  
11 entertainment funds and time and we never -- other than  
12 Kincaid's, we never spend it in Redondo Beach. PM1.25

13 I go to the Landmark Theater in West L.A. for  
14 specialty movies. I would be thrilled not to drive out  
15 to West L.A. to go to a movie I want to see. And I've  
16 been listening, and one of the things that I tend to do  
17 is kind of synthesize the things I've heard today. I  
18 like the idea of a master plan rather than a piecemeal  
19 set of projects that don't mesh and don't make sense. I  
20 love the idea of a marketplace. San Francisco was  
21 mentioned. I'll mention Havana, Cuba. The marketplace  
22 there is an exquisite, wonderful experience. I like the  
23 idea of choice of the kinds of entertainment that I can  
24 enjoy.

25 The safety...the community -- that area is a

1 problem. The beautification...again, I don't go down  
2 there. It's not pretty, it doesn't feel safe, and it  
3 doesn't provide the choices that I want. I like the idea  
4 of a central community. The City revenue cannot be  
5 discounted. We all pay for that when it's not available.  
6 I believe there will be increased recreation and use year  
7 round, not just seasonally. I believe we'll be provided  
8 jobs improving the number of visitors to our community,  
9 which brings in revenue. And, again, the theater, the  
10 choices, the restaurants -- I really like Kincaid's, but  
11 that's not the only place I want to go on the Pier. PM1-25  
cont'd

12 So I really support -- I'm really excited. I  
13 really support this project. I think the tweaking along  
14 the way and listening to residents is the important thing  
15 to do in order to build a stronger consensus, but I also  
16 believe you need to be honest in your concerns about it  
17 so that those are mitigated. But when you're given  
18 information that is not totally honest and clear, you're  
19 mitigating nothing.

20 So I really support this project and hope you  
21 do too.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. MEYER: Dale, Rolf and then Janet Johnson.

24 MR. STRUTZENBERG: Good morning. Rolf Strutzenberg,  
25 resident for 19 years, Redondo Beach. Unfortunately, I'm PM1-28

1 only up to about page 33 of 6500 pages, so all I can  
2 offer is from what I've seen this morning. So I offer  
3 you the David Letterman Top 10 Comments from just what I  
4 have seen this morning.

5 I would say that putting a boat ramp right next  
6 to a lagoon where you want kids and families to swim is  
7 probably not the best idea in the world.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Absolutely.

9 MR. STRUTZENBERG: The number one event for  
10 polluting from boats is the startup and then launching  
11 them. All the oils come out of it in the startup. The  
12 westerly winds are going to blow right into that area.  
13 What are you going to do on the heavy traffic weekends  
14 when you've got a lot of people and families in that PM1-26  
cont'd  
15 lagoon area if you move it out there, and then you've got  
16 all these boats coming in with really no place to queue  
17 up? And they will queue up because everybody is going to  
18 be waiting to get in and out?

19 Along with that -- it's probably in the report.  
20 I haven't gotten to page 6300 yet -- about the lagoon  
21 water quality in general, what that would be if they  
22 expose that to the open breakwater area rather than  
23 having it refrained the way it is now.

24 I haven't heard anything about the time frame  
25 of this. It's probably in there, but is it a two-year

1 project start to finish, is it four years? And honestly  
2 in my mind, if you tell me that number, I'm roughly going  
3 to double it just because that's what happens. So are we  
4 going to be sitting with this, you know, for five years?  
5 And if we are, that's understandable. These things take  
6 time, but please tell us that in the beginning so we at  
7 least know what to expect.

8           Probably in the report also, what's the  
9 construction traffic for this, especially for the  
10 demolition? You're probably talking thousands of dump  
11 trucks going in and out here. Where are they going to  
12 go? What's the traffic effects of that and so forth? PM1-28  
13 The dust that's going to come from that demolition, it's cont'd  
14 going to be almost like a mini 9/11 down there as they  
15 start crushing all this concrete that is really in a  
16 crumbling state already, especially with the parking  
17 garage.

18           And then the building. You know, you got  
19 cement trucks coming in here, you got all the delivery  
20 the concrete trucks, you got all the construction  
21 equipment trucks going in and out. We just want to know  
22 what it is that that's coming to us. In the Marina  
23 itself, in the whole area inside the breakwater -- I  
24 think the gentleman that was up just a few minutes ago  
25 does work with a paddleboard company and a few weeks ago

1 we were at the City Council and they expanded the paddle  
2 boarding. We know the paddle boarding is growing in that  
3 area; kayaking is getting to be more popular. How are  
4 they going to integrate all of that with the boat  
5 traffic, the lagoon traffic and so forth?

6 And the drawbridge I think is a really pretty  
7 thing on the pictures. It probably in reality will end  
8 up having a lot of issues. You've got the need for the  
9 maintenance on that. If you got 10 of them in the area,  
10 great. You call the drawbridge maintenance company and  
11 they run down when it's stuck and they fix that. If  
12 we're the only one within how many miles that has that,  
13 who's going to maintain it? Who's going to repair it  
14 when it's stuck halfway on a busy weekend? And maybe  
15 that's been planned for. I don't know.

PM1.26  
cont'd

16 The -- something I don't see is the  
17 electric -- how is it coming into the project? Typically  
18 in the pretty pictures that you see when they're  
19 presented on things like this, they don't show the power  
20 lines because they don't want you to see that. Is it  
21 coming in overhead, or is it coming in underground, and  
22 if it is coming in underground, which is great, what are  
23 the mitigation measures for all the maintenance that  
24 happens with that because they are constantly tearing  
25 that up, adding new lines, new high-speed cable, new

1 whatever that has to go in underground.

2 Kind of a technical issue: The parking lot  
3 construction, the dirt building that, I'd like to know  
4 what's being planned for that because, while technology  
5 has definitely increased, it makes things more durable in  
6 the seawater environment, I would say that low-bid  
7 construction doesn't always do the best job of putting  
8 that in the way it should be and we don't want another  
9 crumbling parking garage 10 years from now.

10 And finally -- initially I would have said that  
11 the movie theater was not the greatest idea, but now  
12 hearing it maybe as a mixed use kind of deal, not a bad  
13 thing. We could use a venue like that. It would be  
14 another auditorium like this, maybe a little bit smaller,  
15 that people could use to hold their iPhone launches or  
16 something like that. I don't know.

17 But overall I'd just like to say to the people  
18 that are doing it, tell us the bad. Don't just focus on  
19 the good. Let us know what's coming, be honest with us,  
20 and we'd appreciate that. You know, it's not that we're  
21 not going to support it. There may be a lot of issues to  
22 work out, but I do support having some kind of  
23 development down there. There's a lot of things to go  
24 through with this yet, and I please ask you right now,  
25 let's give the City staff and the consultants and

PM1.26  
cont'd

1 everything a hand for doing all of this and for putting  
2 all of this together --

PM1-26  
cont'd

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. STRUTZENBERG: -- (inaudible). I thank you.

5 MS. MEYER: So before we go on to Janet, Dale? Is  
6 there Dale?

7 He left? Okay. Thank you.

8 So Janet Johnson, Joanne Newman and then  
9 Michael Del Tufo.

10 MS. JOHNSON: Hi. I'm Janet Johnson. This project  
11 has been a long time in coming, and I'm so glad it's  
12 here. But I hope we don't have legal entanglements that  
13 some might think of bringing forward to the latest and to  
14 deter it's progress forward.

15 (Applause.)

PM1-27

16 MS. JOHNSON: The EIR looks at possible negative  
17 impacts, and I think they've done it fairly and clearly  
18 and they don't seem so awful to me. They seem like most  
19 things can be mitigated, at least if we permit them to do  
20 that. The EIR does not talk about positive impacts --  
21 that's not it's job -- but there are many more positive  
22 impacts than negative impacts -- that's certainly true --  
23 such as, more recreation, the opening up the Seaside  
24 Lagoon. It's only open 30 days now a year really, and  
25 that has enormous potential.



1 we verify that? Where can we read something in a journal  
2 that says that? Someone else came up here and said that  
3 CenterCal was dropping like \$400 million on the  
4 infrastructure. I've never read a figure over the  
5 300 million, and that was for the entire project.

6 People, if you're going to get up here and talk  
7 about things, talk about things that we can verify. And  
8 this is a waste of time if we can't -- the movie theater  
9 is something I can't verify. On CBS Sunday morning news,  
10 they have a section called "Posts." And they asked a  
11 question, and the question on Sunday morning was, "Where  
12 do you watch your movies?" 84 percent said that they  
13 watched movies at home, and now we're going to be  
14 crammed -- and we're going to have a movie theater  
15 crammed down our throat, which according to Carmike  
16 Cinemas, someone in the industry who did a survey on it  
17 said that movie theaters are the most underutilized  
18 entities in the free world...not just in Redondo Beach,  
19 not just in California but the free world, and we're  
20 going to put a movie theater down there that is doomed to  
21 failure? That's crazy. Why can't we have a community  
22 theater instead?

23 (Applause.)

24 MS. NEWMAN: The boutique hotel: The boutique hotel  
25 was supposed to be 80 rooms. Now we've had a 50 percent

PM1-28  
cont'd

1 increase to 120 rooms and they're still calling it a  
2 boutique hotel. A boutique hotel consists of a hotel  
3 with less than 100 rooms, and this one is going to have  
4 the entire first floor crammed with retail. Now, does  
5 that sound like a boutique hotel to you? It doesn't to  
6 me.

7 And where is there anything unique in this plan  
8 that we can market to world to say we have something  
9 different? I have been asking and asking and asking for  
10 something unique. We don't have anything that's  
11 different from anybody else that we can market to the  
12 world to bring the tourists here, and this community --  
13 no matter what you say this community cannot finance and  
14 make this big bloated development successful. There just  
15 is not that much money. We need the tourists to come,  
16 and we don't have anything to bring them here.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Here, here.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The ocean.

19 (Applause.)

20 MS. NEWMAN: The ocean? They can see the ocean all  
21 the way up and down the coast. They can see that in San  
22 Pedro, they can see it in Long Beach, they can see it in  
23 Santa Monica, they can see it in Marina Del Rey. That's  
24 not a unique item to bring people here.

25 And the delivery trucks: I agree with Janet.

PM1-28  
cont'd

1 I have been trying for two years to find out where the  
2 delivery trucks are going to go, and there's no, no place  
3 for them to go.

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. NEWMAN: And there's going to be a bazillion of  
6 them. They talk about the Pier now. Nobody goes there.  
7 Well, the delivery trucks in and out of that place day by  
8 day by day, all day long, they must just be stockpiling  
9 merchandise down there if nobody goes there because why  
10 would they need delivery trucks. So they must have some  
11 warehouses down there that they're putting all kinds of  
12 stuff.

13 (Applause.)

PM1-28  
10/11/11

14 MS. MEYER: Please wrap it up, Joanné.

15 MS. NEWMAN: I'm sorry?

16 MS. MEYER: Just --

17 MS. NEWMAN: Yeah, okay.

18 MS. MEYER: Thank you.

19 MS. NEWMAN: I just have one thing to say about the  
20 pictures. They're really pretty, but I want to know if  
21 all those mature trees that we see in those pictures are  
22 what's going to be planted? Are they going to be there  
23 from the beginning, or do we have to wait 20 years for  
24 them to grow?

25 (Applause.)

1 MS. MEYER: Michael and then Alex Smith and then Tom  
2 Gray.

3 MR. DEL TUFO: Okay. Compared to most of you guys  
4 here -- my name is Michael Del Tufo -- I just moved into  
5 The Village about two years ago, two-and-a-half years  
6 ago, but I lived about a block and half away from the  
7 Third street Promenade. How many people have been there?  
8 A lot of people, right? It's a great place. I watched.  
9 I lived in Santa Monica for 15 years.

10 We need a change here, people. I want to be  
11 honest with you. I won't go to the Pic right now. You  
12 want to know why? It's a bunch of people that come in  
13 bikers. I live in The Village. I have a view. I'm  
14 going to lose a portion of my view. It's going to happen  
15 it's inevitable, but we have to have change. PM1-29

16 I like your comments about the birds and the  
17 environment. I love that. But I think CenterCal can  
18 work with us. There's people that live in The Village  
19 I think if they said, "We'll go a little lower on our  
20 views," would be fine with it. People wouldn't complain.  
21 People would love it. 37 feet high, I lose my entire  
22 harbor view. I love it. I moved down here for that.

23 I think if they work with the homeowners and  
24 they put the windows in, I love that idea. Put in safety  
25 glass, I think that's a great idea -- I mean, the

1 soundproofing, it's great. Noise and traffic, that will  
2 increase. It's going to happen. I lived about a block  
3 and a half from Third Street Promenade. It's constantly,  
4 constantly busy. At about 11:00 o'clock, 10:30, died  
5 down, same thing that's going to happen now.

6 This place on the weekend will be a little bit  
7 louder. I hear bands on the rocks cause I see them  
8 basically on the rocks. I see Captain Kidd's right in  
9 front of my house. And you guys, we have to change.  
10 It's got to be safe.

PM1-29  
cont'd

11 The movie theater is a little out of control,  
12 putting 20 of them in, but if they put in 5, I'd love to  
13 be able to walk to the theater. Who wouldn't? You'd be  
14 able to take your kids down there. It's a bunch of gangs  
15 down there right now. It's a little crazy. I'm a  
16 50-year-old guy. I love the fact -- I was an ex-cop.  
17 I'm an ex-fireman. We need to change. The video looked  
18 great. I work in television, I thought it was  
19 phenomenal. The pictures look amazing. Just work with  
20 the homeowners and work with the people around here and  
21 that is how this will happen and be done with it.  
22 Everyone has just got to work together. I mean, I really  
23 feel that way.

24 Thanks, you guys.

25 (Applause.)

1 MS. MEYER: Alex, Tom Gray and then Christine --  
2 MS. JESPERSON: "Jesperoon."  
3 MS. MEYER: Thank you.  
4 MR. SMITH: Sorry. I took the long way around.  
5 My name is Alex Smith. I want to thank  
6 everybody for the opportunity to speak tonight [sic]. I  
7 apologize that I didn't prepare anything beyond the mike,  
8 but I do believe that this project with our support, with  
9 our coming together with commentary and direction,  
10 pointing all the arrows in the same direction, I feel  
11 like the community is going to be able to get something  
12 that we need.  
13 What do we need? Let me ask you this for  
14 yourself: When was the last time that you went down to  
15 the waterfront to patronize it? PM1-30  
16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Last weekend.  
17 MR. SMITH: Last weekend? What did you do? Where  
18 did you eat?  
19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Polly's.  
20 MR. SMITH: Polly's?  
21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, yes.  
22 MR. SMITH: Think about all the things that you go  
23 to other places to do that you wish was right there at  
24 the marina because it's so incredible, because it's the  
25 oceanfront and there's boats and there's the sun and

1 that's beautiful picture opportunities. Think about the  
2 things that you wish you could do there, but the  
3 waterfront just isn't that. It's not that now.

4 And we are going to get what we deserve. How  
5 much effort are we going to put to work together to  
6 create what we deserve?

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. SMITH: CenterCal has to listen, and we have to  
9 listen to each other.

10 Wouldn't you agree?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

PM:30  
cont'd

12 MR. SMITH: So don't just come to these things and  
13 throw rocks and flush the toilet. Go to the people who  
14 are running the show and ask them, "When can we go meet  
15 for coffee?" "What do I have to do to take you out to  
16 lunch?" I think there's a lot of opportunities for us to  
17 create a thing that we want it to be, but we have to want  
18 to work together. And these guys are capitalists.  
19 They're putting their money in to make profit, okay? So  
20 they deserve our time and input because they could lose  
21 it all.

22 If we talk about, "Oh, we're going to put in a  
23 theater that's bound to fail," you don't think they  
24 looked at statistics? They're making a calculated  
25 decision. They're going to serve liquor and food at this

1 theater. I'd go to that. I'd go to that. I'd go to  
2 that instead of having to go all the way to Playa Del  
3 Roy, Playa Vista mega malls. I want to go a place I can  
4 ride my bike. Right now I live in South Hermosa. I rode  
5 my bike here today just now.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. SMITH: And I think that more than just Redondo  
8 residents, Hermosa residents, Manhattan, P.V., Torrance,  
9 people want to come to a place that's unique. And it is.  
10 It's at the waterfront. Manhattan Pier and Hermosa Pier  
11 are just a little narrow strip, and almost nothing is  
12 actually on the strand. This thing is on the water.  
13 This thing is way cooler, way unique.

PM1-30  
cont'd

14 So when people say, "Oh, this could be a mall  
15 anywhere in the world, anywhere in the country," not  
16 really. Well, we do have the Pike in Long Beach which is  
17 having it's own issues right now. So when we talk about  
18 how we can steer this thing so it's going to be a  
19 success, think about where they have made a mistake.

20 And personally, I don't really care about the  
21 tourists. I want to go to a place that my residents, my  
22 neighbors want to patronize because we're not going to  
23 the waterfront now. I would so go to the waterfront if  
24 it had all the things I wanted to do there besides going  
25 to the new bars -- the new craft breweries and a few

1 little restaurants that I like. And Hermosa is just all  
2 the bars. I'm getting a little bit older, just a little  
3 bit myself. I don't really want to go to the bars, I  
4 mean, every time. I'd like to go do the things that are  
5 a little more upscale, a little nicer, a little more --

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Like what?

7 MR. SMITH: Yeah. A more -- similar, more like  
8 Manhattan but not so much silver spoon. So I would love  
9 to see this thing, the waterfront turn into something  
10 that we will patronize --

PM1-30  
cont'd

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

12 MR. SMITH: -- so when we talk about this to each  
13 other, think about what will I enjoy, what will my  
14 friends and neighbors go spend money at because it's fun,  
15 not overpay, but because it's going to be good use of our  
16 money and time.

17 So thank you, guys.

18 (Applause.)

19 MS. MEYER: So Tom Gray, Christine, and then if Gary  
20 O'Hagen came back, you would be next.

21 MR. GRAY: Hello, everybody. Like Alex, I don't  
22 have any prepared remarks. I'll just speak from my  
23 heart. There are so many great things about this project  
24 that I am so looking forward to the opening up of the  
25 Lagoon, the public market -- I can't wait for that.

PM1-31

1 We'll take a little movie theater. We can walk to it,  
2 maybe see a lecture or two. I don't think it's got to be  
3 the AMC with thousands of teenagers. So it's just a lot  
4 of great things.

5 My wife and I speak from a very unique  
6 perspective because we live across the street.

7 (Applause.)

PM1-31  
cont'd

8 MR. GRAY: So you can't say "not in my backyard."  
9 We want this right in our backyard because what is the  
10 view that we have right now? It's ugly flat parking lots  
11 that are oil-stained underutilized 99 percent of the time  
12 except for July 4th and some special weekends and all.

13 So we're going to lose a terrible view and get  
14 a fantastic world-class waterfront full speed ahead.

15 (Applause.)

16 MS. MEYER: Christine?

17 MS. JESPERSON: Hello. I'm Christina Jesperson.  
18 I'm married to him, and we have invested a lot of money  
19 in living down here by the waterfront. We have probably  
20 the most view to lose of probably in this particular  
21 audience right now, but we don't care because we're so  
22 excited that we get to live right there. We can walk  
23 across the street, we can go to restaurants, we can go to  
24 movies, we can take our dog to walk and there's going to  
25 be endless paths that are going to be right alongside the

PM1-32

1 ocean. As of right now, very little can you walk right  
2 beside the ocean.

3 And I think one of the things -- a lot of  
4 people here are so concerned about their views. There's  
5 nothing in the books that says your views are guaranteed  
6 if you buy a home, that your view is always going to be  
7 there. If you live on the avenues, you have a little  
8 house and somebody next door builds a three-story  
9 townhouse and you lost your view, is that a right? It's  
10 not a right. We are not given the right to always have a  
11 view. This is public land. It's going to be used by  
12 everyone, and I'm very excited about it.

13 (Applause.)

14 MS. MEYER: So Dinch, the Body Glove -- okay.

15 And then Gary O'Hagen -- I think he left.

16 Did -- Gary, are you here?

17 Okay. So we've gotten to the point where I've  
18 gotten to all my speaker cards for people who want to  
19 speak. So if there's anybody else who'd like to right  
20 now, you know, please fill out one of these and give it  
21 to us.

22 Now, I also want to let you know, if you  
23 haven't already heard this from another staff member, but  
24 we have comment sheets and we have comment boxes. And  
25 again, you can fill these out at any time today or in the

PM1-32  
mm/tt

1 63-day review period as long as we get this by 5:30 p.m.  
2 on January 19th. We also have some information for you,  
3 One was on how we were going to run the meeting tonight,  
4 so -- I mean, today. And then we also have, again, how  
5 do you input on the project and then the Notice of  
6 Preparation and the Notice of Availability of the Draft  
7 EIR. If you'd like to take a copy of this, it has where  
8 you can find the information online as well as the City  
9 departments, and, again, it has the date of which our  
10 public review is going on until.

11 Anybody else want to --

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me. I just have a  
13 question.

14 While you were initially speaking -- hello?

15 MS. MEYER: Uh-huh.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- you said that we would  
17 have questions afterwards, but I don't see -- I mean --

18 MS. MEYER: So the questions really are intended for  
19 out in that lobby area with staff. So -- and again, feel  
20 free to go out there and continue to talk to them.

21 There's some boards there, there's boards back here,  
22 there's staff. Most of us are wearing some lanyard of  
23 sorts. This really is just for taking public comments so  
24 that we can get the court reporter to type it and put it  
25 in the public record cause that will be part of the

1 environmental impact's public record in response to  
2 comments.

3 MR. UDEWITZ: Just one last thing, one comment.

4 I need the microphone. Yeah.

5 MS. MEYER: And say your name again for the record,  
6 please, cause like said, the court reporter is taking  
7 this all down.

8 MR. UDEWITZ: Matthew Udewitz, Keller Williams  
9 Commercial Real Estate, Brentwood and Beverly Hills.

10 I'm under the impression that right now for  
11 sale is in Torrance the Mobil refinery entire land in  
12 addition to the refinery that's here in Redondo across  
13 the street. I don't think that anything should be broken  
14 ground until you have a coordinated effort with  
15 development plans for those other two properties.

16 (Applause.)

17 MS. MEYER: And we did actually get another speaker  
18 card for JoAnn Turk.

19 So JoAnn do you want to get up there?

20 Thank you.

21 MS. TURK: Hello. I am JoAnn Turk. And although I  
22 am involved with a lot of volunteering throughout the  
23 community, like the Chamber of Commerce, the Visitors  
24 Bureau the King Harbor Association, the Round Table, et  
25 cetera, I am speaking today, as my husband is one of the

1 owners of Polly's on the Pier. And I want to say that  
2 our encouragement from CenterCal has been very, very  
3 positive. They have offered to either put us in the  
4 public -- public market or to -- they would like to see  
5 the Pier rebuilt, too. And I think the Sport Fishing  
6 Pier is a high necessity. It's a cultural and a historic  
7 thing in Redondo Beach.

8 We do have a great blue heron out there and a  
9 pet pelican and the birds come in all the time. The  
10 fishing has been there for a long time. The employees  
11 get very involved with kids and teaching them to fish,  
12 and I think CenterCal and the City have been very  
13 receptive to keeping the historic cultural places.

14 I myself personally feel that keeping --  
15 retaining Captain Kidd's and Quality Seafood are  
16 essential. They're treasures. Working with the Visitors  
17 Bureau, they are treasures to this City. Most small  
18 cities of our size don't have that. So is Tony's and  
19 Polly's and the sport fishing and whale watching and the  
20 Looking Glass Bottom Boat, and CenterCal is making a  
21 place for all of those to return.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. TURK: And those are the kind of things that  
24 will mitigate the feeling of any mall. Like  
25 somebody -- a former speaker just said, the developer has

PMI-34  
cont'd

1 to be a capitalist. They have to look to a profit or  
2 they're not going to do it. I worked in Redondo Beach  
3 Marina. My original boss was Chuck Johnston, and we came  
4 down here and bought the Blue Moon Salon and did a lot --  
5 and so we have a lot of history. And I saw developers  
6 come through Chuck Johnston's office all the time, and  
7 they were very fascinated with the area but then they  
8 would get discouraged because there would always be  
9 naysayers or no-growthers and they couldn't get the money  
10 together -- this is a huge risk that the developer has  
11 taken with a huge investment.

12 So I hope -- there will be many -- they have  
13 the flexibility -- they will change some things. Some  
14 things won't work, but everybody in the harbor is ready  
15 for it cause we know things are falling apart, we know  
16 that some people don't want to come down to the harbor  
17 and we want them to come. My husband and I have been  
18 lucky enough to travel a lot in recent years because  
19 we're getting older and we know that we got our bucket  
20 list. But when you go to places like Rome or Paris or  
21 New York or Boston or London, yes, they have traffic  
22 problems

23 Why is that? Because they're popular and  
24 everybody wants to go there. But that's how  
25 people -- how little -- small businesses stay in business

PM1-34  
cont'd

1 because they have the customers. And Polly's has a very  
2 local base of employees, customers and visitors.  
3 Visitors come back over and over again from foreign  
4 countries and airline companies. The flight attendants,  
5 they find Polly's, and they come back over and over  
6 because they like that kind of thing. And I know that  
7 we'll continue to exist, but we hope that the Pier is  
8 rebuilt because we think it's a real cultural necessity.

PM1-34  
cont'd

9 MS. MEYER: So we -- I did get another speaker card,  
10 but before I call up Jane Diehl, if you haven't already  
11 gotten your validation for the parking, please do so  
12 where you signed in. And if you haven't signed in,  
13 please do so, and that's how you're going to get future  
14 information on the project.

15 So Jane, if you're here, come on down.

16 Thank you.

17 MS. DIEHL: One of the things that I think is  
18 important for the citizens of Redondo Beach to think  
19 about with this project is how we're going to improve the  
20 water quality. That's a big issue here. The Pier tends  
21 to get F ratings. Right now, all that water, all the  
22 drainage, because of so much concrete, it just goes right  
23 into the ocean.

PM1-35

24 With the new project, because of the laws of  
25 how things have to be built now, you won't have that.

1 You'll have it draining off and sifting other places;  
2 plus you've got all the rust and all of the things from  
3 the old pipes and everything that are going in.

4 So this is something that will affect every  
5 citizen in Redondo because we have an opportunity. The  
6 City can't pay for that sort of expense, but we've got  
7 somebody coming in, and it's going to make a huge  
8 difference either whether you go to this -- to  
9 CenterCal's development or not. We have an opportunity  
10 in this town to clean up our water.

11 Thanks.

12 (Applause.)

13 MS. MEYER: Well, thank you, everyone, for  
14 participating today. I really appreciate it. There's  
15 still staff outside if you want to look at the boards, if  
16 you haven't already, and talk to them about some of your  
17 comments or questions. They'll be happy to show you  
18 where in the environmental document your questions are  
19 answered or your -- the issues that you're concerned  
20 about. So please feel free to go over there and talk to  
21 them.

22 So thank you so much, and have a great  
23 Thanksgiving.

24 (Whereupon, at 11:36 a.m., The  
25 Waterfront Project Draft EIR Public Meeting

PM1:36  
cont'd

1 was concluded.)

2 -000-

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

102

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COURT REPORTERS CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA     )  
  )    ss.  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES    )

I, Vivian Lane, hereby certify:

I am a duly qualified Certified Shorthand Reporter, in the State of California, holder of Certificate Number CSR 11339 issued by the Court Reporters Board of California and which is in full force and effect.

I am not financially interested in this action and am not a relative or employee of any attorney of the parties, or of any of the parties.

I am the reporter that stenographically recorded the testimony in the foregoing proceeding and the foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony given.

Dated: December 11, 2015

*Vivian Lane*



---

**PM1- Draft EIR Public Meeting Transcript - November 21, 2015**  
**(Beginning page 28 of transcript – Page 2-854)**

---

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-01****BRUCE SZELES**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-01**

Please refer to Master Response #4: Modifications to the Seaside Lagoon. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-02****ROSS YOSNOW**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-02**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC001 and Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-03****ADRINNE TAUFA**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-03**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC027 and Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-04****AL WEST**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-04**

The proposed project is not a 'mall' but is categorized as a mixed-use development, including office and hotel with a retail, dining, entertainment (RDE) component that has enhanced public open spaces and recreational opportunities unique to the waterfront. In fact, as analyzed, the project includes more restaurant use, including a public market hall, than retail. As for the boat launch ramp, the Draft EIR analyzed six alternative locations and ramps (Alternative 8 in Chapter 4). Regarding views, please refer to Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development and Draft EIR Section 3.1. As for profits and revenue, these are not CEQA considerations. The Pacific Avenue Reconnection is an element of the project that is fully addressed in the Draft EIR (e.g., vehicle emissions are addressed in Section 3.2, Air Quality and noise is detailed in Section 3.10, Noise of the Draft EIR). As detailed in Chapter 4, Analysis of Alternative of the Draft EIR, Alternatives 1, 2 and 5 do not include the roadway reconnection. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-05****BETH MINEAU**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-05**

The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body. Please see Draft EIR Chapter 3 for analysis of construction related

impacts of the project.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-06****MARYANN GUTHRIE**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-06**

The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-07****PENNY WIRSING**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-07**

The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-08****BARBARA EPSTEIN**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-08**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC017, PC081, PC082, PC086, PC088, PC279 and PC280. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-09****MATTHEW UDEWITZ**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-09**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC018, PC039-7 and PC090. Regarding the trolley, please refer to response to Comment PC152-11. Please also see Master Response #4: Modifications to Seaside Lagoon and Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-10****GARRY OHST**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-10**

The commenter provides no specifics or scientific basis for their assertions that the Draft EIR is flawed. The Draft EIR Section 3.9, Land Use and Planning did not conclude 'no impact' as mentioned by the commenter. The proposed project was determined to have a less than significant impact associated with Land Use and Planning because the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation (including, but not limited to, the general plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) and would not result in a physical change to the environment not already addressed in the other resource chapters of this EIR. The commenter is incorrect that the project Site is only 15 acres, the project site encompasses 36 acres as described in Draft EIR Section 1.2.2. In addition, please refer to Response to Comments PC017-1 regarding square footage. Please refer to Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site regarding that site. Please also see Draft EIR Section 3.13 for analysis of traffic, Section 3.11 for discussion of public services, and Section 3.1 for discussion of Aesthetics. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-11****GINA DIPIETRO**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-11**

The commenter references “great blue parrots,” it is unclear whether the commenter intended to reference great blue herons, which were discussed in the commenter’s written correspondence (Comment PC085). No “great blue parrots” were found at the project site during the biological survey. Please refer to Response to Comment PC085, which includes discussion of biological resources. Section 3.12, Recreation of the Draft EIR analyzed the impacts of the proposed project associated with recreation. Section 3.12.4.2 provides the City’s significance criteria associated with recreation, which includes (1) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities *such that a substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated* (REC-1), and (2) Include recreational facilities or required the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have *an adverse physical effect on the environmental* not already addressed as part of the proposed project (REC-2). A less than significant impact was determined under threshold REC-1 and no impact under threshold REC-2. Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site, for information on the existing and proposed businesses at the project site. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-12****TAL FINNEY**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-12**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. Your comment will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-13****JIM LIGHT**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-13**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC323. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-14****STEVE RASAK**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-14**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC016 and PC406-1. In addition, please see Master Response #8: Boat Ramp in King Harbor. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-15****SURJIT HORA**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-15**

Please refer to various Master Responses, such as #9: Views and Scale of Development, #6: Summary of Traffic Impacts Associated with the Operation of the Proposed Project, and #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site, for information on size of the development, traffic, and the theater. Regarding noise impacts during construction, Section 3.10, Noise of the Draft EIR addresses potential

noise impacts. The analyses account for the net increase in building area associated with the project and address potential impacts to sensitive receptors in proximity to the project site. As discussed in Draft EIR Section 3.10.4, the City utilized specific sensitive receptor locations (i.e. monitoring locations) which also represent receptors located in close proximity to these locations. These receptor locations are described in Table 3.10-2. As detailed in Section 3.10 of the Draft EIR, construction of the proposed project would cause a substantial temporary and periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (i.e., construction activities lasting more than one day would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 10 dBA or more at a noise sensitive use); a significant noise impact would occur. However, construction impacts on ambient noise levels would be short-term and would not result in permanent increases in ambient noise levels. Even with implementation of mitigation measures MM NOI-2 through MM NOI-6, the construction noise impact relative to the condominiums east of the site would remain significant and unavoidable. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-16****PAT AUST**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-16**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. Your comment will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-17****REGGIE THOMAS**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-17**

Regarding parking at the project site associated with the proposed project, please refer to Master Response #7: Waterfront Parking. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-18****JOANNE GALIN**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-18**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-19****YVONNE VICH (YVONNE VICK)**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-19**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-20****CHRIS VOISOY (CHRIS VOISEY)**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-20**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-21****JOAN IRVINE**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-21**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC323-96 for a discussion of bridge operations and Section 3.11 of the EIR for discussion associated with police services. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-22****MICKEY TURNER**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-22**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-23****JANET GRISWOLD**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-23**

Regarding a stalled car in the area of the Pacific Avenue Reconnection, on-site security would perform traffic control to allow for the movement of traffic from behind the stalled vehicle, as well as facilitate the removal of the stalled vehicle. Please also note that three of the seven project alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, and 5) which do not include the Pacific Avenue Reconnection; please see Draft EIR Chapter 4, Analysis of Alternatives. Regarding massing on the project site refer to Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR and Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development. Please refer to Response to Comment PC039-4 regarding air quality and delivery trucks. Please also refer to Response to Comment PC039-7 for discussion of windows to abate noise. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-24****PATRICK WEBB**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-24**

For discussion associated with police services, please see Draft EIR Section 3.11. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-25****DALE PETRULIS**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-25**

As it relates to ‘piecemeal,’ please refer to Master Responses #2: Cumulative Project and #1: AES Power Plant Site. Safety at the project site was addressed in Section 3.11, Public Services of the Draft EIR. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-26****ROLF STRUTZENBERG**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-26**

Regarding safety of the location of the boat ramp near the lagoon and paddle boarding, as well as water quality, please refer to Sections 3.8 (water quality) and 3.13 (traffic- small craft safety, including Impact TRA-3) of the Draft EIR and Master Response #4: Modifications to the Seaside Lagoon. Section 2.5 of Chapter 2, Project Description details construction sequencing and staging, and Section 3.13 (starting on page 3.13-49) of the Draft EIR details traffic during construction (which includes a reduction in traffic in comparison to existing conditions). Please also see Draft EIR Chapter 4 for discussion of alternative phasing (Alternative 6). Please refer to Response to Comment PC323-96 for a discussion of bridge operations. Utility lines at the project site would be below ground. Finally, refer to Section 3.5, Geology and Soils of the Draft EIR regarding the building of structures at the project site. Please refer to Response to Comment PC346-1 for discussion of vehicle usage for the boat launch. Please see Draft EIR Section 3.2 for discussion of air quality, and fugitive dust regulations, including SCAQMD Rule 403. As outlined in Table 2-2 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project includes numerous infrastructure improvements, which were analyzed as components of the proposed project. Upon completion, maintenance activities are anticipated to be reduced in comparison to existing conditions. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-27****JANET JOHNSON**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-27**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-28****JOANNE NEWMAN**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-28**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC219 and PC256 (delivery trucks) and PC354 (movie theater). Please also see Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. For discussion of existing views, please see Draft EIR Section 3.1 and Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development. As for landscaping, it is anticipated that there would be a mix of larger specimen trees and less mature trees ranging from 24” to 72” box size, which would be agreed upon with the City’s Community Development Department during the permitting and design process. View corridors and shading will be considered in the placement of these trees. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are

acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-29****MICHAEL DEL TUFO**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-29**

Regarding soundproofing windows, please refer to Response to Comment PC039-7 and PC090-3. Please also see Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development, Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site, and Draft EIR Section 3.10 for discussion for noise. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-30****ALEX SMITH**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-30**

Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site for more information on the proposed specialty cinema. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-31****TOM GRAY**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-31**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-32****CHRISTINA JESPERSON**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-32**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-33****MATTHEW UDEWITZ**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-33**

The commenter references a refinery across the street; the commenter appears to be referencing the AES power plant. Please refer to Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site regarding consideration of this property. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-34****JOANN TURK**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-34**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC111 and PC350. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-35****JANE DIEHL**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-35**

Section 3.8 analysis of water quality, including infrastructure improvements, associated with the proposed project. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PM1- Draft EIR Public Meeting Transcript - November 21, 2015**  
**(Beginning page 28 of transcript – Page 2-854)**

---

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-01****BRUCE SZELES**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-01**

Please refer to Master Response #4: Modifications to the Seaside Lagoon. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-02****ROSS YOSNOW**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-02**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC001 and Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-03****ADRINNE TAUFA**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-03**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC027 and Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-04****AL WEST**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-04**

The proposed project is not a 'mall' but is categorized as a mixed-use development, including office and hotel with a retail, dining, entertainment (RDE) component that has enhanced public open spaces and recreational opportunities unique to the waterfront. In fact, as analyzed, the project includes more restaurant use, including a public market hall, than retail. As for the boat launch ramp, the Draft EIR analyzed six alternative locations and ramps (Alternative 8 in Chapter 4). Regarding views, please refer to Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development and Draft EIR Section 3.1. As for profits and revenue, these are not CEQA considerations. The Pacific Avenue Reconnection is an element of the project that is fully addressed in the Draft EIR (e.g., vehicle emissions are addressed in Section 3.2, Air Quality and noise is detailed in Section 3.10, Noise of the Draft EIR). As detailed in Chapter 4, Analysis of Alternative of the Draft EIR, Alternatives 1, 2 and 5 do not include the roadway reconnection. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-05****BETH MINEAU**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-05**

The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body. Please see Draft EIR Chapter 3 for analysis of construction related

impacts of the project.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-06****MARYANN GUTHRIE**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-06**

The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-07****PENNY WIRSING**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-07**

The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-08****BARBARA EPSTEIN**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-08**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC017, PC081, PC082, PC086, PC088, PC279 and PC280. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-09****MATTHEW UDEWITZ**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-09**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC018, PC039-7 and PC090. Regarding the trolley, please refer to response to Comment PC152-11. Please also see Master Response #4: Modifications to Seaside Lagoon and Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-10****GARRY OHST**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-10**

The commenter provides no specifics or scientific basis for their assertions that the Draft EIR is flawed. The Draft EIR Section 3.9, Land Use and Planning did not conclude 'no impact' as mentioned by the commenter. The proposed project was determined to have a less than significant impact associated with Land Use and Planning because the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation (including, but not limited to, the general plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) and would not result in a physical change to the environment not already addressed in the other resource chapters of this EIR. The commenter is incorrect that the project Site is only 15 acres, the project site encompasses 36 acres as described in Draft EIR Section 1.2.2. In addition, please refer to Response to Comments PC017-1 regarding square footage. Please refer to Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site regarding that site. Please also see Draft EIR Section 3.13 for analysis of traffic, Section 3.11 for discussion of public services, and Section 3.1 for discussion of Aesthetics. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-11****GINA DIPIETRO**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-11**

The commenter references “great blue parrots,” it is unclear whether the commenter intended to reference great blue herons, which were discussed in the commenter’s written correspondence (Comment PC085). No “great blue parrots” were found at the project site during the biological survey. Please refer to Response to Comment PC085, which includes discussion of biological resources. Section 3.12, Recreation of the Draft EIR analyzed the impacts of the proposed project associated with recreation. Section 3.12.4.2 provides the City’s significance criteria associated with recreation, which includes (1) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities *such that a substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated* (REC-1), and (2) Include recreational facilities or required the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have *an adverse physical effect on the environmental* not already addressed as part of the proposed project (REC-2). A less than significant impact was determined under threshold REC-1 and no impact under threshold REC-2. Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site, for information on the existing and proposed businesses at the project site. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-12****TAL FINNEY**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-12**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. Your comment will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-13****JIM LIGHT**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-13**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC323. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-14****STEVE RASAK**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-14**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC016 and PC406-1. In addition, please see Master Response #8: Boat Ramp in King Harbor. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-15****SURJIT HORA**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-15**

Please refer to various Master Responses, such as #9: Views and Scale of Development, #6: Summary of Traffic Impacts Associated with the Operation of the Proposed Project, and #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site, for information on size of the development, traffic, and the theater. Regarding noise impacts during construction, Section 3.10, Noise of the Draft EIR addresses potential

noise impacts. The analyses account for the net increase in building area associated with the project and address potential impacts to sensitive receptors in proximity to the project site. As discussed in Draft EIR Section 3.10.4, the City utilized specific sensitive receptor locations (i.e. monitoring locations) which also represent receptors located in close proximity to these locations. These receptor locations are described in Table 3.10-2. As detailed in Section 3.10 of the Draft EIR, construction of the proposed project would cause a substantial temporary and periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project (i.e., construction activities lasting more than one day would exceed existing ambient exterior noise levels by 10 dBA or more at a noise sensitive use); a significant noise impact would occur. However, construction impacts on ambient noise levels would be short-term and would not result in permanent increases in ambient noise levels. Even with implementation of mitigation measures MM NOI-2 through MM NOI-6, the construction noise impact relative to the condominiums east of the site would remain significant and unavoidable. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-16****PAT AUST**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-16**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. Your comment will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-17****REGGIE THOMAS**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-17**

Regarding parking at the project site associated with the proposed project, please refer to Master Response #7: Waterfront Parking. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-18****JOANNE GALIN**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-18**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-19****YVONNE VICH (YVONNE VICK)**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-19**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-20****CHRIS VOISOY (CHRIS VOISEY)**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-20**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-21****JOAN IRVINE**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-21**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC323-96 for a discussion of bridge operations and Section 3.11 of the EIR for discussion associated with police services. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-22****MICKEY TURNER**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-22**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-23****JANET GRISWOLD**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-23**

Regarding a stalled car in the area of the Pacific Avenue Reconnection, on-site security would perform traffic control to allow for the movement of traffic from behind the stalled vehicle, as well as facilitate the removal of the stalled vehicle. Please also note that three of the seven project alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, and 5) which do not include the Pacific Avenue Reconnection; please see Draft EIR Chapter 4, Analysis of Alternatives. Regarding massing on the project site refer to Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR and Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development. Please refer to Response to Comment PC039-4 regarding air quality and delivery trucks. Please also refer to Response to Comment PC039-7 for discussion of windows to abate noise. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-24****PATRICK WEBB**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-24**

For discussion associated with police services, please see Draft EIR Section 3.11. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-25****DALE PETRULIS**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-25**

As it relates to ‘piecemeal,’ please refer to Master Responses #2: Cumulative Project and #1: AES Power Plant Site. Safety at the project site was addressed in Section 3.11, Public Services of the Draft EIR. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-26****ROLF STRUTZENBERG**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-26**

Regarding safety of the location of the boat ramp near the lagoon and paddle boarding, as well as water quality, please refer to Sections 3.8 (water quality) and 3.13 (traffic- small craft safety, including Impact TRA-3) of the Draft EIR and Master Response #4: Modifications to the Seaside Lagoon. Section 2.5 of Chapter 2, Project Description details construction sequencing and staging, and Section 3.13 (starting on page 3.13-49) of the Draft EIR details traffic during construction (which includes a reduction in traffic in comparison to existing conditions). Please also see Draft EIR Chapter 4 for discussion of alternative phasing (Alternative 6). Please refer to Response to Comment PC323-96 for a discussion of bridge operations. Utility lines at the project site would be below ground. Finally, refer to Section 3.5, Geology and Soils of the Draft EIR regarding the building of structures at the project site. Please refer to Response to Comment PC346-1 for discussion of vehicle usage for the boat launch. Please see Draft EIR Section 3.2 for discussion of air quality, and fugitive dust regulations, including SCAQMD Rule 403. As outlined in Table 2-2 of the Draft EIR, the proposed project includes numerous infrastructure improvements, which were analyzed as components of the proposed project. Upon completion, maintenance activities are anticipated to be reduced in comparison to existing conditions. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-27****JANET JOHNSON**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-27**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-28****JOANNE NEWMAN**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-28**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC219 and PC256 (delivery trucks) and PC354 (movie theater). Please also see Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. For discussion of existing views, please see Draft EIR Section 3.1 and Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development. As for landscaping, it is anticipated that there would be a mix of larger specimen trees and less mature trees ranging from 24” to 72” box size, which would be agreed upon with the City’s Community Development Department during the permitting and design process. View corridors and shading will be considered in the placement of these trees. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are

acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-29****MICHAEL DEL TUFO**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-29**

Regarding soundproofing windows, please refer to Response to Comment PC039-7 and PC090-3. Please also see Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development, Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site, and Draft EIR Section 3.10 for discussion for noise. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-30****ALEX SMITH**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-30**

Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site for more information on the proposed specialty cinema. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-31****TOM GRAY**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-31**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-32****CHRISTINA JESPERSON**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-32**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-33****MATTHEW UDEWITZ**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-33**

The commenter references a refinery across the street; the commenter appears to be referencing the AES power plant. Please refer to Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site regarding consideration of this property. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-34****JOANN TURK**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-34**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC111 and PC350. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM1-35****JANE DIEHL**

---

**Response to Comment PM1-35**

Section 3.8 analysis of water quality, including infrastructure improvements, associated with the proposed project. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

PM2

CERTIFIED COPY

THE WATERFRONT PROJECT  
 DRAFT EIR PUBLIC MEETING  
 REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

DECEMBER 9, 2015

Vivian C. Lane, CRS No. 11339  
400494



- |                              |                               |                             |                              |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| (310) 207-8000 Los Angeles   | (415) 433-5777 San Francisco  | (949) 955-0400 Irvine       | (658) 455-5444 San Diego     |
| (310) 207-8000 Century City  | (408) 885-0550 San Jose       | (760) 322-2240 Palm Springs | (800) 222-1231 Carlsbad      |
| (916) 922-5777 Sacramento    | (800) 222-1231 Martinez       | (702) 366-0500 Las Vegas    | (800) 222-1231 Monterey      |
| (951) 686-0606 Riverside     | (818) 702-0202 Woodland Hills | (702) 366-0500 Henderson    | (516) 277-9494 Garden City   |
| (212) 800-8500 New York City | (347) 821-4611 Brooklyn       | (518) 490-1910 Albany       | (014) 510-9110 White Plains  |
| (312) 379-5566 Chicago       | 00+1+800 222 1231 Paris       | 00+1+800 222 1231 Dubai     | 001+1+800 222 1231 Hong Kong |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

THE WATERFRONT PROJECT  
DRAFT EIR PUBLIC MEETING  
REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA  
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2015  
6:10 P.M.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS of THE  
WATERFRONT PROJECT, DRAFT EIR PUBLIC MEETING  
at The Crowne Plaza, The Redondo Beach Main  
Library, 303 North Pacific Coast Highway,  
Redondo Beach, California, on Wednesday,  
December 9, 2015 at 6:10 p.m. before Vivian C.  
Lane, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 11339.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES OF PRESENTERS:

DOROTHY MEYER  
Principal Planner  
CDM SMITH  
111 Academy Way  
Suite 150  
Irvine, California 92617  
(949) 930-7259  
meyerdl@cdmsmith.com

AARON S. JONES  
Community Development Director  
REDONDO BEACH  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
415 Diamond Street  
Redondo Beach, California 90277  
(310) 318-0637 x1-2200  
aaron.jones@redondo.org

1 REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 2015

2 6:10 P.M.

3  
4 MR. JONES: Okay, everyone. We're going to begin  
5 our presentation this evening. Once again, if everyone  
6 can find a seat or settle into place for tonight's  
7 presentation.

8 Well, I'm pleased to see such a great turnout  
9 this evening, and I'd like to welcome everyone to the  
10 second of three public work shops on the  
11 Waterfront Draft --

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Will you turn the mike louder  
13 please.

14 MR. JONES: I'll try to speak up.

15 -- on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.  
16 Once again, thank you for all taking time out of your  
17 Wednesday night to be here to learn about this very  
18 important and transformational project for our community.  
19 I'd like to thank you also in advance for taking your  
20 time to provide us with comments and to give your input  
21 into this process.

22 A little bit of background: On Tuesday,  
23 November 17th, the Mayor and City Council began the  
24 public review of the Waterfront Draft Environmental  
25 Impact Report when they received and filed this document.

1 Prior to that action on November 3rd, the Mayor and City  
2 Council received and filed a report from the staff  
3 recommending this extensive public outreach process that  
4 we're in right now. That process also included  
5 additional time for public review and comment. Because  
6 of the size and content of the EIR, the public review  
7 period for this project has been extended from 45 to 63  
8 days. That also helps with the holiday period for  
9 everyone.

10 Council did direct a very extensive community  
11 outreach effort. To date we posted over 70 signs and  
12 notices on this project. We placed two large format  
13 display advertisements in our newspapers. We've utilized  
14 the local cable access channel for community messaging.  
15 We've issued press releases, placed an article in the  
16 City's newsletter that just came out, if you received the  
17 E-newsletter. We've issued a email blast to everyone  
18 who's interested and has their email on file with us, and  
19 we can see by tonight's turnout, the outreach is working.  
20 So we appreciate you being here.

21 Now, getting back to the EIR, this Draft EIR is  
22 by far the most complex and comprehensive that the City  
23 has ever, ever created. It took over 18 months of hard  
24 work and is prepared by experts in a number of different  
25 science fields. It's a fairly highly technical document.

1 We'll do our best to talk to you about it tonight in  
2 plain English, but, you know, it's inevitable that we'll  
3 bring up some material that you might want to ask  
4 questions about.

5 Speaking of asking questions, the purpose of  
6 the meeting within this portion of the meeting is to  
7 receive comments from the public and that's why we have a  
8 make row phone we have with us tonight uh court so all of  
9 your comments are going to be recorded verbatim. If you  
10 have questions though and want to have a discussion about  
11 the EIR or would like to nowhere to look for information  
12 that you might be interested in, we have staff and boards  
13 out in the lobby for questions that can be answered this  
14 evening. So within this room we're going to be receiving  
15 comments, we go on to the record, there can be comments  
16 about you know where do I look for this but you can also  
17 have your questions answered outside just to clarify that  
18 right upfront.

19 Getting back to the document that took over 18  
20 months and cost well over a million dollars at this point  
21 to prepare. We've had the document now that fully  
22 identifies all potential and environmental impacts of the  
23 project, and it also provides what we call mitigation  
24 measures. And tonight Dorothy will explain what a  
25 mitigation measure is the Waterfront EIR is complex, it's

1 a large document, and I do hope that all of you spend the  
2 time to read large portions if not the entire thing.  
3 There are many ways to express your opinions and comments  
4 on the Draft EIR and that will be explained in our  
5 presentation this evening as one of the last slides. So  
6 this is the second meeting. There will be a third  
7 meeting. Just to clarify if you're at this meeting  
8 tonight, the same information will be presented at the  
9 third meeting. So you don't have to go to all three. If  
10 you've entered in comments, whether they're during the  
11 meeting, before or after the meeting, they will all  
12 become part of the record and they will all be responded  
13 to.

14 So with that, I'm going to turn it over to  
15 Dorothy Meyer from CDM Smith, our Environmental  
16 Consultant. Thank you.

17 MS. MEYER: Thank you, Aaron.

18 Good evening and welcome to the public meeting.  
19 As Aaron said, this is our second of three, and we did  
20 start our 63-day public review period on November 17th  
21 and we are going to 5:30 p.m. on January 19th. So,  
22 again, whatever you say here gets transcribed by a court  
23 reporter. We have boxes throughout this venue that you  
24 can actually put in your public comments, and at any  
25 point in time, you can -- like Aaron said, we'll

1 have -- and we also have handouts to say exactly who to  
2 send them to, how to send them and you've got until  
3 5:30 p.m. on January 19th to comment.

4 My name is, again, Dorothy Meyer. I'm with CDM  
5 Smith. We do planning and engineering and remediation.  
6 I've been dealing with CEQA -- which this is a CEQA  
7 document -- for over 27 years. I will say that the  
8 purpose of the meeting tonight is to provide you with a  
9 summary of the proposed project, the areas studied in the  
10 Draft EIR, the impact conclusions of the Draft EIR,  
11 mitigation measures where we had to apply mitigation to  
12 reduce impacts. Also, we have a list of and kind of a  
13 description of the alternatives that we looked at to the  
14 project, and, again, how you provided comments during  
15 this process. And then at the very end of that, we're  
16 going to open it up for your comments. We've got a  
17 microphone and a court reporter. So we'll all take that  
18 at that time.

19 So the project location: The Waterfront  
20 proposes to revitalize approximately 36 acres of the  
21 City's 150-acre waterfront. The 36 acres does include  
22 land and water. From the south it goes from around  
23 Torrance Circle and the Horseshoe Pier, and in the north  
24 the boundary is around Portofino and Harbor. The  
25 Waterfront Project would remove the pier parking

1 structure and probably 219,881 square feet of existing  
2 structures. The structures at the project site that will  
3 remain are the Plaza Parking Structure, Kincaid's and the  
4 restaurant facility at the Seaside Lagoon. So down here  
5 is the restaurant and restroom facility, Kincaid's and  
6 the Plaza Parking Structure.

7 The pier parking structure would be replaced.  
8 A new parking structure placed at the northeast corner of  
9 the project site, right there (indicating) and 523,939  
10 square feet of buildings would be constructed and this  
11 represents 304,058 square feet of net new development.

12 In the environmental document, we use two sets  
13 of numbers throughout, and one of them is pursuant to  
14 CEQA. We look at a net new square footage of the  
15 304,058. For purposes of the allowable development in  
16 the harbor area under the local coastal plan, the net new  
17 development is 290,113. This is because the CEQA net new  
18 square footage considers what was at the project site in  
19 2014 when we did our scoping project -- our scoping  
20 process, excuse me, whereas the allowable harbor square  
21 footage is based on what was on the site in 2008. The  
22 difference is about 14,000 square feet, and it's because  
23 of the Octagon Building. The Octagon Building was right  
24 about there, and he was demolished in 2013. So he was  
25 there in 2008, but he was not there in 2014.

1           The proposed project is intended to revitalize  
2 a portion of the City's waterfront by redeveloping and  
3 expanding local- and visitor-serving commercial uses,  
4 enhancing public access and coastal recreational  
5 opportunities and facilities and improving the aging  
6 support infrastructure at the site, like the parking  
7 structure. The project also proposes improvements to  
8 site connectivity, public access and open space along the  
9 waterfront and is designed as a new village that seeks to  
10 integrate the best of public and private needs and is the  
11 central part of the City's redevelopment of the harbor  
12 and waterfront. For the purposes of the EIR, we did look  
13 at a certain percentage of land uses at the project site.  
14 12 percent was office, 20 percent retail, 35 percent  
15 restaurant, 24 percent boutique hotel and 9 percent  
16 specialty theater, and all of this is consistent with the  
17 goals and objectives of the City's local coastal program.

18           So to try and describe this project in the  
19 environmental document, we broke it up into pretty much  
20 three basic areas, three geographical areas: The  
21 northern, which is the yellow portion of this map; the  
22 southern, which is kind of the orangey; and then the  
23 water area of Basin 3. So the northern portion of the  
24 site is about 19.5 acres, of which about 1.3 acres is  
25 water and associated with the proposed boat ramp. The

1 southern portion is approximately 13 acres, and Basin 3,  
2 which is all water, is 3.5 acres.

3           As you can see along the back of Basin 3,  
4 there is a little bit of orange that was also considered  
5 as part of the southern area of the project site, and  
6 that's where the International Boardwalk and the elevated  
7 walkway are and that was considered as part of the  
8 southern. And then as you can see at the very bottom  
9 corner here, we've got like a little dash boat -- you'll  
10 see that in all the figures in the EIR -- and that's  
11 basically the underwater footprint for the breakwater  
12 associated with boat ramp.

13           So based on these three geographical areas, in  
14 the northern portion of the project site all the  
15 structures except the Plaza Parking Structure and the  
16 restroom building at Seaside Lagoon would be removed.  
17 The Draft EIR also analyzed taking the Sports Fishing  
18 Pier and removing it and also taking it down and then  
19 putting back a new Sports Fishing Pier that was at the  
20 same footprint but a concrete one instead of a timber  
21 one. We also looked at putting in a new parking  
22 structure at the northeastern portion of the site --  
23 right there (indicating) -- and then there would be a  
24 proposed market hall and a specialty theater also on this  
25 northern portion of the site. There would be expanded

1 boardwalks as well as enhanced site connectivity. As you  
2 can see, there's a new Main Street proposed that would go  
3 through the middle of that northern portion of the site.

4 Also, in the northern portion the site would be  
5 the opening of the Seaside Lagoon to the harbor waters  
6 right here (indicating). Then the replacement of the  
7 boat hoists, which are currently right here in Basin 3  
8 (indicating), we would remove those and put in a boat  
9 ramp that would be two-lane and then a breakwater to  
10 protect it from the waves. And then, again, expanded  
11 boardwalks and also -- yeah, expanded boardwalks.

12 In the southern portion of the project site,  
13 the pier parking structure and pier plaza, would be  
14 removed, a new pier parking structure would be  
15 constructed in its place with a boutique hotel with new  
16 commercial uses on the bottom level. There would  
17 be -- you wouldn't have to worry about the -- right now,  
18 you know, you have to ride your bikes or walk, you can  
19 walk through the parking structure. That wouldn't occur  
20 anymore. We would have designated bicycle and pedestrian  
21 walking that would be outside of the parking structures.

22 Also, in the south -- back in '88, when there  
23 was a fire and storms that took out most of the pier, the  
24 portion of the pier that's remaining today, which is the  
25 southermost portion right this way (indicating), right

1 where Tony's is, that would be removed, and then they  
2 would put in a new portion of the pier that's exactly  
3 like the part that was replaced back in the '90s. So it  
4 would be concrete. You would have to remove the  
5 buildings that are currently on it, but once those  
6 buildings have been removed, they are going to put new  
7 buildings on top. The only building that remains in this  
8 portion of the project site would be Kincaid's.

9           And Basin 3, there would be an improved access  
10 for pedestrians and bicycles with a new -- with a  
11 pedestrian bridge. It would be a drawbridge, and then  
12 there would also be repair to the bulkhead and cap of  
13 Basin 3, and also as part of the project would be  
14 replacement of the existing marina slips, gangways. And  
15 we looked at two different configurations; one that looks  
16 almost exactly what it looks like now, and one with a few  
17 less spaces.

18           Other improvements throughout the site include  
19 the Pacific Avenue reconnection, which would go in the  
20 area of the International Boardwalk and elevated walkway;  
21 there, again, would be new pedestrian and bicycle  
22 pathways throughout the site; we would update a lot of  
23 the infrastructure, not only parking structures, but  
24 sewers, storm drains; and then in the northern portion of  
25 the site particularly, the elevation of the site would be

1 raised enough that we could address future sea level  
2 rise. And then, of course, there would be more gathering  
3 places and more high quality open space than that  
4 currently exists today.

5           So as a reminder of how we got here, we did  
6 have a scoping process back in June and July of last  
7 year, and we had an open house on July 9th. A lot of you  
8 may have showed up for that. Overall, we got about 260  
9 comment letters and emails as it relates as to what you  
10 wanted us to show and look at in the environmental  
11 document. And then we also, back in October of last  
12 year, took a preliminary list of alternatives that we  
13 were going to look at in the EIR to the City Council.

14           So the purpose of the Draft EIR is to disclose  
15 to the public and decision makers the potential  
16 environmental consequences from construction and  
17 operation of the proposed project. Impacts associated  
18 with the project are identified as either being "no  
19 impact," "less than significant impact," which means  
20 there would be no substantial adverse change to the  
21 environment that would reach a certain threshold -- and  
22 that depends upon each of the resource areas, so it's not  
23 the same for them all. Now, if we found that we would  
24 have a potentially substantial adverse effect on a  
25 particular resource, then we would look to see if we had

1 mitigation measures that would reduce that impact, and if  
2 we did, then we had a less than significant impact after  
3 mitigation. Now, if we applied mitigation or there was  
4 no mitigation available and the impact was still  
5 substantial then we had a significant and unavoidable  
6 impact.

7           So the Draft EIR -- we have a copy of just the  
8 Draft itself right here and we have it out in the  
9 hallway. It's about 1,500 pages. It does include an  
10 Executive Summary, a project description, a description  
11 of all the existing conditions for the resource areas  
12 that we looked at. As you can see, we looked at 14  
13 resource areas, and that was all based on our scoping  
14 process that we did that last year in June, July. And  
15 then we also have a quite substantial analysis as it  
16 relates to alternatives. We also looked at cumulative,  
17 what would happen with the project plus other projects  
18 and growth in the future, and then we have some other  
19 environmental chapters, like we call them "Other CEQA  
20 Considerations," and that includes analysis on even urban  
21 decay. And by the way, for these alternatives we looked  
22 at every single one of these 14 environmental resource  
23 areas for each of the eight alternatives.

24           So for the proposed project, the environmental  
25 document shows no impact to recreation as it relates to

1 having to require construction of operation of  
2 recreational facilities outside of the project site. We  
3 found that no impact to that. For less than significant  
4 impacts, the environmental document shows less than  
5 significant for esthetics in terms of designated local  
6 views, visual character, light and glare. For air  
7 quality, it was less than significant for operational  
8 emissions and odors. For biological resources, it was  
9 less than significant for riparian and sensitive natural  
10 communities, and we would not conflict with policies or  
11 ordinances protecting biological resources.

12 For geology and soils with compliance of  
13 building codes, there would be no adverse seismic related  
14 risk and no substantial soil erosion. For greenhouse  
15 gas, we would not create --

16 MS. DiPIETRO: (Coughing).

17 MS. MEYER: Are you okay?

18 We would not create substantial greenhouse gas  
19 emissions, nor would it conflict with policies to reduce  
20 greenhouse gas. For hazards and hazardous materials, the  
21 project would not create a hazard or risk of upset, and  
22 it would not interfere with emergency response or  
23 evacuation plans. For hydrology and water quality, we  
24 would not violate water quality standards, and we would  
25 not -- the project would not substantially change the

1 drainage of the site or the area or cause flooding.

2 For land use, there would be no conflict with  
3 applicable plans and policies. For noise, there would  
4 not be an exposure to sensitive receptors to noise levels  
5 above the City standards. For public services, it would  
6 not -- the project would not require the need for more  
7 police or fire facilities to maintain services. And just  
8 to let you know, the police station and substation that's  
9 at the site would also be in the proposed project and  
10 somewhere at the site, somewhere at the site.

11 For recreation, the project would not increase  
12 the use of existing neighborhood facilities that would  
13 cause a deterioration of those facilities, and the  
14 project would not cause the need to construct other new  
15 recreation facilities.

16 For traffic, the project would not conflict  
17 with the congestion management program --

18 (Laughter.)

19 MS. MEYER: -- that particular program.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What a joke.

21 MS. MEYER: And for utilities, we would not exceed  
22 existing water, waste water, solid waste electricity and  
23 natural gas supplies.

24 Okay, so the EIR has a determination for less  
25 than significant after mitigation. So for that, we had

1 four significant impacts during construction and two of  
2 them were associated with traffic during operation that  
3 could be mitigated to less than significant. So for  
4 biological resources during construction and operation,  
5 we were able to reduce impacts to marine mammals and to  
6 the California grunion also related to increase in  
7 surface coverage and fill of waters in the U.S. For  
8 cultural, during construction, we were able to mitigate  
9 archeological and paleontological potential impacts. For  
10 hydrology and water quality during operation related to  
11 wave uprush and future effects of sea level rise, we were  
12 able to reduce those to less than significant. For  
13 traffic during construction, there were a potential  
14 impact to six intersections, and they were able to -- we  
15 were able to mitigate those -- actually, those were  
16 during operation. Parking management and also potential  
17 safety conflicts between the boat ramp and the lagoon.

18 So as you can see, there is a list of  
19 significant and unavoidable, and that's the ones where we  
20 could either apply mitigation and it was still  
21 significant, or we didn't have mitigation existing to  
22 apply. So as you can see, during construction, which is  
23 considered short term -- it's a two-and-a-half to  
24 three-year period of time, there were six emission  
25 factors that we looked at, and three of them, reactive

1 organic gases, nitrogen oxide and carbon monoxide, we had  
2 exceedances during construction and it's mostly because  
3 of diesel equipment. We were able to mitigate it so that  
4 reactive organic gases were eliminated, but we couldn't  
5 eliminate nitrogen oxides or carbon monoxide.

6 Cultural resources or historical resources: We  
7 did find that -- we called it the pier complex but  
8 basically the Monstad Pier the Sports Fishing Pier and  
9 the Horseshoe Pier were all potentially historical  
10 resources, and so because they would no longer -- well  
11 the Monstad Pier would remain. The Sport Fishing Pier  
12 would not and the Horseshoe Pier would not either remain;  
13 that therefore we would have a significant and  
14 unavoidable impact on historical resources. We did have  
15 mitigation, but, again, those facilities wouldn't exist  
16 any longer. So it was significant and unavoidable.

17 Vibration and increase in the ambient levels  
18 during construction: Obviously, it's a construction  
19 project and sensitive receptors along the eastern  
20 boundary and also liveaboards to the north would be still  
21 around during construction. We did move the -- as a  
22 mitigation, we would move the people in Basin 3, the  
23 Redondo Beach Marina, out of that marina. So there was  
24 still impacts to noise.

25 For operation, which is long term, hydrology

1 and water quality: So the site right now is subject to  
2 tsunamis, and although this is a rare occurrence, it is  
3 something that could occur and has a damaging effect and  
4 that even though it's still an existing condition, we  
5 would also still be -- that would apply to our project as  
6 well.

7 And then noise: There would be an increase in  
8 ambient levels at Torrance Circle.

9 So mitigation measures: Here's a list of  
10 several mitigation measures for air quality, biological  
11 resources, cultural and hydrology, water quality. Staff  
12 can describe them to you or show you where they are in  
13 the document to let you know which ones they are and how  
14 they read. The Executive Summary has a really good  
15 summary of every single one of them. So if you get a  
16 chance to look at the Executive Summary, that's more  
17 manageable in about 72 pages.

18 And then we also have mitigation for noise,  
19 traffic and transportation. And there are two boards out  
20 in the foyer area and somebody who's out there who can  
21 talk to you about it. But it shows the six intersections  
22 and the type of mitigation that we apply to the project.  
23 It looks like this (indicating). We also have a board  
24 that shows all 41 intersections that were analyzed in the  
25 document. So please help -- please look at that on your

1 way out. It's a big board.

2           So as I indicated, we did look at alternatives  
3 to the proposed project. And to do an alternative, it  
4 has to at least reduce one of the significant and  
5 unavoidable impacts to the project. So of the seven that  
6 we took before the City Council back in October 2014  
7 include Alternative 1, the no project no build. That  
8 means everything pretty much stays the same. There is  
9 still growth occurring in the area in terms of traffic,  
10 but the project doesn't occur. And Alternative 2 is a no  
11 project alternative but realizing that the parking  
12 structure is falling apart and that there are other  
13 facilities at the site that are just past their  
14 serviceable age that the City would need to do something,  
15 and that's Alternative 2.

16           Alternative 3 is landside development only. We  
17 call this the "no federal action" because that means we  
18 wouldn't do anything in the water or anything that would  
19 require an Army Corp of Engineer permit. Alternative 4  
20 is no property exchanged with the state. So there's a  
21 portion of the site that is tidelands and a portion  
22 that's uplands, and currently, they don't make sense the  
23 way that they are designated. And this project, as part  
24 of the process, would switch those two and exchange them  
25 with the California State Lands Commission. So if that

1 didn't happen, you're looking at Alternative 4.

2           Alternative 5 is no Pacific Avenue. So that  
3 means the proposed project occurs but anything that would  
4 be in that area behind Basin 3 that Pacific Avenue would  
5 be obstructed, that would not occur and so what would the  
6 impacts look like then? And that's Alternative 5.

7           Alternative 6 is alternative construction  
8 phasing, and that is if you had to do the north first and  
9 then the south, how would you do that, how would you  
10 construct it, what would the impacts be? And then  
11 Alternative 7 is a reduced density alternative, and that  
12 looks at a smaller project at the project site.

13           We also have an Alternative 8. Now,  
14 Alternative 8 is all about boat ramps; so there's been  
15 lots of studies throughout the years about where to put a  
16 boat ramp in King Harbor. And so we looked at, well,  
17 what happens if the proposed project is built, but we  
18 have an alternative location for the boat ramp other than  
19 the one that's in the proposed project. So we looked at  
20 three different options in Mole A, a one lane, a two  
21 lane, and a one lane with a hand launch. And then we  
22 also looked at another one for Mole C, which is Joe's  
23 Crab Shack, but a single lane but wouldn't need that big  
24 breakwater. And then for Mole D, a one lane and a two  
25 lane that would be as part of the project. Now, I know

1 this is hard to read, but we have a board out in the  
2 foyer so that you can look at it closer, and there's also  
3 pictures in the environmental document of each of those  
4 little squares.

5 And like I said, we looked at all 14  
6 environmental resource areas and how each of these  
7 alternatives would have impacts greater or less than the  
8 proposed project and impacts on their own.

9 Okay. So the Draft EIR, again, 63 days, and  
10 the best way to comment is in writing. So like you see  
11 here, there are several different ways to get your  
12 letters across or emails across to us: Email, mail.  
13 We've had already one public meeting. This is our  
14 second. We have a third one January 9th at the Crowne  
15 Plaza, and also if you have any questions, you can call  
16 that number. Somebody will have to return your call.

17 And then tonight -- oh, and if you want to see  
18 the document, we do have copies out here tonight. You  
19 can't take them with you. I mean, they're quite large.  
20 However, they are at these locations, and then if you  
21 wanted to download it, it's at the Redondo.org website.

22 So tonight, as Aaron said, we're going to be  
23 taking public comment. So if you need -- this is how  
24 we're going to do it: If you haven't already filled out  
25 one of these, please raise your hand, and I'll have a

1 staff person run around and get that to you.

2 Do you need pen?

3 MR. RAMIREZ: I have a pen.

4 MS. MEYER: Okay. And he has a couple of pens as  
5 well.

6 So right now I have about 10 people with  
7 speaker cards. We're going to give people -- I think  
8 right now we can do about 30 and have people at three  
9 minutes each. So we're going to start with three minutes  
10 each. And what I'll do is I'll say three people's names  
11 with the first person to come up, and the other two  
12 people will get ready cause then we can go faster and  
13 make sure everybody gets to speak.

14 Again, there's a court reporter. Speak  
15 very -- you can say your name, if you think your name is  
16 hard to spell, please spell it out. That will help her.  
17 I do apologize if I say your name incorrectly I'm. Not  
18 very good with names. So I'll give it a go, but please  
19 forgive me in advance.

20 And also another way -- again, like I said --  
21 comments, we take these. We've got boxes everywhere.

22 Sean you want to lift that box there? They  
23 look like this. Please feel free at any time tonight to  
24 take these or anything that you've brought pre-done. You  
25 can slip it in there, and they do become part of the

1 public record. You can take these home with you, take  
2 some more time, fill 'em out and then send them in.

3 And with that, I am going to -- give me like  
4 two minutes. We'll start setting things up, and we'll  
5 take the first of the comments.

6 Thank you.

7 And the court reporter said if you could speak  
8 slowly, she'd appreciate that, too.

9 Please be careful up here. We don't want to be  
10 tripping.

11 MS. DiPIETRO: Can I go first?

12 MS. MEYER: Oh. You know --

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Don't be shy.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. Don't be shy.

15 MS. DiPIETRO: Well, I've got that big board over  
16 there, and, you know, it's like I need to move it over  
17 and stuff. So it would be nice if I could go first.

18 Anybody have a problem if I go first?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Go for it.

20 MS. MEYER: Well, hold on. We've got a process --  
21 I've got a process.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's why I need to go  
23 first.

24 MS. MEYER: Gina, do you have a speaker card?

25 MS. DiPIETRO: I do.

1 MS. MEYER: Thank you.

2 MS. DiPIETRO: Oh, boy. You lost it.

3 Thank you, guys.

4 MS. MEYER: Okay. So before Gina speaks, I'm going  
5 to call out another two people who will be behind her.

6 All right. Let's do this. Okay. Gina is  
7 going to be first, and then after her -- and again, I  
8 apologize if I get your name wrong -- Roger Light and  
9 then Robert Resnick.

10 And then Juan here is going to keep the three  
11 minutes, so you'll hear his beep --

12 Yes?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Whoever goes to the podium,  
14 could they please say if they're a resident of Redondo  
15 Beach or from outside? That would be nice.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

17 MS. MEYER: You know, we can't make anybody do that.  
18 So if you want to feel like you want to say whether  
19 you're a resident or not, please feel free to do so  
20 obviously. But nobody has to do that. But thank you.

21 All right. Gina, go.

22 MS. DiPIETRO: Dorothy? Is your name Dorothy?

23 MS. MEYER: Yes.

24 MS. DiPIETRO: Thank you for your presentation.

25 MS. MEYER: Sure.

1 MS. DiPIETRO: I really appreciate it.

2 Hi everybody. My name is Gina DiPietro. That's  
3 D-i-P-i-e-t-r-o, and I have spent most of my life living  
4 in Southern California, and I am a resident of Redondo  
5 Beach. And as a resident of Redondo Beach and someone  
6 who lives near Los Angeles, I know that name dropping is  
7 about the worst thing you can do. It is so tacky.

8 So I used to work for Pierce Brosnan. I worked  
9 for his company called Irish Dreamtime. I used to write  
10 coverage for him. That's when you read screenplays and  
11 you write responses. You do a synopsis of the plot, and  
12 you tell whether or not -- "Pierce, hey this is a good PM2-01  
13 role for you." "Hey, you may pass on this one." I used  
14 to read a lot of environmental screenplays where the plot  
15 was a whole bunch of kids get together and they're  
16 fighting the big bad construction company. And low and  
17 behold, here we are in Redondo Beach fighting the big bad  
18 construction company that is totally neglecting our  
19 wildlife, that is totally neglecting our great blue  
20 herons, that is totally neglecting our humpback whales,  
21 that is totally neglecting the brown pelican and the  
22 royal tern, all of which are protected species, protected  
23 but the Environmental Protection Agency, which is now  
24 HUGE. They have their own police force. You should  
25 Google it. The EPA, you do not want to mess around with

1 the EPA. I don't know what these folks from CenterCal  
2 are thinking. They're thinking, "Maybe I could get  
3 arrested for this. I just don't know. I could wind up  
4 in federal prison." I just don't get it because that's  
5 what the plan looks like to me, but that's up to them.

6 So here we go. So there are all of these  
7 species, and notably, especially the great blue heron,  
8 because I see them all the time; totally absent from the  
9 Environmental Impact Report.

10 Okay. Just a little more name dropping. So I  
11 used to be a PA on movies, and I worked on a movie called  
12 Beowulf. It's a Robert Zemeckis film with motion  
13 capture. Anthony Hawkins is in it, John Malkovich is in  
14 it, Angelina Jolie is in it, and one day I was on the  
15 set. It was Halloween 2005, and I was wearing my mom's  
16 Pan Am uniform. And when I was wearing this uniform,  
17 Angelina Jolie came up to me, and she said, "You look  
18 pretty." Now, that is a moment you never forget. And  
19 that moment occurred to me when I was thinking, "Why are  
20 we thinking so small here in Redondo Beach?" We're  
21 thinking about Redondo. We're not even thinking about  
22 the whole world. What we do here now affects the whole  
23 world, it affects the globe. And these animals and many  
24 more in Redondo are protected on a global level. And we  
25 forget to think about these sort of things when we're

PM2-01  
cont'd

1 looking at this very small project, which is, of course,  
2 total rubbish. It's ugly, it's an eyesore, and it will  
3 not attract tourists.

PM2-01  
cont'd

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Three minutes.

5 MS. DiPIETRO: Thanks guys.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. MEYER: Okay. Roger Light.

8 Robert Resnick, I think you said you are not  
9 speaking, correct?

10 MR. RESNICK: You know what? I'll maybe say a  
11 couple of words.

12 MS. MEYER: You will?

13 MR. RESNICK: Yeah.

14 MS. MEYER: All right. Mr. Light?

15 MR. LIGHT: My name is Roger Light. I'm a 15 year  
16 resident of Redondo Beach --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Use the mike.

18 MR. LIGHT: I will use the mike. We're supposed to  
19 talk about the environmental impact here and sufficiency  
20 of environmental impact report. By the very nature of  
21 this project, it doesn't fit with a waterfront community.  
22 This is basically a mall at the sea, and it should be,  
23 pardon my bad pun, "dead in the water." I just came from  
24 playing volleyball at the beach, and it gave me a moment  
25 to contemplate the beauty and what brings us to the South

PM2-02

1 Bay, why we want to live here, why people come here.  
2 It's the beach, it's the ocean, and it's not malls. It's  
3 just not malls.

4           Hundreds of thousands of retail space on a  
5 waterfront makes no sense environmentally, economically  
6 or otherwise. The way we shop is changing. This project  
7 is a white elephant in the making. Brick and mortar is  
8 not growing to the Internet. So building a giant place  
9 on the oceans in the hopes that it will bring people to  
10 our city makes little sense. By the time it's built --  
11 and anyone believe two-and-a-half to three years? Anyone  
12 remodel their house? Anyone come in on time on that?  
13 They don't mean two-and-a-half to three years. By the  
14 time it's built, we'll be even further away from brick  
15 and mortar.

PM2-02  
cont'd

16           It's a trifecta environmental impact: Traffic,  
17 air pollution, impacts on all aspects of that. We have  
18 basically a two-lane road going in there, and you have a  
19 nice blockage from anyone being able to access 25 percent  
20 of the site, that is the ocean. So unless you got a boat  
21 and a way to get off the boat, park it and shop there,  
22 you can't make it there. A mall at the beach makes no  
23 sense. Noise, pollution, inevitable impact on the ocean,  
24 water pollution. You got a nice trifecta of evils that a  
25 computer just can't model. That's what these

1 environmental impact reports are based on, computer  
2 modeling. If this development makes economic sense,  
3 which it doesn't, these environmental impacts should stop  
4 it in its tracks.

5 I heard tonight the document covers all  
6 possible environmental impact. As a scientist myself, I  
7 know that's impossible. Their models have their limits,  
8 the law of unintended consequences. They mentioned  
9 tonight 36 out of 150 acres of our waterfront will be  
10 impacted by this; 380,000 plus feet of development, 200  
11 plus square feet of new commercial development.

PM2-02  
cont'd

12 Redondo Beach deserves better than this. We  
13 deserve a comprehensive plan that includes not just this  
14 site, but the AES site and not just a piecemeal rush to  
15 overdevelopment.

16 Thank you.

17 MS. MEYER: Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MS. MEYER: So Robert Resnick, Tal Finney and Pam  
20 Combar.

21 MR. RESNICK: I'm Robert Resnick. I am with the  
22 Redondo Landing on the pier, and our concern is, assuming  
23 this project goes forward, that there's an adequate  
24 replacement parking for all the tenants who are  
25 hardworking and have businesses and restaurants open on

PM2-03

1 the pier and we don't want them to be negatively  
2 impacted. So my concern for the record is that there be  
3 adequate temporary parking facilities put in there and a  
4 phasing for the project that also allows them to stay  
5 open and have a certain nucleus and grouping of  
6 businesses that are open with access to them so that  
7 they'll all be able to stay open during the process.

PM2-03  
cont'd

8 (Applause.)

9 MS. MEYER: Tal Finney, Pam Combar and Dan Elder.

10 MR. FINNEY: Hi. I'm Tal Finney. I'm a local  
11 resident. I'm a land use attorney. I used to serve in  
12 state government, and I actually have -- I'm going to  
13 drop names -- I was an Administer at CEQA, which is what  
14 we are here for today; I sat on the California Coastal  
15 Commission, I sat on the State Lands Commission for three  
16 different constitutional officers, and I've made my  
17 living for the past over a decade doing land use on  
18 projects like this. I'm a local guy, and I'm not working  
19 for the company and I go to the pier all the time with my  
20 kids. I'm not one of these people who goes up to Hermosa  
21 and Manhattan Beach because, to me, it's all busybody and  
22 fru fru people.

PM2-04

23 And quite frankly, I got to tell you this is  
24 all great stuff, and I actually admire some of the points  
25 that have been made by folks that are opposed to this.

1 But I want you to know that I am the lawyer that just  
2 finished the first and most recent "mall by the sea,"  
3 which is the Pike in Long Beach. I am the lawyer who  
4 worked on that for twelve years, got it done. And that's  
5 a very, very, very different result than what you have  
6 here. This is what you call a multiuse development. And  
7 quite frankly, if you look at it, it's quite beautiful  
8 really. And it's got lots of open space. In fact, it  
9 preserves most of the open space. I think it's short  
10 by something like -- I mean, it's really small, miniscule  
11 amount of open space you lose. It doesn't prevent  
12 endangered species from still being able to live their  
13 full lives. And if anything, it's a huge improvement  
14 from what we have right now. One of the problems I have  
15 when I go down to the pier with me kids on their bikes  
16 and everything is going past and underneath the parking  
17 structure. And one of the fun jobs I had when I was in  
18 Governor's office was dealing with retrofits across the  
19 state in all kinds of state buildings. And this  
20 is -- even a minor quake is going to result in very  
21 serious problems with the infrastructure of this  
22 facility, and this company, quite frankly, is about to  
23 spend \$400 million on the infrastructure for this  
24 project. That's unheard of. Let me tell you. I do  
25 these all over the state. It's unheard of how much money

PM2-04  
cont'd

1 they're going to put into the infrastructure that  
2 otherwise the taxpayer would have to pay for. And the  
3 way they address that is through the monies that come  
4 through the revenues through the facilities and then, of  
5 course, there's the tax that comes back to the City. And  
6 here, there are already existing structures and they're  
7 working with existing structures and they're working with  
8 most of the existing shop owners to stay. And I've quite  
9 frankly never again seen a company go to such great  
10 lengths to include the community. I mean, the City is  
11 doing a great job. This is the second public hearing.  
12 Public hearings are very important --

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's enough. That's  
14 enough.

PM2-04  
cont'd

15 MR. FINNEY: This is the United States of America,  
16 and I have my chance to speak and you'll have a chance to  
17 as well. Thank you so much.

18 What I was going to say is that this is a great  
19 meeting. The last one was well attended. I bet you the  
20 next one will be well attended. And the company is  
21 having these community meetings outside of this, which  
22 they don't have to do at all. In fact, I wish my old  
23 client had done that. Hell, I would have had an easier  
24 job.

25 And the last thing I'm going to say is this:

1 You have very hardworking public officials that are  
2 working for you, not just at the City level, but the  
3 California Coastal Commission and at the EPA and at the  
4 State Lands Commission. These are all hardworking folks.  
5 They don't get the most pay in the world, but they really  
6 care about their jobs and they really care about that  
7 they represent the public. And they look at everything  
8 They make sure every I is dotted and every T is crossed.  
9 That's where lawyers like me get involved because they  
10 make us deal with everything. So you should know that  
11 not only is the company being careful, they're putting a  
12 ton of money into the infrastructure -- but you have a  
13 regulatory and legal framework and people behind it that  
14 are looking out for the interests of this community. So  
15 I encourage you to support this project.

PM2-04  
conf'd

16 Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MS. MEYER: I've got some more names for you.

19 Okay. Pam Combar, Dan Elder and then JoAnn  
20 Turk.

21 MS. COMBAR: Good evening. I'm kind of knew to this  
22 CenterCal project here. I live in South Redondo area,  
23 and I'm involved with Save the Rivera. But all I know is  
24 that I cannot see where this is not impacting our  
25 lifestyle with these mega square footage of retail

PM2-05

1 buildings. My question to the City and to CenterCal is I  
2 was -- somebody said that this was going to be leased  
3 property to CenterCal. They're not buying this property,  
4 and if they don't make money on the leases, with the  
5 merchants and whatnot, then they don't have to pay the  
6 City for their lease.

7 Now, something's wrong with that comment in my  
8 mind. That just doesn't -- nothing works with that  
9 comment in my mind. Like I said, I'm kind of new to  
10 this, but I've lived down here in this area since 1977  
11 and Redondo Beach is one of the last areas that you can  
12 come to in the South Bay and breathe and relax and see PM2-05  
cont'd  
13 the wildlife and see the sunsets and, you know, feel like  
14 you're in open space besides Palos Verdes, which, by the  
15 way, has planned their community for underdevelopment and  
16 we can see what their result is. There's a lot of places  
17 to breathe and relax there, too.

18 My point is that when is it enough? The  
19 density here -- we're like No. 50 out of 1,500 cities  
20 rated in the state for density. We're the most dense  
21 coastal community besides a college community outside of  
22 Santa Barbara. Why do we need more retail and more  
23 building on the coast? From my understanding as well,  
24 this is against the Coastal -- I don't know the full  
25 name -- Coastal Commission and zoning requirements or

1 regulations.

2           So with Save the Rivera, we're not against  
3 development. We're not against revitalation --  
4 revitalization -- thank you -- but to overdo it, to cram  
5 all this down our throat, to overdevelop and end  
6 up -- you know, when I left the meeting the other night  
7 at Redondo Beach Hotel, that little development across  
8 from the VFW down -- not Bearl. Is it where Catalina  
9 comes up to PCH?

10           MS. MEYER: The self storage?

11           MS. COMBAR: Yeah, north of the self storage. That  
12 place isn't occupied. I mean, 1800 PCH, it's not  
13 completely occupied. These mixed use projects, the  
14 retail is not being filled. And what are they going to  
15 do here? They haven't promised -- what are they going to  
16 charge these new tenants for these new buildings? Is  
17 Tony's still going to pay the price he pays now? More  
18 than likely not. Are these tenants -- are they going to  
19 be able to afford it? Who's to say? Anyway, please  
20 reconsider. Please bring this project down -- just scale  
21 it down. We're not against -- we're not against  
22 development. We're just against overdevelopment.

23           Thank you.

24           (Applause.)

25           MS. MEYER: Dan Elder, JoAnn Turk and Joan Riley.

PM2-05  
cont'd

1 MR. ELDER: Hi. My name is Dan Elder. I'm a  
2 resident of Redondo, and I support this project for our  
3 waterfront; the reason being, this waterfront is falling  
4 apart. It's terrible down there. The infrastructure  
5 costs are going to be massive. I don't see how we can  
6 pay for this. I don't have to pay for a waterfront I  
7 can't go to and the waterfront is not a place I would  
8 take my family to. It's not safe, it's run down, it's  
9 disgusting there. So this is something that I really  
10 think we need to support. Obviously, there's things we  
11 can do to regulate it. I think the traffic mitigation is  
12 very important. A lot of these are better, but right now  
13 we've got a waterfront, filtration system, the water down  
14 there is disgusting. All of these improvements being PM2-06  
15 made are going to help fix that. It's not going to be  
16 perfect. It's not the perfect project, it's not going to  
17 be perfect for everyone, but it's about compromise. And  
18 I don't see how we can pay for a having a world class  
19 waterfront. CenterCal is giving a lot, 400 million for  
20 it. So, yes, it is a massive project; yes, there will be  
21 impact, but I think it will be overwhelming positive for  
22 our community. The one thing I do support is exploring  
23 alternative boat ramp locations. I don't think that's a  
24 great location right next to where you'll have a lot of  
25 the standup paddle boards or swimmers or things like

1 that; so exploring alternative locations I think is very  
2 important. But otherwise, I think this is a good  
3 project, and I'm excited to actually have a waterfront I  
4 can go to and visit.

PM2-06  
conf'd

5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. MEYER: Joan Riley and Joanne Galin.

8 MS. TURK: Hi. I'm Joan Turk, and some of you know  
9 me because I'm on the Board of the Chamber of Commerce  
10 and I've volunteered, but I do volunteer for the vase  
11 towards bureau -- I have for 20 years -- and I do  
12 volunteer for the King Harbor Association, which promotes  
13 the harbor, King Harbor part of it.

PM2-07

14 But tonight I'm not speaking for any of them.  
15 I'm speaking for Polly's on the Pier, the little Sport  
16 Fishing Pier. It's kind of ingenuous in the plans what  
17 can happen to it. And we totally understand. The people  
18 at Polly's are realists, and we've realized that the  
19 infrastructure is suffering badly in many parts of the  
20 harbor and we don't have the money to fix it and the  
21 developer has come in -- I've worked for Redondo Beach  
22 Marina for many years, and I saw many developers come and  
23 go and most of them disappeared after three or four  
24 years. Some -- some it took -- some it didn't take three  
25 or four months for them to disappear because they would

1 realize it was going to be such a long haul and so  
2 expensive.

3           So I really commend CenterCal and the City of  
4 Redondo for what they are doing. The investment that  
5 they've made so far in money and time. But I would  
6 caution them. I hope -- we hope that the little Sport  
7 Fishing Pier will be replaced, and there are many  
8 legacies in the harbor that I think make up the sole of  
9 the harbor.

10           There are entities like the Voyager, the whale  
11 watching boat, the boat rides, the little glass bottom  
12 boat, Captain Kidd's and Quality Seafood. The fish  
13 markets are a real treasure. And visitors look for them  
14 when they come into town. And, of course, we'd like  
15 Polly's to stay and the Sport Fishing and Ruby's  
16 (phonetic) and -- because we think they've established  
17 themselves and they've become favorites in the harbor.

PM2-07  
cont'd

18           And last weekend I did a test. I gave some of  
19 the colleagues/employees the comment sheets, and in one  
20 day, I collected about 20 and they said things like "it's  
21 an institutional landmark" and "it's" -- "it's a place  
22 where families go," "I take my visitors there, my  
23 European visitors." That's the first place that  
24 everybody that comes there to town wants to go.

25           So we hope that it will be either rebuilt or

1 replaced and that we can continue to be a home for  
2 pelicans and terns and we even a Great Blue Heron there  
3 now, but --

4 MS. DiPIETRO: Gertrude. Her name is Gertrude.

5 MS. TURK: Yeah. Her name is Gertrude. So we hope  
6 that the City will be supportive. So far they have -- PM2-07  
7 the City and CenterCal have been more than friendly and cont'd  
8 available to us and candid with us. So we just hope that  
9 they can see it in their hearts to rebuild. We know it's  
10 a question of money, and there's always money. But in a  
11 \$300 million project, we think a couple of million  
12 dollars to rebuild the Sport Fishing Pier is a small  
13 investment to make.

14 Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MS. MEYER: Joan Riley, Joanne Galen, Arnette  
17 Travis.

18 MS. RILEY: Hi. My name is Joan Riley, and I'm a  
19 resident of Redondo and I always get so nervous when I'm  
20 talking in front of these groups. But, I don't know,  
21 even if you're just sitting there and other people are PM2-08  
22 speaking for you, if you -- if everyone would just fill  
23 out one of these forms and -- and give -- put it in the  
24 comment box, your comments will be part of a record  
25 that -- of which you can address later if things don't go

1 the way you want them to go.

2           There are so many things I want to say. The  
3 first thing I want to say is I don't want the businesses  
4 that are in and around the pier to suffer. I want them  
5 to flourish, especially one of our neighbors, The Paddle  
6 House. But I think that this project is so far more  
7 complex and larger than anything Redondo -- that would  
8 suit Redondo Beach.

9           One of the things I noticed when I drove down  
10 Harbor Boulevard and went past the Shade Hotel was how  
11 the light -- the light went away. So three stories right  
12 by that bike path and the road just -- I mean, one of the  
13 sources of pollution is building -- blocking the light  
14 which is the reason why you want to live near a coast.

PM2-08  
cont'd

15           But specifically about the EIR, just one thing.  
16 I think they've grossly and inadequately measured the  
17 noise and vibration impact in the area, both the  
18 demolition, construction and the post construction.  
19 There are approximately 1,000 households that are so  
20 close to the proposed project, I mean, some within like  
21 75 feet that will be impacted negatively just with the  
22 ambient noise that this creates. And with a background  
23 of water and the foreground, a canyon that goes all the  
24 way back to Prospect Avenue, you have a big impact on  
25 noise. And I think that the neighborhood -- the

1 neighborhoods that are -- will be impacted by the noise  
2 itself is much greater than measured in the report.

PM2-08  
cont'd

3 Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. MEYER: Joanne Galin, Arnette Travis and Greg  
6 Diete. Thank you.

7 MS. GALIN: Hi. I'm Joanne Galin, and I'm a North  
8 Redondo resident. And I am not a professional speaker,  
9 I'm not an attorney. I'm actually -- I hate public  
10 speaking. So if everyone can just close their eyes while  
11 I talk and promise not to get mad at me.

12 Anyway, seriously is anybody in this room -- by  
13 hand, does anybody love the pier the way it is? Raise  
14 your hand.

PM2-09

15 Really? Really?

16 Okay. That's four maybe. Anyway, this is such  
17 a mess right now. CenterCal has come in, and they have a  
18 wonderful plan. Now, do I agree with everything?  
19 Absolutely not. Nothing is perfect. But as we could see  
20 as people before me spoke, our parking garages are  
21 falling down, we don't get the business -- you know,  
22 these small businesses -- I've become friends with a lot  
23 of these business owners, small business owners. They  
24 can't support themselves. I know when people say "Oh,  
25 it's about greed. "It's not about greed. It's about

1 supporting themselves. We really need to help them, we  
2 really need to help our community.

3           You know, I'm one of those people that do go to  
4 Manhattan Beach and Hermosa Beach all the time because --  
5 we have some great restaurants here, Kincaid's, R10 and  
6 now we have Basq Kitchen and The Slip Bar and King Harbor  
7 Brewing. But you know what? Go there for an hour or  
8 two, and then what? There's nowhere safe to walk around.

9           Anyway, I'm really excited about this, but  
10 let's just not fight. Let's stop with the name calling  
11 and putting people down. I mean, we're all residents of  
12 this community. And what's going on in the world right  
13 now, it's sad, it's scary. So, I mean, most of the  
14 people here -- even though we don't agree on things,  
15 everyone is a good person. So let's -- you know what?  
16 Instead of fighting and calling people out in the paper  
17 and trying to boycott people's businesses, let's try to  
18 work together. I know the CenterCal people personally.  
19 I'm getting to know them. I said before I've gone there.  
20 They will invite every single one of us there, will spend  
21 a half hour, an hour with you and explain what's going  
22 on. Seriously. So just go and let's try to work  
23 together.

24           Thank you.

25           MS. MEYER: Arnette Travis, Greg Diete and Andy

PM2-09  
cont'd

1 Avrick.

2 What's your name?

3 MS. TRAVIS: Arnette Travis.

4 MS. MEYER: Arnette Travis is next. I'm sorry.

5 And then are you Greg?

6 MS. TRAVIS: Thank you.

7 MS. MEYER: Are you Greg?

8 MR. DIETE: Yes.

9 MS. MEYER: Thank you.

10 MS. TRAVIS: Hi. I'm Arnette Travis, and like  
11 Joanne, I am not a professional speaker and I don't  
12 particularly like it. But I am a 25-year resident of  
13 Redondo Beach. I've raised my family here and now my  
14 grandson. I enjoy riding my bike from North Redondo down  
15 to the -- well, to Torrance Beach to the end there.

16 A lot of days I am at a loss because it would  
17 be nice to turn right as opposed to left when I go reach  
18 the waterfront. To the right of me is the crumbling PM2-10  
19 infrastructure of our parking lot. I remember one day I  
20 had my grandson in a -- he was in a stroller at that  
21 time -- he's 10 years old -- but we needed a hat and  
22 sunblock. And I went up on the pier to find a shop that  
23 had that, and there was nothing open, there was nothing  
24 there. I mean, I was forced to go into one store, pay --  
25 I don't -- I can't even remember what it was, but long

1 story short is that there is a real lack of retail space  
2 there.

3           And I don't like malls. I hate malls. I do  
4 not shop at the mall. What CenterCal is proposing, what  
5 I've seen is not a mall. It's a variety of shops. What  
6 I've seen -- and again, getting to know some of the  
7 business owners down at the -- in the International  
8 Boardwalk area, they are there, the growth has occurred  
9 because of the CenterCal project. They want to have a  
10 foothold in there so that when redevelopment comes, they  
11 already got skin in the game. And I -- I hate the  
12 inciting that's happened in our community. I think that  
13 it's ridiculous. I mean, I'm a 70-year-old. I was  
14 raised in Kentucky. We respected people even when we  
15 disagreed with them.

PM2-10  
cont'd

16           (Applause).

17           MS. TRAVIS: It really bothers me that -- the  
18 solacious things and little clever soundbites being  
19 forced to stand here and look at someone else's idea of  
20 what should be or what the impact is going to be. We  
21 have a professional staff in our city that has spent  
22 months compiling this Draft EIR, and rather than respect  
23 their research, we have novices who are claiming to  
24 be -- and some of you may be engineers, you may be  
25 professional land use attorneys or whatever, but rather

1 than, you know, novices speaking out as to what this  
2 project is going to do, the impact that it's going to  
3 have. Why don't we trust our experts? We don't we give  
4 them the respect that this proposal deserves and give  
5 them some respect.

6 (Applause.)

PM2-10  
cont'd

7 MS. DiPIETRO: What experts?

8 MS. TRAVIS: I think that they are a lot better  
9 equipped to valuate the impact --

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No traffic? Excuse me. No  
11 traffic?

12 MS. TRAVIS: And that's all I have to say.

13 MS. MEYER: Greg Diete, Andy Avrick and Joy  
14 Corradetti.

15 MR. DIETE: My first experience in Redondo, I was  
16 purchasing a condominium at The Village condominiums in  
17 1977, and the attraction was Horseshoe Pier and the  
18 energy and excitement down there. I loved all those neon  
19 signs on Casanovas and the Polynesian, Cattleman's, PM2-11  
20 Tony's. You know, it was just really, really terrific.  
21 Then we had that unfortunate fire in -- I believe it was  
22 '88 and we lost 51 or 50 -- 49 percent of the pier. And  
23 so we put in this new pier, high tech with the poly  
24 columns and piers. And it still sits there with one of  
25 the restaurant pads unoccupied. We haven't been able to

1 find anyone to put there.

2 We did tear down the termite-infested Octagon  
3 that was unable to find a restaurant over the years, and,  
4 you know, we have the Cheesecake Factory, we have  
5 Kincaid's, we have wonderful Polly's on the Pier. And I  
6 know that probably won't make much money for the  
7 CenterCal. So that's probably not going to be there.

8 I think we've given up the -- the views that  
9 we -- we now enjoy down on Harbor Drive to the automobile  
10 and to like three-story parking lots on the corner of  
11 Bearl and Harbor Drive. Anyone that's seen -- I'm all in  
12 favor of the Shade's Hotel and its success in Manhattan  
13 Beach and just really pleased to see it come to Redondo  
14 Beach, but as one speaker mentioned, it's a concrete wall  
15 down there --

PM2-11  
cont'd

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It should only be two  
17 stories.

18 MR. DIETE: Have I expired my three minutes  
19 or -- okay. Still going.

20 I joined the group of merchants on the top deck  
21 when it went up in '80, '81, and it was a total disaster  
22 and we had all kinds of financial reports and studies on  
23 it. It was going to be terrific. Never got off the  
24 ground. It was a disaster, white elephant. They said,  
25 "Oops. You know, everyone gets to make a mistake." You

1 know, this pier that we put up, it was promoted -- and  
2 I'm glad it went up -- to be a 3 or \$4 million project.  
3 It turned out to be a \$17 million project. You know,  
4 when has the government ever given you anything close to  
5 a correct estimate about virtually anything, and I've  
6 lived a lot of years and I've paid a lot of attention to  
7 what's going on. I'm a little bit behind the curve on  
8 the Internet, but just this Black Friday and the retail  
9 we're going to have down there. A Wall Street Journal  
10 article talks about the email -- or e-commerce retailer  
11 top brick and mortar. And this is just the start. I  
12 myself know very little about it. You know, I'm not a  
13 fashion plate, but I buy clothes and shoes and everything  
14 on the Internet. I mean, we've lost Nordstrom's, we've  
15 lost -- they're in Torrance. We've lost Peyton Cramer  
16 Ford. And, you know, that's a high tax revenue and we  
17 need the taxes because our City expenses keep going up  
18 and up and up and between the -- God, all -- you know the  
19 costs, I don't know how the City is going to support it.  
20 And this is just scheduled to be a white elephant down  
21 there. I don't know we've got fish shopping on half of  
22 the harbor, and I don't know people that come down  
23 to -- to do their clothes shopping at the beach. And all  
24 the things that they list as far as what we can do down  
25 there on the display boards, they exist right now. I

PM2-11  
cont'd

1 don't see anything added except traffic, congestion and  
2 we're going to build those parking structures. And, you  
3 know, the City budget, it has for capital improvements, 1  
4 percent of the City budget goes for capital  
5 improvements --

6 MS. MEYER: Please wrap up.

PM2-11  
cont'd

7 MR. DIETE: -- we know where all the rest of it  
8 goes. And in 60 years, we haven't maintained that  
9 parking structure down there, and it is in such a  
10 deplorable condition. Why isn't it red tagged like they  
11 would do in any other private industry and shut it down  
12 until it's fixed before we have an earthquake and people  
13 are injured?

14 (Applause.)

15 MS. MEYER: So the next one is Andy, Joy and then  
16 Dr. Lori Zaremski.

17 Thank you Andy.

18 MR. AVRICK: My name is Andy Avrick. It's  
19 A-v-r-i-c-k. I've been a resident here about 35 years.  
20 I love Redondo, and I see -- I've been fortunate enough  
21 to travel quite a bit through my work and so forth, and  
22 I've seen a lot of waterfronts and I've seen a lots of  
23 facilities that have marketplaces and how vibrant they  
24 are. And I like what I see. And I see -- the  
25 infrastructure is crumbling. The structure is unsafe the

PM2-12

1 way it is right now. It's not convenient to go north to  
2 south on the coast, especially on a bike cutting through.

3 I know there are some concerns to people with  
4 the plan about views and blockage from the building, and  
5 I hope that they're addressed. But it's a great City,  
6 and I think having an improved waterfront would really  
7 add to the City and it would be a place for the residents  
8 to gather. PM2-12  
cont'd

9 I don't see it as a mall. You know, maybe some  
10 people are seeing something different. I don't see it as  
11 a mall.

12 That's it. Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MS. MEYER: Joy, Dr. Lori Zaremski and then Eugene  
15 Solomon.

16 MS. CORRADETTI: I'm Joy Corradetti. Hi neighbors.  
17 And I speak to you from the heart, and I know sometimes  
18 when people say things people get upset and mad, and I  
19 just want to say as your neighbor and someone has lived  
20 in the City for close to 30 years -- I traveled all of PM2-13  
21 the United States and Canada with my business, previous  
22 business, and I've gone to school here in the South Bay,  
23 the colleges, and I also worked in aerospace for 12  
24 years. And when the recession hit, I decided to -- since  
25 I love Redondo Beach -- and I have to tell you I'm

1 passionate about Redondo Beach -- that I decided to open  
2 up a store a few blocks from where I live down at the  
3 International Boardwalk.

4 So I've had a store there for four years. I  
5 just celebrated four years. I'm a member of the Chamber  
6 of Commerce --

7 (Applause.)

8 MS. CORRADETTI: -- thank you -- I'm a member of the  
9 Chamber of Commerce. And I love this City. I really  
10 love this City. And I expect to be here until you see my  
11 name in the obituary. And hopefully that's not for a  
12 long time. And I really wish this development were  
13 happening sooner than later. I feel that it isn't a  
14 mall. No, it's not a mall. And I want to say that when  
15 I see the pictures of how it looks, it's almost the same  
16 structure. It looks like waterfront. There's open parks  
17 and ways to -- to see the ocean; and yet I have to tell  
18 you firsthand that the boardwalk is crumbling, folks.  
19 And not only crumbling, in the wintertime, we practically  
20 die down there and -- we do. And I want to tell you, I  
21 spoke to one of the bars, and I know it probably doesn't  
22 matter to you, but one of the bars said to me, "God, it's  
23 been so bad. I sold one pitcher of beer today."

24 And I want to say to you as a business owner  
25 who invested in the City that I love so much, some days

PM2-13  
conf'd

1 I'm down there and maybe I'll make 20 or \$30.00. And I'm  
2 crossing my fingers to stay alive. And I'm say saying  
3 this to you because I'm a member of this community and I  
4 love what CenterCal is proposing. One of the things I  
5 really loved when Fred said, "We have this opportunity to  
6 get it right." And I really think -- I really think that  
7 they're getting it right, and it's not a mall.

8 Have you ever been -- and by the way I was  
9 raised on the East Coast near Atlantic City -- and this  
10 was years ago before the casinos and whatnot, but they  
11 had the boardwalk and the little shops and stuff like  
12 that. And even in Florida -- I mean, beach communities  
13 have little shops. That's what brings in the tourists.  
14 They like that. And I'm a little shop, you know, and I'm  
15 trying to my best to make my foot in the community. And  
16 I want to tell you that I really, really believe in this  
17 project. I think it's going to be wonderful. And I wish  
18 it were happening soon because I think it's going to be  
19 really beautiful. If you've seen the video, if you've  
20 seen some of the pictures, it's not a mall. It's really  
21 beautiful.

PM2-13  
conf'd

22 And thank you, my neighbors, and bless you all.  
23 Thanks.

24 (Applause.)

25 MS. MEYER: Okay. Dr. Lori Zaremski, Eugene Solomon

1 and then Wayne Craig, please.

2 DR. ZAREMSKI: Hi. My name is Lori Zaremski. I'm a  
3 resident of Redondo Beach, and when I came here this  
4 evening, I got off the 105 at the 405, and it took me  
5 about 45 minutes to get here. So the idea that you're  
6 going to put in a monstrosity like that and it's not  
7 going to impact traffic. I think it's ludicrous. So I'm  
8 totally, totally opposed to this project.

9 And I'm just so confused about these folks, PM2-14  
10 these small business owners that are getting up here. If  
11 you think you are going to pay the rent on those gigantic  
12 places that they are going to put up, I am sorry. Get a  
13 business plan cause that is not going to happen. And in  
14 my opinion, if we as Redondo Beach did a terrible job on  
15 maintaining the pier and it's falling apart, but I think  
16 that if I look at my house and I need a new roof and I'm  
17 having trouble affording it, "Gee, I think I'll give away  
18 my house because they want to fix my roof." "Come on in  
19 here, take my house and fix my roof and thank you so much  
20 for doing it."

21 You know, this business about we should be  
22 appreciative to CenterCal I think is ludicrous. First of  
23 all, you know, in the handout it says, "Please provide  
24 substantial evidence when you come stand up here." They  
25 have no substantial evidence whatsoever, nor have they

1 been required to provide it, that this is financially and  
2 economically feasible. Look at Nordstrom's, look at The  
3 Point, look at the Manhattan Beach Mall, look at the Del  
4 Amo Mall, look at the place that they have in Hermosa on  
5 PCH there, this huge movie thing. It was empty forever.  
6 They are not going to find businesses to put in there.  
7 And if CenterCal thinks this is such a good idea, then  
8 why do they have a contract where they're going to walk  
9 away and Redondo Beach is going to be stuck with this  
10 white elephant. If they have such faith in their plan,  
11 great. Sign a lease for this Polly Pie fish person, and  
12 give them a guaranty that their rent is not going to go  
13 up for 30 years because you believe in your project so  
14 much.

PM2-14  
cont'd

15           Also, I do agree that we should have a more  
16 civil debate, but I have a problem when some of these  
17 folks are getting up here, and they are claiming that  
18 this is City staff. It is not. Now, if we're going to  
19 be civil, I think we should be honest and accurate. So  
20 when you're called yourself City staff, you should raise  
21 your hand and say, "No. I'm not City staff, and, no, I'm  
22 not the expert that I was just described as. I'm being  
23 paid up here to sell you folks a project, and it's a bag  
24 of bricks and a fancy bag and you should not buy it."

25           And to continue, I want to be a boat owner

1 someday, and there's going to be no slips and you're  
2 going to kill the wildlife and ruin our City.

PM2-14  
cont'd

3 (Applause.)

4 MS. MEYER: Eugene Solomon, Wayne Craig and Delia  
5 Vechi.

6 MR. SOLOMON: Hello. My name is Eugene Solomon.  
7 I'm a 30-year resident of the City and I have far two  
8 many (inaudible). I visit the pier. When I have family  
9 in town. I go down to the pier and take them to Captain  
10 Tony's (inaudible) raised in Florida and (inaudible).

11 THE REPORTER: Will you speak up, please?

12 MR. SOLOMON: Yes, I will.

PM2-15

13 I think that there is an underestimation of the  
14 traffic impacts, and speaking with the gentleman outside,  
15 one significant difference is -- there's something that  
16 has not been addressed -- would be the AES site. Since  
17 Measure B was voted down, the AES site was taken out of  
18 the traffic impact reports. So the numbers that you're  
19 seeing do not reflect the redevelopment of that 50-acre  
20 site, and anything that may go up on that 50-acre site.

21 Further, if you look at the map outside and you  
22 notice the interaction there of Catalina and PCH, PCH has  
23 an F rating as far as traffic impact is concerned. It  
24 can't get any worse, and yet they are unable, according  
25 to the gentleman outside, to address the traffic on PCH

1 along those corridors that they have addressed in this  
2 impact report. Traffic backs up on a regular basis there  
3 at Catalina getting onto the PCH and heading northbound  
4 at all times during the day. One does not have to  
5 specify a rush hour in order to be backed up, and they  
6 are going to add a third terminal. That simply is not a  
7 wise decision.

8 Traffic affects our quality of life. Traffic  
9 costs quite a bit of money. A study showed that \$1.6  
10 billion last year was lost in the United States due to  
11 traffic, lost productivity. It needs to be addressed.  
12 It hasn't been addressed in the most fulsome manner, and  
13 I would hope that they would take into account the AES  
14 site and whatever development may go up there in studying  
15 these traffic patterns. PM2-15  
cont'd

16 All that being said, compromise is a situation  
17 where everybody walks away a little bit unhappy. We're  
18 not all going to get everything that we want. It would  
19 be nice if the City had not advocated their  
20 responsibility and maintained the pier in the manner in  
21 which it should have been maintained.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. SOLOMON: It would also be nice if we got a good

1 deal from somebody to come in and redevelop the pier. I  
2 think that would be great. But we should get a good  
3 deal. CenterCal needs to make some money. They're a  
4 corporation. They're in business. That's what they do.

5 The businesses on the pier that have struggled  
6 along for years should be able to stay there, and I think  
7 it's a great idea. So maybe give them a sweetheart deal  
8 on their rents. Let's maintain the integrity of our PM2-15  
cont'd  
9 City. Let's maintain the backbone, the marrow of who we  
10 are. But we also need to face the fact that this needs  
11 to be repaired. So let's have compromise, let's give a  
12 little bit of both, and let's move forward in a calm,  
13 civil and wonderful way.

14 (Applause.)

15 MS. MEYER: Wayne Craig, Delia Vechi and Doug  
16 Christiansen.

17 MR. CRAIG: My name is Wayne Craig. I'm actually  
18 one of those rare cases. I'm actually a native. I was  
19 born here at South Bay Hospital, and I've lived here my  
20 whole life -- PM2-16

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Speak up.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

23 MR. CRAIG: -- apart from when I was in college.  
24 But I don't see how anyone can say this is not a mall.  
25 Why would you put a movie theater on the pier? The last

1 thing I would do is, "I'm going to go to the theater.  
2 Let's go to Redondo Beach and hang out on the pier." I  
3 don't think so.

4 The other thing is CenterCal. I'm a realtor.  
5 Don't hate me. I lived in The Village for a lot of  
6 years. So I know how the views are really great over  
7 there. So I asked the presenter, and I go, well,  
8 remember back in 2013, I was in a meeting with Steve  
9 Aspel about it, and he talked about, kind of jokingly,  
10 "If you own any property in The Village, you probably  
11 should sell it now."

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, my God.

PM2-16  
cont'd

13 MR. CRAIG: This was at the Indian restaurant and 30  
14 people heard him say it. Now I can see that it's true.  
15 So I asked the lady at CenterCal who presented in my  
16 office, "What about" -- and I counted. There's like 600  
17 condos between Seascape One, Two and The Village. "How  
18 about them?" I'm sorry. I'm okay for doing some  
19 redevelopment to some extent. You know, fix the parking  
20 garage. That's fine. But people who own property  
21 shouldn't have to have their property valuations decline  
22 for no reason at all. That makes no sense.

23 The other thing is part of this whole  
24 project -- I don't know if anyone is talking about it,  
25 but I've heard from sources familiar the plan, the City

1 of Redondo is actually paying to have the parking  
2 structure demolished, and it's like 10 or \$20 million for  
3 the whole project. Why are we paying for anything? That  
4 doesn't make any sense.

5 And if the company doesn't make the revenues  
6 that are supposed to, Redondo Beach has to pay the  
7 difference. It's similar to Seattle where they put that  
8 stadium. If they don't sell enough tickets, guess who  
9 pays it? The City. Why on earth should we be on the  
10 hook for that. If it's a bad investment, don't do it  
11 right?

PM2-16  
cont'd

12 And finally maybe I made this a little too  
13 personal, but the owner of CenterCal, (inaudible)  
14 project, they moved to Pacific Palisades. They sold  
15 their house last year. I don't know. Maybe that's a  
16 little too personal, but I don't think this that project  
17 makes a lot of sense. It's a mall. Come on.

18 MS. MEYER: Delia. Doug Christiansen and Bill  
19 Schwanebens, and I apologize for pronouncing your names  
20 wrong.

21 MS. VECHI: Delia Vechi. I'm living in this City  
22 since '71 as a homeowner. I saw this City (inaudible)  
23 Boulevard.

PM2-17

24 Now, one thing --

25 Can you hear me?

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

3 THE REPORTER: No.

4 MS. VECHI: Can you hear me better?

5 Okay. One thing I would like to say. I agree  
6 with everybody that we should get along with each other,  
7 no matter if we don't agree. We should have respect for  
8 one another. But one thing that bothered me that they  
9 hid from CenterCal and I think (unintelligible) call the  
10 people that don't agree with his project lightheaded. I  
11 don't consider any lightheaded. I'm a highly educated  
12 person. I can speak four language besides as having a  
13 master in architecture. But I don't like to talk about  
14 my background. But at this time I need to do it because  
15 I speak with accent and maybe people thinking she is not  
16 highly educated. I'm highly educated, and I'm not  
17 lightheaded and I know exactly how they valuated the  
18 project because I have 40 years of professional -- I'm  
19 sorry. I'm only 20. And what I'm saying is this:  
20 There's a lot of discussion and it's not three minutes to  
21 talk about this unfortunately. But I'd like to say very  
22 few things.

23 I will read a small thing that I sent to the  
24 City. "I'm (unintelligible) an eyewitness of many  
25 natural disasters that have occurred in the harbor from

PM2-17  
cont'd

1 the liquefaction to the high tides, the storm surges, the  
2 new storms of 18 years raising of the breakwater, the  
3 (unintelligible) fish die off, the saltwater damage to  
4 the old parking structures, the tends to do away with  
5 Seaside Lagoon, the pier fives, the reconstruction of the  
6 pier, the problematic traffic flows and horrible parking,  
7 the many years of City Hall fighting for the preservation  
8 and inclusion of (unintelligible) and recreation in the  
9 harbor, most of all the boat launch and so on and so on  
10 including being an eyewitness of the now recognized  
11 fiasco of all development along the waterfront pier  
12 plaza, which arguably the City Planning Department  
13 promote and most highly supported of back then when it  
14 pushed for the approvals approved by the City Council."

PM2-17  
cont'd

15 And this is a true story. In the '80s the Pier  
16 Plaza was called different, okay? Spooling bee had  
17 problem was changed the name with the purpose to hire the  
18 fiasco. I was working in an architectural firm in West  
19 L.A. This is a true story, okay?

20 MS. MEYER: Ms. Vecchi, could you please wrap up?  
21 Could you wrap up, please?

22 MS. VECHI: Okay. Then I cannot talk at all. If  
23 that's the case how can I speak and I make my case and --

24 MS. MEYER: We have a lot of people this evening --

25 MS. VECHI: Yeah. But please let me finish.

1 MS. MEYER: Please wrap it up.

2 MS. VECHI: Anyway, to make this story short, we  
3 need to take over the project. They trying to see if we  
4 revitalize the project, it would cause a fiasco, big  
5 restaurants and stores that nobody goes there. That's  
6 what is called -- they change name -- thinking they  
7 change name, the situation change. We only did because  
8 it was historical structure. We didn't go there and the  
9 valuation of code improved all the project the way it  
10 was. But the reason it was a fiasco because

PM2-17  
cont'd

11 architectural is a very important part of the project.  
12 How can you build a project adjacent to the waterfront  
13 when you are using a type of architecture for the cold  
14 weather climb with small windows. You go to the  
15 waterfront when you like the ocean coming inside. You  
16 want the big windows. Who will go to a theater in the  
17 waterfront? Come on. When you come to the waterfront,  
18 you come to see the ocean. That's the boundary or --

19 MS. MEYER: Okay. Please submit your comments in  
20 writing because that's the perfect place for us to read  
21 them all.

22 So Doug, Bill and then Julie Coll.

23 MR. CHRISTIANSEN: I don't like following somebody  
24 as nice as her.

PM2-18

25 Anyway, my name is Doug Christiansen. I'm a

1 40-year South Bay resident, 11-year Redondo Beach  
2 resident. I am a homeowner and I also own a business and  
3 I'm affected positively and negatively by this project.  
4 However, I do support the project. I think there is way  
5 more good than bad, and it outweighs it quite a bit.

6 One thing I think we should remember is that,  
7 you know, perfect is the input. And I think there's a  
8 lot of things that are great to this, all right? So I'm  
9 lucky enough to actually speak after about 20 other  
10 people because there's been a lot of great points on both  
11 sides, and one of the big points I've heard is really  
12 about civility and compromise. We're all good to lose a  
13 little, but it's good to be out here participating,  
14 everybody. So let's try to keep that in mind as far as  
15 that goes.

PM2-18  
cont'd

16 I'm on Facebook quite a bit, and I see opposing  
17 views and supporting views, and it's really not about for  
18 the most part -- you know, it's fixing what we have  
19 there, okay? And it's about how much to develop. And I  
20 think that's really where our great divide is. I would  
21 say that, you know, we have to respect all of the things  
22 that have been voted on in the past. I did not vote -- I  
23 voted for Measure B and it did not win. And I am not  
24 happy about it, but that's what the will of the people  
25 was. Measure G was voted in 2010, and everything that

1 CenterCal is doing is within Measure G. And I think  
2 that's important to remember because we're all going to  
3 have different takes. Some people I saw raise their hand  
4 that really love how the pier is. Personally I don't. I  
5 have a family. I don't come down there that often. I d  
6 like to come down there more because I think there's so  
7 much potential down there.

8 One person up here talked about their business,  
9 and how they'd be lucky to make 20 or \$30.00 a day or a  
10 pitcher of beer. As a business owner, I feel that. And,  
11 you know, part of why new business owners are setting up,  
12 whether it's The Shade or any of these other restaurants  
13 or -- they want a foothold. We talked about Polly's. PM2-18  
cont'd  
14 The owner of Polly's came up here, and she's in support  
15 of this. And, you know, I hear about, you know, freezing  
16 their rents and Tony's and things of that nature. Well,  
17 I'll tell you what? As a business owner, if I can get  
18 more demand, I'd be more than happy to pay more rent,  
19 okay? And I think CenterCal is probably smart enough to  
20 step it up as things get escalated. So we need to give  
21 everybody a break as far as trying to cut everybody's  
22 throat out and our culture and the whole nine years. I  
23 think there's a lot of common ground here.

24 I will say from the benefit standpoint -- and I  
25 know I'm coming up on time, and I respect that -- the

1 infrastructure is needed. The parking lot -- I know we  
2 talked about the past and what the City hasn't done.  
3 It's the past now. We have to think about what we're  
4 going to do cause we don't have the money for that  
5 parking structure.

6 Also, with the tides, we just saw what happened  
7 flooding the businesses down at the International  
8 Boardwalk -- okay. I got three minutes. I'm totally  
9 good with that.

10 MS. MEYER: Please.

11 MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Absolutely. I do feel like it's  
12 going to improve property values all around. I know that  
13 there's going to be issues with some that have felt that  
14 way, but the fact of the matter is does anybody know  
15 people who are in Manhattan Beach downtown area, Hermosa  
16 Beach downtown area that are complaining about their  
17 property values? They'll complain about other things --

PM2-18  
cont'd

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A lot of them are selling and  
19 coming to Redondo.

20 MR. CHRISTIANSEN: And that is true. Absolutely.  
21 And Redondo is a great place. I love it. I grew up in  
22 Manhattan Beach and I love it.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because it's cheaper.

24 MR. CHRISTIANSEN: However, I do feel that there is  
25 going to be a benefit to us.

1           And lastly, there are concerns. Traffic, okay?  
2 I live off of 190th. I know there's going to be more  
3 traffic because it's going to be successful. I do have  
4 enough faith that there's going to be mitigation of that  
5 traffic. Is it going to be perfect? Absolutely not.  
6 But I can deal with something that is a destination  
7 versus what is quite frankly not a nice place to go to  
8 for the most part.

PM2-18  
conf'd

9           Thank you.

10           (Applause.)

11           MS. MEYER: All right. Bill and Julie and then  
12 Jackie Balestra.

13           MR. SCHWANEBERG: Thank you. Hello. My name is  
14 Bill Schwaneberg I'm. A resident of Redondo Beach.

15           THE REPORTER: Louder, please.

16           MR. SCHWANEBERG: Oh. Sorry. My name is Bill  
17 Schwaneberg, S-c-h-w-a-n-b-e-r-g. I'm a resident of  
18 Redondo Beach. I've been here for 35 years. I'm a  
19 homeowner, too, off of Bearl Street. And I've been  
20 working out of the harbor of Redondo for 35 years. I got  
21 off of a flight from Philadelphia and I liked it so much  
22 here, I decided to call this home and I've considered it  
23 home ever since.

PM2-19

24           I'm not against this development that I see  
25 here. The scale of it is concerning to me. It's a

1 little big for what I think the City can handle. Also, I  
2 have concerns with the traffic. The other thing that I  
3 haven't heard mentioned, you know, I've been here -- I  
4 worked for Chuck Johnston when I first came here and I  
5 worked in the Redondo Beach Marina and then I started my  
6 own business here in 1985. And I've been working as a  
7 commercialized speck as, a boat operator down in the  
8 harbor. And, you know, Basin 3 has been designed from  
9 the Corps of Engineer for commercial use, and it was in  
10 the permits for building and funding and -- but what I'm  
11 not hearing and what I see in the plans is that Basin 3  
12 is basically up for grabs and it concerns me, you know,  
13 that harbor has been allocated for commercial use. And I  
14 don't hear anything worded under the relocating any  
15 commercial sports fishing, Polly's on the Pier sports  
16 fishing, the whale watching boat. All of these things  
17 are history to this City.

PM2-19  
cont'd

18 I'm not concerned about my impact on just me  
19 personally, but all the other commercial boats, Foss  
20 Maritime and Chevron works out of there. And I'm not  
21 hearing where we're going. And the Corps of Engineer  
22 designed that basin for a commercial aspect.

23 So my concerns are what are we doing with that  
24 aspect on top of everything else? And that's why I  
25 wanted to get up here and speak tonight because I don't

1 hear it mentioned, and I brought it up in several  
2 meetings and nobody has really said anything. So I just  
3 want it to be on the record that the Corps of Engineer  
4 did design that for commercial use.

PM2-19  
cont'd

5 And I'd like to see us being taken care of down  
6 there cause, again, a lot of us have been there a long  
7 time. And we're not against the redevelopment. We just  
8 want to be included in it.

9 Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MS. MEYER: Julie, Jackie and then Mark Knudson.

12 MS. COLL: Good evening. I'm good Julie Coll. I'm  
13 with King Harbor Boating Foundation and we run waterfront  
14 education classes in the harbor five days a week. We  
15 just started this semester. So I have kids out on the  
16 water and my perspective is from a water standpoint.

PM2-20

17 So my concerns are the Sport Fishing Pier. My  
18 number one class is fishing, and it is so exciting when I  
19 have families come down and I see five-year-old little  
20 boys and girls learning how to fish and learning about  
21 gross morphology. So I think the Sport Fishing Pier is  
22 very important. I think the commercial aspect needs to  
23 be there. We're going to be turning Voyager into a  
24 floating classroom. I see Redondo Beach as an education  
25 destination, and we're getting home school families that

1 are coming from Topanga Canyon and I ask that family -- I  
2 said, "You are really dedicated. I don't know if I could  
3 have done that for my kid." And she said, "Julie, my  
4 kids want to be marine biologists." So that family comes  
5 down here at 9:30 in the morning, and they do not leave  
6 until 5:00 o'clock.

7 They visit Ruby's. Ruby's is my. We go to  
8 R10. So when I take a look up here, I'm not seeing  
9 public access docks, which I think is one of our biggest  
10 gifts. I'm not seeing docks next to the boat ramp. I do  
11 believe the boat ramp should be in that large basin. I  
12 am a boat owner and am very active. I will tell you that  
13 Mole A has a lot of issues. It has huge waves. My boat  
14 goes in and out of there a couple times of a week. We  
15 also have title surges that come in there. So from a  
16 boating perspective, I ask you guys all to take a look.

PM2-20  
conf'd

17 And our biggest gift is access to the water.  
18 We have a lot of standup paddle borders out there. Our  
19 kids are out there learning about the nature that you  
20 guys are talking about. So I think you can be  
21 pro-development, which I am, and pro-harbor. And it's  
22 going to take some compromise, but we can do it. So I  
23 just want to stand up here and say that education out of  
24 this harbor -- when you've been to other harbors and you  
25 go into Long Beach Harbor, that is a huge, huge

1 commercial harbor. It is intimidating even to seasoned  
2 boaters. You take a look at Marina Del Rey. You are 30  
3 minutes to get to that ocean. We are 10 minutes tops.  
4 And that is a gift, and we need to keep that.

5 So what I'm asking all of you to do is take a  
6 look at things from a water perspective and a land  
7 perspective. I feel sometimes if we overlook the fact  
8 that our biggest gift is to get people out on that water  
9 so that they care about it. Well, our kids are learning  
10 about conservation. They're learning how important it is  
11 that the oceans be clean. They're seeing when we have  
12 red tide come in. They're learning it firsthand because  
13 the harbor is their classroom and everything we're doing  
14 for kids, we're doing for adults.

PM2-20  
cont'd

15 So I'm saying I want everyone to look at both  
16 sides, but pro-development in the right ways, but I think  
17 access -- there's a huge need for dry storage and for  
18 public access. The one public access dock that we have  
19 is when the tides are low, it sits on the mud.

20 And my time is up. Yay!

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. MEYER: Okay. Jackie, Mark and then Scott  
23 Fellows.

24 MS. BALESTRA: My name is Jackie Balestra. I'm a  
25 30-year resident of the South Bay. Just a couple of

PM2-21

1 things I wanted to mention. In the 30 years that I've  
2 lived here, I have never brought any of my friends,  
3 visiting friends and family -- all those freezing people  
4 from Boston, New York, New Jersey, they come out to visit  
5 me whenever they can. I have never taken them down to  
6 the harbor, the marina ever, all right? I have never  
7 done it. I take them up to Manhattan Beach, I take them  
8 to Palos Verdes, Terranea the last five years has always  
9 been great. I didn't used to -- I live two-and-a-half  
10 blocks from the beach in the Riviera. When friends and  
11 family come and visit, I wouldn't take them to the beach  
12 down there. I was embarrassed before The Esplanade. I  
13 would take them, again, to Hermosa or Manhattan, all  
14 right?

PM2-21  
cont'd

15           Since they redid The Esplanade, I take  
16 everybody there now. I'm so proud of it. I show them  
17 the beautiful public art that they put in there that  
18 they've installed. I'm down there all the time now. I  
19 think it's beautiful. What beautification can do for a  
20 community is -- you can't say enough about it.

21           The other thing I wanted to mention is Redondo  
22 Beach has always been -- they've always promoted tourism,  
23 and let's not kid ourselves. We need those tourist  
24 dollars. Yeah, there's going to be a little more  
25 traffic, but, you know something? None of the beach

1 cities had have been sleepy beach towns for a long time,  
2 all right? We're all growing. I don't know if any of  
3 you are aware that Manhattan Beach recently did a study  
4 from the Urban Land Institute. They reported findings in  
5 January. Those residents got the shock of their life  
6 when they found out that 80 percent of their taxes come  
7 from tourists, you know. A lot of people in Manhattan PM2-21  
8 Beach like their little quiet beach town, they don't want cont'd  
9 people coming from other places. If people didn't come  
10 from other places, they couldn't afford to maintain their  
11 lifestyle. So don't kid yourselves if you don't think we  
12 need those taxes from the hotels and from the businesses,  
13 all right?

14 And one last thing, if somebody could please  
15 tell me when mall became a four letter word?

16 (Applause.)

17 MS. MEYER: Okay. Mark, Scott and then Gary and  
18 Rose Milnek, are you still here?

19 All right, they support the project, but they  
20 are not here. So then Reggie Thomas.

21 MR. KNUDSON: Hello. My name is Mark. I've been  
22 living in the area off on since I was a little kid. This  
23 has been very interesting. Along with what the last PM2-22  
24 speaker said, you know, I think it's going to cost money  
25 to do some redevelopment that's obviously very needed and

1 this company is making a profit. Otherwise, why would  
2 they do it?

3 At the same time, I think the tenants should be  
4 given some kind of future projection business plan,  
5 something where they know what they're getting into and  
6 should have a really good idea of what their rents are  
7 going to be, and, you know, maybe have somebody negotiate  
8 for them. You know, they need to know what -- are they  
9 going to make money? You know. They need to. So maybe  
10 some kind of grandfather plan for the existing people,  
11 you know, make sure that they can run a good, viable  
12 business.

13 Another thing I'd like to say is I'm  
14 pro-environment, and when they said something about  
15 having a little higher rise in the ocean study, it seems  
16 like, you know, the melting ice and all of that is going  
17 to accelerate. We could have ocean rise of up to  
18 300 feet or more in the next 100 years. Did they  
19 consider that?

20 I am now driving an electric car, and I would  
21 like to know how many electric charging ports are going  
22 to be in these parking lots. Let's make it a green  
23 redevelopment. That will attract a lot of people.  
24 People like that. That's what's in. That's what's hip  
25 you know. Let's include that in the plan, and I think

PM2-22  
cont'd

1 there should be some natural habitat set aside for the blue heron. PM2-22  
2  
3

(Applause.)

4 MS. MEYER: Scott, Reggie and then Stephen Comley.

5 MR. FELLOWS: It's not that hard to raise this up.  
6 I was seven years in college, and I had a good time doing  
7 it.

8 This is what I called in Debate Club -- we used  
9 to call this a visual aid. It's a Dive and Surf T-shirt,  
10 okay? I support the development of the waterfront in a  
11 big way, and my history in Redondo Beach goes back to the  
12 early '60s when the Beach Boys were not down here. They  
13 were singing about it, and I came down with fraternity  
14 brothers on several occasions; one time for a Battle of  
15 the Bands at what is now Seaside Lagoon. It was open air, just had a little kind of a hut there. They had a  
16 Battle of the Bands one night. It was a great time, and  
17 all my buddies, all my training buddies, we just had a  
18 great time before we went back up to school -- it was  
19 actually during the summer. PM2-23  
20

21 Anyway, I support this project because I  
22 believe in making things more modern than they are right  
23 now. The parking structure is scary. Yet the actual  
24 footprint of what's going to be developed here is not  
25 really any larger than you have now. You still have the

1 parking lot. You have the north and the south. You  
2 know, things are going to be built up a little. There's  
3 going to be a great open air market. I like to call it  
4 the sea air market, like a farmers type market, but  
5 what's more important, though, is that it's going to  
6 bring vitality to the area.

7 Now, even if there's three times the cars  
8 coming down here, do you hear cars now? What kind of  
9 noise are you really talking about? You're not really  
10 talking about that much noise. Three times the traffic  
11 and all the people coming down here to spend some fun  
12 money, I fully support developing the area and making it  
13 profitable for the entire city.

PM2-23  
cont'd

14 Now, when it comes to developing the AES  
15 Southern California Edison Plant, you know, I was for the  
16 project and all and the fact that it was defeated is not  
17 the worst thing that happened in the world. But that  
18 would have brought tons of traffic and people down here,  
19 okay? I get all of that. This is very minimal compared  
20 to that. It's going to develop it, make it much nicer,  
21 provide convenient parking. I love the idea of Pacific  
22 Avenue going all the way through and hooking up at  
23 Torrance Boulevard. That's going to be a great addition  
24 to the area. Then all the little turnoffs right and left  
25 to go in and park. There will be some street meter

1 parking. It will be easy to get in and out. That's what  
2 I like about it. It's going to be comfortable for  
3 everybody, and it's going to be just tons of fun. And PM2-23  
conf'd  
4 remember, I like to have fun.

5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. MEYER: Reggie, Stephen and then Jennifer  
8 Goldstein.

9 MR. THOMAS: Hi. Thank you. My name is Reggie  
10 Thomas. I am a resident of Redondo Beach, and I am  
11 literally on the pier seven days a week. You can ask my  
12 wife that. And for those of you who are not like me, I  
13 have to slow down in the morning getting out of my car  
14 because of the amazing view that we have down there. And  
15 so many people don't get a chance to see that. PM2-24

16 So the pier has been there for 60 years. If we  
17 had been supporting the pier all along, we might not be  
18 in this situation. However, we need to fix it. The  
19 parking is a challenge. We attract people that most of  
20 you feel unsafe around. I don't. It pays to be me,  
21 240 pounds. But there's a great opportunity for us to  
22 kind of finish coloring in the lines here. The plan may  
23 not be perfect, but I think if we can continue a dialogue  
24 like adults and like friends and family, it truly does  
25 take a village. And this is our village, and we all need

1 to be engaged in this process.

2 CenterCal has to make their money, just like  
3 any business, just like all of our retirements and  
4 401(k)s. We want it to get the best for us. That's what  
5 they want. So if we refuse to be a part of the process,  
6 we're going to miss out. And whose fault is that?

7 So I'm in support of this as a resident, as  
8 a -- someone who works down on the pier. It's  
9 just -- it's a beautiful, beautiful place. I am -- I was  
10 originally born in the south and across the highway from  
11 where I lived, where I grew up there's a building with a  
12 Confederate flag on it. I can't take my family and live  
13 where I'm from, but I can live here. And this is a  
14 beautiful place, and let's be a part of it. This is  
15 beautiful place.

16 "Applause."

17 MS. MEYER: Stephen, Jennifer and John Gran.

18 MR. COMLEY: Hi. My name is Steve Comley. My wife  
19 and I have been residents of Redondo for over 30 years.  
20 One of our favorite activities is walking around the  
21 community, and especially down at the waterfront.  
22 However, we never pass Bearl. We're always going to the  
23 north. That's because there just really isn't a whole  
24 lot to do on the waterfront south of Bearl.

25 Restaurants are few and far between, and the

1 parking structure, of course, basically exposes people to  
2 falling concrete hazards, oats. There's a lot of  
3 potential, but right now the area is being underutilized.  
4 So I'm excited for the proposed Waterfront Revitalization  
5 Project. We'll finally have a reason to walk south of  
6 Bearl if this happens, we'll be able to grab a cup of  
7 coffee, pick up some food at a public market, go to a  
8 restaurant, shop in some boutique stores or just hang out  
9 at Seaside Lagoon at any time of the year. And I might  
10 even be able to bike down there without having to go  
11 through the crumbling parking structure. So the  
12 possibilities are really endless of this project and I'm  
13 proud to support it and excited to finally see some long  
14 overdue progress in our community.

PM2-25  
cont'd

15 (Applause.)

16 MS. MEYER: Jennifer, John and Tera Guthrie.

17 Jennifer Goldstein?

18 Oh, okay.

19 And then John Gran and Tera Guthrie.

20 MS. GOLDSTEIN: Jennifer Goldstein, Redondo Beach  
21 resident. I'll tell you a little -- a couple of stories.  
22 I came to California about 20 years from Utah. I always  
23 considered myself a California girl, and I finally got to  
24 come here. And when I moved here 10 years ago and I was  
25 able to move to Redondo and buy a home, I felt like I'd

PM2-26

1 come home. This is my home. This is where I should have  
2 been born, and I love Redondo. I love the beach cities,  
3 and I'm for the project.

4 So many things have been said tonight. I could  
5 go on, and I don't want to repeat. But I just want to  
6 tell you, coming from Utah to here, I have a ton of  
7 family as you can all imagine. And guess where they want  
8 to stay when they all go on vacation? Here, in my home.  
9 But we don't take them, as many people have said, to the  
10 Redondo Pier. We take them to Kincaid's. We love  
11 Kincaid's. We love Tony's. But it's not the place that  
12 they want to spend the time.

13 And I see a lot of development happening in  
14 Manhattan Beach and Hermosa and I want to see the  
15 development happening here. Is it perfect? No. But  
16 that's why we're here tonight. And I want to tell you, I  
17 had an opportunity to go back to Utah in October. My  
18 niece is getting married. But I have gone to CenterCal  
19 is what I'm saying, and have seen their display in their  
20 front office and had -- it was a display, a whole diagram  
21 of a complex that they did in Farmington, Utah. And I  
22 know the area very, very well. So my husband and I  
23 decided to go up there and to visit it specifically  
24 because they're involved in this project and we wanted to  
25 see what they had done. I was -- firsthand, I was so

PM2-26  
cont'd

1 impressed. This was a nothing land that they had taken  
2 and developed phenomenally, and they -- water fountains  
3 and you walked into -- it's like walking into Disneyland.  
4 It was beautiful and so engaging. And the people that  
5 were there, I mean, they were having weddings in an area,  
6 or they were having family gatherings in another area.  
7 It was just so family oriented. And I think -- with the  
8 CenterCal people, I think they can do us a job like  
9 they've done in the past. Like Station Park in  
10 Farmington, Utah. And I would love for any of you to go  
11 up there and see it. It's wonderful. So I want this  
12 project to go forward. And I -- it's not perfect, as I  
13 said before, but I think they are willing to work with us  
14 and we need to be willing to work with them.

PM2-26  
cont'd

15 Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MS. MEYER: John, Tera and then Don Szerlie.

18 MR. GRAN: Good evening. My name is John Gran. I  
19 grew up in Torrance and have been living in the South Bay  
20 since I was six years old and I have owned a home in  
21 North Redondo Beach since 1999. I am one that does take  
22 everyone that comes to visit me to the pier. I love it.  
23 I love the pier. I love the fact that it's down there.  
24 I like walking around. I like they have the little  
25 golfing things and they throw them off and they go to the

PM2-27

1 shore. I love it. And I go to Kincaid's quite a bit. I  
2 use the pier quite a bit.

3 But for me and what I believe, I believe that  
4 doing nothing is not an option, okay? This is the  
5 project that we have, and residents of Redondo Beach  
6 agree. We passed Measure G to do something. And this is  
7 what we have. This is the project that we're working on  
8 right now, and it's all of us need to work together, both  
9 pro and con, to make it the best that we can. It's going  
10 to be a compromise. It's going to be something that we  
11 really need to -- we need to fight about. We need to  
12 respectfully fight about it in a nice manner in a place  
13 where -- well, I will call it a respectful dialogue. PM2-27  
cont'd

14 And respectful dialogue to me means working  
15 with the facts. We're all emotional about this. There's  
16 been a lot of emotion. I love it, I hate it, there's  
17 blue herons, we've got all sorts of things going on here.  
18 And a lot of emotion is great, but let's all work on the  
19 facts.

20 One thing that we haven't really spoken about  
21 much here is what we're supposed to be talking about, the  
22 EIR. I encourage all of you to actually read it. Read  
23 at least the 72-page executive summary so that you have  
24 some facts that when you debate over coffee, you actually  
25 have something to say fact based. You don't agree with

1 the facts, challenge them. Let's make them do their job,  
2 okay? That's what we're here for. And I really would  
3 like to see more debate, but respectful, okay?

PM2-27  
cont'd

4 In closing, I would say please let's make this  
5 the best project we can. If it doesn't meet all of our  
6 needs, let's at least make it the best it can be.

7 Thank you so much.

8 (Applause.)

9 MS. MEYER: Tera, Don and then Laura Zahn.

10 MS. GUTHRIE: Hello. My name is Tera Guthrie, and I  
11 grew up here and I grew up going to the pier with my  
12 friends and going to the movies at the pier and family  
13 dinners at Tony's and all of that. And I have a teenager  
14 now, and I tell her to go around the pier. Don't stop  
15 there, don't ride your bike through there, but go around.  
16 I'd love nothing more than to tell her it's a safe place  
17 for you and your friends to go hang out. I'm supportive  
18 of it.

PM2-28

19 (Applause.)

20 MS. MEYER: Don, Laura and then Darryl or Linda  
21 Buffington -- actually, did they leave?

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

23 MS. MEYER: Yeah. They support the project, and  
24 they.

25 Left but then there's Roland. Also left?

1           Lance Libiano?

2           Thank you.

3           MR. SZERLIP: My name is Don Szerlip. That's  
4 S-z-e-r-l-i-p. I would like to make some comments in  
5 regards to the EIR because there are a couple of things  
6 that concern me. By and large, I think it's a wonderful  
7 project with great elements in it that can help our City  
8 move forward. I'm concerned, however, about the opening  
9 up of the Seaside Lagoon. I harken to La Jolla where  
10 there was beach that used to be a swim beach and they  
11 opened it up to the ocean and the sea lions came in and  
12 took over the beach and now people can't go there because  
13 they're a protected species, you can't get them off the PM2-29  
14 beach and they have taken it as their own. And I don't  
15 want to see that happen to the Lagoon. So my query is if  
16 you open this up to the ocean, what are you going to do  
17 to help keep these large mammals from coming in and  
18 taking over this area?

19           Similarly, I do not like the boat ramp location  
20 at the Joe's Crab Shack --

21           (Applause.)

22           MR. SZERLIP: -- I don't believe it's good -- and I  
23 don't want your support -- but I don't believe that's a  
24 good location for it. There's only a two-lane road, and  
25 if people are backed up to get in there with their

1 trailers, where are the other cars going to go? How can  
2 they get in? How can they get out? The noise created by  
3 all of these boats and the people talking just even at  
4 normal levels will interfere with the commercial  
5 operations of Portofino and their -- their center there  
6 for -- where they have a lot of weddings, they  
7 have -- many of them are outside. I don't think that  
8 brides and boats are going to be really compatible there.

9 Also, I'm concerned about the -- the fact that  
10 motorized boats generally leave some oil spill or a sheen  
11 on the water, and I don't want to see that outside of the  
12 Seaside Lagoon if that's a swimming area for people of  
13 any age. So I want to know how that can be mitigated,  
14 and I think the best mitigation is to find a different  
15 location for the boat ramp.

PM2-29  
cont'd

16 Lastly, and I made this comment for many years,  
17 in our pier and harbor there's nobody home. What I mean  
18 by that is if you go down there during the day, contrary  
19 to those people who think that PCH is packed like it is  
20 in the morning all day long, which I will tell you it is  
21 not, down in the pier and harbor by and large you've got  
22 a bowling alley and you can do 10 frames before a car  
23 comes by. Now, this project will help bring things in,  
24 but it still doesn't bring us a daytime population. We  
25 need a conference center, not on the ocean side, on the

1 land side, to help us bring in those tourists on a weekly  
2 and daily basis. PM2-29  
cont'd

3 Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. MEYER: Okay. Laura, Lance and then did  
6 Mickey --

7 MS. ZAHN: Oh, I thought it was Laura Zahn.

8 MS. MEYER: Laura Zahn, yes, and then Lance.

9 And then Mickey Cooper, did you come back?

10 Okay. She supports the project. She's not  
11 here, and then it means it's Mark Libiano after Lance.

12 MR. LIBIANO: Go ahead.

13 MS. MEYER: Yes, please, Laura. Go ahead.

14 MS. ZAHN: I am also a native of Redondo Beach,  
15 having been born at Torrance Memorial Hospital in 1953.  
16 And I said that to somebody, and they said, "Oh. It  
17 wasn't very big back then."

18 I said, "That's okay. (Unintelligible)."

19 Anyway, our family has graduated three PM2-30  
20 generations of Seahawks literally. So you know you're  
21 listening to somebody that has some knowledge. I have  
22 multiple degrees, I've sat on boards and I've chaired  
23 committees.

24 I have five points to make. One is little  
25 shops cannot afford the rent of brand new brick and

1 mortar buildings. Mom and pop shops, the ones that the  
2 tourists like to come to because it's not Best Buy, it's  
3 not Crate and Barrel, it's not Nordstrom's, can't afford  
4 the rent nor can they afford to pay their employees to  
5 work there. Big brand names are the only ones that can  
6 afford the new mall type waterfront or even inland  
7 shopping centers because if that location doesn't make  
8 the rent, they've got 5 or 15 or 25 others that can pull  
9 their resources and pay and pick up the difference, but  
10 the little mom-and-pop shops are one little shop, they  
11 can't make the rent, they have to go out.

12 Kids: Kids want active adventure. They don't  
13 want passive adventure. This pier is not going to offer  
14 one active thing to a kid other than, you know, obviously  
15 paddle boarding, but Legoland down in Carlsbad languished  
16 until it got in the big and fast rides. Then it finally  
17 got what it needed.

18 Three, they're selling to tourists. They're  
19 not selling to the residents. If you want to feel  
20 comfortable in your cutoffs and your flip-flops, then do  
21 what CenterCal wants, to build a mega mall with all these  
22 artifacts and these wonderful stores and wear your Gucci  
23 shoes there cause they're selling to tourists. They're  
24 not selling to local residents.

25 Other cities: Let's not reinvent the wheel.

PM2-30  
cont'd

1 Let's see what happens in other cities. I've been in. I  
2 sat for two years on a National Crime Committee for the  
3 Los Alamitos (unintelligible) for the City of Long Beach.

4 Long Beach Aquarium. That was supposed to  
5 drive money for Long Beach. Less than one year, it's  
6 faltering on its payments after the first year. Long  
7 Beach Convention Center. They built a new convention  
8 center because they thought let's expand the convention  
9 center and that will bring in more profit and more tax  
10 dollars. They defaulted on their first bond payment.

11 Oh, by the way, speaking of bond payment, my  
12 dad sat on the council and was the keynote bond payment  
13 to procure the parking structure that's now  
14 deteriorating. But legacies can't last forever.

PM2-30  
conf'd

15 Four: Okay. So then Hermosa Beach -- somebody  
16 already mentioned it -- the big beautiful theater that  
17 was supposed to be the jewel in the crown. It  
18 languished. La Jolla. Someone else mentioned La Jolla  
19 and Casa Beach. Casa Beach built a hotel. It faltered.  
20 Now it's a senior retirement place.

21 White Sands of La Jolla built a hotel. It  
22 faltered. Now it's a senior retirement place. If that  
23 City has one-tenth of what Redondo Beach has to offer and  
24 can't make it, who can as a hotel?

25 Quickly the fifth point: Mitigation.

1 Mitigation is a slang term that means they can kill and  
2 destroy animal habitats, they can destroy the vegetation  
3 and they can pollute the environment. They just pay  
4 enough money to make it not hurt, but it does hurt the  
5 animals, it hurts the environment and it hurts the  
6 locals.

PM2-30  
cont'd

7 (Applause.)

8 MS. MEYER: Lance, Mark and then Liz Sanchez.

9 MR. LIBIANO: Good evening. My name is Lance  
10 Libiano. I live in Hermosa Beach, but I have property at  
11 630 1st Street. The reason -- I didn't want to actually  
12 get three minutes of talking about myself and then  
13 include that I support the project so I will start with I  
14 support the project as it stands now because I assume  
15 there's going to be lots of improvements that are going  
16 to be done over the next couple of months.

PM2-31

17 So what I just wanted to say was I do like  
18 improvement, and I think the word "improvement" starts  
19 with improve. I do like what they already did. I spend  
20 most of my time down in Redondo, not in Hermosa. Even  
21 though I live in Hermosa, my brother lives in Redondo.  
22 We spend a lot of time with our kids at the beach and the  
23 pier and even going to the Fun Factory even though it's  
24 pretty shady at night there. We make it work.

25 So not to give you a three-minute speech. I

1 just want to say let's be open to the process. I am  
2 thankful that we can actually be a part of this and if  
3 there's something we don't like and enjoy, we can talk  
4 about it and figure out a solution.

PM2-31  
cont'd

5 So thank you very much.

6 MS. MEYER: Mark Mendez.

7 MR. MENDEZ: Thank you. I'm Mark. That's a little  
8 crazy cause usually he just goes on and on and on, but  
9 anyway, I'm the youngest brother. We're from  
10 Pennsylvania. We moved out here -- he moved out here 20  
11 years ago. I moved out here probably a year or two  
12 after. I bought my Redondo Beach property on Bearl  
13 Street, 209 Bearl Street at the same time I bought my  
14 Manhattan Beach property. And my wife, not here -- she's  
15 doing her thing with the kids -- prefers to stay in  
16 Redondo Beach.

PM2-32

17 I take my kids every weekend to the pier, and I  
18 wish that we had more things to do, not just go to the  
19 arcades. I think this is a great idea to expand on. I  
20 think there's a few things that need to be adjusted in  
21 construction and development, and I understand the other  
22 points of view; however, doing nothing after 40 years  
23 does not make sense.

24 The other argument is, hey, listen, I'd rather  
25 do nothing, and that's not a good idea. There's a lot of

1 residents that would like to walk down and spend their  
2 money at restaurants, they would like to spend their  
3 money at the current restaurants and I think the  
4 development, per se, now is a good mix. I think there  
5 needs to be some adjustments, and I think with CenterCal  
6 doing what they're doing, opening up the forum is a good  
7 thing.

8           So leave it to a guy who tries to convince his  
9 wife to move back to Manhattan Beach that says, "No,  
10 Mark. We're staying here in Redondo. I don't care how  
11 busy Bearl Street is. I want to walk down, and I want  
12 you to take the kids and enjoy the shore."

PM2-32  
cont'd

13           That said, a lot of people like to interject  
14 about the Bay Area, the -- I'm trying to figure out what  
15 that is -- the Lagoon. And everyone says, "Well, the  
16 Lagoon this and the Lagoon that. You don't have an idea  
17 about the Lagoon." But in the last six years, we've had  
18 a seasonal pass in Lagoon that we actually used it. I  
19 think what they're trying to do is a good substance of  
20 where it needs to go.

21           So we need to be a community, we need to come  
22 together and we need to adjust what we're doing and we  
23 need to figure out what we really want because at the end  
24 of the day, doing nothing is bad. We go to Europe. My  
25 wife is Japanese. I go to Japan every year. Density

1 does not bother us. It actually helps us because we can  
2 shop and we can do what we want and we can be  
3 entertained. So I think we need to look at the point of  
4 views and come together. And I appreciate it.

PM2-32  
cont'd

5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. MEYER: So Liz is the last person that I have a  
8 speaker card for. So as Liz comes up, is there anybody  
9 else who would like to speak this evening?

10 You do? Okay. So I'll have somebody take you  
11 a speaker card.

12 And remember, we're here till 9:00 o'clock. We  
13 do have the foyer where you can ask questions. You can  
14 also submit comment sheets. So Juan is just going to  
15 come over there, and so --

16 MS. SANCHEZ: Good evening. My name is Elizabeth  
17 Sanchez. I've been a resident of Redondo Beach for over  
18 33 years -- actually, almost 35. And let's say this  
19 project is really successful and we get a lot of people  
20 in there. I live very close over there. My concern is  
21 the health issues. I'm an interpreter for the court  
22 system, and for 20 years I was fortunate enough to  
23 interpret the city council meetings for Long Beach. I  
24 read of those EIR reports every week, EIR reports. And  
25 one of the things -- I learned a lot of things. My

PM2-33

1 concern is somebody said, "So what about the traffic, the  
2 noise?"

3 Traffic, according to some of the reports that  
4 I read, studies brings a lot of pollution and it impacts  
5 the community tremendously in terms of asthma and  
6 respiratory problems. And I live very close by. So  
7 those of you who have children and -- should consider  
8 this because you will have a rise in health costs due to  
9 all the traffic impact.

PM2-33  
conf'd

10 I don't know how they're going to mitigate  
11 that. Perhaps if we do need to go forward and make some  
12 changes, my suggestion or my desire would be to scale it  
13 down. I don't think we need a movie house down there  
14 when you can go and -- how many movie houses are there  
15 that you have 8 and 10 theaters. I know three or  
16 four -- I live on Emerald and PCH. I can get to three or  
17 four theaters in less than 15 minutes and see all the  
18 foreign movies, any movie that I want. So I would like  
19 to see it scaled down and figure out how we're going to  
20 address these health issues that we are going to pay for  
21 dearly.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. MEYER: Gary O'Connor.

24 MR. O'CONNOR: Hi. Thanks very much. My name is  
25 Gerry O'Connor, and I'm a 35-year resident of the beach

PM2-34

1 cities, former Redondo resident, currently a Manhattan  
2 Beach resident. But I'm hearing some interesting things  
3 today, particularly from the supporters of this proposal.  
4 And what I'm hearing almost of them compare it to is  
5 doing nothing. And I don't think there are a lot of  
6 people in this room who are proposing doing nothing. I  
7 think almost all of us tend to agree that we want to see.  
8 So frankly, it's a fallacious argument to say this is  
9 what we need to do because the alternative is doing  
10 nothing. None of us want to do nothing.

11 But in order to do the right thing, we need a  
12 good partner. And I heard it mentioned by the -- by the  
13 EIR person over here that at the scoping meeting, there  
14 were about 260 public comments filed. I went through the  
15 three pages. I counted. And what I counted was a few PM2-34  
cont'd  
16 who didn't commit, just asked questions, but I counted  
17 202 comments in firm opposition, 12 in firm support.  
18 That's almost 95 percent opposition. And what CenterCal  
19 did with what input, which, by the way, was collected in  
20 a meeting, which I would suggest set a new low bar for  
21 actively discouraging public participation.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

23 MR. O'CONNOR: It was in the lobby of the Performing  
24 Arts Center, not in the auditorium, not a seat in the  
25 room. Even the elderly had to stand --

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's right.

2 MR. O'CONNOR: -- by unprepared presenters who  
3 presented materials that you couldn't even see from the  
4 back of the crowded 200 people who attempted to stand.  
5 And to top it off, no public oral comment was allowed.

6 If that's discouraging public input, I don't  
7 know what is. But they took those 202 comments in firm  
8 opposition and went the other direction. They expanded  
9 the project.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

11 MR. O'CONNOR: So we need a good partner.

12 Is that a good partner?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

PM2-34  
cont'd

14 MR. O'CONNOR: I'm going to move on and just talk  
15 about the fact that that's the only harbor between Marina  
16 Del Rey and San Pedro. That's my harbor. I live in  
17 Manhattan Beach. Hermosa Beach is harbor. Everywhere is  
18 harbor between the Marina and San Pedro.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: King Harbor.

20 MR. O'CONNOR: If CenterCal is so confident that  
21 they are protecting the harbor, why have they not  
22 provided the 3D model so that we can all agree on whether  
23 it's a mall or not? We've asked for that for years.  
24 What are they hiding? Clearly, if they're not willing to  
25 put it forward and show us and be proud of their

1 suggestions and be straightforward in their  
2 presentations. They're hiding. CenterCal is not the  
3 partner we need unless they come way more towards the  
4 middle.

PM2-34  
cont'd

5 Thank you.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right.

7 (Applause.)

8 MS. MEYER: Okay. So at this time, I have no more  
9 comment sheets. This is your chance for this particular  
10 public meeting. We do have another one on January 9th.  
11 That's Saturday from 9:30 to 1:00 o'clock at the Crowne  
12 Plaza.

13 So not seeing anything, definitely we're here  
14 till 9:00 o'clock. If you want to go out the front and  
15 look at the environmental document, talk to staff -- I  
16 don't know if there's any more sandwiches or water or  
17 anything, but please help yourself. And thank you so  
18 much for your participation. And this will all be part  
19 of the public record. Thank you.

20 Have a good evening.

21 (Whereupon, at 8:26 p.m., The Waterfront  
22 Project Draft EIR Public Meeting was  
23 concluded.)

24 -000-

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COURT REPORTERS CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA        )  
  )    ss.  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES    )

I, Vivian C. Lane, hereby certify:

I am a duly qualified Certified Shorthand Reporter, in the State of California, holder of Certificate Number CSR 11339 issued by the Court Reporters Board of California and which is in full force and effect.

I am not financially interested in this action and am not a relative or employee of any attorney of the parties, or of any of the parties.

I am the reporter that stenographically recorded the testimony in the foregoing proceeding and the foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony given.

Dated: December 30, 2015

*Vivian Lane*



---

**PM2- Draft EIR Public Meeting Transcript – December 9, 2015**  
**(Beginning page 27 of transcript – Page 2-964)**

---

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-01****GINA DIPIETRO**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-01**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC085. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-02****ROBERT LIGHT**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-02**

Regarding the environmental impacts of the proposed project, please refer to the Executive Summary of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC077-1. The proposed project is specifically designed as a new waterfront village, which would provide a distinctive high quality mixed-use environment to support the City's ongoing economic and recreational revitalization of the Waterfront, reducing seasonality, and renewing a source of pride for the community that honors Redondo Beach's rich history and family-friendly beach culture. Specifically, the proposed development would be mostly restaurant (35 percent), with 20 percent retail, 12 percent office, 24 percent boutique hotel and nine percent specialty cinema. The proposed project would be consistent with approved growth, such as the approved 400,000 square feet of net new development cap in the waterfront (under Measure G and the City's certified Local Coastal Program). Refer to the Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site regarding the future development of the AES Power Plant Site. Please also see Draft EIR Section 3.1 for discussion of aesthetics, Section 3.2 for discussion of air quality, Section 3.8 for discussion of hydrology and water quality, Section 3.10 for discussion of noise, and Section 3.13 for discussion of traffic. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-03****ROBERT RESNICK**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-03**

Please refer to Section 3.13 of the Draft EIR and Master Response #7: Waterfront Parking. Construction phasing associated with the proposed project is detailed in Section 2.5 of Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR. Parking during construction for adjacent uses would occur immediately south of the project site. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-04****TAL FINNEY**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-04**

Please refer to Response to Comments PM1-12. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-05****PAM COMBAR**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-05**

The proposed project would be consistent with the City's zoning regulations, such as the approved 400,000 square feet of net new development cap in the waterfront (under Measure G and the City's certified Local Coastal Program); for more detailed information, please see Draft EIR Section 3.9. The lease document is not a CEQA/environmental issue. Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site regarding the viability of the development proposed at the project site, regarding the existing and proposed businesses at the site. The comments and opinions are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-06****DAN ELDER**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-06**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC004 and PC394. Several different boat launch locations were analyzed in Draft EIR, Chapter 4. Please also see discussion of the Staff Recommended Alternative in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR, including discussion of a boat launch at Mole B. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-07****JOANN TURK**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-07**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC111, PC350, and Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-08****JOAN RILEY**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-08**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC120, PC383, and PC401 regarding issues raised by the commenter including noise. Refer to Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development regarding the scale/massing of development, as well as Section 3.1 for aesthetics analysis and Section 3.9 for the projects consistency with approved heights at the site. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-09****JOANNE GALIN**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-09**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-10****ARNETTE TRAVIS**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-10**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-11****GREG DIETE**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-11**

Refer to Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development regarding the scale of development, as well as Section 3.1 for aesthetics analysis and Section 3.9 for the projects consistency with approved heights at the site, and Section 3.13 for discussion of traffic. Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site regarding the viability of the development proposed at the project site, as well as appropriateness of land uses proposed at the site. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-12****ANDY AVRICK**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-12**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-13****JOY CORRADETTI**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-13**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC148. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-14****LORI ZAREMSKI**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-14**

Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site regarding the businesses at the project site. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-15****EUGENE SOLOMON**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-15**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC149. For discussion of existing conditions at intersections along Pacific Coast Highway and Catalina, please see Draft EIR Table 3.13-4; contrary to the assertions in the comment, none of the intersections under existing conditions operate at LOS F (referenced in the comment as

an “F rating”). Please also refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site regarding the businesses at the project site. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-16****WAYNE CRAIG**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-16**

Please refer to Response to Comment PM2-02 above. The commenter is incorrect that a movie theater is proposed on the pier. The specialty cinema is proposed for the northern portion of the project site (not the southern or pier area). Please see Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site, which addresses viability of project elements including the specialty cinema. The comments and opinions are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-17****DELIA VECHI**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-17**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC336. Please see Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site, which addresses viability of project elements including the specialty cinema, please also see Master Response #7: Waterfront Parking. Please also see Draft EIR Section 3.4 for discussion of historic resources. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-18****DOUG CHRISTIANSEN**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-18**

For discussion of hydrological resources, please See Draft EIR Section 3.8. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-19****BILL SCHWANEBERG**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-19**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC371. As for the sportfishing, please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly’s and Sportfishing. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-20****JULIE COLL**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-20**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC059 and PC345. Please also see Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly’s and Sportfishing. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City’s decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-21****JACKIE BALESTRA**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-21**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-22****MARK KNUDSON**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-22**

Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site regarding existing and proposed businesses at the project site. Green features, such as electric charging stations, are being proposed as part of the project. Please see Draft EIR Section 3.8 and Response to Comment PC336-5 for discussion of hydrology and sea level rise. Please refer to Response to Comment PC085 regarding the blue heron. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-23****SCOTT FELLOWS**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-23**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-24****REGGIE THOMAS**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-24**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-25****STEVE COMLEY**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-25**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-26****JENNIFER GOLDSTEIN**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-26**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-27****JOHN GRAN**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-27**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC085 regarding the blue heron. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-28****TERA GUTHRIE**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-28**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-29****DON SZERLIP**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-29**

Please refer to Master Response #4: Modifications to the Seaside Lagoon and Master Response #8: Boat Ramp in King Harbor. Please refer to Response to Comment PC346-1 for discussion of vehicle queuing for the boat launch once the project becomes operational. Please also see Final EIR Chapter 2, Modifications to the Draft EIR Table 3.10-9, for additional roadway noise information in proximity to the Portofino hotel (approximately 260 feet northwest of Noise Measurement Location 2 at its closest point to the Waterfront project). As noted in Table 3.10-9, peak hour usage of a Boat Launch at Mole C is not expected to be more than 12 vehicles in a worst case scenario. Furthermore, this would be a reduction in comparison to the existing operations of Joe's Crab Shack (8,231 KSF); as noted in Draft EIR Table 3.13-11 Joes Crab Shack was modeled as an existing Quality Restaurant, which yields an existing trip generation of 62 vehicles during the peak hour. As discussed in Note 7 of Modifications to the Draft EIR Table 3.10-9, would have a negligible effect on existing roadway noise along that segment of Portofino Way (i.e., road segment nearest to Portofino hotel). Furthermore, the portion of the access road in front of Portofino hotel would not be used by the Waterfront patrons, as it is a dead end. Additionally, the noise analysis notes that the project site is already subject to existing operational noise typical of existing commercial land uses, including conversations (Draft EIR page 3.10-22), notwithstanding that such conversational noise levels would not likely be discernable from existing background noise levels given that the Portofino Hotel would approximately be 200 feet for the nearest edge of the Project site, and approximately 260 feet north of the boat launch driveway at Mole C. The proposed project is specifically designed as a new waterfront village, which would provide a distinctive high quality mixed-use environment to support the City's ongoing economic and recreational revitalization of the Waterfront, while reducing seasonality. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-30****LAURA ZAHN**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-30**

Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site regarding existing and proposed businesses at the project site. Please refer to Chapter 2 and Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR for recreational elements (passive and active) associated with the project. Mitigation associated with biological resources (MM BIO-1 to MM BIO-4) is described in Section 3.2 of the Draft EIR, which is appropriate and adequate to reduce impacts to less than significant. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-31****LANCE LIBIANO**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-31**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-32****MARK MENDEZ**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-32**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-33****ELIZABETH SANCHEZ**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-33**

Master Response #6: Summary of Traffic Impacts Associated with the Operation of the Proposed Project for information on traffic. Please refer to Response to Comments PC442. Please also see Draft EIR Section 3.2 and Response to Comment PC152-10 for discussion of health effects and air quality. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM2-34****GERRY O'CONNOR**

---

**Response to Comment PM2-34**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC427. The video prepared by CenterCal (available at <http://www.thewaterfrontredondo.com/the-plan.php#video>) includes a computer 3D model of the proposed project. In addition, simulations used in Section 3.1, Aesthetics and Visual Resources of the Draft EIR (see Figures 3.1-7 through 3.1-23) used to analyze the aesthetics and visual resources impacts that could result from the proposed project were based on the 3D computer model. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

PM3

CERTIFIED COPY

THE WATERFRONT PROJECT  
 DRAFT EIR PUBLIC MEETING  
 REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS of THE  
WATERFRONT PROJECT, DRAFT EIR PUBLIC MEETING

JANUARY 9, 2016

Vivian C. Lane, CSR No. 11339  
 400495



- |                              |                               |                             |                              |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| (310) 207-8000 Los Angeles   | (415) 439-5777 San Francisco  | (430) 655-0100 Irvine       | (650) 455-5444 San Diego     |
| (310) 207-8000 Century City  | (408) 885-0550 San Jose       | (700) 529-2240 Palm Springs | (800) 222-1231 Carlsbad      |
| (416) 422-5777 Sacramento    | (800) 222-1231 Montreal       | (702) 565-0500 Las Vegas    | (800) 222-1231 Monterey      |
| (951) 686-0605 Riverside     | (818) 702-0202 Woodland Hills | (702) 565-0500 Henderson    | (616) 277-9494 Garden City   |
| (212) 808-8500 New York City | (347) 821-4511 Brooklyn       | (516) 490-1910 Albany       | (914) 510-9110 White Plains  |
| (312) 378-8888 Chicago       | 00+1+000 222 1231 Paris       | 00+1+900 222 1231 Dubai     | 001-1-800 222 1231 Hong Kong |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

THE WATERFRONT PROJECT  
DRAFT EIR PUBLIC MEETING  
REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA  
SATURDAY, JANUARY 9, 2016  
9:14 A.M.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
WATERFRONT PROJECT, DRAFT EIR PUBLIC MEETING  
at The Crown Plaza, 300 North Harbor Drive,  
Redondo Beach, California, on Saturday,  
January 9, 2016 at 9:14 a.m. before Vivian C.  
Lane, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 11339.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES OF PRESENTERS:

DOROTHY MEYER  
Principal Planner  
CDM SMITH  
111 Academy Way  
Suite 150  
Irvine, California 92617  
(949)930-7259  
meyerdl@cdmsmith.com

AARON S. JONES  
Community Development Director  
REDONDO BEACH  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
415 Diamond Street  
Redondo Beach, California 90277  
(310)318-0637 x1-2200  
aaron.jones@redondo.org



1 REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, SATURDAY, JANUARY 9, 2016

2 9:14 A.M.

3

4 MS. MEYER: Morning, everyone. We're about ready to  
5 start the presentation and comments, so if you could get  
6 seats or make your way to the ballroom, that would be  
7 greatly appreciated. Thank you.

8 Please take your seats we're going to begin the  
9 presentation. Thank you.

10 MR. JONES: Okay. Good morning, everyone. Please  
11 find a seat, and we're going to get started.

12 All right. Good morning, everyone, and welcome  
13 to the third and final public input workshop on the  
14 Waterfront Draft Environmental Impact Report. We really  
15 appreciate you taking time out of your schedule this  
16 Saturday and coming to learn more about the Waterfront  
17 EIR. The EIR is about a very important and  
18 transitional -- transformational project for our  
19 community. While this may be the final workshop on the  
20 EIR. There will be many additional public input  
21 opportunities later this year, when the Harbor Commission  
22 and most likely eventually the City Council have public  
23 hearings on the project. So any of you that are worried  
24 that you might miss an opportunity, there will be further  
25 workshops. This is input on the EIR. The project

1 hearings begin later this spring.

2           Again, we appreciate your taking time to share  
3 your input. Since mid November, we have been reaching  
4 out to the community and providing every opportunity for  
5 public comment. We've done a lot of outreach, and that  
6 includes posting of many signs and posters, placing large  
7 format display ads in the newspaper, utilizing our local  
8 Cable Crawl, placing ads in the City's recreation  
9 newsletter, sending an email blast -- and I hope  
10 everybody is on our email list and signed up out front --  
11 to everyone who has expressed interest in this project  
12 and many other outreach strategies. I can see that the  
13 turnout today means that our outreach strategy is  
14 working.

15           Now, getting back to the Draft EIR, the  
16 Waterfront EIR is by large the most complete and  
17 comprehensive environmental impact report that the City  
18 has ever prepared. It is the result of a lot of hard  
19 work by experts and our staff, and it's taken over 18  
20 months to complete this EIR at a cost of actually over  
21 \$1 million. The Draft EIR explains and examines how our  
22 Waterfront project would impact our community. Most  
23 importantly the Draft EIR not only discloses those  
24 impacts, but it suggests and identifies mitigation  
25 measures.

1           While the Waterfront EIR is highly technical,  
2 and we apologize for the technical terms, we've done our  
3 best to keep and draft this document in plain English. I  
4 encourage each of you to continue to read the Draft EIR  
5 and provide us with your comments, and later today in the  
6 presentation, Dorothy will go through and try to  
7 summarize the EIR and the conclusions in a very  
8 abbreviated format for you. Today all of your comments  
9 on the Draft EIR will be recorded and will be part of the  
10 official record of the proceedings.

11           The -- we also have -- so during this meeting,  
12 the comments that are received at the microphone are part  
13 of that official record. We have a minute secretary here  
14 taking your exact comments, and so the comments received  
15 in this room are just that, official comments. If you do  
16 have questions today, we do have staff in the lobby, and  
17 the staff is prepared to answer some of those questions  
18 today. That can't happen in this room because we're  
19 trying to receive all comments as part of an official  
20 record.

21           With that announcement, I'll turn it over to  
22 Dorothy, and she'll also mention that we still have at  
23 least until the 19th, which is the final day for  
24 receiving comments in the Draft EIR; so about 10 more  
25 days in that process to submit any further comments if

1 you don't manage to get them in today.

2 MS. MEYER: Good morning and Happy New Year  
3 everyone. My name is Dorothy Meyer. I'm with CDM Smith,  
4 and I'm the project manager hired by the City to do the  
5 environmental document analysis. And as Aaron Jones  
6 indicated, who just left -- he's with the City of Redondo  
7 Beach -- we do have a court reporter here taking down  
8 your names and everything, your comments and all that you  
9 say. So please, when you do come up to the microphone,  
10 please state your name. If your name is something that  
11 is difficult to spell or is just not logical to spell,  
12 please do that for her because that will definitely be  
13 helpful for her. Talk slowly, and she will get all of  
14 this down for you.

15 I do have a couple of administrative items. So  
16 if you've not been to this facility before, the restrooms  
17 are on the other side of the hotel. Also, somebody left  
18 a pair of glasses at the sign in table so if you've  
19 missing a pair of glasses, please go up there.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Got them. Thank you.

21 MS. MEYER: You got them? Great.

22 Also, another item is we are validating parking  
23 here at the Crowne Plaza; so if you haven't already been  
24 asked if you need it at the sign-in table, please go to  
25 the sign-in table before you leave today, and we will

1 give you a parking validation. And also, if you haven't  
2 signed in, it's a good thing to do because we will keep  
3 you informed on the document. It goes into a big master  
4 mailing list, and that way we can make sure that you  
5 all -- you all are further given information.

6 I'm going to start the presentation, but I also  
7 want to comment on ways to comment on the EIR. So we  
8 have throughout this venue comment sheets. They look  
9 like this. They're double sided, and if you'd like to  
10 turn in a comment today, you can do so. We have boxes.  
11 They have big stickers on them that say, "Comment Box  
12 No.," whatever the box number is. You can slip them in  
13 there. You can hand it to a staff person -- I would  
14 prefer you put it in the box, though, or you can take  
15 this home with you and mail it to the address below. And  
16 you can do so by the January 19th date at 5:30 p.m., or  
17 you can scan it and email it. We're accepting emails as  
18 well.

19 And then after my presentation, there will be a  
20 chance for all of you to speak or whomever would like to  
21 speak, and we have speaker request cards also in the  
22 back. And I'll say this again, that if you'd like to  
23 speak and you haven't turned in a card, you can do so  
24 throughout the entire comment period as we're sitting  
25 here after the presentation.

1 All right. So thank you for that, and let us  
2 start the presentation.

3 So the purpose of the meeting is to provide a  
4 summary of the proposed project, the areas studied in the  
5 Draft EIR; the impact conclusions of the Draft EIR,  
6 mitigation measures to reduce impacts and how to provide  
7 this input to the Draft EIR during this public review  
8 period. And then the rest of the time will be for  
9 comments.

10 The Waterfront Project proposes to revitalize  
11 an approximately 36 acre portion of the City's 150-acre  
12 Waterfront. The project site is 36 acres, and it  
13 includes both land and water. The site goes from  
14 approximately in the south Torrance Circle and the  
15 Horseshoe Pier and to the north Portofino Way.

16 The Waterfront Project would remove the pier  
17 parking structure and approximately 219,881 square feet  
18 of existing structures. The structures at the project  
19 site that will remain are the Plaza Parking Structure,  
20 Kincaid's' and the restroom facility at Seaside Lagoon.  
21 The pier parking structure would be replaced. There  
22 would be a new parking structure placed at the northeast  
23 corner of the project, and about 523,939 square feet of  
24 new development would be constructed. That's  
25 approximately 304,058 square feet of net new development.

1 at the site.

2           There are two sets of numbers in the EIR. For  
3 the purposes of CEQA, the net new square footage is  
4 304,058 square feet. For the purposes of allowable  
5 development in the harbor area under the local coastal  
6 plan, the net new development is 290,113 square feet.  
7 This is because the CEQA net new development square  
8 footage considers the development existing on the site in  
9 2014 -- and that's when we went out with our Notice of  
10 Preparation -- while the allowable harbor square footage  
11 considers development existing at the site in 2008. The  
12 difference is due to the removal of the Octagon Building  
13 in 2013.

14           The proposed project is intended to revitalize  
15 a portion of the City's waterfront by redeveloping and  
16 expanding local and visitor-serving commercial uses,  
17 enhancing public access and coastal recreational  
18 opportunities and facilities and improving the aging  
19 support infrastructure at the site. The project also  
20 proposes improvements to site connectivity, public access  
21 and open space along the waterfront. The proposed  
22 project is specifically designed as a new waterfront  
23 village that seeks to integrate the best of public and  
24 private needs and interests in a revitalized village  
25 providing broad coastal access and enjoyment. The

1 proposed project is an essential feature of the City's  
2 harbor and as such is a key component of the waterfront  
3 revitalization effort.

4           The proposed Waterfront Village that is  
5 considered in the Draft EIR is consisting of  
6 approximately 12 percent office, 20 percent retail,  
7 35 percent restaurant, 24 percent associated with the  
8 boutique hotel and 9 percent associated with the  
9 specialty cinema. All of this is consistent with the  
10 goals and objectives with the City's local coastal  
11 program.

12           The project site is defined in terms of three  
13 geographic areas. We have the northern portion, which is  
14 this yellow section, that's approximately 19.5 acres that  
15 includes about 1.3 acres of water area that's associated  
16 with the small craft boat launch. It includes the  
17 southern portion, which is this kind of orange looking  
18 area, that's 12 acres. And then Basin 3, which is the  
19 water area, which is about 3.5 acres of water.  
20 Approximately 1 acre of the southern portion, which is  
21 this little strip here, is associated with the  
22 International Boardwalk and the elevated walkway, and  
23 that's behind -- that's the portion behind Basin 3 that  
24 connects the northern portion of the site with the  
25 southern portion.

1           And then we have throughout the environmental  
2 document this little -- kind of like a dash boat right  
3 here, and that is the underwater fill area that would be  
4 associated with the breakwater for the boat ramp at  
5 Mole D.

6           So based on these three geographic areas, in  
7 the northern portion of the project site, all of the  
8 structures except the plaza parking structure and  
9 restroom building at Seaside Lagoon would be removed.  
10 The Draft EIR analyzed removal of the Sports Fishing Pier  
11 and two options: Basically putting it back as a concrete  
12 pier but basically in a similar footprint or not to  
13 reconstruct it at all. A new parking structure is  
14 proposed in the northeastern corner area, and then this  
15 northern portion of the project site is also where the  
16 market hall and specialty theater is being proposed.  
17 Public recreation enhancements in this area include:  
18 Enhanced public open space and pedestrian and bicycle  
19 pathways; also in the northern area, the elements include  
20 opening the Seaside Lagoon to tidal waters of the harbor,  
21 replacement of the boat hosts in Basin 3 with a new small  
22 boat launch ramp at Mole D; and expanded boardwalk along  
23 the water's edge. As part of the enhanced site  
24 connectivity of public access to and along the water,  
25 there is a proposed new Main Street that would traverse

1 between -- well, down the center -- whoop. Where did it  
2 go?

3 There we go.

4 Would traverse the center or the northern  
5 portion of the site. That's a new Main Street.

6 In the southern portion, the pier parking  
7 structure and pier plaza would be removed. A new pier  
8 parking structure would be constructed along with the  
9 boutique hotel and new commercial uses. The new parking  
10 structure and layout would enhance bicycle and pedestrian  
11 paths to avoid navigation through the parking structures,  
12 which is currently the case.

13 We -- the proposed project would replace the  
14 southermost portion of the pier -- that's this part right  
15 here -- that's currently wood. It's the only part  
16 remaining since the storms and the fires back in the '80s  
17 and '90s and that portion would be reconstructed as  
18 concrete and that would -- to do this, we would need to  
19 remove the existing buildings on the pier with the  
20 exception of Kincaid's. Once rebuilt, the pier would  
21 have new retail and restaurants.

22 To improve public access at the site, a  
23 pedestrian bicycle bridge, which is currently being  
24 proposed as a drawbridge, would span the Basin 3  
25 entrance. Also at Basin 3, we would repair and replace

1 the bulkhead and cap that's part of the marina and right  
2 now the marina slips are wood and they would be replaced  
3 with concrete.

4 Other improvements include the demolition of  
5 the international Boardwalk and elevated walkway to  
6 accommodate the Pacific Avenue reconnection, which is a  
7 roadway that would connect the northern and southern  
8 portions of the site. There would be the introduction of  
9 new bicycle and pedestrian pathways throughout the  
10 project site. There would be essential updates to aging  
11 infrastructure, and particularly in the northern portion  
12 of the site, the site would be raised so that it would  
13 address future sea level rise. And throughout the  
14 project, there would be new high quality public open  
15 space, including public seating, gathering places and  
16 pathways.

17 As a reminder of how we got to this Draft EIR,  
18 we first went through the scoping process, which occurred  
19 for a 30-day period back in June and July of 2014, and  
20 then during that period, we did have an open house to  
21 provide information to y'all about what the project was  
22 at that point and also to get information from you as to  
23 what you thought should we should be analyzing in the  
24 Draft EIR.

25 And so then we're now at the Draft EIR phase

1 and toward the close of that phase. But the purpose of  
2 the Draft EIR is to disclose to the public as well as the  
3 decision makers the potential environmental consequences  
4 for construction and operation of the proposed project.  
5 Impacts associated with the project are identified as  
6 either having no impact or a less-than-significant  
7 impact, which means that there would be no substantial  
8 adverse change in the environment because of the project;  
9 or there's less than significant with mitigation, and  
10 that is there was a possible substantial impact but by  
11 adding mitigation, we could reduce it to less than  
12 significant; or a significant and unavoidable impact,  
13 which means there would be a substantial adverse effect  
14 on the environment that couldn't be reduced by mitigation  
15 fully or that there weren't any feasible mitigation  
16 measures available.

17 The Draft EIR contains an Executive Summary, a  
18 detailed project description -- that's Chapter 2 -- a  
19 description of existing conditions and analysis of the  
20 potential environmental impacts associated with 14  
21 environmental resource areas, and they're listed there on  
22 the slide. And these were all determined based on that  
23 scoping period and the Notice of Preparation that we sent  
24 out back in June, July of last year, of 2014. We also  
25 took those 14 resource areas, and we analyzed them for

1 all eight of our environmental alternatives.

2 So the findings of the Draft EIR: There was  
3 one no impact, and as it relates to recreation, it's that  
4 there would not be an impact on recreation facilities or  
5 we wouldn't require the construction of any new  
6 recreational facilities that would have an effect on the  
7 environment other than what's being proposed as part of  
8 the project. So this is with regards to outside of the  
9 project.

10 For less-than-significant impacts, the analysis  
11 of the Draft EIR determined that the proposed project  
12 would not have a substantial adverse effect on esthetics,  
13 and that's designated local views, visual character,  
14 light and glare, air quality, operational emissions and  
15 odors. For biological resources, for a period of  
16 sensitive natural communities, and there would be no  
17 conflict of policies or ordinances protecting biological  
18 resources. For geology and soils, with compliance with  
19 building codes, there would be no adverse seismic related  
20 risk and no substantial soil erosion. For greenhouse  
21 gas, the proposed project would not create substantial  
22 greenhouse gas emissions, nor would it conflict with  
23 policies to reduce greenhouse gas.

24 Hazards and hazardous materials, the project  
25 would not create a hazard or risk of upset and would not

1 interfere with emergency responses or evacuation plans.  
2 For hydrology and water quality, the proposed the project  
3 would not violate water quality standards, nor would it  
4 substantially change the drainage on the site or the area  
5 that would cause flooding. For land use, the project  
6 would not conflict with applicable plans and policies.  
7 For noise, the project would not expose sensitive  
8 receptors to noise levels above the City standards. For  
9 public services, there would not be a requirement or a  
10 need for more police or fire facilities to maintain  
11 service. For recreation, the project would not increase  
12 the use of existing neighborhood facilities that would  
13 cause a deterioration of those facilities, nor would it  
14 cause a need to construct other new recreation  
15 facilities. For traffic, there would not be a conflict  
16 with the Traffic Congestion Management Program. And for  
17 utilities, the proposed project would not exceed existing  
18 water, wastewater, solid waste, natural gas or  
19 electricity supplies.

20 The Draft EIR determined that implementation of  
21 the proposed project would result in four significant  
22 impacts during construction and six during operation that  
23 could be mitigated to less than significant. Biological  
24 resources was one of them, and that had to do with the  
25 marine mammals and the California grunion if they were to

1 run during construction. Also related to the increase in  
2 surface water coverage and fill of waters in the U.S.

3 For cultural, during construction there could  
4 be findings of archeological and paleontological  
5 resources, but we could apply mitigation that would  
6 reduce that impact to less than significant. For  
7 hydrology and water quality during the operation, for  
8 wave uprush and future effects of sea level rise, there  
9 was mitigation available and applied to the project that  
10 could reduce that impact to less than significant. And  
11 for traffic during construction and operation, there for  
12 six existing intersections found and we could mitigate  
13 those and then parking could be managed with a shared  
14 parking that's required under the coastal zone. And then  
15 related to potential safety conflicts between the boat  
16 ramp and the lagoon as proposed, there was mitigation to  
17 reduce any of the safety conflicts.

18 So for air quality, we were able to get the  
19 impacts down to less than significant for reactive  
20 organic gases, but we did have significant and  
21 unavoidable impacts still for nitrogen oxides and carbon  
22 monoxide but there were no operational impacts. For  
23 cultural resources, historic resources, the document  
24 determined that there were three structures that met the  
25 eligibility criteria for the City of Redondo Beach

1 landmark designation, although there are no current  
2 official designations at the project site. Those  
3 included the Sports Fishing Pier, including the  
4 buildings, Tony's on the pier and its companion building,  
5 which is Tony's Hats and Things, and the Redondo Beach  
6 pier complex, which we considered to include the timber  
7 portion of the Horseshoe Pier as well as the Monstad  
8 Pier. And the Monstad Pier is not actually in our  
9 project site, but it is connected to a portion of the  
10 Horseshoe Pier and adjacent. So it was considered as  
11 part of the Redondo Beach Pier complex. Again, there  
12 would be no operational impacts. This is all related to  
13 construction

14 For noise during construction, there would be  
15 significant noise and vibration that could occur at  
16 various times during the two-and a half year construction  
17 period, and although we have several mitigation measures,  
18 which you'll see in another slide, that would reduce  
19 those impacts, it still was considered significant and  
20 avoidable. During operation, because of Pacific Avenue  
21 reconnection and the traffic that would be using that  
22 roadway, there was some additional noise on Torrance  
23 Circle between the project site and Catalina that would  
24 be increased and that can't be mitigated.

25 For hydrology and water quality, the project

1 site is subject currently to the effects of tsunamis.  
2 While the probability is extremely rare, it could have  
3 damaging effects, as it could now. This is the case, and  
4 with the implementation of the project, there would be  
5 additional people and structures on the site. So  
6 therefore, that risk could be increased. Although we did  
7 include mitigation, such as a tsunami warning system, we  
8 could not say that we could reduce that to less than  
9 significant. So that remains significant and  
10 unavoidable.

11 So mitigation measures: These are the resource  
12 areas where mitigation measures were applied to reduce or  
13 avoid a significant impact. If you want additional  
14 information on these mitigation measures, you could ask a  
15 staff person in the back. We could show you where they  
16 are in the Draft EIR, and we can, you know, give you  
17 details on every single one of these. As you can see,  
18 for air quality, it's during construction. Same thing  
19 with biological resources and cultural resources. Those  
20 mitigation are applied during construction. For  
21 hydrology and water quality, it's during operation. And  
22 for noise, again, during construction, those are  
23 mitigation measures. And then for traffic and  
24 transportation, the mitigation was applied during  
25 construction and operation.

1 I've also included a slide that shows the  
2 traffic mitigation. There is a board that's this exact  
3 same board that is out there in the foyer. It's towards  
4 the entrance. So if you have any questions or would like  
5 no look at that one, please feel to do so in the foyer.  
6 The board is out there, and that shows the exact  
7 locations of the traffic mitigation.

8 So an EIR is not required to consider -- is a  
9 range of alternatives that would -- the EIR is required  
10 to consider a range of potentially feasible alternatives  
11 that would reduce at least one of the significant  
12 environmental impacts that we just mentioned, and also it  
13 needs to meet most of the project objectives. The seven  
14 alternatives to the proposed project that the Draft EIR  
15 analyzes are as follows: The Alternative 1 is no  
16 project, no build. That's basically the conditions of  
17 the site today; however, realizing that traffic and other  
18 things are going to continue to grow in the future.  
19 that's what the -- but there would be no construction or  
20 nothing that would occur at the site.

21 Alternative 2 is the no project but necessary  
22 infrastructure improvement project. Basically it  
23 wouldn't include a lot of the redevelopment of the site;  
24 however, realizing that the pier parking structure needs  
25 to be replaced and that there are other items like the

1 wooden portion of the Horseshoe Pier and the Sports  
2 Fishing Pier that really require a lot more than  
3 maintenance. That project would be Alternative 2.

4           Alternative 3 is the landside development  
5 only, and that is also what we call the "no federal  
6 action alternative." Basically, it's anything that is  
7 not in the water that was being proposed is pretty much  
8 part of the Alternative 3 with a few little  
9 modifications, but that would be landside development  
10 only.

11           Alternative 4 is called a "no property exchange  
12 with the state." There is a portion of the site that has  
13 tidelands and uplands designation, and as part of the  
14 project, we would be switching those designations with  
15 the California State Lands Commission. And if that  
16 doesn't go through or that can't happen, then we made  
17 sure that we had an alternative that would address what  
18 would the project site look like and what would the  
19 project look like without that change in tidal and upland  
20 designation.

21           Alternative 5 is a no Pacific Avenue  
22 reconnection. So that one is the northern portion of the  
23 project is proposed would be constructed, the southern  
24 portion would be constructed and there would be some  
25 modifications to what would occur behind Basin 3 but

1 there would be no roadway. There would still be an  
2 elevated walkway that is currently there at the project  
3 site.

4 Alternative 6 is an alternative construction  
5 phasing. Right now the proposed project is assuming that  
6 the entire site is built at the same time, and this would  
7 be, well, what if you build the site north and south and  
8 various pieces of the project at different times but  
9 still within a sequential time frame.

10 And then Alternative 7 is a reduced density  
11 project. It's pretty much most of the project elements  
12 but at a smaller scale.

13 In addition to the seven alternatives to the  
14 proposed project, we did have an alternative to analyze  
15 various small craft boat launch ramp facilities located  
16 throughout King harbor, and along with those, we did the  
17 same impact analysis with those 14 resource areas, but we  
18 were basically looking at what would -- if we put the  
19 alternative ramp at a different mole and make it a one  
20 lane versus a two lane -- cause currently the proposed  
21 project assumes a two lane -- what would the impact be  
22 and what would the project site look like as part of that  
23 project.

24 This board is also out there in the foyer. So  
25 if you'd like a closer look at it, please feel free to

1 look at it. It's either in the back of this room or in  
2 the foyer. I think it's in the foyer near traffic.

3           So as Aaron said, we have been out for a 63-day  
4 public review period. We are towards the end of that  
5 public review. The best way to comment on this project  
6 is to either comment today. In a few minutes, I'll open  
7 up the comments. Also, like I indicated at the  
8 beginning, we will be taking either comments today -- you  
9 can put it on sheets of paper like this that are located  
10 throughout the venue -- or if you've already got one  
11 typed up and you just want to put it in one of our  
12 comment boxes, please feel free to do so. Another way  
13 that we're accepting comments is also through email, and  
14 you can see there's the email address of where to send  
15 them. There's the mailing address. We are -- like Aaron  
16 indicated, we're at the last of our public meetings, and  
17 then we are accepting all these comments before 5:30 p.m.  
18 on January 19th.

19           Also, I just wanted to let you know we do have  
20 a couple of copies of the Draft EIR out in the foyer. We  
21 have it in its full binder glory. We also have all the  
22 appendices here for you to look at if you'd like to look  
23 at them. Also, because the document is so big, we did  
24 break it up into different chapters and sections. So  
25 you'll find that next to the full document, or if you're

1 just interested in a particular resource area or an  
2 alternative section of the project description, you can  
3 look at that out in the foyer. So that's available.

4 We also have the document, if you haven't  
5 already looked for it, at these locations. They are  
6 there. And also, you can get it online and download it.  
7 I understand it is a very large file, so, you know,  
8 hopefully that doesn't cause any problems, but it is  
9 available at all those different locations.

10 So the way that this goes is I have been  
11 receiving these speaker comment cards, and if you have  
12 one and you'd like to speak -- okay, great.

13 Juan?

14 Let's see. Aaron is going to get those. If  
15 anybody needs a blank one, please let us know because  
16 we've got blank ones and pen, but right now I have about  
17 19 so we can definitely go at three minutes each. And  
18 what I'm going to do is I am going to say the first three  
19 names, and if you could come up to the microphone and,  
20 again, you know, speak clearly -- thank you -- and spell  
21 your name, that would be the best for the court reporter  
22 so she doesn't have to guess. We'll also give her these  
23 at the end so she has a better chance of spelling your  
24 name --

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There you go.

1 MS. MEYER: Thank you.

2 And if at the end, I haven't gotten any more.  
3 And we can pick up speaker cards as we're going through,  
4 and I'll have Juan be my little timekeeper and you'll  
5 hear a bell because we are going to limit it to three  
6 minutes to make sure everybody gets a chance to comment.  
7 And if you have questions, like Aaron said, please feel  
8 free -- there's staff out there in the foyer right now to  
9 answer questions, so --

10 Aaron could you help her over there?

11 MR. JONES: Yes.

12 MS. MEYER: Okay. So I'm going to call three names,  
13 and I apologize in advance if I say your name wrong. The  
14 first one up to speak is going to be Wayne Craig, the  
15 second one is Alan Hurd and the third one is Lissa Dye.

16 So if Wayne, if you want to be the first one  
17 up, and again, state your name and it should be on if you  
18 want to test that.

19 MR. CRAIG: Hello.

20 MS. MEYER: Oh, great. We can hear you. Okay.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. CRAIG: Hi. My name is Wayne Craig.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It isn't on.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why don't you raise it up?

25 MR. CRAIG: Is that a little better? Is that

PM3-01

1 better?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's still not picking up.

3 MR. CRAIG: Good morning. My name is Wayne Craig.

4 I have kind of a unique situation --

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The mike is not working very

7 well.

8 MR. CRAIG: It says it's on.

9 I'll hold it like that. Okay.

10 I'll try again. My name is Wayne Craig. Maybe

11 I have a unique position. I was actually born in Redondo

12 Beach at South Bay Hospital, and ironically, I have the

13 same birthday as the City of Redondo, April 29th. So I

14 kind of feel good about talking about Redondo.

PM3-01  
conf'd

15 There's a lot of problems with the Draft EIR.

16 I actually read it.

17 Has anyone else here?

18 Not many of you have.

19 First thing is fuzzy math when it comes to

20 traffic. 12,000 more cars are going to be driving up and

21 down the street over here. Ironically, it doesn't

22 include the impact from Shade Hotel and the fact that

23 there's no left turn lanes over here. I think that's a

24 little bit of an impact, don't you?

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

1 MR. CRAIG: Secondly, the residents, there's like  
2 601 condos up on the hill over here, and none of them are  
3 going to have a negative impact? Now, I've got to reveal  
4 something else. I'm a realtor. I sell homes. You know,  
5 I've sold a lot of houses over there. I am having a hard  
6 time telling my clients, "Guess what? Your house is  
7 going to go up this year in value." It's not. It's a  
8 bad thing. Plus for three years there's going to be  
9 construction noise, pollution problems, come on. That's  
10 a real problem.

11 Existing harbor -- this is a harbor by the way,  
12 not a mall, not Del Amo Mall.

13 (Applause.)

PM3-01  
cont'd

14 MR. CRAIG: We're going to go from 67 parking spaces  
15 for boats to 20. I don't know what kind of harbor it is  
16 going to be after that but not much. But then back to  
17 business. If you take the actual cost of this project,  
18 which is over \$400 million by the way -- and by the way,  
19 you know Redondo is paying for the \$30 to \$40 million to  
20 tear down the parking structure on that as well -- part  
21 of the reason why this project has to be so big is to pay  
22 for the infrastructure costs that CenterCal has to do it.

23 Now, taking these construction costs divided by  
24 square footage -- if you're in real estate, that's how we  
25 figure out economic feasibility for lenders, you know, we

1 go when we go pitch to get a loan -- cost per square foot.  
2 is going to be at the lower seven bucks a square foot.  
3 What's higher than Third Street Promenade. Barney's  
4 Beanery only pays three bucks a square foot versus on the  
5 bay is about two fifty, three. Now, I heard this morning  
6 from a friend of mine that CenterCal is now saying that  
7 if you have an existing lease, you get a preferential  
8 rate. Well, guess what? That's going to raise the rents  
9 on all the other businesses to be even higher now?

10 MS. MEYER: Wayne, could I ask you to slow down just  
11 a little --

12 MR. CRAIG: Oh, sure. No problem.

13 MS. MEYER: -- she's having trouble keeping up.

14 MR. CRAIG: I drank too much coffee.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MS. MEYER: Thank you very much.

17 MR. CRAIG: I guess the main -- the other big  
18 problem with this whole project is that we have other  
19 options. CenterCal has actually said they have other  
20 options and they were specifically told not to present  
21 them. You know, there's eight more that will be  
22 presented here. We have to consider that there's going  
23 to be a lot more things happening in the City. We've got  
24 the power plant that's going to be torn down, we got  
25 another hotel they want to build up behind. So guess

PM3-01  
cont'd

1 what? Why don't we take this time, take a time out, take  
2 a look at the options for maybe a long-term project for  
3 the City of Redondo, maybe something that will yield  
4 benefits for 50 years rather than short-term, quick gain  
5 for a company that gave \$30,000 to our City Council to  
6 get elected.

PMS-01  
conf

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. CRAIG: Anyway, there are other options. I  
9 heard other realtors are freaking out about it. There  
10 are other developers who are willing to step up to the  
11 plate. CenterCal is refusing to give details because  
12 they don't want to get outbid. So there are other  
13 options. Let's consider them before we move on.

14 (Applause.)

15 MS. MEYER: The next one is Alan Hurd, then Lissa  
16 Dye and Brian Hittleman.

17 MR. HURD: Good morning. My name is Alan Hurd with  
18 Pacifica Hotel Company, and we own and operate --

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Speak louder.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

PMS-02

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Speak into the microphone.

22 MR. HURD: Good morning. My name is Alan Hurd with  
23 the Pacifica Hotel Company, and we represent the Redondo  
24 Beach Hotel. Just over a year ago, we spent over \$13  
25 million upgrading and improving that hotel and making it

1 better for guests and the community. We spent over \$1  
2 million establishing a wonderful deck for guests and  
3 locals, residents, businesses to take advantage of the  
4 wonderful views. This whole project has eliminated the  
5 views along the entire corridor. You're establishing a  
6 three story parking structure that pretty much eliminates  
7 any opportunity to take advantage of that deck and  
8 eliminates all the views people are coming to this  
9 community for.

PM3-02  
cont'd

10 We strongly oppose the parking structure in its  
11 location and strongly recommend that they look at other  
12 alternatives not only to improve the area but to take  
13 advantage of what's beneficial for the community and not  
14 just for the developer.

15 Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MS. MEYER: Lissa Dye, Brian Hittelman and Matthew  
18 Bernard.

19 MS. DYE: Hello. Can you hear me?

20 MORE?

21 NOW?

22 Great. My name is actually Lissa Dye.

PM3-03

23 MS. MEYER: Sorry.

24 MS. DYE: -- and I am also with the Pacifica Hotel  
25 Company. I'm the Director of Sales for Pacifica. And I

1 am also very concerned about the parking structure after  
2 the large investment that the Pacifica Hotel Company has  
3 made in the Redondo Beach Hotel.

PM3-03  
cont'd

4 As Alan stated, our observation deck, which is  
5 one of the largest amenities we offer our guests and the  
6 community, would be impeded -- our views would be heavily  
7 impeded which would impact severely our ability to market  
8 the hotel as a harbor view hotel.

9 So thank you for your understanding.

10 MS. MEYER: Brian Hittleman, Matthew Bernard and  
11 James Ecklund.

12 MR. HITTELMAN: Good morning. My name is Brian  
13 Hittleman, third generation Los Angeles resident. I've  
14 lived here for 9 or 10 years, worked in the wholesale  
15 trade for about 25 years. I've just recently got  
16 involved in this. I wrote a few letters. Actually I've  
17 been privileged to have them published in the local  
18 papers recently on this subject, and I have a letter that  
19 I submitted to the Council today that I was going to read  
20 but I have some other ideas since those are already part  
21 of the record.

PM3-04

22 My issues are with the lack of a real long-term  
23 planning for the future of the South Bay. I'm not  
24 talking 10, 20, 30 years. I'm talking 50 or 100 years  
25 from now. What do you want this community to look like?

1 We don't need more retail and glitzy promenade, all  
2 right? I've discussed this in other letters.

3 A couple of points I want to make, and I do  
4 want to relate it to the EIR. This is related to  
5 feasible and unfeasible, infeasible alternatives as well  
6 as to the historical and cultural issues. In terms of  
7 feasibility, I have a very infeasible idea that I  
8 proposed in one of my letters that involves restoring  
9 wetlands, actually expanding the harbor entirely  
10 alongside getting rid of the power plant, building more  
11 recreational opportunities for people as well as  
12 commercial and residential development. It can happen  
13 with the right vision and the right kind of planning and  
14 a lot -- and a lot of money.

PM3-04  
cont'd

15 A couple general comments I want to make that  
16 aren't really so related to this, but a few things that I  
17 think planners in general are missing out on right now.  
18 First of all, I don't know if you noticed, but I live  
19 right by Topaz Beach. The beach between Topaz Beach and  
20 the pier is going to be gone in a couple of years, if not  
21 this year just from the storms alone. If you guys look  
22 at pictures from 100 years ago, look at pictures from 50  
23 years ago, look at pictures from today, that beach will  
24 be gone very soon.

25 All right. We need to plan what's going to

1 happen to Redondo Beach, what's going to happen to that  
2 area of the beach. My idea involves, again, getting the  
3 feds involved and expanding the break wall, make it a  
4 larger harbor. That beach, again, is going to be gone,  
5 and we need to do something about.

6 My other issue that I mention in the letter is  
7 Catalina. Catalina will someday be developed, completely  
8 developed in my view. Why don't we have shuttles? Why  
9 don't we have some kind of service or area where we can  
10 provide a commerce, we can provide transportation to  
11 people of Catalina? We are the closest harbor to the  
12 west end of Catalina.

PM3-04  
CONF

13 I have a lot more to say, but I'm not going to  
14 say anything.

15 Anyway, my last point -- oh, because I'm a  
16 long-time fisherman, I think that a historical and  
17 cultural impact is the loss of the Sport Fishing Pier. I  
18 think sports fishing is an important issue in this  
19 community, in this local community.

20 And then finally what the heck is with that a  
21 freakin' drawbridge?

22 (Laughter.)

23 MR. HITTELMAN: All right. Thank you very much.

24 (Applause.)

25 MS. MRYER: Matthew Bernard, James Ecklund and

1 Jessica Ibarra.

2 MR. BERNARD: Hello, everybody. Can you hear me?

3 I'm the General Manager at the Redondo Beach  
4 Hotel. My name is Matthew Bernard. I know a few of you  
5 that I've seen over at my hotel regarding the project.  
6 So it's great to be here and speak to all of you.

7 You just have to understand the way a hotel  
8 works, I mean we market it so that, you know, that we  
9 have a preferred view and other views. So this 45-foot  
10 beast they're going to put in front of my hotel is going  
11 to definitely inhibit that, and it's going to definitely  
12 take away not only from my revenue but from the money that  
13 I invested into the hotel so that, you know, it would be  
14 amazing for our community and our guests. So just for PM3-05  
15 that I'm opposed to the parking structure. It should  
16 placed somewhere else, somewhere where it won't disturb  
17 the view for our beautiful City because I'm very proud of  
18 this community and very passionate about making sure that  
19 the right items are put there in front of the hotel, not  
20 a 45-foot beast.

21 Thanks.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. MEYER: James Ecklund, Jessica Ibarra and John  
24 Lohue.

25 MR. ECKLUND: Good morning. My name is James PM3-06

1 Ecklund, spelled E-c-k-l-u-n-d. My wife and I have been  
2 down to the marina about 10 years. We own a sailboat  
3 down there. There's two big flaws I see with this  
4 Environmental Impact Report. One, it says Mole A has  
5 less views -- and I'm talking about I'd like to oppose  
6 Mole A as a location for the boat ramp. It says that  
7 Mole A has less views. I've estimated that 30 or  
8 40 percent of the boats pass by Mole A, so that does not  
9 say that it's less views, where less than 5 percent of  
10 the boats currently pass by Mole C and D. Another big  
11 goal of this project was to improve public access. If  
12 you put the boat ramp on Mole A, there's barely enough  
13 vehicle parking for 20 boats with trailers. So I  
14 wouldn't spend money to put a public asset like a boat  
15 ramp when only 20 people can use it. So I oppose Mole A  
16 for the boat ramp location.

PM3-06  
cont'd

17 Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MS. MEYER: Jessica Ibarra, John Lohue and Rick  
20 Wirsing.

21 MR. ECKLUND: I'm sorry, one more thing. I'm going  
22 to leave you pictures of what happens every winter by  
23 Mole A with the storm surges.

24 Thank you. This is every winter.

25 MS. MEYER: Jessica Ibarra? Jessica Ibarra at A

1 Basque Kitchen.

2 Okay. So John Lohue, if you can come?

3 MR. LOHUE: I yield my time.

4 MS. MEYER: Okay. Then Rick Wirsing.

5 Oh, and then after Rick will be Penny Wirsing  
6 and then Heidi Butzine.

7 MR. WIRSING: Check? Check? Can you hear me?

8 My name is Richard Wirsing. I'm a resident of  
9 District 2 of Redondo Beach. I support the proposed  
10 project. I am particularly excited about the public FW3-07  
11 market that is part of the proposed project. I am very  
12 concerned that if this project does not proceed, the City  
13 will be left to seek funding to pay for repairs to the  
14 waterfront and no improvements will be made. We need to  
15 make improvements now, we should take advantage of this  
16 opportunity presented by this proposed project.

17 (Applause.)

18 MS. MEYER: Penny Wirsing, Heidi Butzine and Brian  
19 Garcia.

20 MR. WIRSING: Hi. My name is Penny Wirsing. I'm a  
21 resident of Redondo Beach, and I also support this  
22 project, no surprise there. I've lived here over 12 FW3-08  
23 years, and I've been repeatedly disappointed when things  
24 are proposed and people shoot it down and say, "We don't  
25 like this one. Just wait for the next one." And it's

1 been 12 years now, and absolutely nothing has happened.

2 So I'm very excited about the improvements to  
3 the pier and the parking structure. I'm excited about  
4 the renewed vitality that the new businesses will bring.  
5 My husband and I love to walk and bicycle, although not  
6 right now, but we are definitely look forward to the  
7 marketplace, to the restaurants, the theater, the  
8 20 percent retail that everybody says is the giant  
9 mall -- that's 20 percent of the space -- and we'd really  
10 love to be proud to bring our friends and visitors down  
11 to the pier, and right now that's just not the case.

PM3 08  
cont'd

12 (Applause.)

13 MS. MEYER: Heidi Butzine, Brian Garcia and George  
14 Ikeda.

15 MS. BUTZINE: Good morning. Hopefully you can hear  
16 me.

17 My name is Heidi Butzine, and that's  
18 B-u-t-z-i-n-e, a very nice -- close pronunciation.  
19 That's been the story of my life since I've been growing  
20 up.

PM3 09

21 I am in support of the waterfront  
22 revitalization because I see it as a huge opportunity for  
23 all of us. And while we all have a stake in this -- and  
24 I applaud everybody for being here and at past workshops  
25 for sharing your comments -- we have to come together as

1 a community to direct the future, and that's what we're  
2 talking about today. And right now, our future is not  
3 looking so good cause we are in the state of disrepair,  
4 It's not safe to be down there.

5 We've seen the concrete falling in structures.  
6 We have a huge opportunity here. CenterCal has done  
7 enough due diligence, I believe in my opinion, to show  
8 that they are going to build responsibly, build it right  
9 and to take all these alternative ideas and feedback into  
10 the concept.

11 My passion is small business. I talked to  
12 CenterCal about including local businesses in this plan.  
13 If we don't have an economy that's thriving in our City  
14 to keep the public services and our high quality of life  
15 that we love here, our school districts, it's got to be  
16 up to each and every one of us. We're going to have to  
17 get some help to keep our high quality of life.

18 So they're choosing to invest in us, and for  
19 that, I say let's work this project and move forward for  
20 our future and for our kids so we don't leave them with  
21 an environment that is in need of repair.

22 So thank you. Please support the project.

23 (Applause.)

24 MS. MEYER: Brian Garcia, George Ikeda and then  
25 Adele Gleichman.

PMS-09  
conf'd

1 MR. GARCIA: I'm Brian Garcia. I'm a resident of  
2 Torrance, but my grandfather had a business in Redondo  
3 Beach in 1940. My parents both graduated from Redondo  
4 Beach High, so I have a lot invested in the community and  
5 would really love to see this project -- I support this  
6 project.

7 The Environmental Impact Report stated there  
8 would be no significant impact to esthetics, visual and  
9 visual resources. I would say it would have significant  
10 impacts and make it look a lot nicer than it does right  
11 now.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

PM3-10

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. GARCIA: The Environmental Impact Report says  
15 there would be no impact in noise. I think there will be  
16 a lot of noise created, people enjoying the pier again  
17 and going through. And it said there would be no impact  
18 to recreation. We'd have a place to take our friends and  
19 family down. I just moved out of the area for about ten  
20 years and moved back and I have friends who come and  
21 visit me here. And honestly, I avoid the pier. I don't  
22 take my friends down there because it is such a poor  
23 place. When I bike ride the path I actually go up  
24 Torrance Boulevard to Catalina to avoid going through  
25 that parking structure.

1 We need to do something. We need to do  
2 something now. It's been going on way too long, it's  
3 been dragging on and we need to take this. CenterCal has  
4 presented us with a great option here. Yes, there's some  
5 things that may need to change, the parking structure may  
6 need to move, but this project should go forward because  
7 otherwise -- three years is not much for the last twenty  
8 years of destruction that has been going on.

PM3-10  
conf'd

9 Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MS. MEYER: George Ikeda, Adele Gleichman and Lisa  
12 Rodriguez.

13 George Ikeda? George Ikeda?

14 Okay. Then Adele Gleichman, Lisa Rodriguez and  
15 Arnette Travis.

16 MS. GLEICHMAN: Hi. My name is Adele Gleichman.  
17 I've lived in the South Bay for 30 years and locally  
18 close by in Redondo Beach for about 28 years and I have  
19 serious concerns about this project. One of the things  
20 is the proposed traffic. Currently, when individuals in  
21 their cars are heading west on 190th, it's very confusing  
22 the way the traffic lanes are. You have cars turning  
23 improperly making their left turns onto PCH and Catalina.  
24 This proposal adds an additional lane turning there for  
25 more confusion. I don't think that that is going to work

PM3-11

1 at all.

2 I have serious concerns about the lack of  
3 recreational and open land facilities for the residents  
4 of Redondo Beach. The proposed plan shows a reduction in  
5 area for recreation. I see no open land, places for  
6 individuals who live here to come and play. There is  
7 almost nothing unless you're in the water. If you open  
8 up Seaside Lagoon, and there's no fence around it, it's  
9 not going to be safe. It would be a drowning hazard. If  
10 you open up Seaside Lagoon to the water in the harbor,  
11 it's filthy. When water tests are done, the water  
12 surrounding the pier area failed. They get grades of  
13 "F." You're going to have filthy water in that swimming  
14 area. We need swimming -- large swimming facilities that  
15 you are clean water. We need recreational facilities.

16 (Applause.)

17 MS. GLEICHMAN: Another concern of mine is the  
18 retail. We've a brand new Del Amo Mall. People are not  
19 going to come to our harbor for retail. When I came out  
20 of my car today to come to this meeting, it was really  
21 nice. I could see across the parking lot, the sailboats,  
22 their masts and you have a feeling of atmosphere. If I  
23 park there in a few years, I'm not going to see that.  
24 I'm going to see concrete.

25 This plan proposes removing the wooden parts of

PM3-11  
cont'd

1 our harbor area and replacing them with concrete. It  
 2 calls for creating office space with open concrete. It  
 3 is not going to have the atmosphere of a beach community.

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. GLEICHMAN: People want to come to Redondo Beach  
 6 for the beach feel. They're not going to come for the  
 7 concrete. They're not going to come to walk along the  
 8 sidewalk of Catalina or Harbor Drive if there's no view.  
 9 I have a serious concerns about the traffic, the lack of  
 10 views, the lack of recreation. We don't need to have a  
 11 large project with too many acres of development when all  
 12 we need is the pier reconstructed and the parking  
 13 structure reconstructed.

14 Give us wood. Give us a beach atmosphere. We  
 15 don't need concrete.

16 Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MS. MEYER: Lisa Rodriguez, Arnette Travis and Greg  
 19 Diets.

20 MS. RODRIGUEZ: I'm Lisa Rodriguez,  
 21 R-o-d-r-i-g-u-e-z. While I am not an expert in EIR  
 22 mitigations, environmental impacts, per se --

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

24 MS. RODRIGUEZ: While I'm not an expert in  
 25 environmental impacts, per se, I am an investor of

1 Redondo Beach. For 20 years, I've invested in a home in  
2 District 2, have raised my kids through the Redondo Beach  
3 Unified School District, support the Pier Association --  
4 I am walking distance down. And I go often. We were  
5 there just last weekend during the rain taking our  
6 international students we've been hosting for nearly 20  
7 years, taking them down there. It has been an  
8 embarrassment from my perspective for many, many years.  
9 It's needed revitalization.

10 For the record, I am in support of the progress  
11 for revitalizing Redondo Beach. I appreciate very, very,  
12 very much the process, the opportunity to hear both  
13 positive and negative, and if I may say, more so  
14 sometimes than negative, so that we can learn and work  
15 and grow and work collaboratively together on what will  
16 work best.

PM3-12  
cont'd

17 I appreciate the comments from Redondo Beach  
18 Hotel because as an investor of the City, I too have  
19 concerns. There are many things that are not perfect  
20 about this plan.

21 As a homeowner, I've experienced two floods  
22 that we had to remodel and revitalize our own investment,  
23 and it takes a long process. There are lots of things to  
24 overcome and to mitigate. It takes a big investment of  
25 time, and that's what I see that this process has.



1 leave things as they are, as just -- it's not even a  
2 consideration, it should not be a consideration. We have  
3 been at this for too long. We need to do something.  
4 There's a saying, "When you know better, you do better."  
5 Wood piling in harbor areas is old school, it's old  
6 technology. Concrete is the best so far. Concrete  
7 mixture has proven to be the best material for use in  
8 this area.

9 I also am not that -- I have to take issue with  
10 some of the size of the project with regard to its  
11 diversity and that -- I'm not saying this right.

PMS-13  
cont'd

12 The size of the project is very acceptable to  
13 me and I think it should be to all of us because those  
14 36 acres include ample open spaces for recreational  
15 activities, viewing the harbor area, it joined the  
16 different amenities that will be there. Right now it is  
17 a dump. And I personally do not even ride my bike  
18 anymore through that -- the parking structure because it  
19 looks like it's going to fall apart. It is falling  
20 apart.

21 So we need to do better because we do know  
22 better and doing nothing is simply not an option.

23 (Applause.)

24 MS. MEYER: Greg Diets, Chris Voisey and Tami  
25 McCaslin.

1 MR. DIETHE: Good morning, everyone. Greg -- is it  
2 on?  
3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Louder.  
4 MR. DIETHE: Thank you for offering this opportunity  
5 to address this Draft EIR. The 6800 pages, it's amazing  
6 if anyone is capable of going through that. I doubt it.  
7 There's one page. It's Conceptual Site Plan Figure 2-8.  
8 It's virtually the only page that shows in two dimensions  
9 what the structures will be, the heights of the  
10 structures, and in many of them, they show what this 1/16th  
11 of an inch dimension that's given on the page -- consider  
12 this is 1 page out of 6800 pages. They show heights of  
13 65 feet, 55 feet. I don't know what happened to  
14 Measure G's 45 feet or where the reference is, but  
15 perhaps there's staff out in the lobby that can explain  
16 how the developer that took such care, CentorCal, came up  
17 with these heights.  
18 Also, I had the pleasure of walking to the  
19 hotel this morning and passing through Czuleger Park, and  
20 if any of you notice, there are beautiful views of the  
21 harbor from the Czuleger Park. There's beautiful views  
22 all along Harbor Drive of the ocean.  
23 This plan, if you look at this Figure 2-8 of  
24 the Conceptual Site Plan, the 900 feet from Beryl down to  
25 where it intersects with the current Pacific Avenue,

PM3-14

1 that's a 900-foot stretch at least. There is only  
2 120 feet of that stretch that provides a view of the  
3 ocean. And the only reason that is there I suspect is  
4 because it's the cooling conduits from the California  
5 Southern California Edison Company for their generating  
6 plant, and they have to keep that easement. That is an  
7 easement. That is the only thing available. That might  
8 be filled with trees.

9 And to look at the 6800 pages and all we hear  
10 is "no significant impact," "no significant impact," "no  
11 significant" -- I don't believe it. You look at that  
12 two-dimensional view, there just isn't any open space. I  
13 don't know where they're digging up the open space. They  
14 reduced the amount of trailer and boat parking, they  
15 reduced the size of the Seaside Lagoon. And again, if  
16 anyone's taking some trips through the parking structure  
17 at the south end of this site -- I took some pictures  
18 over the last couple of days -- I don't know who did the  
19 analysis or how thorough that analysis is, but that  
20 structure looks pretty damn good.

21 Now, see, all the bracing, I -- if you take the  
22 exterior closest to the ocean, there's some cosmetic  
23 destruction. You know, if we haven't treated that  
24 pier -- the City has put us in this bind because they  
25 haven't maintained it. They pulled out maybe

PM3-14  
conf'd

1 two-and-a-half million from it and they've been doing it  
2 for decades and they haven't maintained it. For Christ's  
3 sake, it's like the Golden Gate Bridge. You have to keep  
4 painting it and maintaining it. If anyone has looked at  
5 all of the architectural accouterments that were done  
6 with the railing systems and whatnot, they're a pile of  
7 rust. That stuff has to be painted. It's a yearly  
8 activity --

PM3-14  
cont'd

9 MS. MEYER: Mr. Diete, could you wrap up?

10 MR. DIETE: Yeah. That's it.

11 MS. MEYER: Thank you.

12 MR. DIETE: You know, we need a lot to change for  
13 this Draft EIR to go ahead. It's pretty disgusting.

14 Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 MS. MEYER: Chris Voisey, Jami McCaslin and Scott  
17 Fellows.

18 MR. VOISEY: Geez. There. Okay.

19 Good morning. I'm Chris Voisey. I know you  
20 have the spelling up there, so I'll make it easy.

PM3-15

21 The one area of the Draft EIR that I found  
22 interesting that I think needs a lot of exploration is  
23 the boat launch. I have know there's a lot of people  
24 looking into it, a lot of considerations being made.  
25 There's no perfect place.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

2 MR. VOISEY: Okay. Sorry. I thought we had it  
3 turned up. Thank you.

4 So the boat launch really does need better  
5 consideration I think where it needs to go, but there  
6 will not be a perfect place for it. That's the  
7 unfortunate side. There's a lot of options. We started  
8 to explore it just as a community group to do it, and  
9 we'd like to see that really expanded on and, you know,  
10 publicly discussed and maybe think out of the box, think  
11 about what could we move around, what could we move and  
12 adjust to put it in a different place. And I know  
13 there's some considerations on that, but that's where I  
14 would throw it in.

PM3-15  
cont'd

15 As another interesting point, this morning  
16 actually I just got a text and voice mail from a friend  
17 of mine that's in town right now from Vancouver. And I  
18 wanted to meet up with him. I said, "Hey, why don't we  
19 meet down at my friend's place, down at Naja's?" And his  
20 first question was, "Well, why don't we go to Manhattan  
21 Beach? Why don't we leave the area?" And he's like,  
22 "It's not that great down there, and the last time I was  
23 there, I could swear a piece of concrete fell on my car."

24 So, you know, we need to do something about  
25 this, we do need to make it somewhere that our friends

1 and us want to go. They're in from out of town, and they  
2 don't want to come to our area. I know the hotels are a  
3 concern and what we do and I'm actually very appreciative  
4 that the Redondo Beach Hotel next door focused on the  
5 parking structure as just their one concern. It sounds  
6 like the rest of the project is pretty good. It will  
7 actually bring in draw to that hotel as well. And you  
8 know there are some things with the parking structure --  
9 I don't think we drive down Harbor Drive for a view, but  
10 luckily, there's a new area that we can bike, walk and  
11 even, you know, a new street that's going to be there  
12 that is along the coastal access that does reopen that to  
13 what's better today. Put a bunch of cars in that parking  
14 lot across the street right now with boats, trailers, you  
15 don't see the ocean. I've looked, I've been by. There's  
16 videos on Facebook all the over the place on this one.

PM3-15  
cont'd

17 So overall I'm very in favor of this. I'd just  
18 like to see the boat launch, you know, looked at,  
19 explored and understand more about the options for it.

20 Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. MEYER: Jami McCaslin, Scott Fellows and Joanne  
23 Galin.

24 MS. McCASLIN: I'm going to pass.

25 MS. MEYER: Okay. So Scott Fellows, Joanne Galin

1 and Pat Aust.

2 Scott Fellows? From Critics Choice Catering?

3 Scott Fellows?

4 Okay. Joanne Galin, Pat Aust and Alita

5 Rehmeyer.

6 Scott Fellows? Sorry.

7 MS. GALIN: Good morning. Can you hear me okay?

8 Hi. I'm Joanne Galin, a resident of Redondo  
9 Beach. I love this community. I'm going to make this  
10 really short and sweet. I understand -- respectfully, I  
11 understand people's negative choices on this -- on  
12 everything going on, but you know what? I've gone to  
13 CenterCal, I've sat down with them, I've looked at  
14 their -- sorry. I didn't prepare for this at all -- I've  
15 looked at their drawings, I've looked at everything, I've  
16 talked to them, I looked at them square right in the eye,  
17 and I honestly believe this is really great for our PM3-16  
18 community. There's so much that we can do. It's not  
19 just cosmetic.

20 If anybody is here -- I'm sure everybody here  
21 has seen that parking garage. It is not cosmetic. That  
22 thing is a death trap and we're lucky there have not been  
23 any lawsuits about it. It really needs a lot of work. I  
24 think -- if we can sit down and respectfully discuss this  
25 instead of the yelling and the fighting, which is just

1 getting disgusting, it would be great. Anyway, I totally  
2 agree with this. I hope everything can get worked out  
3 and we can move on and more people will come to Redondo  
4 Beach, spend money. Our businesses down there are not  
5 thriving, and it would be great to have them thriving.

PM3-16  
conf'd

6 Thank you. Have a great day. Happy New Year,  
7 everybody.

8 MS. MEYER: Pat Aust, Alita Rethmeyer and  
9 Christopher Brink.

10 MR. AUST: Pat Aust, A-u-s-t. I'm a former city  
11 employee, city councilman. I've been here 67 years. My  
12 family has been here 111 years. I'm a third generation  
13 graduate of Redondo High School, and my grandchildren are  
14 fifth generation; so I've been here a while and seen a  
15 lot. I'm going to talk today about the things that I  
16 like about this plan and that I'm for.

PM3-17

17 I am definitely for the boat launch ramp on  
18 Mole A. A lot of people don't understand we have to have  
19 a boat launch ramp in our harbor. That only goes back 50  
20 years. Our city -- our harbor was dedicated 50 years  
21 ago, and in that -- and we were required to have a boat  
22 launch ramp then. We offset that by putting in the hoist  
23 system, and they let us slide. Well, we can't build  
24 another square inch in this harbor until we put in a boat  
25 ramp, and so that's why -- I've been involved in five

1 different studies as the Fire Chief for this City, and in  
2 those studies, it always comes back, "Where's the best  
3 place? Where's the best place?" Well, the best place is  
4 Mole A. Yeah, it's going to displace the yacht club,  
5 which has been there 50 years and their little haven over  
6 there, and while it may be -- you know, that building  
7 gets damaged every storm we have. It's because of its  
8 close proximity to the wall. Well, if we take that  
9 building out and we put a concrete ramp out there, that  
10 concrete ramp will survive. I guaranty it. So the best  
11 place for the boat ramp is in Mole A.

12 I am also in favor of the reconnection of  
13 Pacific Avenue. As the incident commander on the Redondo  
14 Beach Pier fire in 1988, I sure wish I would have had a  
15 road through there. Getting to that fire and sending  
16 everything around and not having that connectivity for  
17 emergencies was a big detriment. I want to work for the  
18 City in 1969. In 1969 there was a road that went through  
19 there. For 84 years, there was a road that went through  
20 there, and we need to have that road back. And you  
21 firefighters right now -- I guaranty you the Coastal  
22 Commission is going to tell us we need that road back  
23 because they want access to the waterway for the people,  
24 not the people of The Village, all the people of  
25 California. So I'm definitely for the reconnection of

PM3-17  
cont'd

1 Pacific Avenue.

2 And the third thing would be the Seaside

3 Lagoon. I hear a lot of people talk about the Seaside

4 Lagoon, how wonderful it is and how they go there. Not

5 many of our residents actually use the Seaside Lagoon.

6 And when you talk about the water quality in the Seaside

7 Lagoon, the water quality, if you like it today, you'll

8 love it when it gets opened up because it's exactly the

9 same water. In 1965, that Seaside Lagoon got put in

10 there to air cool the hot water that came out of the

11 power plant. The hot water that came out of the power

12 plant -- in 1965, the number one show on TV was "Voyage

13 to the Bottom of the Sea." You put hot water in the

14 bottom of the ocean, you've got sea monsters. And so

15 they had to air cool it before it went back into the

16 ocean. That's why it was there. There were no health

17 requirements back then, they didn't have to put chlorine

18 in the water. We do today. We have to measure the

19 quality. We spend almost a quarter of a million dollars

20 to measure the quality of the water that comes out of

21 there. It comes out cleaner than when it goes in because

22 we're picking up the water now from the outtake of the

23 power plant. It comes directly out of the bubble hole.

24 That's where it's picked up right now in the middle of

25 the harbor.

PMS-17  
cont'd

1 MS. MEYER: Mr. Aust, could you --

2 MR. AUST: -- and the hot water from the Seaside  
3 Lagoon comes out of there now, so if we open up, it will  
4 be better.

PM3 17  
cont'd

5 So thank you,

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. MEYER: Anita Rethmeyer, Christopher Brink and  
8 Gene Noble.

9 MR. FELLOWS: You called my name and I --

10 MS. RETHMEYER: Alita Rethmeyer?

11 MS. MEYER: Alita Rethmeyer and then Christopher  
12 Brink and then Gene Noble.

13 MR. FELLOWS: But you did call Scott Fellows?

14 MS. MEYER: I did --

15 MR. FELLOWS: I had to use the little boys' room

16 MS. MEYER: Okay. All right. Let's do it.

17 MR. FELLOWS: Every once in a while, you just got to  
18 do it.

PM3 18

19 Anyway, I am fully in support of this project.  
20 I think it's time more overdue than ever before. I've  
21 been coming down to Seaside Lagoon and the whole  
22 waterfront area since the late '60s when I was in  
23 college, and me and some of my fraternity brothers would  
24 come down here to hang at Seaside Lagoon and watch the  
25 "Battle of the Bands" and to see all the activity.

1 Tony's on the Pier was there back in the '60s, and it was  
2 a great time to be down here.

3 I loved what Pat said -- Councilman Aust said  
4 about reconnecting the street right behind this here,  
5 going all the way through to Torrance Circle. It will  
6 make everything very easy to deal with.

7 Of course, there's going to be some hassles  
8 during construction. There's no way to avoid that. But  
9 the deal is is that it's going to be better in the long  
10 run for all of us, and nobody can think about what this  
11 whole construction and this revitalization is going to be  
12 in 50 or 100 years, okay? There's no way to even  
13 calculate that, but what you want to do is make the  
14 present as good as possible, and I believe in the near  
15 future, this revitalization will enhance the lives of  
16 everybody here. It will make it better economically for  
17 the City, and it will be more attractive for tourists.

18 I raised my kids at Seaside Lagoon because of  
19 the salt water. They could float, so I taught them how  
20 to swim there. I love this whole place and I want to see  
21 it go forward and get better.

22 Anyway, that's my story, and I'm sticking to  
23 it.

24 (Applause.)

25 MS. MEYER: Alita Rothmeyer, Christopher Brink, gene

HMS-18  
cont'd

1 Noble.

2 MS. RETHMEYER: Well, again, my name is Alita  
3 Rethmeyer, R-e-t-h-m-e-y-e-r. I've been coming here  
4 since 1976 when I moved to the area, and I moved here  
5 because of the water. I have a boat right across the  
6 street. It has lots of air acreage. I take that boat to  
7 Catalina. I take it around the area. I go whale  
8 watching. It's a small boat. It's 28 feet because  
9 that's what the area -- I could afford to maintain. I  
10 had -- I started off with a 12-foot boat which I  
11 trailered, and I trailered and I trailered. I have an  
12 old Volvo with a hitch on it. PMS-19

13 Now, you can't trailer the road -- I kept it at  
14 King Harbor Yacht Club. There's no room there. There's  
15 absolutely no room. I had to take that boat and move it  
16 somewhere else because there's no room to share and have  
17 access.

18 I have gone before the Coastal Commission. The  
19 Coastal Commission says we need a boat ramp, but the City  
20 of Redondo Beach is charged with fire and life safety of  
21 the people who come here. Putting a boat ramp next to  
22 the wall -- if you didn't see it on TV the last three  
23 days, then you're blind. The wall is not a safe place.

24 God bless the yacht club for having taking care  
25 of that area, who trains people who can go into the

1 water, train the children, train the high school, be the  
2 training ground for sailing. That's the public access.  
3 They've done a great job -- you know, it's access.

4 And I am really sorry that, you know, the fire  
5 department -- fireman who just spoke, literally, doesn't  
6 understand the issue of has he really trailered a boat,  
7 has he really gone out into the harbor, has he seen all  
8 the people enjoying the pier? The big thing is the pier  
9 is hideous.

10 Now in '76 I loved going there and walking  
11 there. My sister just came to visit from Florida. It is  
12 embarrassing. The City needs to make the hard choice.  
13 Take care of your assets. Don't find some sexy developer  
14 who's going to come in here and make it something out of  
15 which he can load his pockets.

IMS-V  
cont'd

16 (Applause.)

17 MS. RETHMEYER: And I pay more taxes, I bet you  
18 than a lot of the residents here for my boat to sit  
19 across the street, and it's only 28 feet. But, by golly,  
20 the people here have worked hard, the people who live  
21 here worked hard and listen to them. This new road out  
22 here is hideous. Do you know how many times people are  
23 going to get hit? I mean, let's just not go just to  
24 change something just to change something.

25 Listen to the people, and the Coastal

1 Commission is there for coastal access. It's not there  
2 for developers to fill their pockets. And for people, a  
3 lot of the people that talked today have something to PM3-19  
cont'd  
4 gain. I have nothing to gain. I'm retired. I want to  
5 enjoy my life, and I want to be active in this community.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. MEYER: Christopher Brink, Gene Noble, Reggie  
8 Thomas.

9 MR. BRINK: Hi, everyone. My name is Chris Brink  
10 I'm a resident of Redondo Beach. And have been living  
11 here with my family for about seven years. I have  
12 tendered these in writing, so the court reporter can use  
13 the restroom if she needs to.

14 Thomas Jefferson said the following, and I  
15 think it's particularly appropriate. He said that "The  
16 opinions and beliefs of men follow involuntarily the PM3-20  
17 evidence proposed to their minds." And I think -- so  
18 here now I'm going to attempt to shape 10,000 pages of  
19 information in about 600 words. You know, in order to  
20 provide some perspective on my comments, I just want to  
21 say I'm a businessman, and, you know, I believe that  
22 business can be harmonious with the needs of the  
23 community. And I've run these businesses from 80 to  
24 almost a quarter billion dollars, so I understand you  
25 need progress. I believe in free markets and the idea of

1 improving our communities along with developing strong  
2 local economy.

3           You know, as someone who came to the South Bay  
4 with fresh eyes in 2008, I have always been amazed by  
5 what seems to have been an egregious lack of forethought  
6 in the use of our irreplaceable shoreline, waste  
7 treatment plants, refineries, of course the power plant,  
8 littering a coast that any sane human being should have,  
9 when they first laid eyes upon it, treated with  
10 reverence. You, know the only thing we can do regarding  
11 that is make sure we don't repeat those sins.

12           (Applause)

13           MR. BRINK: You know, developments that avail  
14 themselves to the use of public land or rare property  
15 that should be under eminent domain need to aspire to be  
16 congruent not only esthetically but also with the nature  
17 and the needs of the community. And this continuity can  
18 take many forms. It can be architectural choices that  
19 capture or enhance the feeling of the incumbent  
20 architecture, the history of the area. It should also  
21 mean a skyline and an overall plan that allows the public  
22 to enjoy the ocean, the sky, and the mountains and hills  
23 that surround the South Bay.

24           (Applause.)

25           MR. BRINK: I'm very worried about this project in

PM3-20  
cont'd

1 that regard.

2 Continuity means preserving, or even better,  
3 fostering the wildlife that chooses to live among us  
4 cause who among us haven't been changed by the sight of  
5 the gray whales when you look out at the ocean? Who  
6 among us, you know, haven't enjoyed the antics of the sea  
7 lions, even though they are not always the most  
8 thoughtful neighbors -- I can say that as a boat owner,  
9 right? But these are really our best ambassadors when we  
10 bring people to come visit Redondo Beach.

11 You know, continuity also means fostering and  
12 promoting the fruition of the local businesses that have  
13 organically become dear parts of the community. From Old  
14 Tony's to Captain Kidd's, these are places that the  
15 locals really cherish. I have come to learn to love  
16 these places, and they have been joined in recent years  
17 by new businesses, like down and near the International  
18 Boardwalk, there's almost kind of a weird renaissance  
19 going on down there, A Basque Kitchen and the Paddle  
20 House. These are really neat businesses. And you know  
21 what? These entrepreneurs are the original investors in  
22 this community. You know, they're the original investors  
23 in the boardwalk and shoreline. Their businesses need to  
24 grow both before and after development --

25 MS. MEYER: Mr. Brink, could you start concluding.

PMS-20  
cont'd

1 please.

2 MR. BRINK: Yeah. I'm going to conclude, but I need  
3 at least six minutes to go against 6,000 pages, so give  
4 me a break here.

5 MS. MEYER: Actually, unfortunately, everybody else  
6 would like to speak as well. I do have your comments.  
7 They were submitted in writing. So they were also part  
8 of the record. So please conclude.

9 MR. BRINK: So CenterCal is going to need to learn  
10 to be more congruent if this project is going to go  
11 forward. The project needs to be long-term viable, okay?  
12 So speaking from experience and making projects  
13 economically viable, I want to make a few final points.  
14 All right. The South Bay is surrounded by the carcasses  
15 of two large shopping malls, which by no means can be  
16 considered viable or economically successful, and they  
17 need to be looked at as a precautionary tail. Likewise,  
18 CenterCal's economic projections are aggressive, not  
19 unreasonably, but they're going to need to clear a very  
20 high bar to be successful.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. BRINK: One more minute. We need to be both  
23 prudent in how aggressively -- and now I say "we" --  
24 undertake this project. We need to approach it without  
25 ego. We need to listen to what the market has already

PM3-20  
cont'd

1 told us, that the people who live here look for unique  
2 stores, they want to give business to local business  
3 owners, they seek authenticity, and the economy is here  
4 already. There is a reason why we can support a half  
5 dozen surf shops and yet a Claire's Boutique or a Forever  
6 21 struggles in a soulless shopping mall.

7 You know, there's a reason why Catalina Coffee  
8 is packed and Starbucks, while it gets its share, is not  
9 where everyone gathers on a Sunday.

PM3-20  
cont'd

10 MS. MEYER: Thank you, Mr. Brink.

11 MR. BRINK: One last thing I want to say is we need  
12 an architectural review board and we also need --

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's enough.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Stop.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you sit down, please?

16 MS. MEYER: Gene Noble, Reggie Thomas and Joyce Neu.

17 MR. NOBLE: Hi. I'll try and be brief. My name is  
18 Gene Noble --

19 MS. MEYER: Could you speak more in the microphone,  
20 please. I'm sorry about that. We did turn it up, but it  
21 seems to be sensitive.

PM3-21

22 MR. NOBLE: Okay. I've lived in the greater South  
23 Bay my entire life. I have a property in Redondo. My  
24 daughter lives in Redondo. My mother lives in Redondo  
25 And I'd just like to comment on the location of the

1 launch ramp. Mole A is never going to work. You're  
2 going to have several hundred boats at the back of the  
3 harbor being launched. And then they're going to have  
4 come all the way out in the front of the harbor to get to  
5 go back in again.

6           When you do that, if you ever look out there  
7 early in the morning -- and I'm out there frequently --  
8 you have stand-up paddle borders, you have kayakers,  
9 canoes. You have these weekend boaters -- I have  
10 nothing against them. I was one for many, many years. I  
11 had a boat for 40 years, and I even launched my boat at  
12 the hoist in King Harbor many times. It's never going to  
13 work. You're going to get crosswinds and stuff. You're  
14 going to get people hurt out there. You need to  
15 understand that.

PM3-21  
0001d

16           Not to mention that Mole A is way too small.  
17 The City is ultimately going to be responsible if someone  
18 is injured or killed out there because of this poor  
19 design. What is the worst possible place. Mole C, you  
20 have access to the water. You can launch your boat, you  
21 can get out. And most of the people who launch boats  
22 here are going to Palos Verdes anyway. They're going to  
23 Palos Verdes Cove or Rocky Point or Lunada Bay. That's  
24 where they go to fish.

25           So we really need to think about a redesign of

1 the launch location. It is unsafe and it is too small  
2 You've got room for -- I heard one speaker say 20 boats,  
3 and it's not enough. And you can't -- and through that PM3-21  
4 tight approach you got back in there, it's never going to cont'd  
5 work. Not feasible.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. MEYER: Reggie Thomas, Joyce Neu, N-e-u, and  
8 then Amy Josefek.

9 MR. THOMAS: Good morning. My name is Reggie  
10 Thomas. I'm a Redondo Beach resident and also a City  
11 Commissioner. I am and very much in support of the  
12 project. I think the great thing about all of this is  
13 that we have a chance to dialogue and continue this  
14 discussion and try and craft something that's going to  
15 fit our community. So many people are disenfranchised  
16 from the process, but the great thing about this PM3-22  
17 community that I like is that so many people care about  
18 what goes on. So I am, again, in support of the project.  
19 I look forward to continuing the dialogue so that we can  
20 craft this first rendition of the plan into something  
21 that we can all support and believe in.

22 There are significant number of businesses down  
23 on the pier. I also happen to be the General Manager of  
24 Kincaid's. A lot of businesses down on the pier that --  
25 right now today it's Saturday. It's a beautiful day.

1 It's probably going to be the first day of the week that  
2 they're open. They may have opened yesterday cause this  
3 time of year we get a lot of European and Canadian people  
4 in. So there's some traffic during the week, but they're  
5 not open during the week, and this development gives us a  
6 chance to maybe make the area a little bit more vibrant  
7 and a little bit more competitive in this marketplace  
8 with what's going on in Manhattan Beach, in El Segundo,  
9 Long Beach.

PM3-22  
cont'd

10 So again, very much in support of this. I look  
11 forward to continuing the dialogue, and I'll take  
12 Mr. Aust's recommendation that if that's where we got to  
13 put the boat ramp, then that's where we got to put it.  
14 We've got to make the best of this situation for  
15 everybody.

16 So thank you very much for your time.

17 (Applause.)

18 MS. MEYER: Joyce, Amy and Ron Troupe.

19 MS. NEU: Good morning. My name is Joyce Neu, and  
20 I'm a lifelong resident, born and raised in this area,  
21 and -- and I must say the pier when I was growing up in  
22 the late '50s and '60s was never a great thing of beauty.  
23 It was local. It was where people went to fish. It was  
24 where we would go to pick up fish. We could park the car  
25 right next to it, we could run in and buy our crab or

PM3-23

1 whatever we wanted, local fish that we could eat in those  
2 days. And so it was never a tourist destination.

3 And yet people came because it was authentic.  
4 It was something that was genuine. It was a working  
5 pier. It was a working harbor. So I would like to see  
6 the possibility of having revitalization because now, I  
7 mean, I agree it is nothing of beauty. It has been put  
8 together piecemeal. It's kind of a garbage, junk-looking  
9 place, but in doing so it has minimized somewhat the  
10 working nature of the pier and now you go to restaurants  
11 and places at the pier and it's very hard to find a place  
12 that doesn't just have fried fish that's brought from  
13 somewhere else.

14 But I would like to see us really take  
15 advantage of the strength of what this has always been  
16 which is really dedicated to people who are on the water,  
17 working in the water, and the tourists come to see that.  
18 They don't come because we're going to have a nice store  
19 there. If there's a store there, they might go there,  
20 but it isn't for the stores that anybody goes to the  
21 pier. It's for the water, and it's to see what is going  
22 on on the water, in the water.

23 And I applaud the work that's been done, but I  
24 think we're losing thread here of why this area is so  
25 desirable and the reason it's desirable is because it's

PM3-23  
cont'd

1 one of the only areas left in L.A. County where we  
2 actually can see the water. We can see it, and it's not  
3 blocked. And now you're proposing, from what I see  
4 here -- and I haven't read the 6800 pages -- you're  
5 proposing to do away with that and the idea that we're  
6 going to attract a lot of tourists. And my feeling is  
7 I don't know. Maybe you all have done a lot of market  
8 studies, but it seems to me that we were attracting a lot  
9 of people to our pier simply because it was a place where  
10 you could watch people fishing, like me because I don't  
11 fish, and that was one of the great strengths of it.

12 The issue of Seaside Lagoon also I don't  
13 understand because if you open it to the water, how do  
14 you -- I don't know whether Pat Aust was saying that we  
15 put chlorine in it now. Is it now clean? That's a  
16 question because if it is clean or chlorine is put into  
17 it, how do you do that when it's open? And right now,  
18 we're being told to stay out of the water for three to  
19 four days after every rain because of the pollution. So  
20 how do you control that, how do you make that accessible?

21 I don't understand the drawbridge. I am not  
22 sure how that works, whether it's going to be automated,  
23 which means it will fail from time to time, which means  
24 people won't be able to cross it or take their boats  
25 through, or is it going to be a manned or human made, in

PM3-23  
cont'd

1 which case what funds are CenterCal providing in  
2 perpetuity for the running of the drawbridge and for  
3 this -- and that's just a question for you.

4 So -- and finally, I want to say the views, the  
5 views, the views. It's all about the views --

6 (Applause.)

PM3-23  
cont'd

7 MS. NEU: -- and all of that sea life. And I  
8 applaud the person who raised this. It's all about our  
9 sea lions, the seals, the whales, the dolphins. That is  
10 what makes this desirable. It is not another store. It  
11 is not another mall.

12 So thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MS. MEYER: Amy, Ron and then Gretchen Robbins.

15 MS. JOSEFEK: So we can all agree on one thing, and  
16 that is improvements need to be made, improvements need  
17 to be made. Everybody agrees on that, right?

18 However, what was said before is there are so  
19 many major projects that are on the boards in Redondo  
20 Beach. What we want to see and I think deserve to see is  
21 a cohesive vision and an overall vision as to what  
22 Redondo Beach wants to look like and be known for for  
23 years and decades to come.

PM3-24

24 We know that retail is desired by current  
25 Redondo Beach officials because they like revenue, and we

1 understand why they like revenue. We all like it because  
2 that's what allows the City to function, but stores are  
3 only valuable if they're affordable to be rented and if  
4 they're shopped in a lot. There is so much shopping in  
5 retail -- forget the Internet or don't forget the  
6 Internet -- there is so much retail space that already  
7 surrounds us. It's north, it's south and it's east of  
8 us. Much of it is actually unused.

PM3-24  
cont'd

9 why doesn't Redondo Beach do something unique  
10 and maybe look to define itself as something different  
11 and different from other places instead of wanting to  
12 replicate a huge mall, and I don't know, make something  
13 wacky like a great seaside area?

14 (Applause.)

15 MS. MEYER: Ron, Gretchen and Perry Cohen.

16 MR. TROUPE: My name is Ron Troupe, I have lived in  
17 the South Bay for 42 years, the last 30 years right on  
18 Stanford in Redondo Beach near to Mira Costa High. I  
19 just want to speak on the topic of traffic. I think we  
20 all have the opportunity to become part of the solution  
21 I love walking from near Mira Costa to one of my favorite  
22 restaurants, Cheesecake Factory, and one time when my  
23 foot was sore, I just walked across the street and hopped  
24 on the bus. So let's all think about becoming part of  
25 the solution, walking and public transportation. I'm in

PM3-25

1 favor of the project.

PM3-25  
cont'd

2 (Applause.)

3 MS. MEYER: Gretchen, Perry Cohen and Bob Amadon,  
4 A-m-a-d-o-n.

5 Gretchen? Gretchen Robbins?

6 Okay. Perry Cohen, Bob Amadon and Joan Irvine.

7 MS. IRVINE: "Irvine."

8 MS. MEYER: Irvine. Sorry.

9 MR. COHEN: My name is Perry Cohen. I've owned a  
10 property in Redondo Beach since 1980, and I'm in favor of  
11 the project.

12 Now, let me give you a little details. I've  
13 had the good fortune to live in other parts of the  
14 country, Connecticut, you know, Rhode Island, the  
15 northeast. They are resistant to change and their  
16 economy started growing. California is on the verge of a  
17 booming economy. They are building LAX, they're  
18 expanding that; Pismo Beach and other beach communities  
19 are going through changes to upgrade for the 50 years of  
20 deterioration.

PM3-26

21 All I want to say is with this project, my  
22 concern is that they keep their priorities right. The  
23 environment first, the people who live here second and  
24 businesses third. And the challenge is how to balance  
25 those three. I'm in favor of the project, I'm in favor

1 of change. We just have to balance it, and that's  
2 through dialogue and there's got to be tradeoffs. But  
3 we've got to bring in concrete to replace wood, we've got  
4 to improve access and we've got to improve flow. I mean,  
5 I've read this thing, I've looked through this. Most of  
6 the changes they're going for I like, but I like also  
7 some of the other pieces that people brought up. So I'll  
8 just say I'm in favor of the project, and I look forward  
9 to further dialogue.

10 Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MS. MEYER: Bob, Joan and Mary Ruth Ewell.

13 MR. AMADON: Good morning. My name is Bob Amadon.  
14 That's A-m-a-d-o-n. I'm a resident of the Hollywood  
15 Riviera area. I've lived here in Hollywood Riviera for  
16 only 3 years, but I lived in Palos Verdes for 26 years.  
17 I'm totally in favor of the project for the following  
18 reasons: The pier area has been, as everyone seems to  
19 agree, in a state of disrepair, if that's even a  
20 word -- disrepair for many, many years. We have a very,  
21 very valuable concept here that's gone through all sorts  
22 of vetting. I learned this morning that this has been  
23 going on since 2010. Originally, CenterCal was one of  
24 something like 70 some-odd developers who submitted RFPs.  
25 It was slowly bid out to about 5, and then CenterCal

PM3-20  
cont'd

PM3-27

1 was chosen. And it's much easier in life to destroy  
2 something or to criticize something than it is to build  
3 something or compose something.

4 Here we have experts who have looked at the  
5 Environmental Impact Report about impacts of this  
6 development, and none of us here are real experts in the  
7 area. It doesn't mean we shouldn't criticize the plan as  
8 we have and provide some thought process, but we should  
9 not throw out the baby with the bath water, so to speak.

10 So let's move forward concretely in the  
11 democratic process and not to discard everything because  
12 it's apparently a threat to our existence. The wildlife  
13 will come back. There are views throughout the project  
14 through the bike routes. All the new businesses in the  
15 area will have views. You're going to have a lot of the  
16 same things we have now, just in different  
17 configurations.

18 Thank you.

19 MS. MEYER: Joan, Mary Ruth and David Coe.

20 MS. IRVINE: Hi. Joan Irvine, I-r-v-i-n-e. I've  
21 been a resident off and on for the last 10 years. And  
22 one of the things that I think the last few speakers  
23 brought up -- I mean, the City has gone through a process  
24 to get to this point. And it's been going on, not just  
25 10 years. My understanding is doing something about the

PM3 27  
cont'd

PM3 28

1 waterfront has been going on for 20, 25 years, and we  
2 have the same thing.

3 So we finally have something concrete to be  
4 looking at, something concrete to be making -- you know,  
5 asking for changes, saying this looks good, this doesn't  
6 look good. It's really about working within that.

7 No I like everything about it? No. Do I  
8 understand what the Redondo Beach Hotel is saying?  
9 Absolutely. But these are the things you bring up, and  
10 that becomes part of the process. And my concern is that  
11 here we are going through this process and there is a  
12 group of people that are already planning legal  
13 ramifications, referendums and this and that, rather than  
14 dealing within what has been vetted, what has been going  
15 on. And I really would like to see us taking the issues  
16 that people bring up and saying, "Okay. What can be done  
17 about this?" "Can this be done?" "Can this be done?"  
18 That's the process. And I think it's very important that  
19 we respect everybody and we hear what everybody is saying  
20 and we continue to move forward.

21 And obviously, I support the project.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. MEYER: Mary Ruth, David Coe, John Green. Hear.

24 MS. EWELL: Hello. This close? That's good?

25 Hi. I'm Mary Ruth Ewell, and I want to remind

PM3-28  
conf'd

PM3-29

1 everybody of what we've heard many times. "Without a  
2 vision, my people will perish."

3           If the City Council and the administrative  
4 offices have been responsible to keep up and repair the  
5 parking infrastructure, we would not be in this  
6 compromised position where the CenterCal developer is  
7 overdeveloping the natural resources of our waterfront.  
8 The CenterCal project is a sellout to the very soul of  
9 our residents who bought into the community to have  
10 access to the water, not cement buildings, not a tourist  
11 attraction that will probably go away like many of the  
12 neighboring malls and be empty in the short year, year  
13 and a half.

PM3-29  
cont'd

14           Why trust a developer who feigns to be a  
15 rescuer to a city that does not have a master plan?  
16 Others have commented on this. Our city does not have a  
17 master plan, which is where I remind you, "Without a  
18 vision, my people will perish."

19           The definition of a rescuer is someone who does  
20 more than half the work. That's what we're asking  
21 CenterCal to do, and they have never built on a  
22 waterfront before. Our city councilmen went to Utah to  
23 see Fred Bruning's last lifestyle center. Utah...a  
24 little landlocked, is it not?

25           The pier needs to be redeveloped. We all

1 agree on this. Yet it does not at this point represent  
2 the interests of the community. If the City were to  
3 place a measure bond to repair the infrastructure of the  
4 parking structures, those would be restored and we would  
5 not be beholden to CenterCal to rescue the so-called  
6 rescue of CenterCal.

PM3-29  
confd

7  
8 Redevelopment is in the mind of any citizen's  
9 group that opposes CenterCal's overdevelopment, such as  
10 RescueOurWaterfront.org. It has been shown to us through  
11 interviews that CenterCal's Fred Bruning has built,  
12 previous contractors that have worked for him, and his  
13 record is very questionable.

14 So let us take to mind and heart whether we  
15 entrust our waterfront to his profits only interest.

16 Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MS. MEYER: David Coe, John Green and Tony Czuleger.

19 MR. COE: All right. Good morning, everyone. First  
20 of all, I think the idea that this is a Draft EIR is a  
21 good thing, right? We've been talking about working  
22 together as a community. I think that's why we're all  
23 here. So I'm hoping that a lot of the opinions that have  
24 been forged today on both sides of this debate do get  
25 involved and the project does continue to evolve when we  
get the final EIR.

PM3-30

1 I don't think it's ironic that so much of the  
2 opposition is talking about the views and protecting the  
3 views. Now, a lot of that same opposition helped to  
4 block the redevelopment of AES. Our waterfront is ugly  
5 right now, and we need to improve it. I think overall as  
6 a community, we're so focused on having a long-term plan.  
7 We don't take one step at a time. You don't eat the  
8 elephant in one bite? You have to take it down one at a  
9 time, and this is a significant portion of us improving  
10 our community and improving our waterfront.

11 This isn't a rezoning. This is AES. This is  
12 currently zoned commercial, and we've got an old crappy  
13 building there. This is about tearing down this  
14 structure and building a new clean structure that we'll  
15 all be proud to use. Even those of us that are opposed  
16 to this right now, this new project is one that I think  
17 the entire community would support once it's open and  
18 redeveloped.

19 I also think it's ironic that not in one single  
20 case has anyone said anything about raising taxes, right?  
21 This isn't something that's being a burden on the  
22 community. We're not having to pay for this. The  
23 developer is coming in and taking the risk and supplying  
24 what is needed to improve this infrastructure. That's  
25 another thing I like about this project.

PM3-30  
cont'd

1           So I'm in favor of the project, I like the  
2 project and I'm looking forward to enjoying the views to  
3 the new project, eating at nice restaurants. I'm looking  
4 forward to walking to Redondo versus walking to Hermosa  
5 and Manhattan to eat, and I'm thankful for all the work  
6 that CenterCal has done.

PM3-30  
cont'd

7           Thank you.

8           MS. MEYER: John Green, Tony Czuleger, Julian  
9 Harvey.

10          MR. GREEN: Good morning, everybody. My name is  
11 John Green. I'm a citizen of Redondo Beach. I own a  
12 couple of houses in Redondo Beach. I've lived here for  
13 25 years.

14          You know, I'm not against these projects, but  
15 that doesn't mean I'm for these projects either. You  
16 know, every morning, every morning, I get up and I drive  
17 over to the top of 190th Street and I look over to the  
18 left at Redondo. I look over, and some days I see  
19 Catalina early in the morning and sometimes, I can't. I  
20 look down upon Redondo Beach and it's such a beautiful  
21 site even with the power plants because I don't see just  
22 the power plants. I see our waterfront, I see Redondo  
23 Beach as it is.

PM3-31

24          You know, you got to remember we live in what's  
25 called Redondo Beach, a beach community, not a commercial

1 community, not an upscale community. We don't live down  
2 in Miami Beach with all the fricken bars like Hermosa.  
3 I've seen what happened to Manhattan Beach.

4 Anybody like driving through Manhattan Beach,  
5 getting close to Manhattan Beach? It's a little rough.  
6 You go down to Hermosa, try to find places to park,  
7 that's a little rough too, even with all the parking  
8 places. I look at Redondo Beach. It is what it is.  
9 It's a great place for the boats to dock, to have their  
10 boats their. There are some great people that come in  
11 there and want to put in their private boats and their  
12 daily boats to go fishing. Redondo Beach is known as a  
13 fishing community. The sports fishing has been  
14 fantastic. My whole life I've gone fishing on the sport  
15 fishing boats.

16 Now, maybe some of this needs to be renovated,  
17 and, of course, the structure that faces the west wall of  
18 the harsh storms gets worn out and it does need repair.  
19 Maybe it needs a whole new face and new building,  
20 whatever they want to do to it. I know that things don't  
21 just last to stand forever. I've seen the fires down on  
22 the pier. I've seen the storms destructive tearing out  
23 some of the big restaurants and whatnot and the changes  
24 of where they developed a pier and moved it around.

25 One of the problems I personally have is I live

PM331  
cont'd

1 off of 190th Street. Right now, it's a nightmare trying  
2 to go in and out of that street, especially if you want  
3 to go opposite direction east. You have to go west first  
4 to be able to travel that east. I put up with it, and  
5 it's crowded at certain times of the day. Okay. I have  
6 to live with it. Apparently, a lot of the citizens don't  
7 live down in that area of Redondo Beach so they don't  
8 know anything about those kinds of concerns. The  
9 businesses down in that lower area down by where Anza  
10 comes in, they have trouble with people backing out and  
11 getting out and back on 190th Street.

PM3-31  
cont'd.

12 Now you want to compact with it all this other  
13 traffic that's going to be coming in if you put a bunch  
14 of businesses down there and you put up other hotel or  
15 whatever you're going to put in there for people to shop  
16 and hang around. What's it meant for? It should be  
17 meant for the citizens that live here and to enjoy  
18 Redondo Beach and go boating, go down there and go  
19 fishing, go down there to go swimming and enjoy the areas  
20 that's called Redondo Beach.

21 Thank you for listening to me this morning.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. MEYER: Tony Czuleger, Julian Harvey and Martin  
24 Holmes.

25 MR. CZULEGER: Good morning. My name is Tony

PM3-32

1 Czuleger, and our family has been in Redondo probably  
2 longer than most people sitting in this room. And many  
3 times people look at the City of Redondo Beach, and they  
4 say, "Geez, I don't want change." well, let me tell you.  
5 I've seen a lot of change over the years.

6 My family used to own a business just south of  
7 where Czuleger Park is, which was Redondo Trading Post.  
8 That business was started in 1923 by my grandfather. And  
9 when they did the urban renewal project in Redondo Beach  
10 originally, that was huge. I don't know if you have ever  
11 seen many of the pictures of old Redondo. That's when we  
12 used to have a downtown. PM3-32  
cont'd

13 This is our opportunity right now to get a true  
14 downtown again in Redondo Beach. Our family really more  
15 or less lost that opportunity to have the property there  
16 in Redondo. Of course, they were paid for the property  
17 at the time what was true market value, but of course  
18 that property now would be worth several million dollars.  
19 Back then it wasn't anywhere close to that.

20 So the people that are saying, "Well, geez, we  
21 don't want to have this project in front of our condos,"  
22 well, let me tell you, you all didn't always live there.  
23 There was other people there that did lose their  
24 businesses that had to move because of that  
25 redevelopment. This project here in Redondo Beach is

1 probably the most important project that could happen to  
2 Redondo Beach in the future for the community and for  
3 jobs, and this city really is trying to do the right  
4 thing.

5           It just is phenomenal to me that a lot of  
6 people are against this project. And it's mainly the  
7 people, I believe, that haven't lived here very long. If  
8 you open your eyes and really see what's happened in this  
9 city over the years, you're jaw will drop and hit the  
10 floor. Redondo used to be a small town city that brought  
11 in goods from the ocean. It used to be the main port  
12 here in Los Angeles. We had a railroad that came in  
13 here, the Santa Fe Railroad, that came along Valley and  
14 Ardmore here into the harbor and it had two piers that  
15 went out into the ocean. And all of that is gone because  
16 things change. The Port of Los Angeles was built, and  
17 that became the new port for Los Angeles. That's  
18 changed, and it was changed for the good,

19           Redondo has a lot of opportunities, again, to  
20 make a good positive change to get that downtown  
21 reestablished here. It's not a mall. I don't know who's  
22 saying this is a mall. This is not a mall that you're  
23 going to go shopping. It's not the Del Amo Mall, it's  
24 not The Galleria. This is a destination that we all need  
25 to really realize, something that we can really go to and

PM3-32  
cont'd

1 enjoy.

2 So when people are trying to down this project  
3 because of fear, not really knowing what the project is  
4 about, this is something that we really have to embrace.  
5 Of course, the pier down there at the parking structure,  
6 that was built back in around 1969 --

PM3-32  
cont'd

7 MS. MEYER: Please wrap up, Mr. Czuleger.

8 MR. CZULEGER: -- when that development was started,  
9 and that project does need to be repaired -- replaced.  
10 It can't be repaired.

11 Thank you.

12 (Applause.)

13 MS. MEYER: Julian Harvey, Martin Holmes and Niles  
14 Nehrenheim -- I'm sorry about that one.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nehrenheim.

16 MS. MEYER: Thank you.

17 MR. HARVEY: Okay. Can you hear me? I'm not good  
18 at public speaking. I made some notes, and I hope I can  
19 read them with my glasses on.

20 MS. MEYER: And you're Julian Harvey?

21 MR. HARVEY: Julian Harvey.

22 MS. MEYER: Thank you.

23 MR. HARVEY: I'm a five-and-a-half year resident of  
24 Redondo Beach, and I'm a taxpayer. So I agree with the  
25 speaker earlier who mentioned the way CenterCal is going

PM3-33

1 to take all of this on board and it's not going to affect  
2 our taxes significantly. But anyway, I've been coming to  
3 Redondo Beach since 1977. I'm a foreigner. I'm British,  
4 but I first came in '77, and it was a different city back  
5 then. I remember going to now what is now the defining  
6 Bristol Farms when it was a dance hall, and I had a  
7 really great time there.

8 A little bit later, I went to Chiller's in  
9 1990. That's where I met my wife, and we walked down to  
10 Naja's. So I know what it used to be like. And the  
11 thing I think is what's going to be happening now it's  
12 not a good place to come to. My brother comes over in  
13 two years, and we're embarrassed. My wife and I are  
14 embarrassed to take him down there. We go to Old Tony's  
15 because we still love that, but we don't go to many of  
16 the other places. Even Naja's has changed. What's  
17 interesting is Naja's is on board with this program.  
18 They want to do something different down there.

PM3-53  
cont'd

19 But I want to talk about something a little bit  
20 different which I haven't heard talked about, and that's  
21 the bicycle situation. I was very much in favor of the  
22 Gateway Project and I went to the opening and I know it's  
23 had it's teething troubles, but it's a great project. It  
24 links Hermosa with Redondo, and as the Mayor said at the  
25 opening, he wants people to cycle down from Hermosa and

1 spend their money in Redondo. It was going the other  
2 way. We were all going to Hermosa and spending our money  
3 out there.

4 So I'm very much in favor of what CenterCal are  
5 proposing for the bike paths. I believe they've got four  
6 new routes through the area, the waterfront area. They  
7 all look very interesting, and I can't wait to get on my  
8 bike and go through them.

9 The other thing I'm kind of very interested in  
10 Pacific Avenue. That was closed before I first entered  
11 into Redondo Beach. So I never saw it, but I've seen the  
12 history books of Redondo, and it was a big feature of  
13 Redondo for many, many years. So I support reopening  
14 Pacific Avenue.

PM3-13  
cont'd

15 Okay. And in regards to a mall, I don't  
16 believe it is a mall we're talking about. We're talking  
17 about a recreational area, where you can go and have  
18 coffee with friends, where you can all be proud to bring  
19 your friends to Redondo and not have to say let's go for  
20 dinner in Manhattan Beach or somewhere else.

21 So you might have gathered, I'm in support of  
22 this project for two main reasons: One, something needs  
23 to be done. I've looked into the history of this, and I  
24 think other people have said that this has been going on  
25 for close to 30 years. Redondo has had this situation

1 where it hasn't had a vision for the harbor area for so  
2 long, and I think this is a vision for it and it is an  
3 improvement.

4 And the other thing I like about this project  
5 is I don't foresee an increase on my property taxes,  
6 which to me is very important. I'm retired. I cannot  
7 afford to pay higher property taxes to have the parking  
8 structure torn down and rebuilt by the City.

PM3-33  
cont'd

9 Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 MS. MEYER: Martin, Niles and JoAnn Turk.

12 MR. HOLMES: Hello, folks. My name is Martin Holmes  
13 I was one of the cofounders of RescueOurWaterfront, and  
14 we've about been looking into the project, and I'm trying  
15 to take a very balanced approach here because I am new to  
16 the community. I've lived here for two years. And the  
17 biggest thing that concerns me about it is the economic  
18 viability of the project. And when I look at the  
19 numbers, there's some things you need to start off with  
20 just as basics.

PM3-34

21 First of all, CenterCal is not a charity. They  
22 need to get a return on their investment, and there's a  
23 huge infrastructure cost down there that we, as a City,  
24 are asking CenterCal to pay for, and that's what's  
25 driving the project to be so huge, the fact that they

1 need a really large amount of retail space in order to  
2 cover the costs of that infrastructure investment.

3 So you can crunch the numbers, the \$300 million  
4 project, 15 percent return or even a 10 percent return if  
5 it's less successful, you're talking about rents that are  
6 going to be on the order of \$5.00 to \$7.00 per square  
7 foot each month. The average in the South Bay right now  
8 is \$2.26. Barney's Beanery averages \$3.25, and that's a  
9 prime location right on the pier. So when you start  
10 talking the 5 to \$7.00 per square foot number, which is  
11 what the project is going to need to be for economic  
12 viability, you're talking Third Street Promenade in  
13 Santa Monica, which is \$7.00 per square foot.

PM3-34  
rents

14 Now, businesses also need to be profitable.  
15 For a business to be profitable, they should be spending  
16 around 5 percent of their sales. That's the amount that  
17 should go for rent. So that \$7.16 number, right, if you  
18 backwards calculate that and assume only 5 percent of  
19 their sales are going to rent, that means every square  
20 foot needs to pull in \$1.700 a year. 1,000 square foot  
21 place, which is pretty small, needs to have economic  
22 profitability to pull in 1.7 million a year, okay?  
23 Across 524,000 square feet, the size of the project,  
24 that's \$900 million of sales per year, and that number is  
25 actually a part of the AECON Report as well, around a

1 billion dollars that they're projecting in sales.

2           So ask yourselves, can we as a community and  
3 the visitors that come here support a billion dollars of  
4 business a year? And if we can't, those businesses are  
5 going to struggle and you're going to have failing  
6 businesses. And if we can't, CenterCal is going to  
7 struggle because they can't make the rent that they need.

8           So as I look at the economic viability, there  
9 are some takeaways that I'd like to point out. First of  
10 all, I think that businesses that are on the pier right  
11 now should be demanding conditional leases. Basically,  
12 that's a lease that says, "Okay. We know CenterCal  
13 doesn't have the EIR, doesn't have the entitlements, but  
14 assuming it all goes through I, Tony's or Quality Seafood  
15 or Naja's are going to be paying this dollar for this  
16 location for this many years. That protects the existing  
17 businesses. Right now the businesses are not protected.  
18 They're being made promises, but there's nothing in  
19 writing, there's nothing to back them up if those  
20 businesses just get booted by CenterCal.

21           The other thing I think is really important is  
22 that we, the residents, demand that CenterCal sign a  
23 minimum lease to be part of this project. Right now they  
24 could get the entitlements and flip it. They could sell  
25 it, they could back out, they could file for bankruptcy

PM3-34  
con'd

1 with their LLC and then move on, right? We want to  
2 protect ourselves. So if CenterCal is going to be here,  
3 they should commit to being here in the long run.

4 MS. MEYER: Mr. Holmes, please conclude.

5 MR. HOLMES: Okay. Real quick.

6 So let's see. CenterCal is going to have a  
7 problem shrinking the project due to that infrastructure  
8 cost. So the city should really partner with them and  
9 use the 1.7 million in profits from the parking garage  
10 each year to help pay for the infrastructure. That way  
11 you could have a smaller project.

PMS-36  
confid

12 The last point I'll make is that really between  
13 the AES site and the waterfront, right, these are not  
14 independent; the traffic, the circulation, everything  
15 needs to flow and work together in one city, and right  
16 now this piecemeal development is really dangerous  
17 because you don't know what's going to happen with the  
18 waterfront, you don't know what's going to happen with  
19 AES, and as I result, I really think we need a  
20 comprehensive plan. We need one waterfront, we have one  
21 city, one waterfront, one plan.

22 Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MS. MEYER: Niles Nehrenheim, Nils, JoAnn Turk and  
25 then Boyd Baker.

1           Niles? IF you could go ahead now and spell  
2 your last name, please.

3           MR. NEHRENHEIM: Nehrenheim, N-e-r-h-e-i-m, as in  
4 Mary. AND that's actually Nils, Nils Nehrenheim.

5           MS. MEYER: Oh, Nils?

6           MR. NEHRENHEIM: Yes.

7           MS. MEYER: Thank you.

8           MR. NEHRENHEIM: Hi, everyone. So I've lived in the  
9 South Bay my entire life. And recently, last Wednesday,  
10 I sat down with Mr. Bruning himself over at CenterCal  
11 headquarters in El Segundo. I'm also a  
12 RescueOurWaterfront cofounder, and there are significant  
13 issues with this project. And just to sum up some of  
14 them as well as what Martin did in his phenomenal speech,  
15 one of the significant issues that we have are the view,  
16 people in this neighborhood and the adjoining area have  
17 been spent millions of dollars, spending money on the  
18 views of the waterfront next to the ocean. So for  
19 someone to say that there is no significant issue  
20 according to the views, that's an issue.

21           The -- one of the two view borders that is  
22 provided is actually right of way from the AES pipelines  
23 that come through to actually flow through for the  
24 cooling to the waterfront. So we're building a project  
25 today for the next 60 years for pipes that will not be

1 around in 3 or 4 years from now after they destroy the  
2 power plant. Keep that in mind.

3 One of the significant issues is public safety.  
4 It's not -- we're opening up the lagoon to the ocean. As  
5 we know, the water quality in the ocean is not the best  
6 right there in the harbor. Also, there's nothing in the  
7 report regarding lifesaving services, public safety  
8 services. So that's a huge issue. And no one has talked  
9 at all providing about lifesaving services. The only  
10 mention of lifesaving services is the fact that the L.A.  
11 County lifeguards have a boat which they are not  
12 responsible for inside the harbor, and all the lifesaving  
13 services are up to the City of Redondo Beach. So that's  
14 an issue.

PM3-35  
confD

15 The lifestyle aspect -- everyone keeps talking  
16 about a lifestyle aspect. But coming down here, having a  
17 cup of coffee or having a glass of wine at the side of  
18 the ocean here, I can do pretty much anywhere, and it's  
19 not a lifestyle issue.

20 The pier, it needs to be rebuilt. Old  
21 Tony's -- I like Old Tony's. It's a great place. The  
22 food, we'll have another discussion on.

23 (Laughter.)

24 MR. NEHRENBIM: I realize that, you know, the pier  
25 that was built in the 1920s needs to be rebuilt, but we

1 need to work together to find a better solution than just  
2 tear everything down and restart from the beginning  
3 again.

4 Boat parking: 20 boat parking spots down from  
5 67. That is a significant impact. The fact that no one  
6 can say that is not a significant impact, I'm not sure  
7 how that can get by. Marina Del Rey has 225 boat parking  
8 spots, San Pedro has over 100 boat parking spots. We, if  
9 we have 20 boat parking spots, will be the lowest in the  
10 entire Southern California region, probably the entire  
11 state, if you have time to look at all the marinas in the  
12 state.

13 A significant impact is a study for the  
14 traffic, and may I remind you all that ultimately what  
15 chokes growth is traffic. We already have a traffic  
16 problem on PCH.

PM1-25  
cont'd

17 I hear the beeper, so I'll be quick.

18 The ABS site, the traffic was not included for  
19 this particular study. So we need to include that.  
20 That's a big, major issue.

21 The market study: The market study was done  
22 and said that this would be successful. Well, I need to  
23 remind everyone that the market study was done for the  
24 south side of the project where we have the old buildings  
25 that are being torn down or need to be torn down, and

1 that's enough to be successful, too. We all know exactly  
2 how that turned out, which is it all needs to be torn  
3 down.

4 CenterCal used a phased approach. A phased  
5 approach is because they're not doing it piecemeal.  
6 They're doing it piece by piece, and they have an overall  
7 general plan. That's something we need to do with the  
8 AES site as well.

9 15 percent rent: If CenterCal does not get PM3-25  
cont'd  
10 15 percent return on profit, they will be living there  
11 rent free. Who is to stop them from hiring a new general  
12 manager who makes \$2 million a year. The expenses for  
13 this particular project are going to be determined by  
14 CenterCal --

15 MS. MEYER: Please conclude.

16 MR. NEHRENHEIM: Del Amo is 200 to 300 million in  
17 project size. The Point is \$80 million. Our project is  
18 now \$400 million.

19 Go and do the math.

20 Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. MEYER: Joanne Turk, Boyd Baker, Joanne Newman,

23 MS. TURK: Hello. My name is JoAnn Turk, and I'm

24 involved with many associations within the City, the PM3-38  
25 Chamber and the Visitors Bureau and the King Harbor

1 Association, but I'm not representing any of those today.  
2 I'm representing Polly's on the Pier, which my husband  
3 owns a part of with a couple of other partners. And I  
4 want to first of all say that we're very much in favor of  
5 this new project. CenterCal has been very open and  
6 candid in speaking with us and promising us a spot for  
7 Polly's.

8 And we're -- I've been in the harbor for 40  
9 years, and I've seen many developers come and go. I  
10 worked for Chuck Johnston in the Redondo Beach Marina for  
11 several years before he died --

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Louder.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Louder.

PM3-36  
cont'd

14 MS. TURK: -- 25 years ago, and I've seen developers  
15 come and go. They come in, and they're very excited  
16 because they see the promise of the harbor and what it  
17 could be, and -- and then after six months of analysis or  
18 working with the City, they just didn't -- couldn't get  
19 it off the ground. So it's never a sure thing.

20 I think we've got the surest thing possible  
21 with CenterCal. I do have one concern with the EIR, and  
22 that is that the choice of replacing the Sport Fishing  
23 Pier which Polly's sits on and which the sport fishing  
24 ticket office and the whale watching go from -- there's  
25 an open question as to whether it will need replaced or

1 repaired or removed, and, of course, we don't want it  
2 removed. We've seen so many happy people come out there  
3 and visitors and locals and they seem to love the place  
4 but they love the environment. They love being able to  
5 see the birds and the boats come in.

6 And when you compare the estimated cost of  
7 rebuilding the pier, it's between 4 -- 2 and \$4 million  
8 according to the reports that the City did, and compared  
9 to a \$300 million project, that's a small amount for what  
10 you get in return because that's square footage over the  
11 water and if that square footage is removed, they say  
12 that it can go onto the northern side.

FM3-36  
0000

13 But you can't replace -- If you are removing  
14 it, you can't replace it. So I think that has to be very  
15 closely analyzed. But I do want to say that I want to  
16 applaud the City, I want to applaud CenterCal for having  
17 good vision and good ideas and worked hard for over --  
18 you know, we've got a lot of work to do to get to the end  
19 result, but we hope that everybody will be working  
20 with -- with the City on this.

21 And as far as waiting for the AES project,  
22 that's what we've been doing for 50 years down here is  
23 waiting, waiting, waiting for the next plan, the next  
24 knight to ride in on the white horse. So I think it's  
25 time to move and do something.

1 So we hope that this gets off the ground and  
2 gets going.

PM3-36  
cont'd

3 Thank you very much.

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. MEYER: Boyd Baker indicated that he didn't wish  
6 to speak but supports the project and wanted me to  
7 announce.

8 So the next person is Joanne Newman, then Surge  
9 Hora and then Laura Zahn.

10 MS. NEWMAN: My name is Joanne Newman. I'm a  
11 35-year resident of Redondo Beach.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Speak louder.

13 MS. NEWMAN: I thought I had it right up here.  
14 Okay. There we go.

15 And I'm in favor of redeveloping -- I'm in  
16 favor of redeveloping the waterfront but not this massive  
17 project. We keep talking about acres. Folks, it's 15 to  
18 18 acres of land that they're going to cram 523 square  
19 foot of development on. We don't need that much retail.  
20 If you look at the figures for what happened over the  
21 Christmas sales, the retail increased 7.9 percent and the  
22 Internet sales increased 20.9 percent. That's from a  
23 report on CBS. We just -- it's just too big.

PM3-37

24 What happens when we can't -- this community or  
25 this area cannot possibly make this huge massive

1 development feasibly acceptable or successful. What do  
2 we have to bring the tourists in? That's what it's going  
3 to take. We have nothing unique in this -- in this  
4 development that will bring tourists through that we can  
5 market to them and say, "Come to Redondo Beach and see  
6 what we have. We're different from everybody else."

7 I'd like to see something like in the  
8 marketplace have an artists colony where people could  
9 come and make their own souvenirs instead of this junk  
10 from China.

11 (Applause.)

12 MS. NEWMAN: You know, and still the locals could go  
13 there. PM3-37  
cont'd

14 The movie theater is another vote of contention  
15 by me because there was a report by Carmike Cinema doing  
16 a survey of their own industry that said, "Movie theaters  
17 have the largest amount of excess capacity of any  
18 industry we could find in the free world." And they want  
19 to build a 700-seat theater down there?

20 CBS, again on Pulse on Sunday morning in  
21 February -- the question was: "Where do you watch  
22 movies?" 84 percent watch them at home, 4 percent watch  
23 them in theaters and yet we're going to have a 700-seat  
24 theater down there? I'm trying desperately to find  
25 something in the EIR where I can mention that in a

1 comment.

2 And the other vote of contention with me is the  
3 delivery trucks. Where are they going to go? I've been  
4 trying to get an answer to that for two years. And did  
5 they take the delivery trucks into consideration when  
6 they did the traffic analysis, which they conveniently  
7 left out putting in a traffic analysis for the weekends.

8 But what about the trash trucks? Where are  
9 they going to go? What about the emergency vehicles?  
10 Where are they going to go? This EIR, somebody said it's  
11 a good thing it's a draft because there are some holes in  
12 it that we really, really need to see them filled. Like  
13 I said, I want the whole waterfront developed  
14 because -- and I'm not doing it because it's going -- the  
15 thing is going to destroy my view because it's not. I'm  
16 not doing this from a selfish point of view. I'm doing  
17 it because I love Redondo Beach and I love the water.  
18 I've loved it all my life. But this is just too big,  
19 folks.

20 Everybody says, "Well, I can't wait to go  
21 there." "I can't wait to go there," "I can't wait to go  
22 there." What happens in 5 and 10 and 15 and 20 years?  
23 Are you still going to be, "I can't wait to go there," "I  
24 can't wait to go there," "I can't wait to go there" when  
25 we have nothing unique, we have nothing different that

PM3-37  
cont'd

1 you can't find in any mall. It's just going to be glass  
2 and chrome, dull and boring.

3 So please let's really, really think about this  
4 and develop this project as something sensible, not  
5 nothing massive and bloated and financially  
6 unsustainable.

PM3-27  
cont'd

7 Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MS. MEYER: Surge, Laura Zahn and Gregory Vavrek,  
10 V-a-v-r-e-k.

11 MR. HORA: Hi. My name is Surge Hora, I've never  
12 spoken in front of the public before. I (inaudible)

13 THE REPORTER: Please put the mike right by your  
14 mouth.

15 MR. HORA: This letter was sent to The Beach  
16 Reporter on December 17th, 2015: "Yes, Redondo Beach  
17 Pier is in desperate need of repairs and facelift. Let's  
18 focus on how we can beautify this construction instead of  
19 constructing more and more buildings, adding traffic, PM3-38  
20 adding pollution and not to mention adding stress. It  
21 will totally destroy the lifestyle that we all like to  
22 enjoy. We should demolish some of the lanes and make it  
23 even more open if possible rather than building and  
24 blocking the waterfront. Let everyone enjoy the ocean  
25 breeze, a lifestyle that one has dearly paid for. We can

1 go to the mall anywhere; we can go to the movies  
2 anywhere. Why should -- why building and destroy the  
3 beauty of the ocean. I would urge you to preserve the  
4 nature, the beautiful beach, the openness so the  
5 community can enjoy and relax. To generate revenue, we  
6 should make -- we could introduce a trolley ride to take  
7 people back and forth instead of a through road. We  
8 could make room for bigger boats with restaurants, dinner  
9 cruises and night cruises with live music. Let our ocean  
10 itself work for us rather than blocking it. Let Redondo  
11 Beach be the most beautiful beach ever.

PM3-38  
cont'd

12 Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MS. MEYER: Laura, Gregory and then René Scribe.

15 MS. ZAHN: For the record, it's Laura Zahn, Z-a-h-u.

16 I was hoping to have a podium to put my stuff  
17 on.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

19 MS. ZAHN: I was hoping to have a podium to put my  
20 documents on.

PM3-39

21 First, I'd like to acknowledge and thank all  
22 the tourists in attendance.

23 Could all the tourists please stand up?

24 (Laughter.)

25 MS. ZAHN: Let the record reflect no one stood up.

1 Point made.

2 Now, I'm going to go on to the EIR, and one of  
3 the issues with the EIR is the trading or the exchange of  
4 land. This is an act granting certain tidelands and  
5 submerged lands from the State of California to the City  
6 of Redondo Beach upon certain trusts and conditions. It  
7 says that, "In the trust for the use and purposes set  
8 upon the express conditions following to wit: That it  
9 all has to be commerce, navigation and fisheries." And  
10 this was drafted in English law. This is 1915, and back  
11 in 1915 commerce was moving goods from one location to  
12 another. It wasn't shopping from one store to another to  
13 another to another. Commerce was railroads, commerce was  
14 ships, commerce was large freight they moved around. PM3-39  
cont'd

15 So in regards to this land trust and the  
16 exchange, the conditions upon that trust, and the exchange  
17 was that it's for navigation, commerce and fishing.

18 There's more to go, but I'll cut it short.

19 Then we go on to Chapter 1535 again of the  
20 relating to tidelands and submerged lands. Chapter 1535 of  
21 the statutes of 1915. "The legislature conveyed certain  
22 title and submerged lands in trust to the City of Redondo  
23 Beach for the purposes therein stated, primarily for the  
24 promotion and accommodation of commerce, navigation and  
25 fisheries," direct quote. "The City of Redondo Beach for

1 harbor and slips and boats, okay?

2 Let me go on. Like I said, I was hoping to  
3 have a podium.

4 So this is another -- a legal document  
5 California Public Resource Code, PRC Section 6307. It  
6 says "The exchange" so if this exchange is allowed,  
7 these are some of the conditions of the land exchange.  
8 They want to take upland basically and trade it with  
9 tidelands too. So that if the commission finds that all  
10 of the following conditions are met, CenterCal doesn't  
11 meet any of the conditions that they have to for trade of  
12 this land or the exchange of the land. Some of the  
13 points are that it has to provide a significant benefit  
14 to the public trust.

PM3-39  
cont'd.

15 People that's us. We are the public trust.  
16 Does this development provide us with any significant  
17 benefit? I don't think so.

18 The exchange does not substantially interfere  
19 with public rights of navigation and fishing. It  
20 restricts access with that pedestrian bridge. It removes  
21 boat docks, it removes boat parking, and it removes the  
22 fishing pier. All of those were put in trusts for us.  
23 Navigation, commerce and fishing. It's obliterating all  
24 of these conditions.

25 The exchange is in the best interest of the

1 state. Since when did shopping become the best interest  
2 of the state, okay?

3 To a improve navigation is another point.  
4 CenterCal is not hitting any of these points for their  
5 exchange of this land --

6 MS. MEYER: Please conclude.

7 MS. ZAHN: Okay. And in conclusion, I have 60  
8 copies of this. I ran these at my own expense. It's  
9 called, "Waterfront Development or Waterfront  
10 Destruction, 10 Demandments." I will pass them out.  
11 Please do not take duplicates if you're here with your  
12 husband or wife. I'll try and pass out the handout in  
13 the back. But they are not meeting any of the  
14 conditions.

15 Thank you.

16 (applause.)

17 MS. MEYER: Gregory and then René.

18 And is your last name V-a-v-r-a-k?

19 MR. VAVREK: Yes.

20 MS. MEYER: Thank you.

21 MR. VAVREK: I'm here as a -- I'm here as a resident  
22 and a local, and I'd like to bring up a few things  
23 that --

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Speak into the mike.

25 MR. VAVREK: I'm sorry. I'd like to bring up a few

PMS 38  
cont'd

PMS-40

1 things that are just -- should be self-evident to all of  
2 us, we all should be able to realize these things. And  
3 I'm going to break them down into five bullet points,  
4 which are basically I want to talk specifically about  
5 Mole A.

6 It's a small footprint, and Mole A is also the  
7 most exposed to the harsh environment. And that's most  
8 evident by what we just saw this last week; requires  
9 diligent maintenance and requires planning safety of  
10 so it can be used.

11 So usability. You know, we have to maintain  
12 that facility to -- to make sure that it's safe for all  
13 use. And it requires proactive replacement scheduling  
14 planned ahead because of the harsh environment and. This  
15 is an ongoing project. We have to look forward. We have  
16 two more years before we have to replace something. We  
17 have one year -- we should be planning ahead to secure  
18 these things.

19 Mole A is also -- more public access increases  
20 the risk of a personal injury lawsuit because of the  
21 location that is not the safest choice because of the  
22 environment, which is most evident by what happened last  
23 week when they closed down the area. You couldn't get  
24 down -- drive down the driveway just to get out to our  
25 slip.

PMC1-40  
conf'd

1 All of this is pretty -- is exacerbated by just  
2 this week, this last week by what we've seen by all the  
3 pictures and on the news. And we've experienced this  
4 over and over and over.

5 How could the proposal propose not be protected  
6 from those kind of environments. That would be a very,  
7 very deep issue that we should have to concern ourselves  
8 with.

9 Moles C and D, those are protected by the  
10 ocean. The ocean has easy access to Mole A, and the  
11 boaters would have difficult access to the ocean through  
12 the opening at the harbor. They would have to navigate  
13 through the harbor. Where if they had access at C and D,  
14 the ocean has less access to that particular location and  
15 the boaters have more accessible access to the ocean,  
16 which is what they were using the launch for when it was  
17 to be built there.

PM3 10  
cont'd

18 If you're planning to close a boat -- the boat  
19 launch because of weather conditions, what -- what about  
20 the people who are still in the water? If you close  
21 that, you basically prevent them from getting out of the  
22 water because of the conditions cause conditions can  
23 change rapidly. And so you have to -- if you close it  
24 just because it's unsafe, then there's people that we're  
25 putting at risk in the harbor. Are they going to have to

1 anchor? Are they going to stay in their boats? Are we  
2 going to have less docks because of the season and the  
3 conditions that we're under? This is all a normal  
4 operation for that particular part of the -- the harbor.

5 I think I've said just about all I have to say.  
6 Access to this facility is difficult because there are  
7 chartered buses that go in there and it's difficult for  
8 them to get in and out down through the driveway to get  
9 out to Mole A, and they often to have to have three or  
10 four tries before they can get in and also get out. And  
11 also, too, is really when we have the streets parsed out  
12 for the boats and the bikers makes it more narrow and PM3-40  
cont'd  
13 makes it more difficult. Larger vehicles don't come down  
14 190th. They have to come down Beryl or PCH. The bus in  
15 particular would reroute itself to come down Beryl to PCH  
16 and then back over to 190th before it could come in and  
17 access the harbor area over there.

18 So it's -- it makes that particular location  
19 difficult not just to use but to protect the public and  
20 to maintain. So of course I would hope the decisions  
21 that are being made now are well thought out and actually  
22 consider these issues that I just mentioned, and I know  
23 that I, myself wouldn't want to leave a legacy behind  
24 that -- the City in that position.

25 Thank you.

1 (Applause.)

2 MS. MEYER: So the last speaker card I have is for

3 René Scribe.

4 Is there anyone here that would like to fill

5 out a speaker card and speak after René? If you do,

6 raise your hand and we'll get somebody over there to give

7 you a speaker card.

8 Okay. We see you over there.

9 René, could you wait just a minute while we --

10 Okay. René Scribe.

11 MR. SCRIBE: My name is René Scribe. I am a 50-year

12 resident of the South Bay and a 50-year water boat owner.

13 This EIR is not adequately considering the traffic impact

14 on Harbor Drive and the intersection of the Yacht Club

15 way here on the street the new bike bath to have a ramp

16 on Mole A. In fact, this harbor is simply too small for

17 a public boat ramp as it is already too congested PM3-41

18 especially the approaches and the lack of parking.

19 The exposure to the elements of Mole A is

20 simply the worst possible location.

21 Thank you for your attention.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. MEYER: Melanie Cohen and Gary O'Connor, or

24 Gerry O'Connor.

25 MS. COHEN: Good afternoon -- good morning, Redondo PM3-42

1 Beach residents. My name is Melanie Cohen. I've lived  
2 here for 21 years. I love Redondo Beach. I love it.  
3 You're going to have to kick me out of here kicking and  
4 screaming because this is a great town...and that's what  
5 I want it to be, a town.

6 I appreciate the work that the Draft EIR folks  
7 have done. I do appreciate it. However, I must say that  
8 I would have appreciated it more had there been blurbs  
9 that could pinpoint the major issues, not putting the  
10 onus on us, the citizens, to read 6800 pages to get to  
11 the main point.

12 (Applause.)

13 MS. COHEN: Number one.

PM3-42  
port'd

14 Number two, I would also like to ask the Draft  
15 EIR folks please not underestimate how the citizens feel.  
16 We all love this town, we all want to do what's right for  
17 Redondo Beach, but we don't want to do it at the expense  
18 of the environment, of views, and of culture -- that's  
19 right, a beach culture, a town that I love and want to  
20 see that this stays and it will exist.

21 I also want to stand against this Draft EIR and  
22 the whole process because for a development company to  
23 make these decisions for the residents of Redondo Beach  
24 without including the all the residents of Redondo  
25 Beach, including groups like RescueOurWaterfront, Redondo

1 Beach residents for the revitalization of Redondo, for  
2 groups like South Bay Parkland Conservancy, we all love  
3 Redondo Beach as well.

4 To tell us that this is the only way we can  
5 redo our pier and our harbor area is not true, Redondo  
6 Beach residents. We need a master plan. You can't just  
7 decide to get a development company in here, throw some  
8 6800 pages -- "Let's see what sticks, folks." PM3-42  
cont'd

9 So bottom line, I'm asking you and pleading  
10 with you as citizens to start this process again, work  
11 within the City Council to change our zoning and put  
12 together a master plan which has been brought up here  
13 earlier today to do Redondo Beach proud. I love Redondo  
14 Beach, I appreciate everyone's work, but I do not  
15 appreciate not being appreciated or listened to.

16 Thank you.

17 (Applause.)

18 MS. MEYER: Okay.

19 MR. O'CONNOR: My name is Gerry O'Connor, and I'm a  
20 35-year resident, property owner, business owner of our  
21 South Bay Beach Cities. I've lived in Manhattan Beach,  
22 Hermosa Beach and Redondo Beach. This isn't about me, PM3-43  
23 but I want to give you just a quick nutshell of my  
24 background to qualify the comments I'm going to make  
25 today.

1 I have an undergraduate in mechanical  
2 engineering and economics, graduate studies in business  
3 management and finance. I've been actively engaged in  
4 our local governments for a couple of decades now. I've  
5 been appointed to many city commissions and committees by  
6 our elected officials.

7 Perhaps as it most relates to this project. I  
8 served as a commissioner and the chairman of the  
9 Manhattan Beach Park and Recreation Commission and of the  
10 Manhattan Beach Planning Commission in recent years. So  
11 I'm pretty well experienced at land use matters and  
12 specifically coastal land use matters and EIR processes.

13 I've seen many EIRs come and go, participated  
14 in many, and today's three-minute opportunity offers us  
15 very little time, but I want to encourage everyone here  
16 to submit written comments. It's most critical that you  
17 not only speak today but that you submit written comments  
18 because there's a requirement for them to respond to your  
19 written comments and try to keep your written comments  
20 focused on the EIR. We all have strong emotions about  
21 the financial aspects and many other aspects of this  
22 project but the EIR does not address them, and they will  
23 not respond to that. Stay focused on the EIR issues.

24 As I looked through the EIR, and I didn't read  
25 6800 pages -- I'll be the first to admit that -- but I

PM3-43  
cont'd

1 read summaries, and I read bullet points and I've been  
2 participating in the process all along. I'm going to  
3 take us back to the fact that when I first saw a public  
4 meeting that drew a red flag for me, and that was the  
5 scoping meeting for this EIR in July of 2014. That was  
6 the most blatant example of active discouragement of  
7 public engagement I've ever seen in a public meeting. It  
8 was held in the lobby, not in the auditorium of the  
9 Performing Arts Center. Public oral input was  
10 prohibited. You were forced to go to a terminal and type  
11 that input. And you know what that prevents? That  
12 prevents public hearing each other. The state's called  
13 divide and conquer. That's how CenterCal and the City of  
14 Redondo Beach set that meeting up. PMS-43  
cont'd

15 And so fast forward. I went to the second  
16 Draft EIR meeting December 9th, I believe, in the  
17 library, and sure, I had some questions, I utilized the  
18 staff that was available and was very thankful they were  
19 out there. At that meeting, I found myself talking to  
20 the lead planner of the project that's been hired under  
21 contract for the City. I found out that she's also a  
22 staff member at -- sorry, the name of the firm Smith that  
23 performed the EIR. That's a conflict of interest that  
24 would be illegal if this were a federal contract. It  
25 frankly raises more red flags than I've ever seen in a

1 process before and, in fact, suggests collusion and, yes,  
2 I'll say it, corruption at the Redondo Beach City Hall.  
3 There are a number of issues here that raise  
4 issues for me in the EIR itself, certainly focusing on  
5 things that we all know are outlandish, that they suggest  
6 there's no significant impact, namely, recreation, our  
7 harbor, our harbor that we as regional residents pay for,  
8 not just Redondo residents. And certainly traffic and  
9 esthetic and visual resources. That's views. All of you  
10 that like to take bicycle rides down Harbor Drive, you  
11 certainly see the peninsula, you see the ocean, even if  
12 you don't see the coastline the whole way. Well, we're  
13 going to have a concrete canyon once that parking  
14 structure and that movie theater go in, you know, the  
15 Edison wall that's there, the whaling wall, it won't be  
16 quite as tall as that but it will be longer on the other  
17 side of the road. That nice bright sunny ride is going  
18 be a dark canyon ride --

PM3:43  
cont'd

19 MS. MEYER: Please conclude.

20 MR. O'CONNOR: I will conclude. Thank you. I'm  
21 sorry. I ran over a little bit.

22 But we all agree that revitalization is  
23 necessarily, and we absolutely can achieve that, but not  
24 by this plan. We have a faulty process. The outlook  
25 will be faulty. We absolutely have a faulty process, the

1 most faulty one that I've seen that our South Bay  
2 governments have ever represented before in my 35 years  
3 as a resident. So remember, submit your public input,  
4 written this week by the 19th, which is the deadline.

PM3-43  
cont'd

5 Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 MS. MEYER: Jessica Ibarra, and then Eloy  
8 R-e-t-a-m-a-l.

9 MS. IBARRA: Hi. I'm Jessica Ibarra from A Basque  
10 Kitchen. My husband and I own a business on the  
11 international boardwalk. We've been Redondo residents  
12 for about two years, and we've chosen to invest in our  
13 community. And I think -- you know what we want to say  
14 is something needs to be done with the waterfront.

PM3-44

15 Hopefully, we can all come to a conclusion on what it is.

16 Hopefully, the City will understand the need  
17 for phasing and to acknowledge the small businesses in  
18 the area that are being affected by the development.

19 Thank you.

20 MS. MEYER: Eloy, and is R-e-t-a-m-a-l?

21 MR. RETAMAL: Retamal, yes.

22 MS. MEYER: Thank you.

23 MR. RETAMAL: Good morning.

24 Is that better? Thank you so much.

PM3-45  
cont'd

25 Hello. My name is Eloy Retamal. I'm a

1 structural engineer with a specialty in architectural  
2 engineering, and I've walked many times in your parking  
3 lot -- in your parking structure --

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Keep it close to your mouth,  
5 please.

6 MR. RETAMAL: Is it better there? I'm sorry,

PMA-15  
cont'd

7 And I just have been amazed at the state of  
8 that structure, and as a consultant and many years in the  
9 business, something needs to be done because of the life  
10 safety involved especially accompanied with so many other  
11 interesting projects in this city and that the community  
12 has.

13 So I definitely support the effort.

14 Thank you.

15 MS. MEYER: So that was the last speaker card that I  
16 have. Again, if you'd like to fill out one, this is the  
17 time to do so.

18 Does anybody have a speaker request card that  
19 they'd like to submit and speak?

20 All right. So with that, we're going to close  
21 the comment period at 11:57 p.m.

22 THE REPORTER: a.m.

23 MS. MEYER: a.m. You're right. Thank you.

24 11:57 a.m.

25 Please feel free to go out and talk to staff.

1 look at the boards that we have both in this room as well  
2 as in the foyer and we're going to be here for a little  
3 bit longer.

4 So, again, feel free.

5 And as that gentleman indicated, the best way  
6 is to send a comment card, give us an email with your  
7 comments or give one -- give us some tonight or today.

8 So please have a great day. Thank you so much  
9 for coming. We really appreciate you taking your time,  
10 and have a great rest of the day.

11 Thank you.

12 (A discussion was held off the record.)

13 MR. MORRIS: Let's see. My name is Chris Morris. I  
14 have a boat, 20-foot boat in the Marina, and I want to  
15 talk about the environmental aspects of having the boat  
16 ramp on Mole A.

PM3-46

17 I believe that the water stagnation is greater  
18 as you go into the harbor. The water circulation would  
19 be greatest at the mouth of the harbor and least at the  
20 end of the harbor, where Mole A is. We can see that the  
21 stagnation in the harbor is -- is worse there because of  
22 the -- the mass fish dieoff from the anchovies a few  
23 years ago. The inner harbor was most impacted, the mouth  
24 of the harbor was the least impacted.

25 So for the purposes of circulation of water, I

1 feel it's greatest at the mouth. The boat ramp ought to  
2 be as close to the mouth as possible.

3 I think there's a traffic issue in the harbor  
4 as well. If the boats -- if the ramp is in the inner  
5 harbor, that means all boats going and coming have to  
6 transit the entire length of the harbor, whereas if  
7 they're closest to the mouth of the harbor, they'll have  
8 more direct access, and you'll have less traffic in the  
9 harbor. There was a recent video posted on YouTube from  
10 Keith Hemstreet and --

11 THE REPORTER: Can you spell that?

12 MR. MORRIS: H-e-m-s-t-r-e-e-t -- that showed the  
13 waves coming over the breakwater. That was from PM3-16  
cont'd  
14 hurricane Vance in Mexico, a Category 2 hurricane, 100  
15 mile an hour. Luckily, it veered off and went in between  
16 Baja Peninsula and the mainland. But we could have those  
17 same waves coming over the breakwater from a Hurricane 5  
18 category storm, which would be 200-plus mile an hour.  
19 So it could be twice as bad.

20 They want to put a fuel dock on the inner a  
21 harbor, and looking at that video, there's a man on the  
22 dock approximately where they put the fuel dock that  
23 drops like -- you can witness him dropping like two feet  
24 as the dock falls out from under him, and that is  
25 somewhere around where the fuel dock would be; so proof

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

choice of location as far as having fuel on a dock and  
big storm surge coming over the wall.

PMS-46  
cont'd

Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 12:39 p.m., The  
Waterfront Project Draft EIR Public Meeting  
was concluded.)

-000-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COURT REPORTERS CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA     )  
  )    ss.  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES   )

I, Vivian C. Lane , hereby certify:

I am a duly qualified Certified Shorthand Reporter, in the State of California, holder of Certificate Number CSR 11339 issued by the Court Reporters Board of California and which is in full force and effect.

I am not financially interested in this action and am not a relative or employee of any attorney of the parties, or of any of the parties.

I am the reporter that stenographically recorded the testimony in the foregoing proceeding and the foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony given.

Dated: January 21, 2016

*Vivian Lane*

---

**PM3- Draft EIR Public Meeting Transcript – January 9, 2016**  
**(Beginning page 26 of transcript – Page 2-1067)**

---

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-01****WAYNE CRAIG**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-01**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC379, which notes that the traffic analysis included the Shade Hotel. Regarding the AES site, please refer to Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site. Please see Draft EIR Section 3.2 for discussion of air quality and Section 3.10 for discussion of noise. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-02****ALAN HURD**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-02**

The Redondo Beach Hotel is located northeast of the project site and not directly in front of the hotel (northeast corner of Harbor Drive and Beryl St.), and private views of the Harbor would remain available from the upper floors of hotel upon implementation of the project (as noted in Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development, there are very limited view from the ground floor along Harbor Drive). Please refer to Draft EIR Section 3.1 and Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development for information from the Draft EIR analysis regarding visual resources. It should be noted that the proposed Waterfront would provide the guest at the adjacent hotels first-class amenities that would enhance their stay. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-03****LISSA DYE**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-03**

The Pacifica Hotel Company owns and operates the Redondo Beach Hotel. Please refer to Response to Comments PM3-02 above. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

---

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-04****BRIAN HITTELMAN**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-04**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC186. As discussed in Draft EIR Section 2.1.1.5.8, the project site has been the subject of over a decade of planning efforts, which were approved by Planning Commission, City Council, Coastal Commission, and the Redondo Beach electorate, which specifically allow for development of 400,000 square feet in the Harbor Pier area. (See also *Citizens v. Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors of Santa Barbara County* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553,571-573 [The Court held that the analysis of alternative locations in a project level EIR "would have been in contravention to the legislative goal of long-term, comprehensive planning...case-by-case reconsideration of regional land-use policies, in the context of a project specific EIR, is the very antithesis of that goal."] As also noted in Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site, it is expected that a major zoning change would delay the project a decade or more, and would not allow the project to be completed within a reasonable period of time. In addition, please refer to the Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing.

As noted, in Draft EIR Section 3.13.2.3.4 (in Section 3.13, Traffic and Transportation), the project site is well served by transit service under existing conditions. Please also be aware, it is not feasible to provide a transit stop at every location in the City. However, transit operators routinely assess the need for transit demand, service, and additional stops as part of their routine function. As discussed in Draft EIR Section 3.13.2.3.4, transit service is provided by several entities including LA County Metro. Furthermore, Catalina Avenue is located approximately 500 feet from the project site; such users are anticipated to visit the site through alternate modes of transportation (i.e. walking), which is one of the project objectives. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-05****MATTHEW BERNARD**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-05**

Please refer to Response to Comment PM3-02. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-06****JAMES ECKLUND**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-06**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC176. The commenter claims that the EIR says Mole A has 'less views.' It is unclear what language the commenter is referencing. Beginning on page 4-308, the analysis in Chapter 4, Analysis of Alternatives, indicated that during operation, the Mole A boat launch ramp facility options would have the same visual elements of surface parking and docks, albeit reconfigured, as compared to the existing conditions. This would not change the public views available from the surrounding areas. As summarized in Table 4-64 (page 4-431) the impact was a 'O' = Impact considered to be equal to the proposed project. For discussion of boat activity, please see Response to Comment PC343-1. Please also see Master Response #8: Boat Ramp in King Harbor, and Master Response #7: Waterfront Parking. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-07****RICHARD WIRSING**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-07**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-08****PENNY WIRSING**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-08**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-09****HEIDI BUTZINE**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-09**

Please See Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-10****BRIAN GARCIA**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-10**

The commenter appears to reference beneficial impacts as impacts that should be disclosed in the Draft EIR. As noted under CEQA Guidelines Section 15382, impacts which require disclosure under CEQA are "adverse" impacts. Please also see Draft EIR page 3.10-22 for discussion of operational noise. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-11****ADELE GLEICHMAN**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-11**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC426 and Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site. The traffic would improve with the implementation of mitigation measure MM TRA-3. As detailed in Section 3.12, Recreation, enhancements to public recreation and open space include a new small craft boat launch ramp, Redondo Beach Marina/Basin 3 reconstruction/redevelopment (including repair of bulkhead and cap within Basin 3), the opening of Seaside Lagoon to the harbor as a protected beach (currently the lagoon is not directly connected to the ocean), new and expanded pedestrian and bicycle pathways, as well as new open spaces. Site connectivity and coastal access would be increased by the establishment of a new pedestrian bridge across the Basin 3 entrance, a new pedestrian promenade along the water's edge from the base of the pier to Seaside Lagoon, and the Pacific Avenue Reconnection. The amount of open space at the site is currently 11.6 acres and the proposed 11.4 acres; however, the proposed open space would be enhanced and more useable. (Refer to Figures 2-7 and 2-21 of the Draft EIR for a view of open space now and with the proposed project.) Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site for information on the viability of the proposed project. Refer to Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development for a summary of the projects massing. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-12****LISA RODRIGUEZ**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-12**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-13****ARNETTE TRAVIS**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-13**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-14****GREG DIETE**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-14**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC152, Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development, and Master Response #4: Modifications to Seaside Lagoon. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-15****CHRIS VOISEY**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-15**

The proposed two-lane boat ramp launch facility with breakwater at Mole C was analyzed throughout the Draft EIR. The other six boat ramp locations were analyzed in Chapter 4, Analysis of Alternatives, as Alternative 8. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-16****JOANNE GALIN**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-16**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-17****PAT AUST**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-17**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-18****SCOTT FELLOWS**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-18**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-19****ALITA RETHMEYER**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-19**

Please refer to Master Response #8: Boat Ramp in King Harbor. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-20****CHRISTOPHER BRINK**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-20**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC196, Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development, Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site, and Draft EIR Section 3.3 for discussion of biological resources. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-21****GENE NOBLE**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-21**

Please refer to Master Response #8: Boat Ramp in King Harbor. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-22****REGGIE THOMAS**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-22**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-23****JOYCE NEU**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-23**

Please refer to Chapter 5 and Appendix O of the Draft EIR and Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site for information on the viability of the proposed project. Please refer to Response to Comments PC323-96 regarding the operation of the drawbridge. Views are detailed in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR, as well as Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development. Regarding biological resources refer to Section 3.3 of the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-24****AMY JOSEFEK**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-24**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC373. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-25****RON TROUPE**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-25**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-26****PERRY COHEN**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-26**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC202. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-27****BOB AMADON**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-27**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-28****JOAN IRVINE**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-28**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-29****MARY RUTH EWELL**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-29**

Please see Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site regarding comments about a Master Plan. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-30****DAVID COE**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-30**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM331****JOHN GREEN**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-31**

For information on traffic, refer to Section 3.13 and Appendix L1 of the Draft EIR and Master Response #6: Summary of Traffic Impacts Associated with the Operation of the Proposed Project. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-32****TONY CZULEGER**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-32**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-33****JULIAN HARVEY**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-33**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC204. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-34****MARTIN HOLMES**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-34**

Please refer to Chapter 5 of the Draft EIR and Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site for information on the viability of the proposed project. Please also see Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-35****NILS NEHRENHEIM**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-35**

Please see Response to Comment PC323 and Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR and Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development regarding views. Refer to Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site regarding the years of past planning efforts associated with that site, and Master Response #4: Modifications to Seaside Lagoon. Please see Response to Comment PC312-1 and Section 3.5, Geology and Soils of the Draft EIR for information on the condition of the piers and challenges to maintaining them. In addition, the Draft EIR analyzed in Chapter 4 two alternatives – Alternatives 1 and 3, which would not rebuild the piers. Refer to Master Response #7: Waterfront Parking and Master Response #8: Boat Ramp in King Harbor regarding existing and proposed vehicle/trailer parking. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-36****JOANNE TURK**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-36**

Please refer to Response to Comment PC111 and Master Response #5: Sportfishing Pier, Polly's and Sportfishing. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-37****JOANNE NEWMAN**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-37**

The commenter is incorrect that the project Site is only 15 acres, the project site encompasses 36 acres as described in Draft EIR Section 1.2.2. Please refer to Response to Comments PC256 and PC354. Refer to Master Response #6: Summary of Traffic Impacts Associated with the Operation of the Proposed Project for information of weekend traffic. Regarding emergency vehicles, refer to Section 3.11 of the Draft EIR and Response to Comment PC323-131. Please see Response to Comment PC203-1 for discussion of delivery trucks and refuse collection vehicles. Massing is discussed in Section 3.1 of the Draft EIR and Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development. Please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site for information on the viability of the proposed project. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-38****SURGE HORA**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-38**

Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR look at eight alternatives to the proposed project, including reduced density alternatives. Alternative 2 would just replace aging infrastructure within the existing square footage. Alternative 7 would reduce the development proposed by about 50 percent. Please see Response to Comment PC083-1 for discussion of a trolley and Master Response #9: View and Scale of Development. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-39****LAURA ZAHN**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-39**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC194 and PC526. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-40****GREGARY VAVREK**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-40**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC188 and Master Response #8: Boat Ramp in King Harbor. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-41****RENE SCRIBE**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-41**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC191 and Master Response #8: Boat Ramp in King Harbor. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-42****MELANIE COHEN**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-42**

Please be advised that the Draft EIR included an 82 page Executive Summary. Please also see Draft EIR Chapter 4 which included eight Alternatives to the proposed project. Please see Master Response #1: AES Power Plant Site for discussion of a Master Plan. Please also be aware that the development regulations for the project site were subject to numerous public hearings associated with consideration and approval by the City Council, approval by the Redondo Beach electorate (Measure G), and approval by the California Coastal Commission. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-43****GERRY O'CONNOR**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-43**

Please refer to Response to Comments PM2-34 and PC427, including PC427-9. Please also see Master Response #9: Views and Scale of Development and Master Response #6: Summary of Traffic Impacts Associated with the Operation of the Proposed Project. The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-44****JESSICA IBARRA**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-44**

Please refer to Response to Comments PC161. As detailed in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR, an alternative that addressed phasing of the project was analyzed (Alternative 6). In addition, please refer to Master Response #3: Economic Vitality and Compatibility of Businesses at the Project Site for information on businesses at the project site. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-45****ELOY RETAMAL**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-45**

The commenter states an opinion and does not introduce new environmental information or directly challenge the information presented in the Draft EIR. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.

**PUBLIC MEETING NO. PM3-46****CHRIS MORRIS**

---

**Response to Comment PM3-46**

Please refer to the analysis of Alternative 8 in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR and Master Response #8: Boat Ramp in King Harbor. For discussion of boat activity, please see Response to Comment PC343-1. There is no fuel dock proposed in association with the proposed project. The comments are acknowledged and will be included in the Final EIR presented for review and consideration by the City's decision-making body.