

BEFORE THE
BEACH CITIES HEALTH DISTRICT

PUBLIC HEARING

V.C. VERBAL PUBLIC COMMENT

REMOTE VIA ZOOM

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24, 2021

9:01 P.M.

Reported By:

Martha Nelson

APPEARANCES

Public Comment

Melanie Cohan

Craig Cadwallader

Susan Yano

Fred

P R O C E E D I N G S

V.C. VERBAL PUBLIC COMMENT

MS. COHAN: Do you hear me? Okay. I'm not going to show. Great. You just took off my -- can you take this screen off so I can see my comments please? Thank you. Okay. Thank you.

This is my fourth letter in opposition to the BCHD project. Thank you to those who continue to speak and out against this project which will be larger than the South Bay Galleria in a residential neighborhood.

Why does the Board continue to ignore the pandemic and the millions who perish nationwide in group settings by continuing with this EIR without investigating the new findings of virus transmission?

In three previous letters and submission I continue to ask, where is the significant study that shows a need for more assisted living in the South Bay? Who will be able to afford an average \$12,250 per month for their care? Were the

MC-2
(Cont.)

1 residents of Redondo Beach surveyed on a mass
2 basis to ask what services they require? Because
3 Redondo Beach will ultimately bear the brunt of
4 expenses, building, police, fire, parks,
5 recreation. Why was this not done? Only the
6 bare minimum survey was done. Who will the South
7 Bay be served by this project?

8 But one of the most perplexing impacts is
9 that of the environmental hazards from the
10 Flagler Street abandoned oil well project, and
11 PCEs, and the exposure of decades-old asbestos
12 usage from the demolition of the existing
13 buildings that the EIR states has no impact on
14 our community.

MC-3

15 On the Beach Cities Health District site,
16 the bchdcampus.org/deir, the YouTube Video
17 supplied by BCHD, and their company, Wood, who is
18 known as a refinery partner to excessive
19 environmental impacts on neighbors, both are
20 addressed in nebulous terms, especially -- oops,
21 I lost my place, I'm sorry, it's hard to do --
22 especially the abandoned oil well.

23 The answer to this response is, quote,
24 "We will not build there and will report to the
25 newly-organized California Energy Management

MC-3
(Cont.)

1 Division," which is CalGEM and Department of
2 Conservation. I personally spoke to Andrew Lush,
3 Geologist, and I have his email if you want it,
4 who said that the EIR must include an inspection
5 to make sure the property is viable to build upon
6 and safe for the community. After all this time,
7 why has these issues not been addressed?

MC-4

8 Also on those links in YouTube there is
9 only a brief explanation of the first phase of
10 this project. Phase 2, which the lifestyle gym
11 and supposed pool project, are being written
12 about in the newspaper and talked about online.
13 Whoa, slow down. Where is the actual project?
14 The video states it would be developed at a later
15 date.

16 Okay. I didn't have time to address
17 anything else. Thank you.

18

19 ***

20

21 MR. CADWALLADER: Okay. Can you hear me
22 okay? Thank you.

23 Yes, this is Craig Cadwallader. And I've
24 been active and I've looked at many, many EIRs
25 over the years. And the worst case scenario was

CC-1

CC-1
(Cont.)

1 the one done for the Hermosa Beach Oil Project,
2 which Tom Baklay and Ed Amanza (phonetic) are
3 familiar with. The final EIR on that was 12,291
4 pages. And, thankfully, this one isn't anywhere
5 near that.

6 I did go through in great detail. One of
7 my faults or, you know, strengths is doing deep
8 dives into information. And I believe this Draft
9 EIR was well done in scope and depth. And it did
10 cover all the concerns that I think are
11 appropriate in a Draft EIR. And, actually, I
12 would encourage people to read that document
13 because it does explain a lot of obscure things,
14 like stormwater dealings and water sources and
15 whatnot that are very important on other
16 projects. So I think it was well researched and
17 well written.

18 And I want to complement that outcome.
19 It doesn't attempt to hide the difficult areas,
20 like the noise generation or the viewpoint from
21 Location 6, which I admire that for being fully
22 transparent on those issues.

23 So overall, I think this is a well-
24 executed Draft EIR. And I have gone through
25 every single page. I have not read the detail on

CC-1
(Cont.)

1 all pages. I did skim some. My favorite pages
2 were the ones that says, "This page intentionally
3 left blank." But I have gone through the whole
4 thing and I do think it's well done. And I
5 appreciate the effort of the Board and the
6 consultants to produce a good product. I think
7 it covers all the bases and covers them well for
8 this stage of the EIR. And that's all I have to
9 contribute at this point.

10 Thank you.

11

12 ***

13

14 MS. YANO: Okay. I'm sorry. Can you
15 hear me now? Okay. I'm sorry. It's Susan Yano.
16 Yeah, I have several questions, possibly for
17 Nick.

SY1-1

18 Does the EIR address or is it supposed to
19 address the financial aspects of this project?

20 Who is the monied BCHD partner? Has that
21 been addressed?

SY1-2

22 What happens if there are overruns? Who
23 supplies the money, the partner, who we don't
24 know, or BCHD? Does the project come to a
25 screeching halt with a mound of toxic dust?

1 On page 51 of the EIR, I'm quoting,
2 "Because Phase 2 would be developed approximately
3 five years after the completion of Phase 1, there
4 are uncertainties in the future health and
5 wellness programming needs and financing." Those
6 are the EIR words. What are those uncertainties
7 and how are they being addressed?

SY1-3

8 I'm surprised that this group claims it's
9 for the community. It's planning to build a
10 203,700 square foot elderly care facility. And,
11 maybe, five years later in Phase 2, while, quote,
12 "less defined," as it says in the EIR, you're
13 planning a wellness center, maybe an aquatic
14 center, maybe, a center for health and fitness,
15 maybe, and the total of those would be 118,450.
16 I don't get it. I don't get why you're a
17 community-based Health District and you're
18 building a twice as big elderly care facility for
19 very rich people, probably most not coming from
20 the beach community.

SY1-4

21 And as for noise, I can't believe that
22 for all issues, except noise, your report
23 concludes the impact to less than significant or
24 less than significant with mitigation. I just
25 cannot believe an oil well, dry cleaning fluid

SY1-4
(Cont.)

1 contaminating soil, has been addressed,
2 especially when your answers to mitigating noise
3 is to build noise barriers where feasible, and
4 you're saying they're not feasible. And you have
5 one month of -- well, I'm sorry, I'll skip that
6 one.

SY1-5

7 I'm also concerned. Who would be
8 managing this program? And if it's anybody at
9 BCHD, they can't even get the fence on the
10 property line correct. I'd like to know, who is
11 responsible for that? Because that fence on the
12 vacant Flagler lot is still on Torrance property,
13 even though you've moved it once. So in your
14 sugar cube diagram in the EIR, it still doesn't
15 have it on Redondo property. It's still on
16 Torrance property.

17 So please tell me nobody at BCHD is
18 managing this program when they can't get a fence
19 line straight.

20

21 ***

22

23 FRED: I pass. I'm too upset.

24

25 ***

1

2 FRED: Hello. Can you hear me? Hello?

3 Okay.

4 I was just curious, has any other
5 location been considered besides the location on
6 Prospect? I would think that there are other
7 locations throughout the city, if not Lomita or
8 Torrance, that would be more apropos to your
9 development than trying to squeeze 600 -- 700,000
F-1 10 feet of development in just about that size of a
11 piece of property? So has any other sites, any
12 other locations ever been considered? And if
13 they haven't, why not? Hello?

14 Well, but I go through your EIR and the
15 only thing I see is for one location. I would
16 think there are other locations that would much
17 more suitable for the type of facility that you
18 want to put together, rather than trying to cram
19 it all into a small property.

F-2 20 Well, yes, your EIR is faulty then, okay?
21 Because you take nothing into consideration.

F-3 22 The noise abatement is a joke. I was in
23 the steel industry for 35 years. And you're
24 going to be pounding beams into the ground as
25 shoring. And that alone will shake up the Vons

F-3
(Cont.)

1 and that little strip mall to where you're going
2 to drive those people out of business, so now
3 you're going to have to pay for them.

4

5 V.C. VERBAL PUBLIC COMMENT CONCLUDES

6

7 -o0o-

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BEFORE THE
BEACH CITIES HEALTH DISTRICT

PUBLIC HEARING

V.C. VERBAL PUBLIC COMMENT

REMOTE VIA ZOOM

TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 2021

6:30 P.M.

Reported By:

Martha Nelson

APPEARANCES

Public Comment

Mark Nelson

Geoff Gilbert

Sheila Lamb

Sabrina Kerch

Frank von Coelln

Michael

Ann Wolfson

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

V.C. VERBAL PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. NELSON: Hi. I had to un-mute. It just gave me a message to press star six. Did that work?

(Staff response not transcribed.)

MR. NELSON: It's okay. I need to use my own for notes, so --

(Staff response not transcribed.)

MR. NELSON: I am. Do you have your court reporter there?

(Staff response not transcribed.)

MR. NELSON: Okay. Mark, M-A-R-K, Nelson, N-E-L-S-O-N, Redondo Beach. All right, so I'm going to begin by providing a prism that reviewers --

(Staff response not transcribed.)

I'd like to begin by providing a prism that reviewers could use to read the DEIR. This is very specific, using a Beach Cities Health District example. Reviewers should read the DEIR

MN1-1

1 for interpretation, the impacts and the damages,
2 not just the raw numbers. Raw numbers are often
3 twisted.

MN1-1
(Cont.)

4 Here's a brief example. As you walk into
5 Beach Cities Health District there's a sign up in
6 514 that says, "The vote was 6,601 to 3,242 to
7 fund the South Bay Hospital." If left to the
8 readers lack of knowledge, that's sounds like a
9 landslide. However, if you know it required a
10 two-thirds vote, that's only a 39-vote margin,
11 that's only 0.4 percent. It's razor think, not a
12 landslide.

13 You need to interpret everything that you
14 read in the DEIR and not rely on just the
15 numbers, so I have a few factual corrections.

MN1-2

16 We've used big data analysis. The NOP
17 comments were heavier on height comments than
18 they were on build during comments. Build
19 duration and the actual size were about tied, so
20 we should get our facts straight on that. These
21 cities did not, in fact, pay attention to the
22 size of the development, more to the height.
23 Those comments went unanswered.

MN1-3

24 190th and Flagler is not the high point.
25 The high point on 190th is at Prospect, so that

MN1-3
(Cont.)

1 aesthetics analysis needs to be looked at.

MN1-4

2 And Beach Cities should propose noise
3 barriers that are at least as tall as what Legado
4 (phonetic) used. That was a City of Redondo
5 Beach approved project where the city did the EIR
6 and they look taller than 30 feet to me. And
7 those barriers are off the corner of Palos Verde
8 and PCH.

MN1-5

9 Comment one, project -- objective number
10 one is invalid. Based on Redondo's ordinances
11 and the strictest City of L.A. ordinance in the
12 state, Beach Cities has not objective obligation
13 for seismic retrofit or demolition of 514. Beach
14 Cities has chosen to use a more stringent moral
15 obligation standard, according to the CEO's
16 video. Sadly, this same moral obligation to
17 protect the health and safety of surrounding
18 residents isn't applied.

MN1-6

19 Aesthetics, quantitatively, this project
20 has a significant negative impact as it is three
21 times the average height of the 514 building.
22 The City of Redondo Beach, when doing EIRs, and
23 especially Legado, the most recent large EIR,
24 uses average height, not maximum height. And even
25 if it used maximum height, only 968 square feet

MN1-6
(Cont.)

1 of the 514 building is at 75 feet. That's only
2 0.3 percent of the current campus size, so that's
3 a bit of a misstatement in terms of height.

4 MR. NELSON: The 2019 proposed plan was
5 only --

6 (Staff response not transcribed.)

7 MR. NELSON: Okay.

8 (Staff response not transcribed.)

9 MR. NELSON: Yeah, they're written.

10 (Staff response not transcribed.)

11 MR. NELSON: No problem. Thanks.

12

13 ***

14

15 MR. GILBERT: Hello. Can you hear me?

16 (Staff response not transcribed.)

17 MR. GILBERT: Yes. My name is G-E-O-F-F,
18 last name Gilbert, G-I-L-B-E-R-T or Redondo
19 Beach.

20 (Staff response not transcribed.)

21 MR. GILBERT: All right, this is in
22 reference aesthetics, visual resources, air
23 quality, and biological resources, and noise.

24 And under the EIR, page 3.319,
25 construction under Phase 1 would require the

GG-1

1 removal of an additional 20 landscaped trees
2 along Diamond Street to provide space for the
3 SCE's substation yard. The location of the
4 substation yard is in the current greenspace
5 buffer zone between the current hospital building
6 and parking lot and the residents of Diamond
7 Street. Removal of 20 additional trees, plus any
8 trees removed earlier, and replacing them with an
9 SCE substation yard, of which no specifications,
10 impacts, or hazards are provided in the EIR, will
11 significantly reduce or eliminate the
12 effectiveness of the greenspace buffer zone now
13 enjoyed.

14 This would have tremendous aesthetics and
15 visual impact -- and this is VIS-2 and VIS-3 --
16 on the homes along Diamond Street and Prospect
17 Avenue, but nothing is written in the EIR about
18 that.

19 Also, with regards to air quality, the
20 reduction or elimination of the greenspace buffer
21 zone due to tree removal would affect the air
22 quality, AQ-3.2, by eliminating the natural
23 filtration or screening barrier between the
24 proposed parking structure, buildings, et cetera,
25 and the homes on Diamond Street and Prospect

GG-1
(Cont.)

GG-2

1 Avenue.

GG-3
2 Furthermore, with regards to noise
3 impact, the reduction of elimination of the
4 greenspace buffer zone due to tree removal would
5 increase the noise level from the parking
6 structure, buildings, et cetera, and the homes on
7 Diamond Street and Prospect Avenue. There was
8 nothing in the EIR that I could find to address
9 any of the impacts of the SCE substation yard on
10 the health and well-being of the residents on
11 Diamond Street or Prospect Avenue. What is it?
12 Is it a transformer? How many megawatts does it
13 have? Does it have any effect on human health?
14 I view this as a serious omission of the EIR and
15 must be included

GG-4
16 The greenspace on Diamond Street between
17 Diamond Street and the hospital has, since the
18 very beginning, been a zone of contention between
19 the residents of Redondo Beach and Beach Cities
20 Health District. And Beach Cities Health
21 District, even in its own EIR, has failed to
22 address this problem. They have only announced,
23 through the biological impacts, that, oh, there
24 won't be any biological effects suffered by the
25 removal of 20 additional trees in this

GG-5
(Cont.)

1 greenspace. The substation yard constitutes a
2 major portion of the greenspace but nothing is
3 indicated in the EIR about this.

4

5 ***

6

7 MS. LAMB: Thank you. Can you hear me
8 now?

9 (Staff response not transcribed.)

10 MS. LAMB: Okay. My name, Sheila,
11 S-H-E-I-L-A, last name is Lamb, L-A-M-B. Okay.

12 (Staff response not transcribed.)

13 MS. LAMB: Okay. Section of the Draft
14 EIR, Existing Land Use Designation, the DEIR
15 misleads the public by omitting the Redondo Beach
16 Municipal Code zoning definition of PCF and its
17 permitted uses. The PCF Zone is a Public
18 Community Facilities Zone with the following
19 permitted uses, parks, parkettes, open space,
20 recreational facilities, beaches, and coastal
21 bluffs. The PCF Zone is intended for land
22 development that serves the public, not
23 commercial or quasi-commercial enterprises, such
24 as senior housing.

SL-1

25 Section 2.4, Project Objectives, the

SL-2

SL-2
(Cont.)

1 Draft EIR misleads the public by
2 mischaracterizing the scope and reach of BCHD
3 programs and services. According to BCHD's own
4 Gallup Survey, only nine percent of Beach Cities'
5 residents have participated in three or more BCHD
6 activities. Aside from -- (clears throat) excuse
7 me -- aside from participating in the L.A. County
8 COVID-19 testing and vaccinations, like hundreds
9 of other organizations, BCHD has no evidence, no
10 evidence to support the provision of direct
11 services to 123,000 Beach Cities' residents as
12 the Draft EIR states.

SL-3

13 Section 3.1, Aesthetics and Visual Resources,
14 the BCHD project is too tall for the adjacent
15 neighborhood. The proposed project is 133-and-a-
16 half feet above street level and significantly
17 contrasts with the 30-foot tall residential
18 buildings adjacent to the project. The project
19 includes -- intrudes on the surrounding
20 neighborhood by blocking views of the Palos
21 Verdes hillside, blocking the blue-sky view for
22 neighbors, and casting shadows.

23 The BCHD project is too big for the
24 adjacent neighborhood. BCHD is proposing a
25 develop that is roughly the size of the South Bay

SL-3
(Cont.)

1 Galleria or the Staples Center. It is two-and-a-
2 half times the size of the current buildings on
3 the site. And it is located in the middle of a
4 low-density residential area of single-family
5 homes.

SL-4

6 And finally -- I only have 22 seconds,
7 we'll see how we go here -- the BCHD project is a
8 commercial enterprise intended for 80 percent
9 non-residents of the three beach cities. BCHD is
10 chartered and funded to serve residents of
11 Hermosa, Manhattan, and Redondo.

12 Thank you very much

13

14 ***

15

16 MS. KERCH: Testing.

17 (Staff response not transcribed.)

18 MS. KERCH: Thank you. Sabrina,

19 S-A-B-R-I-N-A, Kerch, K-E-R-C-H.

20 (Staff response not transcribed.)

21 MS. KERCH: Thank you. I was just
22 commenting. Earlier this evening during the
23 presentation there was the visual rendering from
24 the view at Flagler and 190th and about how it
25 might affect seeing the ridgeline of Palos

SK-1

SK-1
(Cont.)

1 Verdes. Well, nobody actually lives at that
2 corner. I would like to see a rendering from my
3 street, Tomlee Avenue, which is directly below
4 where that building would be a view from any of
5 my neighbors front yards or back yards, or even
6 my own.

SK-2

7 And also, I would like to comment that,
8 talking about these proposed vehicle trips, that
9 was once the project is completed. But what's
10 the traffic? What are all the vehicle trips
11 going to be like during demolition and
12 construction? How much net increase is that
13 going to be? And I realize I'm not referencing
14 the document right now. I'm just commenting on
15 Mr. Meisinger's presentation this evening.

16 So thank you very much.

17 (Pause)

18 MS. KERCH: Thank you. Yes, since I
19 didn't use all of my time before, I'll just add
20 one more thing. Thank you.

SK-3

21 At the end there, there was the slide
22 about the different alternatives. And in bold
23 print it said -- I think what it was saying was
24 the one with the least amount of deleterious
25 effects would be to only do Phase 1. I think

SK-3
(Cont.)

1 that's what it was saying. But I think, to
2 Sheila Lamb's point, that would be even less
3 serving the public because there wouldn't even be
4 the aquatic center, if that's -- if I'm
5 understanding correctly. So it seemed like that
6 was being highlighted as the most desirable
7 option, for some reason, in the presentation.

8 So thank you. That's it.

9

10 ***

11

12 MR. VON COELLN: Yes. Can you hear me?

13 Hello?

14 (Staff response not transcribed.)

15 MR. VON COELLN: Yes. Thank you. My
16 name is Frank Von Coelln, F-R-A-N-K, last name is
17 two words, first, V, as in Victor, -O-N, capital
18 C-O-E-L-L-N.

19 (Staff response not transcribed.)

20 MR. VON COELLN: Thank you. I have a
21 question and I hope you can answer it for me.
22 You mentioned that there will be a similar Zoom
23 meeting on Saturday, this coming Saturday. And
24 I'm just curious to know if you would be reading
25 the letters that many of us and many of my

FVC-1

1 neighbors, including myself, had sent in?
2 Because that would be very instructive, I think,
3 for the entire community to hear.

FVC-1
(Cont.)

4 So is there someone that can answer that
5 for me while I'm still online here?

6 (Staff response not transcribed.)

7 MR. VON COELLN: I just had that one
8 question. And maybe, even if I'm offline, you
9 would offline, you would be able to answer it?

10 And I would just say that I'm also
11 calling in huge opposition to this project. I
12 live -- my house backs up to Flagler. And I'm
13 probably one of three or four or five houses
14 along Flagler Lane that will be in the shadow of
15 this enormous structure that you're intending to
16 build. And so I think it's very, very unkind.

FVC-2

17 And I've lived in my house for over 50
18 years. I'm elderly now. My daughter and her
19 husband are taking care of my wife and I. My
20 wife is an invalid. And we would not like to
21 have to move from our neighborhood but we would
22 feel obliged to move and forced to move should
23 this campus be built as it is currently designed.

24 And that's all I really have to say.

25 Thank you very much

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

MICHAEL: Okay. Can you hear me?

(Staff response not transcribed.)

MICHAEL: Well, related to the procedural issue, there's lots of ways for these comments to get to you. The benefit of having them read during the meeting is so that the community can hear them. So I would advocate that you find some way to let the community have a look at the comments from other people before the end of this process when it's too late.

My comment to the technical adequacy of the EIR, I've already submitted that but, you know, I'll say it again, you're supposed to evaluate the no-project alternative. To me, no project means no project. There is no requirement to tear down the old hospital building for seismic reasons. So if you're forecasting that that's going to happen if we don't do the project, you're just forecasting the environmental effect of a BCHD temper tantrum. And I submit that that's out of scope.

So I would advocate that the no-project alternative be analyzed as, literally, no

M-1

M-2

1 project, and that's it.

2

3

4

5 MS. WOLFSON: Hi. Can you hear me?

6 (Staff response not transcribed.)

7 MS. WOLFSON: Okay.

8 (Staff response not transcribed.)

9 MICHAEL: I just have a couple of
10 questions, actually.

11 The first question is it was a very
12 cursory review that was given. The slides were
13 gone through very quickly. It didn't feel very
14 substantive. So that would be something to
15 consider for the Saturday briefing. I'd like to
16 see something that was a lot more substantive.
17 Some of the charts that you went through, like
18 the noise chart, just about to look at it and it
19 was gone. So there's some really important
20 issues here that I feel have been just sort of
21 pushed by quickly, so it's hard.

22 Also, in the three-minute comment, is
23 that typical for hearings, having the three
24 minutes, like a Board meeting, and no response?
25 I remember at the scoping meeting, questions were

AW1-1

AW1-1
(Cont.)

1 actually answered. There was a little bit of
2 exchange. So I feel like I wonder why? That's
3 just a question there.

4 So -- and then I would say, I could
5 probably talk for three hours on some of the
6 issues of this project but, of course, I'm going
7 to be saving it for a letter.

8 Anyways, I would hope that on Saturday
9 the presentation was a little more in-depth and
10 you actually spent some time talking about the
11 issues.

12 Thank you.

13

14 V.C. VERBAL PUBLIC COMMENT CONCLUDES

15

16 -o0o-

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BEFORE THE
BEACH CITIES HEALTH DISTRICT

PUBLIC HEARING

V.C. VERBAL PUBLIC COMMENT

REMOTE VIA ZOOM

SATURDAY, APRIL 17, 2021

12:00 P.M.

Reported By:

Martha Nelson

APPEARANCES

Public Comment

Susan Yano

Ann Wolfson

Mark Nelson

Brianna Egan

Brian Wilson

Tim Ozenne

P R O C E E D I N G S

V.C. VERBAL PUBLIC COMMENT

MS. YANO: Yes. It's Susan, S-U-S-A-N,
Yano, Y-A-N-O.

So, Nick, I just want to point out,
Flagler does not encroach, your word, into the
project. The project encroaches onto Torrance
property. In fact, BCHD had to move a fence
which encroached on Torrance property. And
BCHD's fence is still encroaching on Torrance
property.

Secondly, your Alternative 2 you
presented in this EIR says, can BCHD sell that
property? I don't think that's legally true. I
would like an answer in the next EIR as to the
legalities of selling for that alternative.

On page 51 of your DEIR, you say,
"Because Phase 2 would be developed approximately
five years after the completion of Phase 1 there
are," quote, "uncertainties in the future health
and wellness programming needs and financing."

1 What are these uncertainties exactly? And you
2 brought up financing, so I want to ask you to
3 address the full scope of financing for both
4 Phase 1 and Phase 2.

SY2-3
(Cont.)

5 Most construction projects I've ever seen
6 to not meet budget or scheduled targets. So what
7 happens if the money runs out before the project
8 can be completed? What are we left with? A
9 toxic dump on the hilltop. What happens if there
10 are project overruns?

11 Then this noise thing is just ridiculous.
12 Noise, it's not mitigated. Your mitigations are
13 just a bunch of noise. I'd be embarrassed to put
14 these mitigations into a document.

SY2-4

15 Construction six days a week, all day,
16 "to the maximum extent feasible," that's your
17 quote, "to the maximum extent feasible." You use
18 that a lot, "feasible." Who determines feasible?
19 What does that mean? If not -- if it's not
20 feasible, do you get to go seven days a week, all
21 night? That's not acceptable.

SY2-5

22 Another mitigation for noise, build noise
23 barriers, here's your term again, "where
24 feasible." What is feasible? You say,
25 "Feasible," this is a quote, "noise barrier

SY2-5
(Cont.)

1 heights do not reduce noise levels for
2 construction activities occurring above 55 -- 30
3 feet. These construction activities would result
4 in noise levels that would exceed FTA residential
5 criteria." That's not acceptable to me.

SY2-6

6 Haul trucks, the third attempt -- "should
7 attempt to operate," that's a quote. They don't
8 have to, according to this mitigation, "attempt
9 to operate in the inner lane." But you show in
10 your -- in this document that they're going to go
11 down Beryl, which is a two-lane street, right by
12 residences and a school. Not an acceptable
13 mitigation.

SY2-7

14 One month prior to construction you're
15 going to notify residents and businesses located
16 in a quarter-mile radius. Big deal. Don't
17 bother.

18 BCHD will provide a telephone number for
19 complaints. They'll "log the complaints and
20 address complaints," this is your term, "as
21 feasible." Not acceptable. I want details.

22

23

24

25 MS. WOLFSON: Okay. Can you hear me now?

1 (Staff response not transcribed.)

2 MS. WOLFSON: Can you also take that off
3 the screen? I can't see my note. Okay. Thank
4 you. Hold on just a moment. Let me go back.
5 Okay. You could let me know when.

6 (Staff response not transcribed.)

7 MS. WOLFSON: Okay. Okay.

8 (Staff response not transcribed.)

9 MS. WOLFSON: Okay. Thanks. Hi. I'm
10 Ann Wolfson, A-N-N, last name, W-O-L-F-S-O-N, and
11 I oppose this project. And I have just a few
12 comments.

13 First of all, if the Phase 2 development
14 phase discusses the most conservative analysis,
15 as stated, and shows three illustrative designs,
16 why are no, zero, key viewing locations or actual
17 renderings or anything that looks realistic shown
18 of it? It seems to be a phantom phase. The only
19 hint of Phase 2 shows very unassuming, simplistic
20 block diagrams, the same diagrams we saw of Phase
21 1 for eight months, since the June 17th meeting.
22 So how can that possibly be called illustrative?
23 It's just not shown.

24 Second, a big red flag of the DEIR is
25 that BCHD dismisses many of the significant

AW2-1

AW2-2

AW2-2

1 impacts in five serious words, "mitigated to less
2 than significant." But what logic and rationale
3 is used for this?

4 Here's just one of the more obvious
5 examples. The DEIR claims in the Aesthetics
6 section that the height and mass of the 103-foot
7 tall, city-blocks long RCFE, which is situated on
8 a 30-foot hill and blocks views and invades
9 privacy for at least half a mile around, can be
10 mitigated from significant to less than
11 significant, as was stated?

12 The vista that was chosen, as shown, the
13 RCFE is seen from the vantage point of 190th and
14 Flagler. And whose viewpoint is this from? From
15 the viewpoint of drivers speeding along 190th and
16 Flagler. Describing the view from 190th and
17 Flagler from the DEIR Section 315, quote, "As
18 such, vehicles traveling the speed limit of 35
19 miles per hour experience this view for
20 approximately 30 seconds. Depending on the
21 traffic at the signalized intersection the view
22 could be available for slightly longer but,
23 generally, less than a minute," unquote.

24 The EIR states it considered the impact
25 the building would have on the view from the very

AW2-2
(Cont.)

1 top of the Palos Verdes ridgeline from the view -
2 - from the point of view of drivers speeding
3 along 190th and Flagler. The DEIR also claims
4 that if they remove 20 feet of height, which, by
5 the way, they just added to the height of the
6 structure prior to the release of the DEIR,
7 drivers passing by the 190th and Flagler can see
8 the very top of the PV ridgeline. And that would
9 make the total impact of the building's height
10 and mass less than significant. Really?

11 What about the everyday view of thousands
12 of Redondo Beach and Torrance residents, school
13 children and the public who, after 29 months,
14 which is very optimistic, of mass construction
15 will permanently be in its shadow?

AW2-3

16 We're seeing now, and in the past two
17 days, the effects that one misstep can make. A
18 main water line was accidentally hit during
19 drilling on Prospect and Del Amo. What ensued
20 was and is --

21 (Staff response not transcribed.)

22 MS. WOLFSON: -- a traffic and
23 environmental nightmare, no involving city
24 services of Redondo Beach, Torrance, and L.A.
25 County services. In addition to a giant

AW2-3

1 sinkhole, dirt --

2 (Staff response not transcribed.)

3 MS. WOLFSON: Yes?

4 (Staff response not transcribed.)

5 MS. WOLFSON: Oh, sorry. All right.

6 Thank you.

7

8 ***

9

10 MR. NELSON: Hi Dan. It's Mark Nelson.

11 (Staff response not transcribed.)

12 MR. NELSON: Okay. I would like to

13 comment.

14 (Staff response not transcribed.)

15 MR. NELSON: Sure. Mark, M-A-R-K,

16 Nelson, N-E-L-S-O-N. Okay.

17 According to a March 2021 *Wall Street*

18 *Journal* article, Wood PLC has agreed to pay a

MN2-1

19 \$9 million fine as part of a civil settlement

20 with Scottish prosecutors. And Wood now

21 estimates it will have to spend up to \$197

22 million to resolve the bribery scheme.

23 Moving on, all six of Beach Cities'

MN2-2

24 project objectives lack foundational basis.

25 Beach Cities purpose and need lacks a

MN2-2
(Cont.)

1 foundational basis. And because there is on
2 legal requirement for demolition or retrofit of
3 514, the no-project alternative lacks
4 foundational basis.

MN2-3

5 The proposed DEIR is both taller and more
6 square feet of above-ground buildings than the
7 2019 design was that the community commented was
8 too large. At 103 feet the proposed RCFE is 43
9 feet taller than the 2019 plan that was only 60
10 feet tall. At 103 feet tall the RCFE is over
11 three times the average height of the 514
12 building. And average height is what the City of
13 Redondo Beach used as a limit on Legado
14 construction for its large development.

15 By removing 160,000 square feet of
16 underground parking from the 2019 plan, Beach
17 Cities current plan now has 65,000 square feet
18 more of above-ground buildings. It is,
19 therefore, bigger than the 2019 plan and taller
20 than the 2019 plan.

MN2-4

21 Due to its increase in height the current
22 plan shades public recreation areas and
23 surrounding neighborhoods and roadways. And
24 last, the 85 decibel intermittent noise will, in
25 fact, have a significant negative impact on

1 Towers Elementary, despite the fact that Beach
2 Cities used LEQ average sound levels. And, of
3 course, average level is barely moved by an
4 intermittent 85 decibel noise. However, as you
5 UC Santa Barbara has found in its prior CEQA
6 analyses, intermittent noise can be much more
7 important as a distraction.

8 Thank you.

9

10 ***

11

12 MS. EGAN: Hi. My name is Brianna Egan,
13 spelled B-R-I-A-N-N-A E-G-A-N.

14 So I'm a long-time resident of Redondo
15 Beach, born and raised, and I have been able to
16 be part of like the Beach Cities Health
17 District's Center for Health and Fitness Gym in
18 the past. And I am familiar with some of the
19 programs offered.

20 So I would just like to share that I
21 think that the Beach Cities Health District
22 should really center the community and keep the
23 community in mind in any like new services or
24 plans that are developed, particularly with
25 things like the aquatic center. I know there was

BE-1

BE-1
(Cont.)

1 a lot of feedback of a need for, actually, more
2 like swimming space and not something that would
3 be kind of like recreational or just for kids.
4 So that's an example.

BE-2

5 And then, also, just kind of trying to
6 wrap my head around some of the concepts and the
7 Environmental Impact Report. I would also like
8 to emphasize that you all keep in mind the impact
9 of climate change and knowing things like urban
10 heat islands and things that are really going to
11 be very much a part of our future in our next
12 years and decades. So with that in mind, also,
13 the environmental cost of things like demolishing
14 buildings and building new buildings and all of
15 the materials involved in that. It can be
16 wasteful.

BE-3

17 And so, as much as possible, if the site
18 could do a lot of retrofitting of existing
19 structures, rather than just completely like
20 building something from scratch. So I think I
21 see that with something like some of the Phase 1
22 plans that would still include existing
23 structures. And so, yeah, if that direction
24 could be continued?

25 And then the final thing would be for

1 it possible, in this time, to walk me through the
2 columns and the findings and an explanation for
3 why there's a yes and why there's a no? Some of
4 the noes confuse me.

5 (Staff response not transcribed.)

6 MR. WILSON: Yes.

7 (Staff response not transcribed.)

8 MR. WILSON: Yeah. Thank you. I was
9 looking through the appendix and then I wasn't
10 sure because some of it is just numbers. So I
11 didn't know the difference between Phase 1 and
12 Phase 2 by those numbers, if there is a physical
13 location that has now changed to come to
14 determine the impacts from Phase 2 as opposed to
15 Phase 1.

16 (Staff response not transcribed.)

17 MR. WILSON: Okay. So it's a safe
18 assumption for Phase 2 to assume the footprint of
19 the current district hospital is kind of the
20 location for Phase 2?

21 (Staff response not transcribed.)

22 MR. WILSON: Yeah. Yeah. Exactly. So I
23 was assuming that that, upon demolition, folks
24 doing the Phase 2 study find a location that's
25 about in that approximate area and says now we'll

BW-1
(Cont.)

1 do a phased -- a study here to determine the
2 impacts for these same sensitive receptors in the
3 surrounding areas. Does that make sense?

4 (Staff response not transcribed.)

5 MR. WILSON: Okay. That's really
6 helpful.

7 Can you -- do you know, offhand, how they
8 do that? Are they at the site doing it?

9 (Staff response not transcribed.)

10 MR. WILSON: Okay. Okay. That helps.

11 (Staff response not transcribed.)

12 MR. WILSON: Okay. Thank you very much.

13

14 ***

15

16 MR. OZENNE: Yes. Tim Ozenne here.

17 (Staff response not transcribed.)

18 MR. OZENNE: Yes. My name is Tim, T-I-M,
19 Ozenne, O-Z-E-N-N-E.

20 (Staff response not transcribed.)

21 MR. OZENNE: Okay. First, I'd like to
22 thank Ann Wilson for pointing out something that
23 I wanted to mention, which is that the Phase 2
24 visual (indiscernible) are completely absent but
25 that's a big part of why this community might not

BW-1
(Cont.)

TO-1

