

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 AUGUST 5, 2025

J.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

- **PUBLIC COMMUNICATION**

From: Mark Nelson (Home Gmail)
To: CityClerk; James Light; Paige Kaluderovic; Brad Waller; Chadwick B. Castle; Scott Behrendt; Zein Obagi
Cc: Kevin Cody
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT - 8/5/25 RBCC - Flawed Assumptions by RBPW on 500-600 N Prospect Intersection = Flawed Outcome by RBPW
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 3:35:34 PM
Attachments: image.png
REFUTE RBPW Assumptions of REQUIRED on-street parking 8-1-25 7AM (1).mp4


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

We were finally able to extract the finalized plan from RBPW after a 30-day wait from an email request and then a follow-up formal CPRA request. The following is by no means a totality of issues, it is however, a fact-based discussion of some of the more obvious errors.

RBPW ASSUMPTION ERRORS - 1) Wrong-way traffic is NOT thru traffic from residents; 2) Wrong-way traffic IS from illegal U-turns off Prospect

In its meetings, RBPW has represented that it believes (without evidence and against video evidence) that illegal, wrong way traffic is from residents on the street. While there is one resident that routinely drives illegally the against the one way, we have plenty of video of her actions and can let the RBPW pay a visit later. Otherwise, as demonstrated with video to the PWSC and RBPW, the overwhelming majority of wrong way traffic is generated by ILLEGAL U TURNS FROM PROSPECT


RBPW RESULTING DESIGN FLAW - 1) RBPW wrongly concludes that ON STREET PARKING is required to stop wrong-way traffic



When in reality and as demonstrated in numerous videos presented to RBPW, the illegal U-turn vehicles - the overwhelming majority of wrong way traffic - are not deterred by RBPW's incorrect assumption of a parked vehicle, nor the decades old, ineffective street signage lack of effective street lettering warnings.

The attached video shows 2 cars at the intersection, 2 adults attempting to warn an illegal U-turner, and an ILLEGAL U-TURN. The parking cited by RBPW has absolutely no impact on the illegal action. The same can be said for the ineffective signage and road lettering. Excerpt are below.

NOTE: The white car is parked illegally across the driveway in violation of California Vehicle Code (CVC) 22500 - narrowing the already narrow 26-foot wide roadway and creating a hazard for emergency response. Two pedestrians are pointing north to the illegal U-turner. And finally, there is no sidewalk on the east side of the frontage with the disabled bus stop. The closest ADA access to the sidewalk on the west side of the frontage is over 200-feet away.



The video can be viewed at <https://youtu.be/ZmuUI6byY8Q> as well. **CLEARLY - CARS PARKED IN THE INTERSECTION ARE NOT A DETERRENT AS ASSUMED BY RBPW**

RBPW IGNORED THE PLENTIFUL ON-STREET PARKING - No preservation of one parking spot is meaningful nor needed

As previously demonstrated to both the RBPW and the Council, there are 68 on-street parking places in the 2 blocks of the Prospect frontage for 27 homes. Each home has a 2 car garage and a 2 car (or 3 car) driveway. At 2.5 on street parking spaces per home, this area is likely the "richest" neighborhood in on-street parking in the City.


In short, now that the RBPW finally released a final plan on July 30, 2025 for the intersection, it is clear that it is flawed.

From: Mark Nelson (Home Gmail)
To: City Clerk; James Light; Paige Kaluderovic; Brad Waller; Chadwick B. Castle; Scott Behrendt; Zein Obagi
Cc: Kevin Cody
Subject: PUBLIC COMMENT - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION 8/5/25 RBCC - Flawed Assumptions by RBPW on 500-600 N Prospect Intersection = Flawed Outcome by RBPW
Date: Monday, August 4, 2025 10:18:39 PM
Attachments: image.png
image.png
image.png
Attempted Illegal U Turn Wrong Way Thwarted by Good Samaritan (1).mp4

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

Further Example of the ineffectiveness of parked cars in the intersection from reducing illegal U-turn, wrong way traffic. In this video a good Samaritan catches the attention of the illegal turning driver, points upward to the decades old ineffective wrong way sign, and with personal interaction, is able to stop the illegal turn.

Note that the 5500 pound white van and illegally parked Range Rover across the driveway did NOTHING to thwart the planned illegal U-turn and wrong way driver. Only the personal intervention of a neighbor "literally" pointing to a thoroughly misplaced sign was able to get the point across. This is yet another example of why evidence is so critical, especially in the face of flawed assumptions. Watch the video to see the determination of the pedestrian..




On Mon, Aug 4, 2025 at 3:34 PM Mark Nelson (Home Gmail) [REDACTED] wrote:

We were finally able to extract the finalized plan from RBPW after a 30-day wait from an email request and then a follow-up formal CPRA request. The following is by no means a totality of issues, it is however, a fact-based discussion of some of the more obvious errors.

RBPW ASSUMPTION ERRORS - 1) Wrong-way traffic is NOT thru traffic from residents; 2) Wrong-way traffic IS from illegal U-turns off Prospect

In its meetings, RBPW has represented that it believes (without evidence and against video evidence) that illegal, wrong way traffic is from residents on the street. While there is one resident that routinely drives illegally against the one way, we have plenty of video of her actions and can let the RBPW pay a visit later. Otherwise, as demonstrated with video to the PWSC and RBPW, the overwhelming majority of wrong way traffic is generated by ILLEGAL U TURNS FROM PROSPECT

RBPW RESULTING DESIGN FLAW - 1) RBPW wrongly concludes that ON STREET PARKING is required to stop wrong-way traffic



When in reality and as demonstrated in numerous videos presented to RBPW, the illegal U-turn vehicles - the overwhelming majority of wrong way traffic - are not deterred by RBPW's incorrect assumption of a parked vehicle, nor the decades old, ineffective street signage lack of effective street lettering warnings.

The attached video shows 2 cars at the intersection, 2 adults attempting to warn an illegal U-turner, and an ILLEGAL U-TURN. The parking cited by RBPW has absolutely no impact on the illegal action. The same can be said for the ineffective signage and road lettering. Excerpt are below.

NOTE: The white car is parked illegally across the driveway in violation of California Vehicle Code (CVC) 22500 - narrowing the already narrow 26-foot wide roadway and creating a hazard for emergency response. Two pedestrians are pointing north to the illegal U-turner. And finally, there is no sidewalk on the east side of the frontage with the disabled bus stop. The closest ADA access to the sidewalk on the west side of the frontage is over 200-feet away.



The video can be viewed at <https://youtu.be/ZmuUI6byY8Q> as well. CLEARLY - CARS PARKED IN THE INTERSECTION ARE NOT A DETERRENT AS ASSUMED BY RBPW

RBPW IGNORED THE PLENTIFUL ON-STREET PARKING - No preservation of one parking spot is meaningful nor needed

As previously demonstrated to both the RBPW and the Council, there are 68 on-street parking places in the 2 blocks of the Prospect frontage for 27 homes. Each home has a 2 car garage and a 2 car (or 3 car) driveway. At 2.5 on street parking spaces per home, this area is likely the "richest" neighborhood in on-street parking in the City.

In short, now that the RBPW finally released a final plan on July 30, 2025 for the intersection, it is clear that it is flawed.

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [Communications](#); [CityClerk](#); [City Council](#); [cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov](#); [cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov](#); [citycouncil@manhattanbeach.gov](#)
Subject: Public Comment - All Agencies - BCHD FACT CHECK on RFI
Date: Tuesday, July 22, 2025 3:57:04 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)

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

BCHD FACT CHECK SHEET JULY 2025 (PUBLIC COMMENT)

- CLAIM:** BCHD committed to a parking and greenspace buffer between Residential and BCHD's Commercial, Private development cite: (BCHD CWG Presentations, Mtg #1 5/15/17 p.25, Mtg #2 6/19/25 p.7)
- FACT:** FALSE: BCHD provided a 6-story building proposal on the site perimeter with NO BUFFER. cite: (BCHD CWG Presentation, 7/31/17 p.8)
BCHD LIED TO THE COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP AND SURROUNDING NEIGHBORS IN THE FIRST TWO CWG MEETINGS IN MAY AND JUNE 2017 REGARDING ITS PLANS.
- CLAIM:** *"due to seismic concerns, it (BCHD) would tear down the hospital"* cite: (Easy Reader BCHD Interview 7/3/25)
- FACT:** FALSE: There are no seismic requirements that would result in a retrofit nor demolition of the building. cite: (BCHD Consultant Youssef Assoc. CWG Presentation 1/16/18 p.6)
BCHD WANTS TO TEAR DOWN THE BUILDING AND THE VOTERS REJECTED THEM
- CLAIM:** *"six-story former South Bay Hospital"* cite: (Easy Reader BCHD Interview 7/3/25)
- FACT:** FALSE: The hospital building is only 4-stories cite: (BCHD Certified FEIR, p 3.4-4 9/2/21)
DID BCHD LIE TO THE GOVERNORS OFFICE AND VIOLATE CEQA?
- CLAIM:** *"This (project offering) is a lot smaller ..."* cite: (Easy Reader BCHD Interview 7/3/25)
- FACT:** FALSE: The current 4.6-acre project offering is 1.5-times the size of the immediately prior 3-acre, failed PMB LLC proposal. No offering of the entire 10-acre campus has EVER been issued. cite for 4.6-acre offer (BCHD June 2025 Fact Sheet). cite for PMB 3-acre lease (BCHD Board Meeting, Cain Investment Bankers page 1, 9/28/22)
BCHD TRIED TO COMPARE THE CURRENT RFI TO A NON-EXISTENT HYPOTHETICAL
- CLAIM:** *"Height is to be limited to 60 feet – that of the four-story main hospital building"* cite: (Easy Reader BCHD Interview 7/3/25)
- FACT:** FALSE: The hospital building is only 51.5 feet tall while the remaining projection (penthouse) is 24.75 feet tall. cite: (BCHD filing with City of Redondo Beach 2/2/22 p 13.) **DID BCHD LIE TO THE CITY IN ITS PRE-CUP?**
- CLAIM:** BCHD has received more than a 1000 comments on how to modernize the facility cite: (BCHD June 2025 Fact Sheet)
- FACT:** PARTIALLY TRUE: BCHD fails to disclose that 95% of the 1317 pages of comments objected to BCHD's plan to certify the 133-foot tall, 6-story, 300,000 sqft facility. cite: (BCHD Certified FEIR, Appendix N)
- CLAIM:** *"completed bike path"* cite: (BCHD June 2025 Fact Sheet)
- FACT:** PARTIALLY TRUE: BCHD failed to disclose that at a cost of \$2.1M, the 400-foot bike path is the most expensive bike path per foot constructed in the US. cite: (Google AI, Seattle's \$2200 per foot is believed to be the highest cost bike path before BCHD)

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [Communications](#); [CityClerk](#); cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov; cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov
Subject: Public Comment - All Agencies - Data showing that gardening decreases BMI has been falsified
Date: Tuesday, July 22, 2025 12:39:48 PM

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

Like BCHD, others make false claims about the causality and performance of their programs.

The following demonstrates the fallacy in believing sources like BCHD.

The Improbable Case of Gardening and Obesity

In our paper, we illustrate these concepts by examining the idea that gardening can treat or prevent obesity. Although space limits in this post prohibit full exposition, we and others have shown that expecting large effects of gardening on obesity was never reasonable. We further contend that there is not a single study showing a causal effect of gardening on either prevention or treatment of obesity, and at least one study shows no statistically significant effect on any obesity measure. Nevertheless, there is a body of literature that treats the notion of a causal relationship between gardening and obesity as having a high degree of credibility.

One recent evidence synthesis from 2023 concluded, "...we investigated... school gardening... Types of positive outcomes included ...improved BMI..." However, the literature cited to support that claim variously did not measure BMI, did not find changes in BMI score, did not analyze gardening as a primary intervention, or contained other errors. Then, that synthesis was cited in a 2025 review of gardening (with a focus on cancer prevention) as showing "improvements in anthropomorphic outcomes after gardening initiatives." Evidence provided to support that claim also included a paper (which was already part of the 2023 synthesis) that found that "changes in cooking and gardening behaviors were not associated with changes in BMI z-score or waist circumference."

While this science may (and likely will) be corrected over time, the specific types of errors made in the gardening and obesity literature appear, in the short term, to be cultivating additional errors.

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [Communications](#); [CityClerk](#); [Jane Diehl](#); [Michelle Bholat](#); [Noel Chun](#); [Martha Koo](#); [Chadwick B. Castle](#); [Brad Waller](#); [Paige Kaluderovic](#); [Kevin Cody](#); [Scott Behrendt](#); [Zein Obagi](#); cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov; cityclerk@hermosabeach.gov; [City Council](#); citycouncil@manhattanbeach.gov
Subject: Public Comment All Agencies - BCHD's Board Meeting 7-23-25
Date: Tuesday, July 22, 2025 1:14:09 AM

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

BCHD's 6-year plan is defective. Measure BC's rejection by nearly 20% was a clear repudiation of 91% non-resident service area ALLCOVE, demolition of the hospital, creation of open space, and further spending on a flawed and failed campus privatization. The Board wasted over \$12M so far on pre-development costs for the hLC - cost that NEVER should have been paid by TAXPAYERS. Developers pay pre-development costs, unless of course the landowner is incompetent or inexperienced or both in the art of development.

The City Councils of Hermosa, Manhattan and Redondo Beach have the legal ability as impacted agencies to request dissolution of BCHD at LALAFCO if the District continues to ignore the will or the voters.

BCHD Comment

Goal A is faulty. The Community is undefined. The community must be defined as the 3 beach cities comprised of resident-taxpayers in Hermosa, Redondo and Manhattan Beach. Measure BC was soundly rejected. It would have funded the 91% non-resident service area of ALLCOVE. The rejection is a clear voice of the BCHD owners that out-of-district services should not be provided.

Goal B is also faulty. It too fails to define Community as the resident-taxpayers of the three beach cities. Clearly, the failure of Measure BC was a vote not to extend services to the rest of SPA8 and disapproval to build any ALLCOVE facility for non-residents.

Goal C is defective. BCHD spends roughly \$1M annually on marketing-communications. The resident-taxpayers of the 3 beach cities cannot afford any more "bought and paid for" awareness. The limit of BCHD communications must be the contiguous limit of the three combined cities.

Goal D is defective. BCHD is thoroughly inept and untrustworthy with the funds of resident-taxpayers. BCHD plans to accept a meager \$6.3M ALLCOVE grant that will require 30-years of operation of both the ALLCOVE building and ALLCOVE program for the 91% non-resident service area of SPA8. The estimated 30 year cost is in excess of \$150M. BCHD is either incapable of computing the 30-year cost, or refuses to do so. That is based on BCHD CPRA responses.

BCHD's Measure BC was rejected. Voters who are the resident-taxpayers of the District rejected the plan to demolish the Hospital. They rejected the plan to create open space. They rejected the plan to fund an ALLCOVE building and they rejected any more wasted funds on the HLC development or consultants. Clearly the resident-taxpayers voted "no confidence" in the BCHD Executives and future spending plans.

From: Mark Nelson (Home Gmail)
To: CityClerk; Chadwick B. Castle; Brad Waller; Paige Kaluderovic; Scott Behrendt; Zein Obagi; James Light
Cc: Kevin Cody; Communications; info@redondochamber.org; Jane Diehl; Noel Chun; Martha Koo; Michelle Bholat
Subject: Public Comment RBCC - Non Agenda Item : BCHD's Attack on Surrounding Property Owners and Residents
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 9:25:44 PM
Attachments: image.png
image.png

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

The Neighbors of BCHD. Our Lived Experience 2017-2025.

May 15, 2017. BCHD Lied to the Working Group.


BCHD formed the Community Working Group (CWG) in 2017 to consult about their HLC plans. The group consisted of local leaders (Mayor Light was a member) and neighboring residents.

At the VERY FIRST MEETING – BCHD committed to protecting the surrounding neighborhoods from the development with a buffer of parking and greenspace, as seen in the BCHD slide #25.

The CWG was unaware that BCHD was actively spending hundreds of thousands of resident-taxpayer dollars to develop a plan with 4-story and 6-story buildings on the edge of the site UP AGAINST TORRANCE AND REDONDO BEACH.

Healthy Living Campus Parking Approach

BCHD claimed it would buffer homes from their project with parking and green space



#25

June 19, 2017. BCHD Repeated the Lie at the next Working Group.

July 31, 2017. BCHD Presented its REAL PLAN.

While BCHD was busy misleading the CWG, City Officials, and Neighbors, it was developing a plan to put 4-story and 6-story buildings up against homes along Beryl, Flagler, and Diamond.

OBVIOUSLY, BCHD had a contract with consultant Withee Malcolm prior to the 1st and 2nd CWG meetings where BCHD Executives LIED to the CWG.

BCHD WILLFULLY MISLED THE CWG AND NEIGHBORS

BCHD'S CREDIBILITY WITH LOCAL RESIDENTS ENDED ON JULY 31, 2017.

Site Concept Plan Review



IT'S BEEN A LONG 8 YEARS FOR RESIDENTS

- Measure BC Voters DENIED the misguided plans of the Board and Executives of BCHD.
- BCHD claimed that the hospital must be demolished for seismic despite no legal requirement.
- Over 95% of the 1,317 pages of comments to the BCHD EIR objected to the project's impacts.
- BCHD accepted a mere \$6M ALLCOVE construction grant that requires 30-year building and ALLCOVE operation for all of LA County SPA8 (1.4M pop) without any long-term funding source.

The Board and Executive Management of BCHD are Uniquely Unqualified to Undertake ANY Development

BCHD BUILT THE MOST EXPENSIVE BIKE PATH IN THE U.S. PER FOOT!

The 400-foot bike path in Flagler Alley and on existing Diamond St cost \$2,064,568 (\$5,161.42 PER FOOT). The City of LA's bike path cost is under \$350 per foot. (Note: 2nd most expensive bike path was under \$2,300 per foot in Seattle.)



LANDOWNERS DO NOT PAY PRE-DEVELOPMENT COSTS – DEVELOPERS DO!

SO FAR – BCHD has used up **over \$12M in Resident-Taxpayer funds on PRE-DEVELOPMENT** for the HLC. Only an inexperienced landowner would foot the bill for its “development partner” and let them terminate the agreement for convenience with no payment. That’s nearly ONE FULL YEAR of District services that’s being denied to Resident-Taxpayers because our funds were squandered by BCHD.

RESIDENT-TAXPAYERS HAVE SUBSIDIZED NON-RESIDENT CHF MEMBERS SINCE THE 1990s

In a public records response, BCHD provided data showing about one-third of CHF members were non-residents. There is NO REASON that Resident-Taxpayers should subsidize non-resident costs. **We have NO IDEA what the costs have been, since BCHD refuses to track RESIDENT vs NON-RESIDENT costs.**



LAFCO AGREED BCHD CAN REQUIRE RESIDENCY FOR ALL PROGRAMS

So why is BCHD providing subsidized services to non-residents using Resident-Taxpayer assets and funds? The South Bay Hospital lawyers' pleading asked for condemnation of the Prospect campus for the benefit of “**residents who reside**” **within the District**. Ultimately it was expanded for compliance with Hill-Burton Act funding to “and others”. BUT CLEARLY – THE LAWYERS WERE PRESENTING THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF THE SCOPE OF THE DISTRICT IN THE PLEADING.

THE \$6M ALLCOVE BUILDING GRANT COST RESIDENT-TAXPAYERS UP TO \$150M+ ACROSS THE MANDATED 30-YEAR OPERATION

BCHD expanded the ALLCOVE service area to a 1.4M population of LA County SPA8 to win a \$6M grant. But that grant also required that BCHD operate ALLCOVE for 30-years minimum WITH NO LONG TERM FUNDING GRANT. That's absurd that 120,000 RESIDENTS fund services for 1.28M NON-RESIDENTS. BCHD conducted NO Cost-Benefit analysis. A \$6M grant that requires \$150M+ across 30 years in services is \$1 of benefit for \$25 of costs.

THE VOTERS HAVE SPOKEN IN DENYING MEASURE BC. NO DEMOLITION. NO ALLCOVE BUILDING. NO GREENSPACE.

- Measure BC Voters DENIED the misguided plans of the Board and Executives of BCHD.
- BCHD claimed that the hospital must be demolished for seismic despite no legal requirement.
- Over 95% of the 1,317 pages of comments to the BCHD EIR objected to the project's impacts.
- BCHD accepted a mere \$6M ALLCOVE construction grant that requires 30-year building and ALLCOVE operation for LA County SPA8 (1.4M pop) without any long-term funding source.

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); [Zein Obagi](#); [Brad Waller](#); [Paige Kaluderovic](#); [Chadwick B. Castle](#); [Scott Behrendt](#)
Cc: [Kevin Cody](#)
Subject: Public Comment RBCC Meeting - The City's Standing to Request Dissolution of the BCHD on behalf of City resident-taxpayers
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 7:07:04 PM

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

In order to simplify future public comments to the City Council regarding BCHD:

As an "affected local agency," the City of Redondo Beach has standing at LA LAFCO under Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg to request a dissolution hearing of BCHD.

The actions of BCHD that damage the resident-taxpayers of the City (such as BCHD taking on \$150M+ of ALLCOVE debt for a 91% non-resident service area) can reasonably be considered by the City as an "affected agency." At such time as the City concludes the damages or risks to its constituents of BCHD's actions have become excessive, the City can move at LA LAFCO to dissolve BCHD.

Dissolving a California healthcare district is a formal legal process guided by the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act) and overseen by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) in each county.

Here are the general steps involved

Initiation of the process: Dissolution can be initiated by a petition from property owners or registered voters within the district, a resolution from an affected local agency, or in certain cases, by LAFCO itself.

LAFCO Public Hearing and Consideration: LAFCO will hold a public hearing to receive testimony and consider the proposed dissolution. Following the hearing, LAFCO will decide whether to approve or disapprove the proposal.

Public Hearing for Protests and Potential Election: If the dissolution is approved by LAFCO, a second public hearing may be required to consider any protests against the dissolution. Depending on the level of protest and other specific circumstances, LAFCO might need to order an election among the district's voters.

Dissolution Election (if required): If an election is ordered, the dissolution must be approved by a majority vote of the district's voters.

Winding up the district's affairs: As part of the dissolution process, the district's

assets and liabilities must be managed according to the CKH Act. This may involve coordinating with the California Attorney General's Office, Secretary of State, and Franchise Tax Board to ensure the proper distribution of assets and fulfillment of obligations.

LAFCO Staff Completes Dissolution Filings: After all requirements are met and, if applicable, the election results are certified, LAFCO staff will file the necessary documents to formally complete the dissolution.

Expedited Dissolution

Under the CKH Act, dissolution can be expedited if initiated by the district's board and aligned with a previous LAFCO action, allowing LAFCO to order dissolution without a protest period or election. Proposed legislation may further allow LAFCO to order dissolution without an election for districts meeting specific criteria like not receiving property tax and not providing direct healthcare services.

From: Mark Nelson (Home Gmail)
To: CityClerk; Chadwick B. Castle; Brad Waller; Paige Kaluderovic; Scott Behrendt; Zein Obagi; James Light
Cc: Kevin Cody
Subject: Public Comment: BCHD Caught in YET ANOTHER LIE! The hospital is 4 stories and 51.5-feet tall
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 9:37:41 PM
Attachments: image.png

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

Tom Bakaly's interview to the Easy Reader was MORE BIG LIES!


BCHD Certified in the FEIR that the hospital was only 4-stories TALL. WHO DID BCHD LIE TO? THE STATE OR THE ER?

"The invitation features only the six-story former South Bay Hospital and its ground parking lot."

BCHD filed a draft Pre-CUP that stated the 4-story hospital was 51.5-feet tall. WHY THE LIE TO THE ER?

"Height is to be limited to 60 feet – that of the four-story main hospital building, not counting its tower."

From the BCHD Pre-CUP to the City - WHO DID BCHD LIE TO? THE CITY in 2022?



These are LIES and BCHD cannot be trusted.

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); [Zein Obagi](#); [Chadwick B. Castle](#); [Brad Waller](#); [Paige Kaluderovic](#); [Scott Behrendt](#); [James Light](#)
Cc: [Kevin Cody](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Voters are Increasingly Fed Up with The District and its ABUSE OF SURROUNDING RESIDENTS
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 9:30:48 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)
[image.png](#)
[image.png](#)
[image.png](#)

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

VOTERS INCREASINGLY OPPOSE THE DISTRICT'S ACTIONS AND SPENDING

1956 - South Bay Hospital District was **Funded by 0.4%** or 39 votes of 9,843 (BCHD lobby wall)

1984 – South Bay Hospital **Financially Fails** as a public owned and operated entity and is turned over to professional, commercial third-party leasing (Daily Breeze 12/5/2015 archive article)

2024 – BCHD's Measure BC was **Rejected by 19.2%** or 12,087 votes of 63,047 (LACounty.gov)

REJECTED: BCHD's Board and Management Direction

REJECTED: Demolition of the Hospital


REJECTED: Preparing the Campus for Development

REJECTED: 30-Year Obligation for ALLCOVE building and services

The District Has Demonstrated Poor Judgement with Voter Rejection.
BCHD cannot be allowed to encumber 4.5 acres to commercial developers for multiple generations for its

REJECTED BOARD AND MANAGEMENT DIRECTION

NO CREDIBILITY– BCHD LIED TO THE CWG AND SURROUNDING NEIGHBORS FROM DAY ONE



At the inaugural meeting of the CWG, BCHD stated that it would build away from the edges of the site to protect the residents and buffer with parking

One month later at the next CWG meeting, BCHD presents hundred\$ of thousand\$ of dollar\$ in conSultant work to build on the edge of the campus

NO EXPERIENCE– BCHD FORCES TAXPAYERS TO TO PAY OVER \$13M PRE-DEVELOPMENT COSTS

LET'S TAKE COMMON SENSE FOR \$100

And the answer is: DEVELOPERS

Who pays PRE-DEVELOPMENT COSTS?

BCHD PRE-DEVELOPMENT BUDGET	\$13,865,700
BCHD 2024-25 BUDGET	\$15,628,000

RESIDENT-TAXPAYERS WERE DENIED A FULL YEAR OF HEALTH SERVICES DUE TO BCHD'S LACK OF DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE AND POOR DECISION MAKING PAYING COMMERCIAL DEVELOPER EXPENSES

LOST FOCUS – BCHD DOESN'T EVEN TRACK EXPENDITURES ON NON-RESIDENTS

1947 – Need survey for Hermosa/Manhattan/Redondo hospital beds

1955 – Vote by H/M/R to form Hospital District (specific ballot language lost by the District)

1957 – District files pleading for condemnation of land for a hospital for the “**residents who reside**” within the District – **CONTEMPORANEOUS DOCUMENTATION OF SCOPE**

AT SOME POINT SBHD MUST HAVE READ THE HILL-BURTON ACT AND REALIZED THAT IT NEEDED TO ADD and others for ER services FOR FEDERAL FUNDING

1998-present – BCHD provides taxpayer subsidies to non-residents for use of CHF, Adventure Plex and other activities (only Care Management and Blue Zones restaurants are resident only activities)

2022 – BCHD provides ALLCOVE to a 91% (1.4M) non-resident LA County SPA8 market
BCHD receives \$6M of \$15M required to build ALLCOVE building and with **UNFUNDED REQUIREMENT to provide ALLCOVE to all SPA8 (1.4M pop) with NO OPERATING FUNDING. BCHD also encumbers taxpayer land for 30 years to ALLCOVE use.**

LALAFCO stated that there was NO PROHIBITION TO BCHD having a RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR ALL SERVICES.

TAXPAYERS CAN GET THE VALUE OF THEIR TAXES AND ASSETS!

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: communications@bchd.org
Cc: [CityClerk](#); [Noel Chun](#); [Martha Koo](#); [Michelle Bholat](#); [Jane Diehl](#)
Subject: Re: CORRECTION: Join us for Volunteer Day 2025, Healthy Living Campus Updates, Summer Tips and more...
Date: Friday, July 18, 2025 12:19:40 PM

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

Public Comment - BCHD spends \$1M in marcomm costs annually. Mistakes on simple facts like dates are inexcusable.

This is no different than BCHD stating that the 4 story hospital is 60-feet tall, when BCHD's consultants already labeled it as 51.5-feet.

Whether it's lying or poor quality control - BCHD cannot tell the truth.

On Fri, Jul 18, 2025 at 9:49 AM Beach Cities Health District <communications@bchd.org> wrote:

