

BLUE FOLDER ITEM

Blue folder items are additional back up material to administrative reports and/or public comments received after the printing and distribution of the agenda packet for receive and file.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OCTOBER 7, 2025

J.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

- **PUBLIC COMMUNICATION**

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [PRR](#); [Noel Chun](#); [Jane Diehl](#); [Kevin Cody](#); [Michelle Bholat](#); [Martha Koo](#)
Cc: [CityClerk](#); cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov; cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov; citycouncil@manhattanbeach.gov; [City Council](#)
Subject: CPRA to BCHD and Public Comment to Mayors and Councils of the District Cities
Date: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 11:04:46 PM

CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

CEO Bakaly implies that BCHD has 30 year analyses, despite its statement in a November 2023 CPRA response that it had none.

Therefore, this PRR provides the CEO the ability to provide ANY analyses of costs for allcove, the allcove building, and compliance with the BHCIP 30 year terms.

#1 Provide any 30-year cost analyses of the operation, maintenance and upkeep of the proposed allcove building.

#2 Provide any 30 year cost analyses of the allcove program, independent of the entity providing funding.

#3 Provide any 30 year cost analyses of compliance with the use of the \$6.3M in BHCIP funding - that is, 30 years of mental health services provision in the "allcove" building.

I look forward to a flood of analysis that would inform the District Resident-Taxpayers of their financial burden exposure from allcove.

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [Communications](#); [Vanessa I. Poster](#); [CityClerk](#); cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov; cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov; [James Light](#); [Brad Waller](#); [Chadwick B. Castle](#); [Zein Obagi](#); [Martha Koo](#); [Scott Behrendt](#)
Subject: Get Serious - No one said ALLCOVE failed - the BOARD AND MANAGEMENT OF BCHD FAILED
Date: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 6:22:42 PM

CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

Public Comment - BCHD District Mayors and Councils:

Vanessa Poster simply misrepresented the comment. And the transcript will show that.

At a minimum, Poster should be removed for board if in fact the transcript bears out her falsehoods.

BCHD Board is misdirecting the conversation away from the BOARD's process failures. No commenter ever stated the program is a failure, the implementation and spending is a failure.

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov; cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov; [Kevin Cody](#); executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov
Subject: Public Comment - BCHD is bleating out the same tired PR story they told about FAILED PMB LLC deal that cost TAXPAYERS \$12M+
Date: Tuesday, September 23, 2025 6:26:59 PM

CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

Be very wary of BCHD's current PR blitz. BCHD assured us that PMB LLC was the best provider and partner, yet BCHD spent over \$12M on pre-development and PMB LLC walked away scot-free paying \$0 of the taxpayer funded PRE-DEVELOPMENT TAB.

I worry, as should all residents, that BCHD's continued lack of experience in development will cost Resident-Taxpayers millions more.

From the BCHD PR sheets:

Request for Expressions of Interest (RFEOI) Update

BCHD has received several responses to its recent Request for Expression of Interest (RFEOI) as it gathers new ideas from potential partners on how to redevelop the former South Bay Hospital site and what kinds of health services could be offered where the 514 Prospect Ave. building now stands. That building is slated to be vacated in 2027.

The responses include a variety of potential uses, ranging from assisted living to senior housing, medical offices, and other health-related services, all within the scope of services BCHD can provide under the California Healthcare District law.

"We were pleased with the innovative and unique visions each of these groups expressed and look forward to evaluating with the community how each proposal aligns with our mission and vision to meet the community's ongoing health and wellness needs," said BCHD CEO Tom Bakaly. *"Equally impressive was the fact that many well-respected and experienced firms have expressed interest in this project."*

The BCHD BOARD AND EXECUTIVES POOR DECISION-MAKING ON PMB LLC WAS FLUFFED IN THE FOLLOWING \$12M OF TAXPAYER-PAID BLATHER

" **Praising the Proposal:** In a 2022 press release, Bakaly was quoted as saying, "During a lengthy, meticulous selection process with input from the community and advisory groups, PMB/Watermark presented the most impressive, detailed plan." He highlighted the developer's work on other projects as a model for the BCHD campus.

- **Emphasizing Collaboration:** Bakaly noted that PMB's team was "collaborative and... understands our need for social and fiscal responsibility, innovation and developing a sustainable campus." This quote underscores the importance of the public-private partnership model in achieving BCHD's vision for the project.

- **Project Vision:** Bakaly has also framed the planned residential care facility for the elderly as a "centerpiece for our campus, a modern, environmentally sustainable complex that will serve older adults, local youth and everybody in between." This quote speaks to the broader community-focused goals of the project.

Bakaly said that the BCHD Board has indicated that any redevelopment plan must create sustainable revenue to support BCHD services, address the seismic safety of the aging former hospital building, and consider community feedback.

A BCHD committee is currently evaluating the submissions and will present its findings at a Board study session on October 22 at 5:30 p.m.

From: Mark Nelson (Home Gmail)
To: City Clerk: cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov; cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov; City Council: citycouncil@manhattanbeach.gov
Subject: Public Comment - BCHD Misrepresentation to the Public - YET AGAIN - Just like the lie that the 4-story hospital isn't 51.5-ft tall!
Date: Thursday, September 25, 2025 5:47:25 PM
Attachments: image.png
image.png

CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

So one would like to believe that when BCHD puts up an AGENDA, it is an AGENDA. But oh no! BCHD's AGENDA links are to "Coming Soon"
WHAT SCAMMERS! BCHD and its BOARD need to be replaced.



https://bchd.org/public-information/board-meetings-agenda/



Meetings are arranged by date, with the most recent at the top of the list. Click **Video** to listen to the meeting and view agenda documents, or **Agenda** or **Minutes** to see just the documents. You can also search the archives by typing keywords into the Search box.

Upcoming Events

Agenda Packet		
Study Session	Oct 22, 2025 - 05:30 PM	Agenda
Board of Directors	Oct 22, 2025 - 06:30 PM	Agenda
Strategic Development Half-Day	Oct 31, 2025 - 08:00 AM	Agenda
Policy Committee	Nov 3, 2025 - 09:00 AM	Agenda
Study Session	Nov 19, 2025 - 05:30 PM	Agenda
Board of Directors	Nov 19, 2025 - 06:30 PM	Agenda

Available Meeting Archives

Search Archives:

Search

Advanced Search

- + Ad-Hoc Mind Health Committee Meeting
- + Board of Directors Meeting



STUDY SES:
BEACH CITIES HEAL
WEDNESDAY, OCTC
5:30 PM

In Perso
Beach Cities Hea
Beach Cities Room ·
514 N. Prospect Ave. Redon

Video Confer
Password: t

Phone Confe
Dial In:
Webinar I

AGENDA COMING SOON

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [CityClerk; cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov; cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov; Kevin Cody; executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Mayors and Councils - Agenda for BCHD Board Study Session
Date: Tuesday, September 23, 2025 10:14:05 AM

CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

Public Comment

BCHD continues to delay access to its agendas, especially in this case where the meeting was moved to a Tuesday and apparently BCHD dumped out the agenda over the weekend, making it difficult to analyze. BCHD only has 10 meetings per year (takes 2 months off) so there is no excuse for BCHD not providing FULL TRANSPARENCY.

You'll see that BCHD's cites never provided detail nor the agenda until the 11th hour.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mark Nelson <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, Sep 22, 2025 at 7:52 PM
Subject: Re: CPRA (BCHD) and Public Comment (BCHD, City of Redondo Beach Council) - Agenda for Board Study Session
To: PRR <PRR@bchd.org>

None of Beach Cities cited references, provided the agenda in a timely fashion for a monthly meeting.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 22, 2025, at 6:03 PM, PRR <PRR@bchd.org> wrote:

Dear Mr. Nelson,

Please see below (in red) for the District's response to your public records requests received 9/12/25 that reads:

BCHD Board is concealing its actions from the public. The public deserves adequate advance provision of the agenda for monthly meetings. This is unlike the City that has weekly meetings. BCHD can only manage 10 meetings annually with vacation in the summer and holiday seasons.

Upcoming Regular Board of Directors Meeting
Tuesday, September 16, 2025
6:30 p.m.

In Person:
Beach Cities Health District
Beach Cities Room – Lower Level
514 N. Prospect Ave. Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Please see below and attached all the ways the District notified the change of the Board Meeting day and time.

- Resolution of Date Change (done in the March 2025 BOD meeting)
 - See attached.
- August Newsletter (Sent 8/21/25) – attached.
 - <https://conta.cc/4mY4fu2>
- August Volunteer Newsletter sent 8.28.25
 - <https://conta.cc/4oVTgTk>
- Social media Post on FB (Posted 9/3/25) – attached.
- Social media Post on FB (Posted 9/15/25) – attached.
- Also, see Public-meetings website “upcoming events” shows next board meetings:
 - [Public Meetings - Beach Cities Health District](#)

If you believe we have not correctly interpreted your request, please resubmit your request with a description of the identifiable record or records that you are seeking.

Please note that if records you are seeking do not exist, BCHD has no obligation to create new records, or to obtain records from other sources, unless those sources are considered “prepared, owned, used by, or retained by” by the District.

Please note that the District may not respond to questions or comments included with your request that are not themselves requests for identifiable public records under the California Public Records Act. The lack of response by the District to any such questions or comments, including follow-up questions and comments, is not an indication of the District’s position on any topic or item, and should not be presented as such to any person.

From: Mark Nelson (Home Gmail) [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2025 4:20 PM
To: PRR <PRR@bchd.org>; Communications <Communications@bchd.org>; Eleanor Manzano <cityclerk@redondo.org>; Kevin Cody <kevin@easyreadernews.com>
Subject: CPRA (BCHD) and Public Comment (BCHD, City of Redondo Beach Council) - Agenda for Board Study Session

EXTERNAL EMAIL - CAUTION

BCHD Board is concealing its actions from the public. The public deserves adequate advance provision of the agenda for monthly meetings. This is unlike the City that has weekly meetings. BCHD can only manage 10 meetings annually with vacation in the summer and holiday seasons.

Upcoming Regular Board of Directors Meeting

**Tuesday, September 16, 2025
6:30 p.m.**

In Person:
Beach Cities Health District
Beach Cities Room – Lower Level
514 N. Prospect Ave. Redondo Beach, CA 90277

THE PRECEDING E-MAIL, INCLUDING ANY ATTACHMENTS, CONTAINS INFORMATION THAT MAY BE CONFIDENTIAL, BE PROTECTED BY ATTORNEY CLIENT OR OTHER APPLICABLE PRIVILEGES, OR CONSTITUTE NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION. IT IS INTENDED TO BE CONVEYED ONLY TO THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OF THIS MESSAGE, PLEASE NOTIFY THE SENDER BY REPLYING TO THIS MESSAGE AND THEN DELETE IT FROM YOUR SYSTEM. USE, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION, OR REPRODUCTION OF THIS MESSAGE BY UNINTENDED RECIPIENTS IS NOT AUTHORIZED AND MAY BE UNLAWFUL. PLEASE NOTE THAT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE BEACH CITIES HEALTH DISTRICT, ALONG WITH ALL ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER ITEMS, MAY BE SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT. THE BEACH CITIES HEALTH DISTRICT SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY CLAIMS, LOSSES OR DAMAGES RESULTING FROM THE DISCLOSURE OR USE OF ANY INFORMATION, DATA OR OTHER ITEMS THAT MAY BE CONTAINED IN ANY CORRESPONDENCE.

<RES603-Board Meeting September Date Change.pdf>

<mime-attachment>

<Social media Post - September 2025.PNG>

<Social Media Post - Sep 15 2025.png>

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [James Light](#); [CityClerk](#); [Scott Behrendt](#); [Brad Waller](#); [Chadwick B. Castle](#); [Zein Obagi](#); [Paige Kaluderovic](#)
Cc: [Kevin Cody](#); [Darryl Boyd](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Redondo Beach Mayor and Council
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 8:10:31 AM
Attachments: [NOTICE TO CITY OF RB.PDF](#)

CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

TO: Mayor and Council
CC: Mr. Boyd and the Easy Reader News
BCC: 500-600 N Prospect Residents

The letter below was provided on behalf of the 500-600 blocks of the N. Prospect service road by Mr. Boyd in hard copy as well as electronic version to the City. I reiterate these issues to the Mayor and Council and thank Mr. Boyd for his continued service to the neighborhood.

As the City is well aware from unopposed testimony in the destructive Metro extension EIR and the BCHD privatization and development EIR as examples, noise is clinically linked to various health conditions.

Excessive road and environmental noise is linked to a wide range of adverse health conditions, going far beyond just hearing loss. The primary mechanism for many of these non-auditory effects is the activation of the body's stress response system, leading to chronic stress, inflammation, and the disruption of sleep.

The main health conditions caused or exacerbated by excessive road and environmental noise include:

Auditory Effects

Noise-Induced Hearing Loss (NIHL): Permanent or temporary loss of hearing, typically from high-intensity noise exposure.

Tinnitus: A persistent ringing, buzzing, or hissing sound in the ears.

Hyperacusis: Increased sensitivity and intolerance to normal everyday sounds.

Cardiovascular and Metabolic Diseases

Chronic noise exposure, even at levels that don't cause hearing damage, activates the "fight-or-flight" response, which over time puts a strain on the cardiovascular system.

Hypertension (High Blood Pressure): The most common cardiovascular effect, as noise can prevent the normal drop in blood pressure during sleep.

Ischemic Heart Disease (IHD): Including heart attacks (myocardial infarction) and other conditions caused by reduced blood flow to the heart.

Stroke (both ischemic and hemorrhagic).

Heart Failure and Arrhythmias (irregular heart rhythms, like atrial fibrillation).

Type 2 Diabetes and other metabolic disturbances.

Premature Mortality from all natural causes, particularly cardiovascular disease.

Neurological and Mental Health Effects

Noise acts as a chronic stressor, affecting mental and cognitive functions.

Sleep Disturbance: Including difficulty falling asleep, reduced total sleep time, and fragmentation of sleep (waking up or being shifted to lighter sleep stages).

Annoyance and Stress: Leading to increased levels of stress hormones like cortisol and adrenaline.

Mental Health Issues: Exacerbation or contribution to conditions like anxiety and depression.

Cognitive Impairment: Including difficulties with memory, attention deficits, and reduced productivity.

Childhood Learning Delays: Associated with noise exposure (e.g., aircraft noise near schools), resulting in lower reading scores and problems with hyperactivity and attention.

Other Effects

Annoyance: Considered a major adverse health effect itself, often leading to anger, displeasure, and reduced quality of life.

Endocrine Effects: Disturbances in hormonal function due to the constant activation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis.

Inflammation and Oxidative Stress: Underlying mechanisms that drive many of the long-term, non-auditory diseases.

Please review and heed Mr Boyd's communication to the City. He has completed substantial research and organized public meetings with City electeds and staff. Mr. Boyd has made clear and compelling showings of the damages from excessive noise, the risks and damages of traffic, and the lack of noise and traffic enforcement in the neighborhood.

Thank you for your review and action.

Mark Nelson
Property Owner

COMMUNICATION FROM MR BOYD ON BEHALF OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD

To: Jim Light, Mayor
Paige Kaluderovic, Council Member District 3
Joe Hoffman, Redondo Beach Chief Of Police

Cc: Mike Witzansky, City Manager
Joy Ford, City Attorney
Eleanor Manzano, City Clerk
500-600 N Prospect Ave. Neighbors

RE: 500-600 Block N Prospect Ave. Redondo Beach - **ACTION REQUIRED IMMEDIATELY**

Be informed that The City of Redondo Beach is out of compliance and in violation of many laws, codes, and ordinances. We have the legal right as Residents and the majority of us are owner occupied here, to a safe, healthy, and peaceful living environment. The City of Redondo Beach has provided neither safety nor a peaceful living environment for Residents of the 500-600 N. Prospect Ave. block for decades.

California Health and Safety Code 46000 is very clear regarding excessive noise and our rights to peaceful enjoyment of our property. This is a California State LAW and part of the **Noise Control Act**.

The Legislature hereby finds and declares that:

- (a) Excessive noise is a serious hazard to the public health and welfare.**
- (b) Exposure to certain levels of noise can result in physiological, psychological, and economic damage.**
- (c) There is a continuous and increasing bombardment of noise in the urban, suburban, and rural areas.**
- (d) Government has not taken the steps necessary to provide for the control, abatement, and prevention of unwanted and hazardous noise.**
- (e) The State of California has a responsibility to protect the health and welfare of its citizens by the control, prevention, and abatement of noise.**
- (f) All Californians are entitled to a peaceful and quiet environment without the intrusion of noise which may be hazardous to their health or welfare.**
- (g) It is the policy of the state to provide an environment for all Californians free from noise that jeopardizes their health or welfare. To that end it is the purpose of this division to establish a means for effective coordination of state activities in noise control and to take such action as will be necessary to achieve the purposes of this section.**

California Civil Code 3479 addresses Public Nuisance and our rights to peaceful free enjoyment of our property.

Anything which is injurious to health, including, but not limited to, the illegal sale of controlled substances, or is indecent or offensive to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property, or unlawfully obstructs the free passage or use, in the customary manner, of any navigable lake, or river, bay, stream, canal, or basin, or any public park, square, street, or highway, is a nuisance.

Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.390 defines acceptable noise levels during the day and the evening as **50 decibels** during the day, **45 decibels** at night. The City of Redondo Beach is out of compliance. There may be several other code sections that the City of Redondo Beach is out of compliance with as well.

Section 12.08.210 addresses Intrusive Noise

Section 12.08.230 addresses Noise Disturbance

Section 12.08.250 addresses Noise Level

Section 12.08.300 addresses Public Right Of Way

Section 12.08.320 addresses Real Property Boundry

Section 12.08.560 addresses Vibration

City of Redondo Beach Code Section 4-24.301 defines acceptable noise levels during the day and the evening as **50 decibels** during the day, **45 decibels** at night, same as LA County. The City of Redondo

Beach is out of compliance with its own ordinance.

Noise levels on the 500-600 N. Prospect Ave. block have been collected ranging from **55 to 60 decibels** sitting traffic, **65 to 75 decibels** moving traffic, **80 to 85 decibels** motorcycles, cars with illegal exhausts, or super cars, and as high as **98.5 decibels** emergency vehicles. The City Of Redondo Beach was also made aware of non-compliance through data provided by BCHD. The City of Redondo Beach has an obligation to remedy, yet has done **nothing** about it. This is way above the acceptable levels of both LA County and the City of Redondo Beach ordinances. It is totally intolerable.

Beach Cities Health District is a major contributor of noise with increased traffic, employee and patient/customer vehicles, and constant emergency vehicles in and out of there. The City of Redondo Beach has been and continues to be an enabler of intrusive and unsettling noise upon our persons and our properties by not remedying the situation with proper traffic control, citing traffic and noise offenders which includes drivers on North Prospect Avenue, and controlling activities at BCHD that cause constant noise disturbances. The noise levels we have been forced to are a sonic noise nuisance and is totally unacceptable.

Additionally, this ongoing situation and due to nonexistent sound and safety barriers on the North Prospect Ave. median may also be considered a Dangerous Condition Of Public Property and a Public Safety and Noise Nuisance, defined under **California Government Code 835** and **California Penal Codes 372, and 373A**. This may apply to the City of Redondo Beach for allowing a Dangerous Condition and a Public Safety and Noise Nuisance to continue without taking the steps to remedy. The N Prospect Ave. median is an outdated design and is not compliant with modern safety or noise codes. We have had cars flip that median twice in the past. At the excessive speeds vehicles are traveling on N Prospect Ave. the next time could be fatal.

City of Redondo Beach Code 3-7-902 Prohibits large load commercial vehicles from using any City street unless designated in **City of Redondo Beach Code 3-7-903. Prospect Avenue is NOT a truck route**. Code 3-7-902 is violated day and night on N Prospect Ave with no enforcement by Redondo Beach Police Department. Again, The City of Redondo Beach is out of compliance with its own ordinance.

California Public Records Act CPRA: California Government Code 7920.000 - 7931.000 Our Public Records Requests for traffic and accident data at the Beryl St./N Prospect Ave./BCHD/Diamond St./Del Amo Blvd. streets and intersections have been ignored, stonewalled, not responded to. This is in violation of California State LAW. Additionally, data and video evidence that has been offered to you from Residents has been ignored or rejected.

The City of Redondo Beach, Mayor Jim Light, Council Member Paige Kaluderovic, and Redondo Beach Police Department Chief Joe Hoffman, you have not taken these problems seriously and you have not represented us well. You have neglected your duties and obligations to the Residents of 500-600 N Prospect Avenue and the Beryl Heights community. Ignoring these very serious problems and your inaction to bring remedy greatly impacts our quality of life and our property values. We are suffering mental, physical, personal, and economic damages due to your dereliction of your City Government duties. We need resolutions to safety, traffic control, traffic calming, traffic enforcement, noise abatement, and privacy issues immediately.

We have had 3 neighborhood meetings. We have attended and tried to speak at several City Council and Public Works meetings. We had to force our voices to be heard at Council Member Kaluderovic's 9/19/25 community meeting as we were not included on her agenda. A year of emails, lodging complaints to RBPd, and fighting with you all to just do what is needed and what is right. It's enough going back and forth fighting with you all. Now you need to take the proper and required action to remedy.

This is a demand that you provide your plan of corrective action and remedy to us for the problems stated

at 500-600 N Prospect Ave. Redondo Beach, CA 90277. In writing and within 30 days from receipt of this letter.

October 6, 2025

Darryl Boyd


City Of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

BY EMAIL AND USPS PRIORITY MAIL (4 PAGES)

To: Jim Light, Mayor
Paige Kaluderovic, Council Member District 3
Joe Hoffman, Redondo Beach Chief Of Police

Cc: Mike Witzansky, City Manager
Joy Ford, City Attorney
Eleanor Manzano, City Clerk
500-600 N Prospect Ave. Neighbors

RE: 500-600 Block N Prospect Ave. Redondo Beach - **ACTION REQUIRED
IMMEDIATELY**

Be informed that The City of Redondo Beach is out of compliance and in violation of many laws, codes, and ordinances. We have the legal right as Residents and the majority of us are owner occupied here, to a safe, healthy, and peaceful living environment. The City of Redondo Beach has provided neither safety nor a peaceful living environment for Residents of the 500-600 N. Prospect Ave. block for decades.

California Health and Safety Code 46000 is very clear regarding excessive noise and our rights to peaceful enjoyment of our property. This is a California State LAW and part of the **Noise Control Act**.

The Legislature hereby finds and declares that:

- (a) Excessive noise is a serious hazard to the public health and welfare.**
- (b) Exposure to certain levels of noise can result in physiological, psychological, and economic damage.**
- (c) There is a continuous and increasing bombardment of noise in the urban, suburban, and rural areas.**

(d) Government has not taken the steps necessary to provide for the control, abatement, and prevention of unwanted and hazardous noise.

(e) The State of California has a responsibility to protect the health and welfare of its citizens by the control, prevention, and abatement of noise.

(f) All Californians are entitled to a peaceful and quiet environment without the intrusion of noise which may be hazardous to their health or welfare.

(g) It is the policy of the state to provide an environment for all Californians free from noise that jeopardizes their health or welfare. To that end it is the purpose of this division to establish a means for effective coordination of state activities in noise control and to take such action as will be necessary to achieve the purposes of this section.

California Civil Code 3479 addresses Public Nuisance and our rights to peaceful free enjoyment of our property.

Anything which is injurious to health, including, but not limited to, the illegal sale of controlled substances, or is indecent or offensive to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of property, so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property, or unlawfully obstructs the free passage or use, in the customary manner, of any navigable lake, or river, bay, stream, canal, or basin, or any public park, square, street, or highway, is a nuisance.

Los Angeles County Code Section 12.08.390 defines acceptable noise levels during the day and the evening as **50 decibels** during the day, **45 decibels** at night. The City of Redondo Beach is out of compliance. There may be several other code sections that the City of Redondo Beach is out of compliance with as well.

Section 12.08.210 addresses Intrusive Noise

Section 12.08.230 addresses Noise Disturbance

Section 12.08.250 addresses Noise Level

Section 12.08.300 addresses Public Right Of Way

Section 12.08.320 addresses Real Property Boundry

Section 12.08.560 addresses Vibration

City of Redondo Beach Code Section 4-24.301 defines acceptable noise levels during the day and the evening as **50 decibels** during the day, **45 decibels** at night, same as LA County. The City of Redondo Beach is out of compliance with its own ordinance.

Noise levels on the 500-600 N. Prospect Ave. block have been collected ranging from **55 to 60 decibels** sitting traffic, **65 to 75 decibels** moving traffic, **80 to 85 decibels** motorcycles, cars with illegal exhausts, or super cars, and as high as **98.5 decibels** emergency vehicles. The City Of Redondo Beach was also made aware of non-compliance through data provided by BCHD. The City of Redondo Beach has an obligation to remedy, yet has done **nothing** about it. This is way above the acceptable levels of both LA County and the City of Redondo Beach ordinances. It is totally intolerable.

Beach Cities Health District is a major contributor of noise with increased traffic, employee and patient/customer vehicles, and constant emergency vehicles in and out of there. The City of Redondo Beach has been and continues to be an enabler of intrusive and unsettling noise upon our persons and our properties by not remedying the situation with proper traffic control, citing traffic and noise offenders which includes drivers on North Prospect Avenue, and controlling activities at BCHD that cause constant noise disturbances. The noise levels we have been forced to are a sonic noise nuisance and is totally unacceptable.

Additionally, this ongoing situation and due to nonexistent sound and safety barriers on the North Prospect Ave. median may also be considered a Dangerous Condition Of Public Property and a Public Safety and Noise Nuisance, defined under **California Government Code 835** and **California Penal Codes 372, and 373A**. This may apply to the City of Redondo Beach for allowing a Dangerous Condition and a Public Safety and Noise Nuisance to continue without taking the steps to remedy. The N Prospect Ave. median is an outdated design and is not compliant with modern safety or noise codes. We have had cars flip that median twice in the past. At the excessive speeds vehicles are traveling on N Prospect Ave. the next time could be fatal.

City of Redondo Beach Code 3-7-902 Prohibits large load commercial vehicles from using any City street unless designated in **City of Redondo Beach Code 3-7-903**. **Prospect Avenue is NOT a truck route.** Code 3-7-902 is violated day and night on N Prospect Ave with no enforcement by Redondo Beach Police Department. Again, The City of Redondo Beach is out of compliance with its own ordinance.

California Public Records Act CPRA: California Government Code 7920.000 - 7931.000 Our Public Records Requests for traffic and accident data at the Beryl St./N Prospect Ave./BCHD/Diamond St./Del Amo Blvd. streets and intersections have been ignored, stonewalled, not responded to. This is in violation of California State **LAW**. Additionally, data and video evidence that has been offered to you from Residents has been ignored or rejected.

The City of Redondo Beach, Mayor Jim Light, Council Member Paige Kaluderovic, and Redondo Beach Police Department Chief Joe Hoffman, you have not taken these problems seriously and you have not represented us well. You have neglected your duties and obligations to the Residents of 500-600 N Prospect Avenue and the Beryl Heights community. Ignoring these very serious problems and your inaction to bring remedy greatly impacts our quality of life and our property values. We are suffering mental, physical, personal, and economic damages due to your dereliction of your City Government duties. We need resolutions to safety, traffic control, traffic calming, traffic enforcement, noise abatement, and privacy issues immediately.

We have had 3 neighborhood meetings. We have attended and tried to speak at several City Council and Public Works meetings. We had to force our voices to be heard at Council Member Kaluderovic's 9/19/25 community meeting as we were not included on her agenda. A year of emails, lodging complaints to RBPD, and fighting with you all to just do what is needed and what is right. It's enough going back and forth fighting with you all. Now you need to take the proper and required action to remedy.

This is a demand that you provide your plan of corrective action and remedy to us for the problems stated at 500-600 N Prospect Ave. Redondo Beach, CA 90277. In writing and within 30 days from receipt of this letter.



Darryl Boyd

On behalf of the majority of 500-600 N Prospect Ave. Residents

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [GreenlineExtension](#); [CityClerk](#); [BoardClerk@metro.net](#); [executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov](#); [cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov](#); [cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov](#); [Holly J. Mitchell](#); [RightOfSav/RBQoL](#)
Subject: Public Comment - The FEIR is defective and failed to quantify health impacts - Metro's dismissal for lack of a one-size-fits-all correlation is defective.
Date: Wednesday, September 17, 2025 8:27:59 PM

CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

The following dismissive statement is contained in the FEIR:

"It is not scientifically feasible to directly correlate project-related noise impacts with specific health outcomes, due to the wide variability in how individuals respond to noise. Factors such as age, health status, pre-existing conditions, and personal sensitivity to noise vary greatly. Scientific studies, including the ones cited by commenters, generally establish broad patterns of how long-term exposure to high levels of noise may increase the risks of stress, cardiovascular disease, or sleep disturbance, **but they do not provide a direct, one-size-fits-all correlation between specific decibel levels and individual health impacts.** Moreover, transit-related noise is intermittent (e.g., from train pass-bys), making it difficult or impossible to model the cumulative effect of short bursts of noise over time as compared to continuous, high-level noise exposure found in occupational settings."

Metro is assuming away the health damages of its project by claiming that the presented studies do not provide a one-size-fits-all correlation. Few, if any, health damages are one size fits all. California's Prop 65 as an example classifies a number of products as potentially toxic without ever creating the non-existent "one-size-fits-all" correlation that Metro seeks to use.

Metro is engaging in unscientific absurdity. Metro must USE THE SCIENCE and RESPECT THE SCIENCE. The various studies, including those from the Beach Cities Health District multimillion dollar Blue Zones project clearly demonstrate a wide variety of very serious health impacts across a wide variety of age, ethnicity, health, and average sensitivity conditions.

Various rail and noise studies clearly link health damages to rail noise. Other long accepted studies link general elevated noises to health damages. Even more studies demonstrate the links between sleep interruptions, stress, and other impacts of the Metro project and operation on health.

In short, there is no "one-size-fits-all" rule. Nor has Metro made any good faith attempt to determine the specific damages on a finite set of impacted populations of minorities, elderly, disabled, and health impaired.

The FEIR is defective for these reasons.

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [PRR](#); [City Council](#); cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov; cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov; citycouncil@manhattanbeach.gov; [CityClerk](#); [Jane Diehl](#); [Kevin Cody](#); [Martha Koo](#); [Michelle Bholat](#); [Noel Chun](#); [James Light](#); [Chadwick B. Castle](#); [Brad Waller](#); [Scott Behrendt](#); [Zein Obagi](#); executiveoffice@bos.lacounty.gov; [info](#)
Subject: Re: CPRA to BCHD and Public Comment to Mayors and Councils of the District Cities
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2025 10:14:36 AM

CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

Public Comment All Agencies

BCHD is blatantly violating the California Public Records Act by responding with documents that bear no relationship to the PRR question requesting 30-year analysis documents of the obligation to taxpayers and costs of 30-year operation and ownership of the "ALLCOVE" building and required 30-year stream of mental health services required by the BCHD-BHCIP contract.

Not a single link provided by BCHD contains any BCHD produced 30-year analysis of allcove operations, maintenance, building or other activities that would be obligated by BCHD's use of the \$6.3M BHCIP grant that obligate BCHD Taxpayers to a 30-year provision of a building and assurance of mental health services.

THEREFORE - THE ONLY CONCLUSION IS THAT CEO BAKALY MISREPRESENTED BCHD'S LACK OF FIDUCIARY ANALYSIS AND THERE IS NOT EVEN A SINGLE BCHD 30-YEAR ANALYSIS THAT WAS EVER CONDUCTED OF THE \$150M+ OBLIGATION TO TAXPAYERS CAUSED BY BCHD'S \$6.3M ALLCOVE BUILDING GRANT ACCEPTANCE.

On Mon, Sep 29, 2025 at 8:22 PM PRR <PRR@bchd.org> wrote:

Dear Mr. Nelson,

Please see below (in red) for the District's response to your public records requests received 9/17/25 that reads:

The District is committed to its legal mandate to provide preventative health services that address the most prevalent health needs of our community, with youth mental health being a top priority. In fulfilling this mission, the District has secured a Behavioral Health Continuum Infrastructure Program (BHCIP) grant to build capacity and expand critically needed mental health services for residents ages 25 and younger. This investment underscores the District's long-term commitment to enhancing the well-being of the community.

The District maintains a robust process of ongoing strategic and financial planning to ensure the long-term sustainability of all our programs, including allcove Beach Cities. In our regular public meetings, the District has consistently discussed long-term strategies, reviewed overall financial forecasts that include allcove as an ongoing program, and utilized priority-based budgeting to evaluate future programs and services.

Please see the District updated [BCHD_CommunityHealthReport_2025-2028.pdf](#)

Please visit the District website and public meeting presentations.

[Public Meetings - Beach Cities Health District](#)

Through the years, the District has provided strategic plans, District overall financial strategies and allcove sustainability plans.

Below are a few presentations discussing the District financial strategies.

[BCHD Innovation: Evolution & Transformation - Jan 27, 2021](#)

Behavioral Health is identified as a long-term future need.

[BCHD Strategic Half-Day - Jan 29, 2021](#)

Identified Priority Based Budgeting as a tool to evaluate programs and services for the future.

[Operating Budgets - Beach Cities Health District](#)

The District's budget website provides access to Financial forecasts that assume allcove is an ongoing program.

[Board Study Session - Feb 26, 2025](#)

Please see slide 7 for District sustainability plans to fund District services, including allcove Beach Cities.

While the grant for the facility was awarded, the funds have yet to be committed. As stated by the CEO at the September 16 Board meeting, the Board has requested additional financial information specifically isolating the allcove Beach Cities commitment. This information will be reviewed during the public Board Study Session on October 22.

The District disagrees with your assumptions regarding past statements. Please join the October 22 Board Study Session to learn more.

CEO Bakaly implies that BCHD has 30 year analyses, despite its statement in a November 2023 CPRA response that it had none.

Therefore, this PRR provides the CEO the ability to provide ANY analyses of costs for allcove, the allcove building, and compliance with the BHCIP 30 year terms.

#1 Provide any 30-year cost analyses of the operation, maintenance and upkeep of the proposed allcove building.

#2 Provide any 30 year cost analyses of the allcove program, independent of the entity providing funding.

#3 Provide any 30 year cost analyses of compliance with the use of the \$6.3M in BHCIP funding - that is, 30 years of mental health services provision in the "allcove" building.

I look forward to a flood of analysis that would inform the District Resident-Taxpayers of their financial burden exposure from allcove.

If you believe we have not correctly interpreted your request, please resubmit your request with a description of the identifiable record or records that you are seeking.

Please note that if records you are seeking do not exist, BCHD has no obligation to create new records, or to obtain records from other sources, unless those sources are considered “prepared, owned, used by, or retained by” by the District.

Please note that the District may not respond to questions or comments included with your request that are not themselves requests for identifiable public records under the California Public Records Act. The lack of response by the District to any such questions or comments, including follow-up questions and comments, is not an indication of the District’s position on any topic or item, and should not be presented as such to any person.

From: Mark Nelson (Home Gmail) [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 11:04 PM
To: PRR <PRR@bchd.org>; Noel Chun <Noel.Chun@bchd.org>; Jane Diehl <Jane.Diehl@bchd.org>; Kevin Cody <kevin@easyreadernews.com>; Michelle Bholat <Michelle.Bholat@bchd.org>; Martha Koo <Martha.Koo@bchd.org>
Cc: Eleanor Manzano <cityclerk@redondo.org>; cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov; cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov; citycouncil@manhattanbeach.gov; City Council <citycouncil@hermosabeach.gov>
Subject: CPRA to BCHD and Public Comment to Mayors and Councils of the District Cities

EXTERNAL EMAIL - CAUTION

CEO Bakaly implies that BCHD has 30 year analyses, despite its statement in a November 2023 CPRA response that it had none.

Therefore, this PRR provides the CEO the ability to provide ANY analyses of costs for allcove, the allcove building, and compliance with the BHCIP 30 year terms.

#1 Provide any 30-year cost analyses of the operation, maintenance and upkeep of the proposed allcove building.

#2 Provide any 30 year cost analyses of the allcove program, independent of the entity providing funding.

#3 Provide any 30 year cost analyses of compliance with the use of the \$6.3M in BHCIP funding - that is, 30 years of mental health services provision in the "allcove" building.


I look forward to a flood of analysis that would inform the District Resident-Taxpayers of their financial burden exposure from allcove.

THE PRECEDING E-MAIL, INCLUDING ANY ATTACHMENTS, CONTAINS INFORMATION THAT MAY BE CONFIDENTIAL, BE PROTECTED BY ATTORNEY CLIENT OR OTHER APPLICABLE PRIVILEGES, OR CONSTITUTE NON-PUBLIC INFORMATION. IT IS INTENDED TO BE CONVEYED ONLY TO THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENT. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OF THIS MESSAGE, PLEASE NOTIFY THE SENDER BY REPLYING TO THIS MESSAGE AND THEN DELETE IT FROM YOUR SYSTEM. USE, DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION, OR REPRODUCTION OF THIS MESSAGE BY UNINTENDED RECIPIENTS IS NOT AUTHORIZED AND MAY BE UNLAWFUL. PLEASE NOTE THAT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE BEACH CITIES HEALTH DISTRICT, ALONG WITH ALL ATTACHMENTS OR OTHER ITEMS, MAY BE SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT. THE BEACH CITIES HEALTH DISTRICT SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY CLAIMS, LOSSES OR DAMAGES RESULTING FROM THE DISCLOSURE OR USE OF ANY INFORMATION, DATA OR OTHER ITEMS THAT MAY BE CONTAINED IN ANY CORRESPONDENCE.

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [PRR](#); [Noel Chun](#); [Jane Diehl](#); [Kevin Cody](#); [Michelle Bholat](#); [Martha Koo](#)
Cc: [CityClerk](#); cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov; cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov; citycouncil@manhattanbeach.gov; [City Council](#)
Subject: Re: CPRA to BCHD and Public Comment to Mayors and Councils of the District Cities
Date: Saturday, September 20, 2025 7:05:10 PM

CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

Gosh, one would think that 3 days would have been plenty of time for BCHD to provide some of its 30 year cost analyses that it alleges to have on the shelf. But so far, nothing.

On Tue, Sep 16, 2025 at 11:04 PM Mark Nelson (Home Gmail)  wrote:

CEO Bakaly implies that BCHD has 30 year analyses, despite its statement in a November 2023 CPRA response that it had none.

Therefore, this PRR provides the CEO the ability to provide ANY analyses of costs for allcove, the allcove building, and compliance with the BHCIP 30 year terms.

#1 Provide any 30-year cost analyses of the operation, maintenance and upkeep of the proposed allcove building.

#2 Provide any 30 year cost analyses of the allcove program, independent of the entity providing funding.

#3 Provide any 30 year cost analyses of compliance with the use of the \$6.3M in BHCIP funding - that is, 30 years of mental health services provision in the "allcove" building.

I look forward to a flood of analysis that would inform the District Resident-Taxpayers of their financial burden exposure from allcove.

From: [Ginny Weinert](#)
To: [CityClerk](#)
Subject: Non-Agenda Comment: Support Certification and Approval of C Line Extension to Torrance
Date: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 2:41:16 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

City Clerk City Clerk,

Dear Mayor Light and City Council Members,

As a Redondo Beach resident, I urge you to support certification and approval of the Metro C Line Extension to Torrance project and its Final EIR to the LA Metro Board.

This extension represents a once-in-a-generation opportunity to bring light rail further into the South Bay and strengthen Redondo Beach's economic future. The Extension to Torrance will reduce regional traffic congestion by providing a fast, direct transit connection between Redondo Beach, Torrance, LAX, Inglewood, and the E Line. It will link our city's Redondo Beach Transit Center to the Torrance Transit Center by rail—enhancing mobility for the city's residents, workers, and visitors.

The project delivers major local benefits for Redondo: The Hybrid Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) modernizes the existing freight corridor with upgraded trackwork, safer pedestrian crossings, and quiet zone-ready improvements—making it safer and quieter for nearby neighborhoods. Improved access to the South Bay Galleria area will strengthen redevelopment, support new housing and jobs, and bring long-term tax revenue to the city. The project also supports Redondo Beach's mobility goals by creating new walking and biking paths connecting to planned bike paths on Grant Avenue and Redondo Beach Boulevard.

Metro's Hybrid LPA is both cost-effective and inclusive—it thoughtfully addresses community concerns and provides the most viable project, while generating over 15,000 jobs and attracting approximately 1.5 million new annual riders. As a Redondo Beach resident, I strongly support the project and the Hybrid LPA. I urge the City Council to recognize the broad community support for this transformative project and advocate for its timely certification and construction. Thank you.

Ginny
California