



100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project

Final Environmental Impact Report

SCH#2021030597

prepared by

City of Redondo Beach

Community Development Department

415 Diamond Street

Redondo Beach, California 90277

Contact: Antonio Gardea, AICP, Senior Planner

prepared with the assistance of

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

250 East 1st Street, Suite 1400

Los Angeles, California 90012

April 2022

100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project

Final Environmental Impact Report

SCH#2021030597

prepared by

City of Redondo Beach

Community Development Department

415 Diamond Street

Redondo Beach, California 90277

Contact: Antonio Gardea, AICP, Senior Planner

prepared with the assistance of

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

250 East 1st Street, Suite 1400

Los Angeles, California 90012

April 2022



RINCON CONSULTANTS, INC.

Environmental Scientists | Planners | Engineers

rinconconsultants.com

This report prepared on 50% recycled paper with 50% post-consumer content.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1-1
1.1	Format of the Final EIR.....	1-1
1.2	Environmental Review Process.....	1-2
1.3	Revisions to the Draft EIR.....	1-3
2	Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR.....	2-1
3	Errata	3-1
3.1	Impact Analysis Revisions	3-1
3.2	Effect of In-Text Revisions.....	3-2
4	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.....	4-1

Appendices

Appendix A Draft Environmental Impact Report and Appendices

This page intentionally left blank

1 Introduction

This Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the City of Redondo Beach (City) for the proposed mixed-use development located at 100, 112, 116, 124, and 132 North Catalina Avenue, Redondo Beach, California, or the 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (hereafter referred to as the “proposed project” or “project”). This Final EIR complies with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) statutes (California Public Resources Code [PRC], Section 21000 et. seq., as amended) and implementing guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et. seq.) (the *CEQA Guidelines*).

Before approving a project that may cause a significant environmental impact, CEQA requires the lead agency to prepare and certify a Final EIR. The City has the principal responsibility for approval of the proposed project and is considered the lead agency under PRC Section 21067. According to the *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15132, the Final EIR shall consist of:

- The Draft EIR or a revision of the Draft EIR;
- Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary;
- A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR;
- The responses of the lead agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process; and
- Any other information added by the lead agency.

The Draft EIR and its appendices are included as Appendix A to the Final EIR and can also be found on the City’s website: www.redondo.org/CatalinaVillage. To clarify, while the Final EIR under the *CEQA Guidelines* includes the Draft EIR, the “Final EIR” in this document will refer to everything contained in this document (as described in Section 1.1, *Format of the Final EIR*) and not the Draft EIR, whereas “EIR” will refer both to the Final EIR and the Draft EIR.

1.1 Format of the Final EIR

The Final EIR summarizes the project information presented in the Draft EIR and contains responses to comments on environmental issues received from agencies, organizations, and individuals who reviewed the Draft EIR as part of the 45-day public review period, which began on December 2, 2021, and ended on January 18, 2022, for the proposed project. The Final EIR consists of the following four sections:

- **Section 1 – Introduction.** This section summarizes the contents of the Final EIR and the environmental review process.
- **Section 2 – Response to Comments on the Draft EIR.** During the public review period for the Draft EIR, the City received written comment letters pertaining to the Draft EIR. This section contains a summary of these comment letters (provided by individuals and agencies) and the City’s responses to the comments that raise significant environmental points.
- **Section 3 – Errata.** A comment that is addressed in Section 2 resulted in minor revisions to the information contained in the Draft EIR. These revisions are shown in strikeout and underline text in this chapter.

- **Section 4 – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.** This section of the Final EIR provides the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the proposed project. The MMRP is presented in tabular format and identifies mitigation measures for the proposed project, the enforcing agency, the actions required by the responsible agency, the implementation period for each measure, and the monitoring period for each measure. The MMRP also provides a section for recordation of mitigation reporting.

1.2 Environmental Review Process

Notice of Preparation

The City determined that an EIR would be required for the proposed project and issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP), which was filed with the Los Angeles County Clerk and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, interested agencies and groups, and the public on March 25, 2021, for 33-days. Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15082, recipients of the NOP were requested to provide responses during the public review period after their receipt of the NOP. In addition, the City held a virtual EIR Scoping Meeting on April 8, 2021. The purpose of this meeting was to seek input from public agencies and the general public regarding the environmental issues and concerns that may potentially result from the proposed project. The NOP public review period ended on April 26, 2021. Written comments received during the NOP public review period, as well as verbal comments received during the Scoping Meeting, were considered during the preparation of this EIR. The NOP and NOP comments are included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. Table 1-1 of the Draft EIR summarizes the content of the letters and Scoping Meeting comments and identifies where the issues are addressed in the Draft EIR or the Initial Study. The Initial Study is included in Appendix B of the Draft EIR.

Noticing and Availability of the Draft EIR

The Draft EIR was made available for public review and comment pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15087. The 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR started on December 2, 2021 and ended on January 18, 2022. The Draft EIR and Notice of Completion (NOC) were submitted to the State Clearinghouse on December 2, 2021. A Notice of Availability (NOA), which included a City website link to the posted Draft EIR, was mailed to 47 agencies and organizations. In addition, the NOA was sent to individuals who had previously requested such notice in writing. The NOA and NOC were also filed at the Los Angeles County Clerk on December 6, 2021. The NOA described where the document was available and how to submit comments on the Draft EIR. The NOA and Draft EIR were also made available for public review at the City of Redondo Beach Community Development Department, local libraries (i.e., the City's Main Library and North Branch Library), and on the City's website. The public review period provided interested public agencies, groups, and individuals the opportunity to comment on the contents of the Draft EIR.

Final EIR

The Final EIR addresses the comments received during the public review period and includes minor changes to the text of the Draft EIR in accordance with comments that necessitated revisions. As demonstrated by the following discussion, the refinements to the project as a result of these revisions would not cause new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts and therefore do not warrant recirculation of the EIR. Accordingly, this Final EIR will be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council for

potential certification as the environmental document for the proposed project. All persons who commented on the Draft EIR will be notified of the availability of the Final EIR prior to the public hearings, and all agencies that commented on the Draft EIR will be provided with a copy of the Final EIR at least 10 days before EIR certification, pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088(b). The Final EIR is also posted on the City's website: www.redondo.org/CatalinaVillage.

Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091, the City shall make findings for each of the significant effects identified in this EIR and shall support the findings with substantial evidence in the record. After considering the Final EIR in conjunction with making findings under Section 15091, the lead agency may decide whether or how to approve or implement the project. The Final EIR for the proposed project identified potentially significant impacts that could result from project implementation. The City finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of project approval will still result in certain impacts being significant and unavoidable. As such, a statement of overriding considerations prepared pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15093 is required for this project.

In addition, when approving a project, public agencies must also adopt a MMRP describing the changes that were incorporated into the proposed project or made a condition of project approval to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15097). The MMRP is adopted at the time of project approval and is designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. Upon approval of the proposed project, the City will be responsible for implementation of the proposed project's MMRP.

1.3 Revisions to the Draft EIR

A comment received during the public review period for the Draft EIR resulted in several minor clarifications and modifications in the text of the Draft EIR. These changes are included as part of the Final EIR, to be presented to City decision makers for certification and project approval.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 sets forth requirements for why a lead agency must recirculate an EIR. A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR, but before certification of the Final EIR. New information may include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not considered significant unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. As defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088.5(a), significant new information requiring recirculation includes the following:

1. A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
2. A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
3. A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
4. The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

The minor clarifications, modifications, and editorial corrections that were made to the Draft EIR are shown in Section 3, *Errata*, of this Final EIR. As stated in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088.5(b), “recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.” None of the revisions that have been made to the EIR resulted in new significant impacts; none of the revisions resulted in a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact identified in the Draft EIR; and none of the revisions introduced a feasible project alternative or mitigation measure that is considerably different from those set forth in the Draft EIR. Furthermore, the revisions do not cause the Draft EIR to be so fundamentally flawed that it precludes meaningful public review. Because none of the CEQA criteria for recirculation have been met, recirculation of the EIR is not warranted.

2 Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

This section includes comments received during the public review period for the Draft EIR prepared for the proposed project. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public review period that began on December 2, 2021 and ended on January 18, 2022. The City of Redondo Beach received 49 comment letters on the Draft EIR, consisting of 47 letters from individuals and two letters from agencies. The commenters and the page number on which each commenter's letter appear are listed below.

Letter No. and Commenter		Page No.
Individuals (I)		
1	Alison Bailey	2-3
2	Surjit Hora	2-6
3	Mark Nelson	2-8
4	Ilse Callari-O'Neil	2-10
5	Kathryn Welsh	2-12
6	Colleen Yawn	2-14
7	Ginger Herrick	2-16
8	John Evans	2-18
9	Lauren Bergloff	2-20
10	Renee Dibrell	2-22
11	Meri Nuhbegovich	2-24
12	Barbara Epstein	2-26
13	Keatly Haldean	2-29
14	Nicholas Farrah	2-31
15	Paul Larson	2-33
16	Raman Gulati	2-35
17	James Meehan	2-37
18	Joyce Goldstein	2-39
19	Michael Lord	2-41
20	Jonathan Meister	2-43
21	Nata Hobba	2-45
22	Charles LeVine	2-47
23	Steve Bram	2-49
24	Kevin Hourigan	2-51
25	Steven Nelson	2-53
26	Kevin Nemandoust	2-55
27	Ashish Patel	2-57
28	Roy Sherman	2-59
29	Claudia Boghosian	2-61
30	Al Wahlberg	2-63

Letter No. and Commenter		Page No.
Individuals (I)		
31	Serena Shlomof	2-65
32	Russell Czuleger	2-67
33	Shmuel Siegel	2-69
34	Maxwell Allen	2-71
35	Liana Hamilton	2-73
36	Mark Murrel	2-75
37	Alisa True-Daniels	2-77
38	Kathie Gavin	2-79
39	Leslie Ogg	2-84
40	Sherry Ward	2-87
41	Amy Hudson	2-89
42	Emmett Jones	2-94
43	John Hanks	2-96
44	Eric Aukland	2-98
45	Brett Detmers	2-100
46	Regina Fisher	2-102
47	Kathleen Rebentisch	2-108
Agencies (A)		
1	Mandy Huffman, Environmental Planner, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts	2-110
2	Renee Purdy, Executive Officer, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board	2-113

The comment letters and responses follow. The comment letters have been numbered sequentially and each separate issue raised by the commenter, if more than one, has been assigned a number. The responses to each comment identify first the number of the comment letter, and then the number assigned to each issue (Response 1.1, for example, indicates that the response is for the first issue raised in comment Letter 1).

Letter 1

From: Alison Bailey [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, December 4, 2021 6:24 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Cc: Alison Bailey [REDACTED] >
Subject: Catalina Village Project at 100-132 N. Catalina Ave Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

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

Dear Mr. Gardea,

The development looks like it will be a much more intensive use of the land than previously/currently.

I am concerned with the on-street parking situation as a result of this development.

I have a unit on the Diamond street and Catalina Ave NW corner.

Parking is already at a premium on the north and south sides of Diamond with competition for people parking for the beach.

Will you be turning this into permit-only parking for residents as a result of the 30 new units proposed?

I viewed the April meeting video and the description of the parking seems inadequate for both the new residents (that could exceed this number in terms of how many people will live there and need parking given the number of bedrooms you listed in the meeting) and the businesses proposed of course.

Given the exceptionally large number of bedrooms you mentioned for these units, are these intended to be used as half-way homes, homeless rehousing, youth care homes or similar?

Where in the EIR do you address the parking situation expressly and the mitigation attempts to address this concern?

Thank you,
Alison Bailey

1.1

1.2

1.3

Letter I-1

COMMENTER: Alison Bailey

DATE: December 4, 2021

Response 1.1

The commenter states concern regarding the project's impacts on street parking as a result of the residential units and businesses proposed and adds that parking is already at a premium along Diamond Street with residents competing against people visiting the beach. The commenter asks if the City will be turning nearby on-street parking spaces into permit-only parking for residents as a result of the 30 proposed units.

The proposed project would provide a total of 72 on-site parking stalls including 66 residential parking spaces (i.e., 44 private garage spaces and 22 at-grade spaces) and six commercial parking spaces (i.e., all standard spaces). Each of the 22 townhomes would have at least two private garage parking spaces, and each of the eight apartment units would have access to at least two surface parking spaces. The project would also provide 22 bicycle parking spaces for residents and an additional 15 bicycle racks for guests. Furthermore, the project introduces transit-oriented living options with access to several bus routes operated by four transit operators, including the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), Los Angeles Department of Transportation Commuter Express (LADOT CE), Beach Cities Transit (BCT), and Torrance Transit (TT), which would encourage project residents to utilize public transportation rather than operate a personal vehicle.

While the project would provide six on-site parking spaces for commercial uses, an additional seven on-street parking spaces would be retained in front of the proposed commercial development as public/street parking to accommodate project patrons. The applicant requests a parking variance to allow for less parking than required for adaptive reuse of commercial structures.

The City does not currently have plans to modify on-street parking spaces in the project vicinity into permit-only parking for City residents, as part of this project. Although the concern regarding parking is noted, CEQA does not consider the adequacy of a project's parking or its "impacts on parking" unless it will result in significant secondary effects on the physical environment. Due to the project's provision of on-site parking, bicycle parking, and proximity to public transit options, the project would provide various transportation options for residents and patrons and no secondary effects on the physical environment would occur. As such, the commenter does not raise any significant environmental issues or raise other issues on the adequacy of the environmental analysis included in the EIR.

Response 1.2

The commenter asks if the proposed units are intended to be used as half-way homes, homeless rehousing, youth-care homes, or similar housing.

The units are not proposed for use as half-way homes, homeless rehousing, and/or youth-care homes. Rather, a project objective is to support the City's future housing needs by developing new quality multi-family, transit-oriented living options at different income levels including affordable housing units per California State Density Bonus law. Of the 30 proposed residential units, four units would be affordable units and would consist of two townhome units and two apartment units.

Response 1.3

The commenter asks where parking is addressed in the EIR and what mitigation is included to address the parking concern.

The commenter's concern regarding parking is noted; however, the provision of parking is not considered a CEQA issue (as discussed under Response 1.1) and is, therefore, not explicitly addressed in the EIR. The commenter does not raise any significant environmental issues or other issues on the adequacy of the environmental analysis included in the EIR.

Letter 2

From: Surjit Hora [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Project name 100-132 North Catalina Avenue

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

Dear Mr. Gardea,
Catalina is already congested with condominiums. Please do not make it more congested. Traffic is already too much. Please do not make it more difficult by adding more cars on the road. Please do not ruin our beautiful city by bringing more condominiums to this community. Thanks

Surjit Hora
The Village
Redondo Beach

2.1

Letter I-2

COMMENTER: Surjit Hora

DATE: December 6, 2021

Response 2.1

The commenter states that Catalina Avenue is already congested with condominiums and traffic and requests that City not make the situation more difficult by adding cars to the road.

Traffic impacts, including level of service (LOS) impacts from operational vehicle trips, were analyzed in Section 4.7, *Transportation*, of the Draft EIR although LOS impacts are no longer required for analysis under *CEQA Guidelines*. The project was determined to not conflict with any programs, plans, ordinances, or policies and would not involve any significant disruptions to the local public transit, active transportation, and roadway systems. In addition, the project was determined to have a less than significant impact related to LOS during a.m. or p.m. peak hours.

Specifically, page 4.7-16 of the Draft EIR states:

Based on the LOS analyses, the project is not expected to have any operational effects under the cumulative scenario. Under baseline and plus project conditions, all intersections operate at LOS D or better, with the exception of Intersection 6 (Pacific Coast Highway & Herondo Street/Anita Street), which operates at LOS E under all scenarios.

Therefore, the project would not result in significant operational effects under any analyzed scenario and would not worsen existing LOS E intersection conditions.

As of July 2020, the transportation analysis for a CEQA document requires a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis, which is now is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. For the purposes of this analysis, VMT refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. The analysis found that the proposed project would generate VMT exceeding the City's VMT per capita and VMT per employee thresholds of 11.1 and 15.3, respectively. Implementation of various transportation demand measures (TDM) (listed under Impact T-2 of Section 4.7) would reduce VMT for both the residential and commercial components of the project. However, implementation of TDMs would not be sufficient in mitigating the project's home-based VMT per capita. Therefore, the VMT associated with the project would be significant and unavoidable and the City's decision-makers will determine if the merits of the project outweigh this significant impact.

Letter 3

From: Mark Nelson (Home Gmail) [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, December 13, 2021 9:03 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: This isn't clear to me

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

The DEIR states

CONSTRUCTION NOISE While the City does not have specific noise level criteria for assessing construction impacts, the FTA has developed guidance for determining whether construction of a project would result in a substantial temporary increase in noise levels. Based on FTA guidance, for residential land uses, a significant impact would occur if construction noise exceeds an eight-hour 80 dBA Leq daytime noise limit and an eight-hour 70 dBA Leq nighttime noise limit. However, as discussed in Section 2, Project Description, construction hours would comply with Section 4-24.503 of the RBMC and would not occur during nighttime hours. Therefore, nighttime construction noise is not analyzed further

City of Redondo Beach 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project 4.6-12 herein. In addition, for commercial land uses, a significant impact would occur if construction noise exceeds an eight-hour 85 dBA Leq daytime noise limit (FTA 2018).

1. The site is zoned R-3, so it is residential and must comply with 80 dBA Leq, correct?
2. Even if the site were zoned commercial, since the adjoining receptors are residential, it would be required to comply with 80 dBA as well, correct?

If this is not the correct interpretation, please advise. The DEIR is not clear.

3.1

Letter I-3

COMMENTER: Mark Nelson

DATE: December 13, 2021

Response 3.1

The commenter provides an excerpt from Section 4.6, *Noise*, of the Draft EIR regarding construction noise and asks for clarification regarding the applicable Federal Transportation Authority (FTA) construction noise limit for the project and adjoining sensitive receptors.

Based on FTA guidance for residential land uses, a significant impact would occur if construction noise exceeds an eight-hour 80 dBA L_{eq} daytime noise limit and an eight-hour 70 dBA L_{eq} nighttime noise limit for residential receivers. However, project construction hours would comply with Redondo Beach Municipal Code (RBMC) Section 4-24.503 and would not occur during nighttime hours (i.e., between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays, between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m. on Saturdays) and would not occur at any time on Sundays or holidays. Therefore, nighttime construction noise would not occur and is not analyzed in the EIR.

Because the analysis focuses on project impacts to surrounding receivers, the construction noise analysis compares construction noise to the eight-hour 80 dBA L_{eq} daytime noise limit for adjacent residences. This would be the applicable limit to determine impacts to adjacent residences irrelevant of the project site's own proposed land use (e.g., residential or commercial). As determined in Section 4.6, Mitigation Measure N-1 (Construction Noise) would be required to implement noise-attenuation measures and reduce construction noise levels at adjacent uses to the north and east to a less than significance level. With implementation of mitigation, construction noise levels would not exceed the FTA standards at other residences and noise-sensitive uses.

Letter 4

From: Ilse Oneil [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2021 3:05 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Catalina 100-130 project

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

Please, please do not let this happen. Project is completely out of line with the area and should not be permitted at such a huge scale! Parking is inadequate for this size and traffic will be horrendous! I currently own property in redondo beach and hate to see these huge projects!

4.1

Sincerely,
Ilse Callari-O'Neil

Letter I-4

COMMENTER: Ilse Callari-O'Neil

DATE: December 14, 2021

Response 4.1

The commenter states that the project scale is out of line with the area and adds that parking and traffic would be horrendous as a result of the project.

An objective of the project is to improve the area by providing neighborhood-serving uses and amenities that cater to City residents and encourages pedestrian and bicycle activity through re-programming and reactivating the facades of the existing commercial buildings and providing access to a new shared courtyard and public bike racks. The project would include a stepped-back elevation of the buildings to integrate a gradual increase in scale, with the three-story townhomes located at the rear of the site. Furthermore, the project would also use the State Density Bonus and approval of an Affordable Housing Agreement. As part of the Density Bonus application, a waiver of the maximum height limit (development standard) and the following concessions and incentives are requested: mixed-use zoning for adaptive reuse of non-residential structures, lot consolidation of conforming lots, and three-story residential structure(s).

Please refer to Responses 1.1 and 2.1, which respectively address parking and traffic congestion concerns.

Letter 5

From: Kathryn Welsh [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2021 4:25 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project Draft EIR Comments

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

Hello,

There is already a dearth of parking in Redondo Beach west of Pacific Coast Highway.

I want to comment that 66 parking spaces is not nearly enough for 30 units.

Every unit will likely have at least two drivers and it is likely that the units with 5 and 7 bedrooms will have at least one driver per bedroom.

15 - 5 unit bedrooms and 3 - 7 unit bedrooms equals 96 drivers and that doesn't even include the other 12 units.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Welsh
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

5.1

Letter I-5

COMMENTER: Kathryn Welsh

DATE: December 16, 2021

Response 5.1

The commenter states that 66 parking spaces is not enough for the 30 proposed units under the assumption that every unit would have at least two drivers with others having at least one driver per bedroom.

Please refer to Response 1.1, which addresses parking concerns.

Letter 6

From: Colleen Yawn [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2021 4:07 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project Draft EIR Comments

I am very concerned about the proposed development at the location of the Old Catalina Coffee shop that was at 126 N. Catalina Avenue. The proposed development will have inadequate parking for the number of units. The proposed density is out of sync with the current housing in that area. I urge you to stop the 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project. Redondo Beach is not Silicon Valley. There is already a big traffic problem, lack of water and no personal space for citizens to enjoy. Please stop this terrible project. Don't destroy Redondo with your lust for money.

6.1

Colleen Yawn

Letter I-6

COMMENTER: Colleen Yawn

DATE: December 14, 2021

Response 6.1

The commenter states the project will have inadequate parking for the number of proposed units and adds that the proposed density is out of sync with existing housing in the area. The commenter adds that there is already a traffic issue, lack of water, and no personal space for residents to enjoy.

Please refer to Responses 1.1 and 2.1, which respectively address parking and traffic congestion concerns.

With respect to density, the project site has a General Plan land use designation of Low-Density Multi-Family Residential, which is intended to accommodate multiple-unit housing developments consistent with the project. The site is also zoned R-3A (Low-Density Multifamily Housing), which permits multi-family residences with a maximum density of 17.5 units per acre. While the project would provide 23.8 units per acre (based on a total of 30 units on a 1.26-acre site), the project would also use the State Density Bonus and approval of an Affordable Housing Agreement. The proposed Density Bonus uses State-mandated concessions and development standard waivers and thereby would not require amendments to the City's General Plan, Local Coastal Program, or the Redondo Beach Municipal Code (RBMC) – Coastal Land Use Plan Implementation Ordinance. With required approvals, the proposed uses and density would be consistent with the site's land use designation and zoning while also providing commercial/retail amenities for the surrounding neighborhood.

With respect to water supply, the City receives its water service from the California Water Service Company (Cal Water). The applicant received a will serve letter for the proposed project from Cal Water (see Appendix IS-5 of the Initial Study, which is included as Appendix B of the Draft EIR) on September 18, 2020, indicating that Cal Water would provide adequate water supplies to the project. The project would also comply with Chapter 7.113 of the RBMC which regulates the implementation of low impact development (LID) strategies for projects in the City of Redondo Beach. In addition, the project would include high-efficiency indoor water fixtures (e.g., toilets, sinks, showers) and landscape irrigation system, as well as drought-tolerant landscaping, to reduce water consumption.

Without additional context regarding the commenter's concern for lack of personal space, this response considers the site's existing conditions and potential to impact the City's existing open space uses. The site is currently developed with five buildings and associated surface parking lots. Therefore, the project would not be developed on existing open space. Furthermore, the project would also include 12,295 square feet of open space, consisting of 9,196 square feet of private space (i.e., roof decks and balconies), a 1,350-square-foot deck, a 525 square-foot roof lounge, and 1,214 square feet of common space (i.e., courtyard). Therefore, the project would include outdoor amenities such that on-site residents would not significantly impact the City's existing open space/parkland.

Letter 7

From: ging [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2021 5:43 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Concern Over Catalina Coffee House Proposed Planned Use

Hi Antonio,

I'm reaching out as a close by resident to the once Catalina Coffee House. From reading the information it appears that as residents we can reach out until Jan 18, 2022 to voice our concerns.

Given the location of the property and the proposed use, myself along with other are highly concerned that while there will be some commercial space that they are proposing 30 residential rental units, 15 of them to be 5 bedroom and 3 as 7 bedroom units and you're only allocating 66 parking spaces. This was described in a city council meeting as a Silicon Valley type co-housing" therefore the 5, 6, 7 bedroom units

Both the residential rental and the parking are huge concerns for our neighborhood. This property is on Catalina a major through fare and in addition given the the density being sought here it is completely out of sync with current housing in the area and the parking allotted for the project is way under what will be needed. This poses congestion problems, density liveability issues, filled up needed street parking, and just overcrowding in our neighborhood.

Thanks for listening to a concerned resident that cares about keeping Redondo Beach a beautiful, clean, charming and peaceful neighborhood...not an up and coming dense downtown congestion big city!

Your consideration is appreciated. Thank you kindly,

Ginger Herrick
N. Elena Redondo Beach Resident

7.1

Letter I-7

COMMENTER: Ginger Herrick

DATE: December 14, 2021

Response 7.1

The commenter states that 66 parking spaces is not enough for the 30 proposed units and the sought density is out of sync with the current housing in the area. The commenter adds that the project's parking and density pose congestion problems, livability issues, decreased street parking, and overcrowding in the neighborhood.

Please refer to Responses 1.1 and 2.1, which respectively address parking and traffic congestion concerns.

Please refer to Response 6.1, which addresses the project's density with respect to the site's land use designation/zoning and the project's required approvals.

Letter 8

From: John Evans [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2021 7:44 AM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Project Name: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Everyone in the city knows that this unwanted project will be built. Will there be a requirement for charging stations for the electric cars and bikes? No consideration given for the impact on sewer or water or electrical use. Just pack them in like soviet union.

8.1

Letter I-8

COMMENTER: John Evans

DATE: December 15, 2021

Response 8.1

The commenter asks if there will be a requirement for charging stations for electric cars and bicycles and adds that no consideration is given for the project's impact on sewer, water, or electrical use.

As discussed in Section 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR, the project would encourage fuel-efficient methods of transportation to and from the site by equipping 10 percent of all parking spaces with EV chargers, providing 22 secured bicycle parking spaces for residents, and providing a common bicycle rack with 15 spaces for short-term bicycle parking for guests.

Please refer to Response 6.1, which addresses water supply for the project.

The local wastewater collection system is managed, operated, and maintained by the City's Public Works Department. Wastewater in the City is conveyed to the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) located in the City of Carson. As discussed in Section 19, *Utilities and Service Systems*, of the Initial Study (Appendix B of the Draft EIR), the project's estimated daily wastewater generation accounts for less than 0.01 percent of the JWPCP's remaining daily capacity of approximately 140 million gallons. The analysis in the Initial Study found that JWPCP has sufficient capacity to accommodate additional wastewater flows generated by the proposed project, and the proposed project would not require the construction of new or expanded treatment facilities. Therefore, the potential wastewater impacts were not addressed further in the Draft EIR.

The project's electricity demand would be served by Southern California Edison (SCE). As discussed in Section 19, *Utilities and Service Systems*, of the Initial Study, the project's electricity demand would represent less than 0.01 percent of electricity provided by SCE. Therefore, SCE would have sufficient supplies for the project. Furthermore, the project would be subject to the energy conservation requirements of the 2019 California Energy Code (Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations, *California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings*) and the California Green Building Standards Code (Title 24, Part 11 of the California Code of Regulations). The California Energy Code and Green Building Standards Code provide sustainability standards for all new and renovated commercial and residential buildings constructed in California. Based on the impact determination from the Initial Study, the potential impacts associated with electricity demand were not addressed further in the Draft EIR.

Letter 9

From: Lauren Bergloff [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2021 8:32 AM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>; Bill Brand <Bill.Brand@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project Draft EIR Comments

Good Morning,

While I am supportive of revitalizing our Redondo Beach economy, I strongly disagree with the direction of the project. My lifestyle will be greatly impacted based on location of the new development.

These are my concerns:

1. Multiple room floorplans (5-7-bedroom units) with short term leases a. Marketing to a niche audience of young, tech professionals 2. Not consistent with the current residential area a. 5-7-bedroom units with multiple tenants will cause a parking shortage and more traffic b. Superfluous rooftop decks. Infringement on privacy and will bring noise into a now quiet, family-oriented area.

I am a longtime resident of Redondo Beach and appreciate it's charm, different from our sister beach cities. Our hope was that the Catalina Village Project would bring in new townhomes or condos for purchase along with small shops. This would raise the values of our homes, be consistent with our family residential area, while also providing new business.

Thank you for your time,

Lauren Bergloff

9.1

Letter I-9

COMMENTER: Lauren Bergloff

DATE: December 15, 2021

Response 9.1

The commenter states general support for revitalizing the City's economy and raising property values but expresses concern about the project's multiple-room floorplans marketed to young professionals not being consistent with the surrounding residential area. The commenter states that the proposed units will cause a parking shortage and more traffic, while the proposed rooftop decks will result in infringement on privacy and noise.

Please refer to Response 6.1, which addresses the project's density with respect to the site's land use designation/zoning and the project's required approvals.

Please refer to Responses 1.1 and 2.1, which respectively address parking and traffic congestion concerns.

Potential privacy issues are not an environmental impact that is required for analysis under CEQA. Nonetheless, as shown among Figures 2-3b through 2-5a in Section 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR, the project's balconies and rooftop decks would be positioned with line-of-sight to North Catalina Avenue away from adjacent residences abutting the northern property line. Proposed residential structures would be located between balconies and rooftop decks, helping preserve the privacy of residents.

As discussed in Section 4.6, *Noise*, the primary on-site noise sources associated with operation of the proposed project would include noise from delivery trucks, trash hauling trucks, HVAC units, and persons associated with outdoor areas such as conversation on residential balconies/decks or at street-facing seating areas along North Catalina Avenue. With respect to proposed rooftop decks, conversational noise would be similar to that of existing residences in the vicinity and would result in a negligible change to existing noise levels. Furthermore, traffic noise from North Catalina Avenue would dominate conversational noise from outdoor seating areas associated with project commercial uses. Noise from outdoor conversations would be an intermittent and temporary noise source, which would typically be concentrated around less-sensitive daytime hours. As determined in Section 4.6, on-site operational noise generated by the project would not exceed the City's exterior noise limits and interior noise standards identified by Sections 4-24.301 and 4-24.401, respectively, of the RBMC.

Letter 10

From: Renee Dibrell [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2021 8:46 AM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project Draft EIR Comments

Good morning,

The density being sought here is way out of sync with the current housing in that particular area and the parking allotted for the project is way under what will be needed in actual need.

10.1

Thank you,
Renee

Letter I-10

COMMENTER: Renee Dibrell

DATE: December 15, 2021

Response 10.1

The commenter states that the project's density is out of sync with the current housing in the area and adds that the project will provide inadequate parking compared to actual need.

Please refer to Response 1.1, which addresses parking concerns.

Please refer to Response 6.1, which addresses the project's density with respect to the site's land use designation/zoning and the project's required approvals.

Letter 11

From: MERI NUHBEGOVICH [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2021 11:19 AM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project Draft EIR Comments

As a homeowner and resident of So. Redondo Beach for 34 years, I am asking you not to approve this project.

11.1

Thank you.
Meri Nuhbegovich

Letter I-11

COMMENTER: Meri Nuhbegovich

DATE: December 15, 2021

Response 11.1

The commenter requests that the City deny the project.

The commenter does not raise any significant environmental issues or raise other issues on the adequacy of the environmental analysis included in the EIR.

Letter 12

From: Barbara Epstein [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, December 31, 2021 5:02 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Draft DEIR Comments 100-132 N. Catalina

Thank you so much for reviewing my comments.

We live directly across the street.

At first glance the project looks very nice. The style is very attractive and will improve the visual impact that is there now.

12.1

We welcome the opening of the new coffee shop and bakery, with high hopes that the managers know how to cook and bake at a very high home-cooking level. Our neighborhood really needs an informal, really good, one-of-a-kind cafe.

Parking

We are concerned about the lack of adequate parking, especially for the cafe. We request that full parking will be required by the city. We have not yet reached the place in our culture where everyone is taking public transportation or riding their bikes. Hopefully South Bay will eventually have safe bike routes, urban trails, and adequate public transportation connections, but we are not nearly there yet.

12.2

Tree Canopy and Open Space

The City of Redondo Beach is in the conversation about having an adequate tree ordinance. The residents have made it very clear that they agree with expanding the tree canopy in our city. This project needs to leave enough space for many shade trees on the site. This is necessary for healthy air quality, habitat, and aesthetics.

Natural open space within the project will add to strategical drainage to serve trees, replace groundwater, and add ambience for residents and visitors alike.

12.3

Density

The total space is not visually adequate to accommodate the number of dwelling units in this plan. It looks claustrophobic in its crowded mass.

The number of units needs to be reduced in order to increase parking, trees, and green space. Buyers will find this change beneficial, as will neighbors, as a quality of life issue.

12.4

In light of onerous new land use laws from Sacramento I would be in favor of grandfathering this project as being applied before SB 9 and 10 were passed.

We appreciate your efforts and any consideration the applicant may give to our comments.

Please keep us updated.

Barbara Epstein
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Letter I-12

COMMENTER: Barbara Epstein

DATE: December 31, 2021

Response 12.1

The commenter states that the project is attractive and will visually improve the project site. The commenter welcomes the proposed café use.

The commenter does not raise any significant environmental issues or raise other issues on the adequacy of the environmental analysis included in the EIR.

Response 12.2

The commenter states the project will provide inadequate parking, particularly for the café, and requests that full parking be required by the City. The commenter adds that the City has not reached a place where everyone is taking public transportation or riding bicycles.

Please refer to Response 1.1, which addresses parking concerns.

Response 12.3

The commenter requests that the project leave enough space for shade trees on the site for promote air quality, habitat, aesthetics, and groundwater replenishment.

As discussed in Section 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR, drought-tolerant landscape such as succulents including agave, aeonium, Dudleya, and Senecio, matched with flowering shrubs and perennials such as blue-eyed grass, purple sage, and California fuchsia would be integrated in the courtyard between the two proposed commercial buildings. The courtyard entry would be anchored by two flowering trees and additional canopy trees over the booth seating at the rear of the space. Medium shade trees would be planted along the east corridor where a series of residential patio spaces connect to the perimeter walkway. The existing east perimeter wall with vines would remain. The northeast and southeast corners would contain a variety of medium and large canopy trees. Landscaping around the townhomes would include local native species such as yarrow, manzanita, buckwheat, and Matija poppy. The corridors between the townhomes would include Island alum root, camellia, hydrangea, and schefflera species. The streetscape frontage would include large specimen planting of Mexican fan palms, with existing palms to be protected when possible. All the landscaping installed on the proposed project would be used in part of the effort to comply with the State-mandated Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

The provision of drought-tolerant landscaping would serve to reduce the frequency of irrigation while the incorporation of trees throughout the site would assist with groundwater percolation during rainy weather. Furthermore, when compared to existing site conditions, the project would increase habitat for local wildlife and visually enhance the site.

Response 12.4

The commenter states that site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed number of units and appears crowded. The commenter states that the number of units needs to be reduced to increase parking, trees, and green space to appeal to buyers and neighbors.

Please refer to Response 6.1, which addresses the project's density with respect to the site's land use designation/zoning and the project's required approvals.

Please refer to Response 12.3, which discusses the project's landscaping (i.e., trees and drought-tolerant vegetation).

Letter 13

From: Keatly Haldeman [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 6, 2022 5:10 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I really like the design of the project and I think it makes that part of Redondo near the beach inviting. It adds a lot to the aesthetic of the area. Besides the look of it, I'm happy that the soil is being cleaned up and that the historical buildings will be preserved. I hope that this project can go through.

Thanks,
Keatly Haldeman
Redondo Beach resident

13.1

Letter I-13

COMMENTER: Keatly Haldeman

DATE: January 6, 2022

Response 13.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, and the preservation of on-site historic resources.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 14

From: Nicholas Farrah [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 6, 2022 5:24 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Dear Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential, incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property, and courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.

I feel it is important to continue to improve our city with projects like this one. I sincerely appreciate your support.

Nick Farrah

[REDACTED]
Redondo Beach

14.1

Letter I-14

COMMENTER: Nicholas Farrah

DATE: January 6, 2022

Response 14.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, proposed commercial and residential uses, and the preservation of on-site historic resources.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 15

From: Paul Larson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 6, 2022 5:30 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 N Catalina Ave

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at [100-132 North Catalina Ave](#). I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

1. **Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings**
2. **Great Architecture.**
3. **A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.**
4. Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
5. High quality coastal plantation style

Paul Larson

15.1

Letter I-15

COMMENTER: Paul Larson

DATE: January 6, 2022

Response 15.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 16

From: Raman Gulati [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 6, 2022 5:34 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project, which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood-serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

- Preserving the historical commercial buildings (since the land has been rezoned to residential)
- Soil contamination clean-up
- Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings
- High quality coastal plantation-style design of the residential buildings, which complements the craftsman style of historic Redondo Beach homes
- Townhome-style rental units that diversify offerings for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes
- Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy
- Courtyard dining, which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking (and enables safe dining during the pandemic)

Sincerely,
Raman Gulati

16.1

Letter I-16

COMMENTER: Raman Gulati

DATE: January 6, 2022

Response 16.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 17

From: James Q. Meehan [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 6, 2022 5:39 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing in support of the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood-serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.

Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.

High-quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.

Townhome-style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.

Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.

Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.

A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

Sincerely,
James Meehan

17.1

Letter I-17

COMMENTER: James Meehan

DATE: January 6, 2022

Response 17.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 18

From: Goldstein, Joyce @ LA North [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 6, 2022 5:42 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Happy New Year Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

1. Soils contamination clean up.
2. Refresh to the neighborhood with new product.
3. A for-rent project offers housing to large families and/or junior executives
4. The commercial element that will provide for an amenity to the neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration,

Joyce Goldstein | Vice President | Broker Lic. 1903737
CBRE | Investment Properties | Multifamily and Land
400 S. Hope Street, Suite 2500 | Los Angeles, CA 90071
234 S. Brand Boulevard, Suite 800 | Glendale, CA 91204
5921 Owensmouth Avenue | Woodland Hills, CA 91367
T +1 213 613 3333 | F +1 213 613 3005 | D +1 818 907 4641
[REDACTED] | www.cbre.com | [Meet the LA North Multifamily Team](#)

18.1

Letter I-18

COMMENTER: Joyce Goldstein

DATE: January 6, 2022

Response 18.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design, associated soil remediation, and proposed commercial and residential uses.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 19

From: Michael Lord [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 6, 2022 5:58 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Redondo Development

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

Here are some examples:

Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.

Soils contamination clean up.

Great Architecture.

A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.

Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.

High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.

Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.

Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.

Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.

A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

Sincerely,

Michael

19.1

Letter I-19

COMMENTER: Michael Lord

DATE: January 6, 2022

Response 19.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 20

From: Jonathan Meister [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 6, 2022 6:25 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Ave Project - Catalina Village

Hi Mr. Gardea,

We have corresponded a few times in regard to some of the single family residential projects I've worked on in Redondo Beach.

This time I am reaching out to share my support for the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 N Catalina Ave. It thoughtfully preserves the historic buildings while pleasantly filling out the gaps in this stretch of Catalina Ave. The project will seamlessly tie both neighborhoods and uses on either side of Catalina, and make this a true destination niche in the South Bay.

I hope that the City will unanimously and speedily approve this project. Our community needs it.

Thank you,
Jonathan

--

Jonathan Meister

20.1

Letter I-20

COMMENTER: Jonathan Meister

DATE: January 6, 2022

Response 20.1

The commenter states support for the project, including the preservation of on-site historic resources, and adds that the project will tie both neighborhoods and uses on either side of Catalina Avenue.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 21

From: Nate Hobba [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 6, 2022 6:26 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Ave Project

Hi Mr. Gardea,

I am a Redondo Beach resident. I'm writing to support the 100-132 North Catalina Ave Project that is going to Planning Commission soon.

I support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave because I feel it will enhance our neighborhood and transform a fairly neglected block into something we can be proud of. A few things I like about this project are:

- Beautiful architecture style that meshes with the local environment and compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
- Provides off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
- Incorporates a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy.
- Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.

I hope to see this project approved by the Planning Commission.

Let me know if I can be of any assistance.

Thank you,

Nate Hobba

21.1

Letter I-21

COMMENTER: Nate Hobba

DATE: January 6, 2022

Response 21.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, proposed commercial uses, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

From: charles levine [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 6, 2022 7:47 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

1. **Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.**
2. **Soils contamination clean up.**
3. **Great Architecture.**
4. **A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.**
5. Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
6. High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
7. Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.
8. Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.
9. Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.
10. A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

22.1

Sincerely,

Charles LeVine
[REDACTED]

Letter I-22

COMMENTER: Charles LeVine

DATE: January 6, 2022

Response 22.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 23

From: Steve Bram [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 6, 2022 7:46 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave

Dear Antonio,

I have been following this project for many years.
I think its an amazing project because it preserves the historic buildings, creates great new retail spaces and provides for new housing at affordable prices.
The architectural style is outstanding.
It will become a space which makes the city proud.
There are always NIMBY voices.
But if we don't grow, we shrink, which is bad for the city.
I have known the developer, Jason Muller for many years and I know he will complete the project and it will be beautiful.
I strongly support the project.
Thank you,

Steve Bram
Co-Founder and Principal

10250 Constellation Boulevard
Suite 2700 | Los Angeles, CA 90067

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
BRE License No: 00822654
[vCard](#) | [Bio](#)

23.1

Letter I-23

COMMENTER: Steve Bram

DATE: January 6, 2022

Response 23.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, proposed commercial and residential uses, and the preservation of on-site historic resources.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 24

From: Kevin Hourigan [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 7, 2022 8:10 AM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Dear Mr. Gardea,

I am writing you in hopes to support the development of the Catalina Project in your jurisdiction, located at 100 – 132 N. Carolina Avenue. I feel the project will provide a great balance of enhancement for the community while also preserving the culture at the same time. It is a great way to make sure the community continues to get better but without too much change that compliments the tradition of the community at the same time.

I hope this message is helpful and in support of this approval.

Best regards,
Kevin Hourigan

Kevin Hourigan
President
Spinutech, LLC

24.1

Letter I-24

COMMENTER: Kevin Hourigan

DATE: January 7, 2022

Response 24.1

The commenter states support for the project and adds that the project will enhance the community while preserving its culture.

The commenter's support is noted.

From: Steven Nelson [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 7, 2022 8:11 AM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Hi Mr. Gardea,
Happy New Year!

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

Here are some examples:

1. **Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.**
2. **Soils contamination clean up.**
3. **Great Architecture.**
4. **A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.**
5. Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
6. High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
7. Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.
8. Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.
9. Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.
10. A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Steven

Letter I-25

COMMENTER: Steve Nelson

DATE: January 7, 2022

Response 25.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

From: Kevin Nemandoust [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 7, 2022 9:54 AM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the beautiful and thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community! The things that appeal to me include:

Here are some examples:

1. **Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.**
2. **Soils contamination clean up.**
3. **Great Architecture.**
4. **A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.**
5. A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.
6. Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
7. High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
8. Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.
9. Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.
10. Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.

26.1

Sincerely,
Kevin Nemandoust

Letter I-26

COMMENTER: Kevin Nemandoust

DATE: January 7, 2022

Response 26.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

From: Ashish Patel [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 7, 2022 9:56 AM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

Here are some examples:

1. **Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.**
2. **Soils contamination clean up.**
3. **Great Architecture.**
4. **A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.**
5. Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
6. High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
7. Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.
8. Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.
9. Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.
10. A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

Sincerely,
Ashish Patel

Letter I-27

COMMENTER: Ashish Patel

DATE: January 7, 2022

Response 27.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

From: Roy Sherman [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 7, 2022 10:08 AM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

1. Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.
2. Soils contamination clean up.
3. Great Architecture.
4. A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.
5. Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
6. High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
7. Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.
8. Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.
9. Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.
10. A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

Sincerely,

Roy Sherman

Letter I-28

COMMENTER: Roy Sherman

DATE: January 7, 2022

Response 28.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

From: Claudia Boghosian [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 7, 2022 12:22 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

Here are some examples:

1. **Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.**
2. **Soils contamination clean up.**
3. **Great Architecture.**
4. **A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.**
5. Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
6. High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
7. Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.
8. Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.
9. Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.
10. A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

Sincerely,

Claudia Boghosian

Letter I-29

COMMENTER: Claudia Boghosian

DATE: January 7, 2022

Response 29.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

From: Al Wahlberg [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 7, 2022 12:22 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

Here are some examples:

1. **Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.**
2. **Soils contamination clean up.**
3. **Great Architecture.**
4. **A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.**
5. Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
6. High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
7. Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.
8. Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.
9. Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.
10. A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

Sincerely,

Alfred Wahlberg

Letter I-30

COMMENTER: Al Wahlberg

DATE: January 7, 2022

Response 30.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 31

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 7, 2022 1:00 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Hello Antonio,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which will bring more areas to enjoy with my family and friends. I find that Redondo Beach, except for a few areas, lacks thoughtful developments that clean up the area and allow for enjoyment. My girlfriend is a Resident pediatric physical at UCLA- Harbor and after a long shift, we are always left with nowhere nice to hang out in the area. I urge you all to approve this project and get more people the quality of life they deserve!

31.1

Best Regards,
Serena Shlomof
Torrance Resident

Letter I-31

COMMENTER: Serena Shlomof

DATE: January 7, 2022

Response 31.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture and the opportunity to clean the area and incorporate uses the community will enjoy.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 32

From: Russell Czuleger [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 8, 2022 8:38 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Project

Good Morning Antonio

I feel that this project should not be built as planned. The major reason is the lack of parking for owners and visitors. The main reason is the lack of underground parking. This is because about five years ago the landowners drilled a large number of test wells on this property. As the result of these tests it was found that a large plume of toxic chemicals is underground and to do underground construction the soil must be cleaned up to eighty feet down. This plume reaches out to Broadway, Catalina and Emerald streets. This chemical originated at the old Wardrobe cleaners site. The cleaners had a large concrete tank in the back of the building to hold the dry cleaning chemical. The problem being that the concrete was porous and the chemical leaked into the ground for over sixty years. And when the owners found out about the toxic situation plans for building were adjusted. Most likely the previous owners of the Wardrobe cleaners property are on the hook to pay for the property cleanup.

Russell Czuleger
[REDACTED]

32.1

Letter I-32

COMMENTER: Russell Czuleger

DATE: January 8, 2022

Response 32.1

The commenter states that the project should not be built as planned due to lack of parking for residents and visitors and lack of underground parking. The commenter attributes the lack of underground parking to past drilling of test wells on the site finding a large plume of toxic chemicals, which requires clean up prior to underground construction.

Please refer to Response 1.1, which addresses parking concerns.

With respect to site contamination, the project includes project design features (PDFs) proposed by the applicant which would reduce or negate impacts concerning associated with the existing contamination conditions. As discussed in Section 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR, Hazards PDF 1 (Shallow Soil Remediation), Hazards PDF 2 (Soil Vapor), and Hazards PDF 3 (Vapor Intrusion) would be included as part of the project under the oversight of the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD). According to the impact discussion in Section 4.5, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, of the Draft EIR, Hazards PDF 1 would address impacts associated with shallow contaminated soil and associated air quality or fugitive dust emissions during excavation, grading, stockpiling, transport, or disposal of soils provided that such activities are conducted under the oversight of LACoFD and in accordance with applicable local, State, and federal regulations, including South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rules 402, 403, 1166, and 1466. As such, Hazards PDF 1 would address the potential for exposure to off-site commercial or residential receptors, including during transport of treated excavated soil to disposal facilities, if required. Furthermore, according to the Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC) *Proven Technologies and Remedies Guidance – Remediation of VOCs in Vadose Zone Soil* (2010), soil vapor extraction (SVE) is the most frequently selected remedial alternative for chlorinated volatile organic compounds (VOCs) such as tetrachloroethylene (PCE) and trichloroethylene (TCE) in vadose zone soil. As such, impacts associated with potential vapor migration to indoor air by residual VOCs in soil and soil vapor would be addressed with Hazards PDF 2 and Hazards PDF 3. In addition to implementation of the Hazards PDFs, the project includes Mitigation Measures HAZ-1a (Shallow Soil Remediation), HAZ-1b (Soil and Soil Vapor), HAZ-1c (Operation Maintenance and Monitoring), and HAZ-1d (Lead and Asbestos) would be required to further address impacts related to soil contamination, soil and soil vapor, and lead and asbestos at the project site.

From: Shmuel Siegel [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 9, 2022 1:04 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

Here are some examples:

1. **Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.**
2. **Soils contamination clean up.**
3. **Great Architecture.**
4. **A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.**
5. Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
6. High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
7. Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.
8. Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.
9. Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.
10. A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

Sincerely,

Shmuel Siegel

Letter I-33

COMMENTER: Shmuel Siegel

DATE: January 9, 2022

Response 33.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 34

From: Maxwell Allen [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 9, 2022 8:57 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I have lived in the South Bay my entire life and have spent a lot of time driving past the site. For such a great location, I've always felt it was an eyesore. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community.

As a lifelong resident, I'm excited about this project, which will clean up a contaminated site and revitalize existing retail. Most developers would just bulldoze the existing retail and try to max out profit but this design will give us the best of both worlds.

Sincerely,

Max Allen

--

Maxwell Allen

[REDACTED] Lic. 02116387

34.1

Letter I-34

COMMENTER: Maxwell Allen

DATE: January 9, 2022

Response 34.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, and the preservation of on-site historic resources.

The commenter's support is noted.

From: Liana [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 12:23 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

1. **Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings**
2. **Soils contamination clean up.**
3. **Great Architecture.**
4. **A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.**
5. Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
6. High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
7. Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.
8. Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.
9. Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.
10. A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

Sincerely,

Liana Hamilton

Letter I-35

COMMENTER: Liana Hamilton

DATE: January 10, 2022

Response 35.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

From: Mark Murrel <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 1:12 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Redondo Beach Project

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

Here are some examples:

1. **Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.**
2. **Soils contamination clean up.**
3. **Great Architecture.**
4. **A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.**
5. Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
6. High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
7. Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.
8. Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.
9. Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.
10. A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

Sincerely, Mark Murrel

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Letter I-36

COMMENTER: Mark Murrel

DATE: January 10, 2022

Response 36.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

From: Alisa True-Daniels [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 11, 2022 1:13 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. The things that appeal to me include:

Here are some examples:

1. Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.
2. Soils contamination clean up.
3. Great Architecture.
4. A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.
5. Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.
6. High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
7. Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.
8. Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.
9. Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.
10. A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

Sincerely,
Alisa True-Daniels

Letter I-37

COMMENTER: Alisa True-Daniels

DATE: January 11, 2022

Response 37.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 38

From: Kathie Gavin [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2022 9:16 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: North Catalina Ave. Project

Hello Antonio,

I would like to introduce myself as a 35 year resident of Redondo Beach and a local small business owner. I know that I am coming a bit late to the party, however with no employees back after Covid and the restrictions that have been implemented due to Covid, my days are full. I call it the "buffet of life" and the plates are overflowing for all of us.

I made my way through much of the paperwork that was online and just listened to the April 2021 virtual video which helped me understand some of the direction the project, if approved, will be taking.

Having lived at Seascape One for all of those 35 years, I have seen many changes to the community. I would be remiss if I didn't say that I have concerns about the housing portion of the project and the preservation of our "small town" feel. I agree that the area of the project needs a face lift on the East side of Catalina, however I am concerned with the height of the residential buildings, which appear to possibly restrict views of the neighborhood eg., the St. James Catholic Church spire, the beautiful trees in the neighborhood and the Methodist Church steeple where my husband and I were married. Having a better understanding of the project, I will now peruse the area and see if my concerns are warranted. This addresses the Land Use and Planning comment in 1.7 of the EIR.

38.1

My main concern, which I know your staff has mentioned they too are aware of, is the number of what seems to be an inordinate amount of bedrooms and the property only being rentals. Our seaside community, has property values that have quadrupled since I bought my condo and the "affordable housing units" that are part of the project may effect the value of our community.

38.2

My second concern is the power grid not being able to handle the current level of consumption leading to more rolling black outs over the course of not only construction, but the actual occupancy once construction is completed. Perhaps there is somewhere in the documentation that explains the possible impact on the electrical grid and I did not see it.

38.3

Thirdly, the number of people proposed to increase the population, 299 of which only 93 may be students, leads me to wonder if everyone had a car, that is a huge increase of 200+ cars to find parking spaces in a radius of 4 blocks. I figure that is as far as the average person wants to walk from parking their car to their residence. As it is now, there is a shortage of spaces throughout the community. Perhaps the applicant, who wants to cut construction costs at the expense of community parking congestion, would like to lower the number of proposed units OR cough up the money for underground parking. Currently, our guest parking is abused by visitors to the area going to the pier or the park, so I want to be sure there is always available spots for our visitors.

38.4

Lastly, there is mention of a wastewater treatment plant being built which may add to the noise levels from this project (1.9 Utilities). We currently have one on our property, which I vehemently opposed years ago, which increases noise levels to the surrounding units most of the time and is constantly being monitored or serviced. I am double checking to make sure that I identifying this correctly, and if not, I will let you know.

38.5

Thank you for taking time to read and hopefully address my concerns about the North Catalina project. If there are any resources that you think would be helpful for me to acquaint myself with about the progress, please point them out to me.

38.6

Sincerely,

Kathie

Kathleen Gavin

President & CEO

b. dazzle, inc.

Producers of gifts, games and fun!

P. O. Box 4244

Redondo Beach, CA 90277

(800) 809-4242

Letter I-38

COMMENTER: Kathie Gavin

DATE: January 14, 2022

Response 38.1

The commenter introduces themselves as a 35-year resident and local small business owner and states concern regarding the height of the residential buildings. The commenter adds that the buildings appear to possibly restrict views of the neighborhood (e.g., St. James Catholic Church spire, trees in the neighborhood, and the Methodist Church steeple).

The project would include a stepped-back elevation of the buildings to integrate a gradual increase in scale, with the three-story townhomes located at the rear of the site. The proposed townhomes and apartment building would be of similar height (30 feet) to other single- and multi-family residences surrounding the site, which range from one- to five-stories tall. Furthermore, the project would also use the State Density Bonus and approval of an Affordable Housing Agreement. As part of the Density Bonus application, a waiver of the maximum height limit (development standard) and the following concessions and incentives are requested: mixed-use zoning for adaptive reuse of non-residential structures, lot consolidation of conforming lots, and three-story residential structure(s).

Furthermore, as discussed in Section 1, *Aesthetics*, of the Initial Study (Appendix B of the Draft EIR), the City does not have any officially designated scenic vistas (i.e., views of the St. James Catholic Church spire, Methodist Church steeple, and trees in the neighborhood) but considers its coastal recreation areas (e.g., beaches, public piers, bikeways, and regional and local parks) as providing important scenic views in the city. The project site is not located on a scenic turnout or other visual access point and is not visible from the beach or harbor areas of Redondo Beach, which are located about 0.3 mile to the southwest and 0.2 mile to the west of the site, respectively, due to the existing multi-family and commercial development between three- and five-stories that block views from the coast to the project site. While the project site is visible from Czulagar Park, the park's scenic views are facing west towards the Pacific Ocean; the project site is to the southeast of Czulagar Park and is already developed with existing commercial buildings that are surrounded by urbanized development and thus, does not constitute a scenic vista.

In addition, as part of project development, the streetscape frontage would include large specimen planting of Mexican fan palms, with existing palms to be protected when possible. Therefore, when compared to existing site conditions, the project incorporation of trees throughout the site would visually enhance the site.

Response 38.2

The commenter states concern about the number of proposed bedrooms, the units only being rentals, and the project's effect on the value of the community.

Please refer to Response 6.1, which addresses the project's density with respect to the site's land use designation/zoning and the project's required approvals.

As defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15382, an "economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment." Therefore, although the concern regarding the renting of these units and the project's economic effect on the community is noted, financial impacts are not impacts required for analysis under *CEQA Guidelines*. Nonetheless, an objective of

the project is to provide neighborhood serving uses and amenities that cater to City residents and encourages pedestrian and bicycle activity through re-programming and reactivating the facades of the existing commercial buildings and providing access to a new shared courtyard and public bike racks. Therefore, when compared to existing site conditions, the project would visually enhance the site and provide the neighborhood with new commercial uses.

Response 38.3

The commenter states concern regarding the City's power grid not having the capacity to accommodate energy use during construction and operation of the project.

Please refer to Response 8.1, which addresses the project's energy use during operation.

As discussed in Section 6, *Energy*, of the Initial Study (Appendix B of the Draft EIR), energy use during construction would be temporary in nature, and construction equipment used would be typical of similar-sized construction projects in the region. In addition, construction contractors would be required to comply with the provisions of California Code of Regulations Title 13 Sections 2449 and 2485, which prohibit diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles and offroad diesel vehicles from idling for more than five minutes and would minimize unnecessary fuel consumption. Construction equipment would be subject to the United States Environmental Protection Agency Construction Equipment Fuel Efficiency Standard, which would also minimize inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary fuel consumption. Furthermore, per applicable regulatory requirements such as California's Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen; California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11), the project would comply with construction waste management practices to divert a minimum of 65 percent of construction and demolition debris. These practices would result in efficient use of energy necessary to construct the project. In the interest of cost-efficiency, construction contractors also would not utilize fuel in a manner that is wasteful or unnecessary. Therefore, the project would not involve the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary use of energy during construction.

Response 38.4

The commenter states concern regarding the increase in population by approximately 300 people and associated increase of approximately 200+ cars attempting to find parking within a four-block radius. The commenter states there is a shortage of parking spaces throughout the community with guest parking being abused by visitors going to the pier or park. The commenter suggests that the applicant lower the number of proposed units or construct underground parking.

As discussed in Section 5, *Other CEQA*, the project would include a total of 130 bedrooms. By applying the City's average household size of 2.3 persons to the 130 bedrooms proposed by the project, it is estimated the proposed project would accommodate up to 299 new residents in the city. This is a conservative estimate that assumes each bedroom would at least have 2.3 persons; however, it is likely not all bedrooms would accommodate two people. Therefore, it should be noted that the actual population that the project would accommodate would be a range between 130 and 300 people at any time.

Please refer to Response 1.1, which addresses parking concerns.

Response 38.5

The commenter states concern regarding the potential construction of a wastewater treatment plant on the project site, which would add to noise operational noise levels on surrounding receivers.

Please see Response 8.2, which addresses the project's impact related to wastewater conveyance to the JWPCP and the plant's daily capacity. The project does not include an on-site wastewater treatment plant and would not generate noise from such machinery.

Response 38.6

The commenter requests that any resources that would help them acquaint themselves with the project progress be pointed out to them.

As noticed in the Notice of Availability, which was circulated to the public on December 2, 2021, the Draft EIR is available for review on the City's website online at www.redondo.org/CatalinaVillage. Furthermore, hard copies are also available for review at the City of Redondo Beach Community Development Department and at local libraries (i.e., Main Library and North Branch Library). Any additional resources would be presented circa the public hearings for the project, which are anticipated to begin in April 2022.

Letter 39

From: Leslie Ogg [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, January 15, 2022 8:50 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

After reading the project DEIR, I feel the city should seriously consider option 3. I think we need more affordable housing in this city. Also, per the DEIR, Option 3 is environmentally superior. I don't think it is absolutely necessary to build 26 market rate units. When my brother bought his first condo in Torrance, it was below market rate. He was able to buy and live in a nice place. He was restricted from selling for a profit for a number of years as part of the purchase.

I also disagree with the construction of the units with 5 to 7 bedrooms and baths. We all know those will not be single family units. Who knows how many people will cram in. I think those will just be bought and rented out by a corporate landlord so investors can make money. What we need are affordable places for families to purchase. At the rate we are going, corporate landlords will be buying and renting out all the housing and individuals will be priced out of buying.

Leslie Ogg
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

39.1

39.2

Letter I-39

COMMENTER: Leslie Ogg

DATE: January 15, 2022

Response 39.1

The commenter states that the City should consider Alternative 3 (Increased Affordable Housing) to the proposed project to increase affordable housing for families and adds that it is environmentally superior. The commenter adds that they don't think it necessary to build 26 market-rate units.

As discussed in Section 6, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR, Alternative 3 would provide 13 more below-market rate units than the proposed project, which would result in less total VMT. Implementation of all recommended Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures would be sufficient to fully mitigate both residential and work VMT impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, this alternative would result in less than significant transportation impacts with mitigation incorporated, which is less than that of the proposed project. As further detailed in Section 3, *Errata*, of this Final EIR, Section 6, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR has been revised as follows:

Alternative 3 would maintain the same uses and total number of units as the proposed project, but would not fulfill the same objectives. Objective 1 seeks a project that is "responsive to market demands" and includes the construction of "at least 26 market-rate units." ~~Although this alternative would have less transportation impacts with mitigation incorporated,~~ Alternative 3 would not include at least 26 market-rate units and would not meet Objective 1 due to the increase in affordable housing units from four units to 17 units of the total 30 units. The total number of new housing units would be the same, but rather than 26 units being market-rate, only 13 units would be market-rate.

The City's approval criteria for density bonus projects requires a dispersal of affordable units throughout the development. In addition, the project site would be unduly burdened in terms of proportional dispersal of affordable units under this alternative. The distribution of high-density and affordable housing throughout the community is a strategy of the City's Housing Element (Program 8: Residential Sites and Monitoring of No Net Loss-Residential Overlays). The City's goals and policies are intended to balance the location of affordable units, noting that previous decades of rezoning added significant density to south Redondo Beach.

Nonetheless, Alternative 3 would reduce a significant and unavoidable VMT impact to a less than significant level when compared to the proposed project. Therefore, the Increased Affordable Housing Alternative would ~~not~~ be considered environmentally superior.

Therefore, the Increased Affordable Housing Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Response 39.2

The commenter expresses disagreement with the construction of units with five to seven bedrooms and baths and states that corporate landlords will be buying and renting out all units and individuals will be priced out of buying.

As defined in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15382, an "economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment." Therefore, although the concern regarding

financial feasibility of these units is noted, financial impacts are not impacts required for analysis under *CEQA Guidelines*. The commenter does not raise any significant environmental issues or raise other issues on the adequacy of the environmental analysis included in the EIR.

Letter 40

From: SHERI WARD [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 17, 2022 9:57 AM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Catalina Village

Hello,

I am a resident of Redondo Beach and live across Catalina from the proposed development referred to as "Catalina Village." I have concern about the proposed development as follows:

1. I am very concerned about the advisability of having 300 people in 30 units. I would like to understand how these units would be configured, particularly the units with 4, 5, 6 or 7 bedrooms. I would assume these will be rental units with people essentially renting a bedroom and sharing common facilities such as kitchen and bath. Who are the targeted tenants? I feel as though the density is too great for the area.

40.1

2. I am also concerned about parking. The proposed 66 parking spots for 300 people (I would assume most of these tenants would be adults with transportation needs) is simply inadequate.

40.2

Thank you.

Sheri Ward
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Letter I-40

COMMENTER: Sherry Ward

DATE: January 17, 2022

Response 40.1

The commenter states concern about the project accommodating 300 people in 30 residential units and adds that the density is too great for the area. The commenter states they would like to understand the configuration of the units with four to seven bedrooms (i.e., would residents rent a bedroom and share common facilities such as the kitchen and bathrooms?). The commenter asks who the targeted tenants are for the project.

Please refer to Response 6.1, which addresses the project's density with respect to the site's land use designation/zoning and the project's required approvals.

Please see Response 38.4, which calculates a project population range between 130 and 300 people.

According to project plans, each townhome would include shared kitchen facilities among all bedrooms. Furthermore, some bedrooms would have private bathrooms whereas other bedrooms would share a common bathroom. While specific tenants are not identified at this time, an objective of the project is to support the City's future housing needs by developing new quality multi-family, transit-oriented living options at different income levels.

Response 40.2

The commenter states the project will provide inadequate parking (i.e., 66 parking spaces) for 300 people with transportation needs.

Please refer to Response 1.1, which addresses parking concerns.

Letter 41

From: Amy Hudson [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 17, 2022 7:50 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project Draft EIR Comments

Hello, my name is Amy Hudson and I live at 129 North Broadway Unit B Redondo Beach. I live directly East of the shuttered Catalina Coffee, and our HOA shares a property line with the proposed project.

Here are a list of my concerns with the project after reviewing the DEIR.

- The current site is zoned R-3A (Low Density Multi- Family Residential). The project is asking for a Density Bonus concession. This will have significant environment impacts to the neighborhood. Parking issues will be a major impact to the neighborhood. The change from a 1-2 story building on the property set away from the property line, to 3 story townhomes close to the property line will amplify noise, reduce air currents, and reduce ambient light to the properties directly east of the project.

41.1

- Proposed Roof Top decks and a Roof Lounge will amplify noise beyond an acceptable level to what is a very quiet, low density residential neighborhood. Another concern is for inhabitants of the proposed project to smoke on the decks. Air currents will carry second hand smoke directly to surrounding residential properties. Surrounding properties will no longer be able to enjoy ocean breezes to cool our homes and we will have to rely on air conditioning to cool our homes, keeping windows closed to block out noise and second hand smoke.

41.2

- The proposed project is forecasted to generate a population of 299 residents. (P. 1-8) However has only 66 Residential parking stalls included in the design. This is an unacceptable ask for the current residents of this neighborhood to absorb an excessive number of vehicles due to the developer greedily seeking a Density Bonus Concession for the inclusion of self claimed "historic" buildings. (These buildings are not historically registered). To use an existing store front and the ceiling of another building to entirely change the parking environment of a neighborhood is egregious.

41.3

- The current site is zoned R-3A (Low Density Multi - Family Residential) The project as designed is to include 22, 3 story townhomes, 15 of which are to be 5 bedroom units and 3- 7 bedroom units! The scale of this project is completely outsized for the neighborhood and what it can absorb. When my unit was built, a modest privacy wall was constructed to separate our property from a quiet coffee shop that ended operation by evening. Now a colossal residential project is proposed to take over the site and take over the entire block. There has been no thought placed on buffering this project once built from the east bordering properties. There is no green line between the properties other than what is currently there. If this development is to move forward, a tree line should be required between it and the existing neighbors at minimum. There should be no roof decks, and only west facing balconies to minimize impact to the east residing neighbors.

41.4

- As far as the construction phase, I am extremely concerned with the arsenic contamination on the site (P. 2-25). The disruption of this lethal contaminate will likely put wildlife at risk and possibly the people living near or eventually on the site. I am also concerned that proper asbestos abatement and remediation be followed. Any aerosolization of these toxic chemicals will directly contaminate my home and my daughter. Lastly, due to the close proximity of my home to the development, I have a high concern over ground borne vibration during construction causing damage to my property.

41.5

I appreciate the City of Redondo Beach for considering my concerns to the project.

Amy Hudson

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Letter I-41

COMMENTER: Amy Hudson

DATE: January 17, 2022

Response 41.1

The commenter states that the requested Density Bonus concession will result in a significant parking impact to the neighborhood and in three-story townhomes that will amplify noise, reduce air currents, and reduce ambient light to the properties east of the project.

Please refer to Response 1.1, which addresses parking concerns.

Please refer to Responses 3.1 and 9.1, which discusses project noise during construction and operation, respectively.

Air currents are not an environmental impact that is required for analysis under CEQA. Nonetheless, as discussed in Section 4.1, *Air Quality*, of the Draft EIR the project would not result in significant impacts related to air pollutants during construction and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentration of carbon monoxide or toxic air contaminants during operation.

As discussed in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, of the Initial Study (Appendix B of the Draft EIR), existing lighting and glare in the project area consist of streetlights and exterior lighting/glare associated with the on-site commercial structures, surrounding residential and commercial/retail structures, and associated vehicles. Implementation of the project would replace existing lighting with new outdoor on-site lighting for the rehabilitated commercial buildings, proposed townhomes and apartment building, internal walking paths, driveway/garage lights, landscaping, and other safety-related lighting. New residential lighting that is proposed as part of the project would represent an increase in daytime and nighttime lighting at the project site relative to existing lighting associated with commercial uses. However, the light sources would not substantially increase the overall levels of day or nighttime lighting in the area because they would be comparable to existing light levels from the surrounding residences. Furthermore, Catalina Avenue and Emerald Street are already illuminated by street lighting. For these reasons, the proposed project would not result in a substantial new source of light such that day or nighttime views in the area would be adversely affected. Rather, the proposed exterior lighting and building materials would be consistent with those of surrounding uses and would be an important aide to public safety.

Furthermore, the project design does not propose any new highly reflective materials that would cause significant glare during the day, such as stainless-steel panels or expansive glass windows. The design of this project, including its finish, colors, and materials, would be reviewed for approval through the City's review process. This regulatory procedure provides the City with an additional layer of review for aesthetics including light and glare, and an opportunity to incorporate additional conditions to improve the project's building materials and lighting plans.

Response 41.2

The commenter states that the proposed rooftop decks and lounge will amplify noise beyond an acceptable level to a currently quiet, low-density neighborhood, and result in secondhand smoke being brought to surrounding residences.

Please refer to Response 9.1, which discusses noise generated from open space areas.

As shown among Figures 2-3b through 2-5a in Section 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR, the project's balconies and rooftop decks would be positioned with line-of-sight to North Catalina Avenue away from adjacent residences abutting the northern property line. Proposed residential structures would be located between balconies and rooftop decks, helping preserve the privacy of residents and reducing potential secondhand smoke emanating from these spaces.

Response 41.3

The commenter states the project is projected to generate a population of 299 residents but only provides 66 on-site parking spaces. The commenter adds that it is unacceptable for the community to absorb an excessive number of vehicles due to the Density Bonus concession for the inclusion of buildings that are not historically registered.

Please refer to Response 1.1, which addresses parking concerns.

With respect to the historic eligibility of on-site buildings, Section 4.3, *Cultural Resources*, of the Draft EIR determined that four out of the five on-site buildings were found to qualify as historical resources pursuant to CEQA. The following four buildings are contributors to a locally eligible historic district in Redondo Beach's early commercial core: 112 North Catalina Avenue, 124 North Catalina Avenue, 126 North Catalina Avenue, and 132 North Catalina Avenue. The four contributing properties of the historic district "exemplify and reflect special elements of the City's social, commercial, and transportation history as well as its architectural history".

Response 41.4

The commenter states that the scale of the project is outsized for the neighborhood and no thought is placed on buffering the project from eastern bordering properties. The commenter requests that a tree line be required between the project and existing neighbors and that no east-facing roof decks be included to minimize impacts.

Please refer to Response 38.1, which addresses the project's scale and height in comparison to the surrounding neighborhood.

Potential privacy issues are not an environmental impact that is required for analysis under CEQA. Nonetheless, please refer to Response 41.2, which addresses the configuration of proposed balconies and roof decks with respect to privacy and noise.

Response 41.5

The commenter states concern regarding the arsenic contamination on the site and adds that disruption of the contaminant during construction will put wildlife and residents near the site at risk. The commenter asks that proper asbestos abatement and remediation be followed during construction. The commenter also states concern regarding groundborne vibration during construction causing damage to their property.

Please refer to Response 32.1, which addresses PDFs and mitigation measures associated with the project that would reduce impacts related to soil contamination, soil and soil vapor, and lead and asbestos at the project site to a less than significant level.

As discussed in Section 4.6, *Noise*, of the Draft EIR, groundborne vibration would not exceed the applicable threshold of 2.0 inches per second (in./sec.) peak particle velocity (PPV) for building damage at the nearby commercial buildings nor would it exceed the applicable threshold of 0.5 in./sec. PPV for building damage at off-site residences. Furthermore, groundborne vibration would

not exceed the threshold of 0.24 in./sec. PPV for human annoyance at any of the modeled distances (i.e., distances to the nearest commercial buildings, churches, on-site buildings, and residences). Nonetheless, since project construction could result in groundborne vibration that may cause building damage to historic buildings, implementation of Mitigation Measure N-5 (Construction Equipment Operations Near Historic Buildings) would be required to reduce impacts to on-site buildings to a less than significant level.

Letter 42

From: Emmett Jones [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 7:42 AM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Cc: Dana Briskin [REDACTED]
Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project Draft EIR Comments

Hi Antonio,

My name is Emmett Jones. My wife and I are the owners / residents at 129 N. Broadway Unit A in Redondo Beach.

I'm writing to share comments on the Catalina Avenue Project that will directly impact our entire HOA at 129 N Broadway and all 6 homes / families here. To keep things organized I'll outline our 3 biggest concerns. Thank you for taking the time to review:

42.1

1) Potential Impact to Home Values: Since most of this development will be apartment style, even though it's labeled as condos, I do think it has the ability to devalue home prices in our area. Part of this is because some units in the project are 5-7 units. While this could appeal to young families, I strongly believe it could also attract larger groups of young residents. Outdoor patios and communal areas + noise worry us.

2) Parking: With high church traffic already in our block of Redondo, this project tells us they're essentially providing the minimum number of parking spots for residents. 1-2 spots for a 4+ bedroom unit. This will lead to a possible elimination of street parking for our guests and even us as frequent users of these spots.

42.2

3) Timeline: With this being a residential + multi-use property, the timelines seem vague. The last thing we want is 12 + months of construction, especially given that it is not to townhomes / single family homes that would raise values, in our opinion. We'd like more clarity on the timeline disruption / inconvenience caused by this construction.

42.3

Thank you, again, and have a great day!

--

Emmett Jones

Letter I-42

COMMENTER: Emmett Jones

DATE: January 18, 2022

Response 42.1

The commenter states the project would have potential to impact to devalue home prices in the area due to the high number of bedrooms in each unit. The commenter adds that the project could attract young residents and result in noise from outdoor open space areas.

Please refer to Response 38.2, which clarifies that economic effects are not impacts required for analysis under *CEQA Guidelines* and discusses the project's objective to provide neighborhood serving uses and amenities that cater to City residents. While specific tenants are not identified at this time, a project objective is to support the City's future housing needs by developing new quality multi-family, transit-oriented living options at different income levels.

Please refer to Response 9.1, which discusses noise generated from open space areas.

Response 42.2

The commenter states concern regarding the project providing the minimum number of on-site parking spaces and adds that it will lead to a possible elimination of street parking for guests and current City residents that use these street parking.

Please refer to Response 1.1, which addresses parking concerns.

Response 42.3

The commenter states they do not want 12+ months of construction and asks for clarification on the timeline of project construction.

As discussed in Section 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR, construction of the project is anticipated to occur over an approximately 21-month period with completion in 2024. Furthermore, construction hours would comply with Section 4 24.503 of the RBMC and limits imposed on days/hours as a condition of approval. As analyzed in Section 4.1, *Air Quality*, Section 4.5, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, and Section 4.6, *Noise*, construction activities associated with the project would not result in significant impacts that cannot be mitigated.

Letter 43

January 18, 2022

Mr. Antonio Gardea
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Regarding: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Dear Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave.

The City of Redondo Beach is in desperate need of additional housing. The city is becoming unaffordable, even for families with dual incomes, and this development would provide the kind of housing that the community needs.

Catalina Village fits well within the fabric of the neighborhood. It's appropriate in scale and the design is far more aesthetically pleasing than some of the other multifamily developments in the immediate area. It also would preserve the historic buildings and provide much needed retail amenities.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Hanks", written in a cursive style.

John Hanks
South Bay Resident

43.1

Letter I-43

COMMENTER: John Hanks

DATE: January 18, 2022

Response 43.1

The commenter states support for the project, noting the City's need for additional housing and affordable units. The commenter states the project fits the neighborhood, is aesthetically pleasing, is appropriate in scale, would preserve historic buildings, and would provide much needed retail amenities.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 44

From: Erik Aukland [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 3:46 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: 00-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I live at 425 S. Catalina Ave, Unit #6. I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. Some things that appeal to me include:

- Tasteful and modern architecture
- Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings
- High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.
- Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.
- Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property
- Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking

44.1

Sincerely,

Erik Aukland
[REDACTED]

Letter I-44

COMMENTER: Eric Aukland

DATE: January 18, 2022

Response 44.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, proposed commercial and residential uses, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

Studio M of A Inc.

Brett L. R. Detmers
Master of Architecture

Phone: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

January 18, 2022

Subject: 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project (Catalina Village Project)

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. I appreciate the thoughtful design of the project which preserves the commercial space and incorporates neighborhood serving retail amenities while also providing more high-quality housing options for the community. Some things that appeal to the community include:

Preserving the Historical Commercial Buildings - since the land has been rezoned to Residential.

Soils contamination clean up.

Great Architecture.

A for-rent project offers large families and/or junior executives to rent and live in a city they grew up in.

Providing off-street parking and a design that does not create the feel of a parking lot between the street and the project buildings.

High quality coastal plantation style design of the residential buildings which compliments the craftsman style of the historic Redondo Beach homes.

Townhome style rental units that diversify offerings in the current market for families who are not yet ready to purchase homes.

Incorporating a commercial element that the neighborhood can enjoy beyond the residents of the property.

Courtyard dining which creates an outdoor experience for patrons that doesn't take up valuable street parking.

A stepped back elevation of the buildings to avoid a cavernous effect of the Catalina Corridor.

Thank you.

45.1

Feel free to call or email if you have any clarifications.

Kind regards,
Brett L. R. Detmers
Studio M of A inc

END

Letter I-45

COMMENTER: Brett Detmers

DATE: January 18, 2022

Response 45.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, associated soil remediation, proposed commercial and residential uses, the preservation of on-site historic resources, and provision of off-street parking.

The commenter's support is noted.

Letter 46

January 18, 2022

Homeowners Association
131, 135, 129 (Units A-D) N Broadway
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

City of Redondo
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

To whom it may concern:

We are writing to address concerns we have regarding the Catalina Village Project 100-132 N Catalina Ave. While we are all supportive of revitalizing our Redondo Beach economy, we strongly disagree with the direction of the project. Our homes are greatly impacted based on proximity of the new development.

These are our concerns:

1. Rentals in place of owning
 - a. Target rent can impact the surrounding home values
 - b. 30-unit complex (4 below market)
2. Multiple room floorplans (5-7-bedroom units) with short term leases
 - a. Marketing to a niche audience of young, tech professionals
3. This model is unproven in the South Bay
 - a. Poses a high risk to investors
 - b. Not consistent with the current church and residential area
 - b. 5-7-bedroom units with multiple tenants will cause a parking shortage
 - c. Superfluous rooftop decks
 - i. Infringement on privacy and will bring noise into a now quiet, family-oriented area

We are all longtime residents of Redondo Beach and appreciate it's charm, different from our sister beach cities. Our hope was that the Catalina Village Project would bring in new townhomes or condos for purchase along with small shops. This would raise the values of our homes, be consistent with our family residential area, while also providing new business.

If possible, we would like to request a meeting with you to discuss this in further detail before it goes before the Planning Commission this fall. Please contact Amy Hudson at ahudsoncrna@gmail.com or Regina Fisher at [REDACTED]

We appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Samuel and Christine Munoz
Steve and Kendall Johnson
Emmett Jones and Dana Briskin
Amy Hudson
Karen Kaminskis
Lance and Regina Fisher

46.1

46.2

46.3

46.4

HOA QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS REGARDING THE CATALINA VILLAGE PROJECT

DATE: JANUARY18, 2022	100-132 NORTH CATALINA PROJECT EIR COMMENTS
PURPOSE	Concerns from HOA regarding The Catalina Village Project
ADDRESS	131, 135, 129 (Units A-D) N Broadway Redondo Beach 90277 (Unit balconies face the project)

#	TOPICS
1.	Target rent and impact to surrounding home values
2.	Multiple room floorplans
3.	Parking
4.	Rooftop decks, privacy and noise
5.	Direction of new unit balconies and lighting
6.	Trash and recycling overflow
7.	No smoking units
8.	Distance from new units to our wall and balcony
9.	Duration of project

46.5

#	TOPIC DETAIL
1.	<u>Target rent and impact to surrounding home values</u> What is the target rent? There is a concern that it will lower the value of surrounding homes.
2.	<u>Multiple room floorplans</u> The floorplans being socialized are 5-7-bedroom units. There is a strong concern that the units will bring in college students with multiple roommates into a now family residential area. On the previous call there was an assumption that these units would attract multi-generational families and work from home tenants. Is there a study/analysis that proves this theory?
3.	<u>Parking</u> With the proposal of 5-7-bedroom floorplans, how will 1-2 parking spaces be sufficient for those units? There is concern that the parking will spill over into the residential neighborhoods, limiting parking for guests and church patrons.
4.	<u>Rooftop decks, privacy and noise</u> Will these units have a rooftop deck? There is a strong concern that this will infringe on the privacy of the surrounding homes. This will bring noise into a now quiet residential area.
5.	<u>Direction of new unit balconies and lighting</u> What direction will the new balconies face? The preference of the surrounding homes would be to face them toward Catalina. This will ensure the existing homes will retain their privacy and also mitigate light pollution. There is also a request to have downward facing lighting and low wattage that would not illuminate the homes around it.
6.	<u>Trash and recycle bin allocation</u> There is currently not enough trash or recycle bins allocated. This will increase with people moving in and out.
7.	<u>No smoking units</u> Preference for no smoking units as these will be very close to already existing housing.
8.	<u>Distance from new units to our wall and balcony</u> What will the distance be between the new units and our existing wall and balconies? Will there be a backyard in the new units?
9.	<u>Duration of project</u> Understanding that the project will still need to go through Scope and Design, how long will the Development and Implementation timeline be? (physical construction)

46.6

46.7

46.8

46.9

46.10

46.11

46.12

46.13

46.14

Chris Munoz (President)		Amy Hudson	
Karen Kaminskas (Vice President)		Gina Fisher (Secretary)	
Kendall Bateman (Treasurer)		Emmett Jones & Dana Briskin	

Letter I-46

COMMENTER: Regina Fisher

DATE: January 18, 2022

Response 46.1

The commenter states concern regarding the units being rented instead of owned due to rentals potentially impacting surrounding home values.

Please refer to Response 38.2, which clarifies that economic effects are not impacts required for analysis under *CEQA Guidelines*.

Response 46.2

The commenter states that the project's multi-room floorplans are marketed to young professionals in the technical field.

While specific tenants are not identified at this time, an objective of the project is to support the City's future housing needs by developing new quality multi-family, transit-oriented living options at different income levels.

Response 46.3

The commenter states that the project's multi-room floorplan model poses a risk to investors, is not consistent with the current church and residential area and will cause a parking shortage. The commenter adds that proposed rooftop decks would result in an infringement on privacy and noise in a quiet, family-oriented area.

Please refer to Response 38.2, which clarifies that economic effects are not impacts required for analysis under *CEQA Guidelines*.

Please refer to Response 38.1, which addresses the project's scale and height in comparison to the surrounding neighborhood.

Please refer to Response 1.1, which addresses parking concerns.

Potential privacy issues are not an environmental impact that is required for analysis under CEQA. Nonetheless, please refer to Responses 9.1 and 41.2, which addresses the configuration of proposed balconies and roof decks with respect to privacy and noise.

Response 46.4

The commenter states their hope was that the project would bring in new townhomes or condominiums for purchase along with small shops, which would raise the value of surrounding homes while being consistent with the residential area and providing new business. The commenter requests a meeting with the City to discuss the project in further detail.

Please refer to Response 38.2, which clarifies that economic effects are not impacts required for analysis under *CEQA Guidelines*. Nonetheless, an objective of the project is to provide neighborhood serving uses and amenities that cater to City residents and encourages pedestrian and bicycle activity through re-programming and reactivating the facades of the existing commercial buildings and providing access to a new shared courtyard and public bike racks. Therefore, when compared to

existing site conditions, the project would visually enhance the site and provide the neighborhood with new commercial uses.

With respect to the commenter's requested meeting with the City, City staff is available to discuss the project with City residents or other interested parties in person by appointment or virtually via Zoom. An opportunity to become more familiar with the project details will occur at the Preservation Commission meeting anticipated in April 2022.

Response 46.5

The commenter identifies a brief numbered list of topics that are further elaborated upon in the rest of their letter.

Responses to individual topics are provided among the following Responses 46.6 through 46.14.

Response 46.6

The commenter asks that the target rent is for the proposed units and states concern that the project will lower the value of surrounding homes.

Please refer to Response 38.2, which clarifies that economic effects (including future rent for units) are not impacts required for analysis under *CEQA Guidelines*.

Response 46.7

The commenter states concern that the proposed multi-room units will attract college students with multiple roommates in a family-oriented residential area and adds that there was a previous assumption that units would attract multi-generational families and work-from-home tenants. The commenter asks if there is a study/analysis that supports their assumption.

While specific tenants are not identified at this time, an objective of the project is to support the City's future housing needs by developing new quality multi-family, transit-oriented living options at different income levels.

Response 46.8

The commenter states concern that the project's parking needs will spill into the residential neighborhood due to insufficient on-site parking, thereby limiting parking for visitors and church patrons.

Please refer to Response 1.1, which addresses parking concerns.

Response 46.9

The commenter asks if units will have a rooftop deck and adds that there is concern that use of proposed decks will infringe the privacy of surrounding homes and result in noise impacts.

The project includes 12,295 square feet of open space, consisting of 9,196 square feet of private space (i.e., roof decks and balconies), a 1,350-square-foot deck, a 525 square-foot roof lounge, and 1,214 square feet of common space (i.e., courtyard).

Potential privacy issues are not an environmental impact that is required for analysis under CEQA. Nonetheless, please refer to Responses 9.1 and 41.2, which address the configuration of proposed balconies and roof decks with respect to privacy and noise.

Response 46.10

The commenter asks what direction the proposed balconies will face and states that the preference is for them to face Catalina Avenue to ensure the retention of privacy and mitigation of light pollution. The commenter requests that the project incorporate downward facing lighting and low wattage such that surrounding homes are not illuminated.

Potential privacy issues are not an environmental impact that is required for analysis under CEQA. Nonetheless, please refer to Responses 9.1 and 41.2, which address the configuration of proposed balconies and roof decks with respect to privacy.

Please refer to Response 41.1, which discusses the project's impacts related to lighting and glare on surrounding properties.

Response 46.11

The commenter states there are currently not enough trash or recycle bins allocated and trash will increase with tenants moving in and out of the project.

As discussed in Section 19, *Utilities and Service Systems*, in the Initial Study (Appendix B of the Draft EIR), Athens Services is the City's exclusive franchise waste hauler that services all residential and commercial waste and recycle programs. As analyzed in the Initial Study, the project would generate a net increase of an estimated 36.2 tons of solid waste per year (or approximately 0.1 tons per day), which would not exceed the current estimated remaining daily capacity of 27,113 tons per day of the landfills serving the site. Furthermore, the proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, such as AB 939 and the City's recycling programs for residences. With respect to the supply of trash and recycle bins, the project would include private on-site receptacles for collecting waste and recyclable materials and would not utilize those of the surrounding neighborhood.

Response 46.12

The commenter states preference that proposed units be non-smoking due to their proximity to existing housing.

The commenter's request that units be non-smoking is noted; however, the commenter does not raise any significant environmental issues or raise other issues on the adequacy of the environmental analysis included in the EIR. Nonetheless, proposed residential structures would be located between balconies and rooftop decks, helping preserve the privacy of residents and reducing potential secondhand smoke emanating from these spaces.

Response 46.13

The commenter asks what the distance between the new units to existing walls and balconies and if units will have a backyard.

The nearest residences to the project site consist of residences abutting the northern property line adjacent to the proposed townhomes. As shown in Figure 2-3a in Section 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR, these townhomes will each have a backyard; however, backyards will be separated from off-site residences by a six-foot-tall block wall. Furthermore, per project plans, the proposed townhome building will be setback by 15 feet from the property line from the northern property line to accommodate backyard space.

Response 46.14

The commenter states that they understand that the project still needs to go through Scope and Design and asks for clarification on the timeline of project construction.

As discussed in Section 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR, construction of the project is anticipated to occur over an approximately 21-month period with completion in 2024.

Letter 47

From: Kathleen Rebentisch [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 18, 2022 4:26 PM
To: Antonio Gardea <Antonio.Gardea@redondo.org>
Subject: Support for Catalina Village Project

Mr. Gardea,

I am writing to support the development of the Catalina Village Project at 100-132 North Catalina Ave. It's a well thought-out and well-designed project which will benefit our community. It has a nice balance of residential and commercial space with an attractive layout and appealing architecture. I'm a long-term resident of Redondo Beach and spent lots of time at the old Catalina Coffee establishment. I'm so happy that the proposed project preserves the historic buildings and upgrades the site in a way which fits into our community. It's time to move forward with this plan!

47.1

Sincerely,

Kathleen Rebentisch

Letter I-47

COMMENTER: Kathleen Rebentisch

DATE: January 18, 2022

Response 47.1

The commenter states support for the project, including its design/architecture, proposed commercial and residential uses, and the preservation of on-site historic resources.

The commenter's support is noted.



**LOS ANGELES COUNTY
SANITATION DISTRICTS**
Converting Waste Into Resources

Robert C. Ferrante

Chief Engineer and General Manager

1955 Workman Mill Road, Whittier, CA 90601-1400
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998
(562) 699-7411 • www.lacsd.org

January 11, 2022

Ref. DOC 6392780

Mr. Antonio Gardea, Senior Planner
Community Development Department
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Dear Mr. Gardea:

NOA Response to DEIR for 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project

The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (Districts) received a Notice of Availability (NOA) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the subject project on December 3, 2021. The proposed project is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the South Bay Cities Sanitation District. We offer the following comments regarding sewerage service:

1. The wastewater flow originating from the proposed project will discharge to local sewer lines, which are not maintained by the Districts, for conveyance to either or both the Districts' South Bay Cities Main Trunk Sewer, located in Carnelian Street at Catalina Avenue and in Broadway Avenue near Beryl Street, or Herondo Trunk Sewer, located in Herondo Street near Monterey Boulevard. The Districts' 18-inch diameter South Bay Cities Main Trunk Sewer has a capacity of 2.4 million gallons per day (mgd) and conveyed a peak flow of 0.2 mgd when last measured in 2015. The Districts' 14-inch diameter Herondo Trunk Sewer has a capacity of 2.1 mgd and conveyed a peak flow of 0.8 mgd when last measured in 2015.
2. The expected increase in average wastewater flow from the project site, described in the DEIR as 22 condominium units, 8 apartment units, a tasting room, and a coffee shop, is 5,328 gallons per day, after the structures on the project site are demolished. For a copy of the Districts' average wastewater generation factors, go to www.lacsd.org, under Services, then Wastewater Program and Permits, select Will Serve Program, and scroll down to click on the [Table 1, Loadings for Each Class of Land Use](#) link.
3. The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant located in the City of Carson, which has a capacity of 400 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 249.8 mgd.
4. The Districts are empowered by the California Health and Safety Code to charge a fee to connect facilities (directly or indirectly) to the Districts' Sewerage System or to increase the strength or quantity of wastewater discharged from connected facilities. This connection fee is used by the Districts for its capital facilities. Payment of a connection fee may be required before this project is permitted to discharge to the Districts' Sewerage System. For more information and a copy of the Connection Fee Information Sheet, go to www.lacsd.org, under Services, then Wastewater (Sewage) and select Rates & Fees. In determining the impact to the Sewerage System and applicable connection fees, the Districts will determine the user category (e.g. Condominium, Single Family home, etc.) that best represents the actual or anticipated use of the parcel(s) or facilities on the parcel(s) in the development. For more specific information regarding the

1.1

connection fee application procedure and fees, the developer should contact the Districts' Wastewater Fee Public Counter at (562) 908-4288, extension 2727.

1.1

5. In order for the Districts to conform to the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA), the capacities of the Districts' wastewater treatment facilities are based on the regional growth forecast adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Specific policies included in the development of the SCAG regional growth forecast are incorporated into clean air plans, which are prepared by the South Coast and Antelope Valley Air Quality Management Districts in order to improve air quality in the South Coast and Mojave Desert Air Basins as mandated by the CAA. All expansions of Districts' facilities must be sized and service phased in a manner that will be consistent with the SCAG regional growth forecast for the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial. The available capacity of the Districts' treatment facilities will, therefore, be limited to levels associated with the approved growth identified by SCAG. As such, this letter does not constitute a guarantee of wastewater service, but is to advise the developer that the Districts intend to provide this service up to the levels that are legally permitted and to inform the developer of the currently existing capacity and any proposed expansion of the Districts' facilities.

1.2

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (562) 908-4288, extension 2743, or mandyhuffman@lacsdsd.org.

Very truly yours,

Mandy Huffman

Mandy Huffman
Environmental Planner
Facilities Planning Department

MNH:mnh

Letter A-1

COMMENTER: Mandy Huffman, Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts

DATE: January 11, 2022

Response 1.1

The commenter provides a summary of the wastewater facilities (i.e., sewer lines and JWPCP) that would serve the project, their respective daily capacities, and the wastewater generated by the proposed project. The commenter adds that the Districts are empowered by the California Health and Safety Code to charge a fee to connect facilities (directly or indirectly) to the Districts' Sewerage System or to increase the strength or quantity of wastewater discharged from connected facilities. This connection fee is used by the Districts for its capital facilities. Payment of a connection fee may be required before this project is permitted to discharge to the Districts' Sewerage System.

The commenter's clarification regarding the connection fee is noted, however, the commenter does not raise any significant environmental issues or raise other issues on the adequacy of the environmental analysis included in the EIR.

Response 1.2

The commenter clarifies that their letter does not constitute a guarantee of wastewater service, but is to advise the developer that the Districts intend to provide this service up to the levels that are legally permitted and to inform the developer of the currently existing capacity and any proposed expansion of the Districts' facilities.

The commenter's clarification regarding wastewater service is noted. Nonetheless, please see Response 8.2, which addresses the project's impact related to wastewater conveyance to the JWPCP and the plant's daily capacity.



Letter 2



Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

January 18, 2022

Mr. Antonio Gardea
Senior Planner
Community Development Department
City of Redondo Beach
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Dear Mr. Gardea:

The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (Los Angeles Water Board) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project. Staff in the Board's NPDES permitting program reviewed the DEIR and have one comment regarding this project. Section 4.1.3. discusses a requirement to water the construction site at least twice per day for dust control, but it does not indicate the source water for this operation. Please indicate whether the source water for dust control will be potable or recycled water. If recycled water is planned for this purpose, a new or updated Title 22 engineering report may need to be submitted to both the Los Angeles Water Board and the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water.

2.1

If you have any questions please contact Steven Webb at Steven.Webb@waterboards.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

R Purdy
Digitally signed by R Purdy
Date: 2022.01.18 08:31:26
-08'00'

Renee Purdy
Executive Officer

LAWRENCE YEE, CHAIR | RENEE PURDY, EXECUTIVE OFFICER

320 West 4th Street, Suite 200, Los Angeles, CA 90013 | www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles

Letter A-2

COMMENTER: Renee Purdy, Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

DATE: January 18, 2022

Response 2.1

The commenter points to Section 4.1.3 under Section 4.1, *Air Quality*, of the Draft EIR, which discusses a requirement to water the construction site at least twice per day for dust control and asks whether potable or recycled water would be used for dust control. The commenter states that if recycled water is planned for this purpose, a new or updated Title 22 engineering report may need to be submitted to the Los Angeles Water Board and State Water Resources Control Board for review.

There is no existing requirement enforcing the use of recycled water for dust control for compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403. Therefore, it is assumed that construction of this project will utilize potable water for dust control.

3 Errata

This Errata addresses revisions to proposed project evaluated in 100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project EIR. The EIR is comprised of the Draft EIR dated December 2021, and the Final EIR dated March 2022. Section 2, *Response to Comments on the Draft EIR*, of the Final EIR responds to the agency and public comments provided on the Draft EIR. This Errata presents the in-text revisions as discussed in Section 2. The revisions are organized by section and page number. In-text deletions are noted by ~~strikeout~~ and in-text insertions by underline. Individual typographical corrections are not specifically indicated here. As shown herein, only Section 6, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR included revisions to the text based on the comments received during the 45-day public review period. As discussed in this section, none of the conditions in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines would be met because of these proposed refinements and revisions, and recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required.

3.1 Impact Analysis Revisions

Section 6 Alternatives

Section 6.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative – Page 6-12

In response to comment letter I-39 (see Response 39.1), the following text revisions have been incorporated to page 6-12 to clarify Alternative 3 (Increased Affordable Housing Alternative) as the environmentally superior alternative when compared to the other alternatives and the proposed project:

Alternative 3 (Increased Affordable Housing Alternative) would involve the same rehabilitation work of the existing commercial buildings, retention of 3,063 square feet of commercial/retail space for a tasting room and coffee shop, and development of 30 residential units. This alternative would increase the percentage of affordable housing units from 13 percent to 57 percent of the total number of units. As such, Alternative 3 would include 17 below-market rate units, which would be 13 more units compared to the proposed project. Construction and operational air quality impacts as well as impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and tribal cultural resources would be the same as the proposed project since the same amount of rehabilitation work, commercial/retail space retention, and development would occur, resulting in the same anticipated population increase as the proposed project. This alternative would provide 13 more below-market rate units than the proposed project, which would result in less total VMT. Implementation of all recommended TDM measures would be sufficient to fully mitigate both residential and work VMT impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, this alternative would result in less than significant transportation impacts with mitigation incorporated, which is less than that of the proposed project.

Alternative 3 would maintain the same uses and total number of units as the proposed project, but would not fulfill the same objectives. Objective 1 seeks a project that is “responsive to market demands” and includes the construction of “at least 26 market-rate units.” ~~Although this alternative would have less transportation impacts with mitigation incorporated,~~ Alternative 3 would not include at least 26 market-rate units and would not meet Objective 1

due to the increase in affordable housing units from four units to 17 units of the total 30 units. The total number of new housing units would be the same, but rather than 26 units being market-rate, only 13 units would be market-rate.

The City's approval criteria for density bonus projects requires a dispersal of affordable units throughout the development. In addition, the project site would be unduly burdened in terms of proportional dispersal of affordable units under this alternative. The distribution of high-density and affordable housing throughout the community is a strategy of the City's Housing Element (Program 8: Residential Sites and Monitoring of No Net Loss-Residential Overlays). The City's goals and policies are intended to balance the location of affordable units, noting that previous decades of rezoning added significant density to south Redondo Beach.

Nonetheless, Alternative 3 would reduce a significant and unavoidable VMT impact to a less than significant level when compared to the proposed project. Therefore, the Increased Affordable Housing Alternative would not be considered environmentally superior.

This addition does not alter the analysis or conclusions presented in the EIR.

3.2 Effect of In-Text Revisions

As demonstrated by the foregoing discussion, the in-text revisions to Section 6, *Alternatives*, of the Draft EIR would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts and therefore do not warrant recirculation of the Draft EIR.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires that an EIR that has been made available for public review, but not yet certified, be recirculated only if significant new information has been added to the EIR. Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088.5(c), the entire document need not be circulated if revisions are limited to specific portions of the document. The relevant portions of *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088.5 read as follows:

- (a) *A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. As used in this section, the term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that:*
- 1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*
 - 2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*
 - 3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.*
 - 4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.*

(b) Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.

The information contained in this Errata makes insignificant changes to the information that has already been presented in the Draft EIR. In addition, the minor proposed revisions are not significant because the EIR is not changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project. The proposed revisions would not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of any impact already identified in the Draft EIR. Therefore, none of the conditions in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088.5 are met and recirculation is not required.

This page intentionally left blank.

4 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

CEQA requires that a reporting or monitoring program be adopted for the conditions of project approval that are necessary to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (PRC Section 21081.6). This mitigation monitoring and reporting program is intended to track and ensure compliance with adopted mitigation measures during the project implementation phase. For each mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR, specifications are made herein that identify the action required, the monitoring that must occur, and the agency or department responsible for oversight.

City of Redondo Beach
100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
Biological Resources							
BIO-1: Nesting Bird Avoidance							
<p>Prior to issuance of grading permits, the following measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">To avoid disturbance of nesting birds, including raptorial species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the California Fish and Game Code, activities related to the project, including, but not limited to, vegetation removal, ground disturbance, and construction and demolition shall occur outside of the bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31). If construction must begin during the breeding season, then a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted no more than seven days prior to initiation of construction activities. The nesting bird pre-construction survey shall be conducted on foot inside the project site, including a 100-foot buffer, and in inaccessible areas (e.g., private lands) from afar using binoculars to the extent practical. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist familiar with the identification of avian species known to occur in southern California.If nests are found, an avoidance buffer shall be demarcated by a qualified biologist with bright orange construction fencing, flagging, construction lathe, or other means to mark the boundary. All construction personnel shall be notified as to the existence of the buffer zone and to avoid entering the buffer zone during the nesting season. No parking, storage of materials, or construction activities shall occur within this buffer until the biologist has confirmed that breeding/nesting is completed, and the young have fledged the nest. Encroachment into the buffer shall occur only at the discretion of the qualified biologist.	<p>Review and approve the pre-construction survey if demolition or construction occurs during bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31).</p> <p>If nests are found, field verification that avoidance buffers are demarcated and enforced. Review and approve the survey reports upon completion of the monitoring.</p>	Before and during construction	Continuous	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">A survey report by the qualified biologist documenting and verifying compliance with the mitigation and with applicable State and federal regulations protecting birds shall be submitted to the City. The qualified biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities would occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests would occur.							
Cultural Resources							
CUL-1: Preservation Input and Secretary’s Standards Project Review							
As the proposed project evolves through the schematic and design development phases, the City shall require ongoing historic preservation project review and documentation, to ensure ongoing compliance with the <i>Secretary’s Standards</i> . The City shall ensure that the project design team includes an architectural historian or preservation architect who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards to provide ongoing review and comment of project plans for conformance with the <i>Secretary’s Standards</i> . The architectural historian or preservation architect shall provide input to the design team through the schematic and design development phases to facilitate ongoing project compliance with the <i>Secretary’s Standards</i> . <i>Secretary’s Standards</i> project review shall include all project components that could result in a physical change to character-defining features, insofar as these project details are available. This may include the identification and retention of additional features, such as the machinery and pulleys at 112 N. Catalina Avenue. The preservation professional shall document the results of the <i>Secretary’s Standards</i> project review in a memorandum to be reviewed and approved by the City.	Review and approve the <i>Secretary’s Standards</i> project memorandum submitted by the preservation professional. Verify that the preservation professional meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards.	During the schematic and design development phases of the project	Once	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			

City of Redondo Beach
100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
The memo shall include design recommendations drawn from the <i>Secretary’s Standards</i> that, if needed, would facilitate compliance with the Standards and avoid, lessen, or mitigate significant adverse impacts to historical resources.							
CUL-2a: Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP)							
Prior to project construction, a qualified archaeologist shall prepare a project-specific Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) to ensure the proper treatment and long-term protection of unanticipated discoveries during project construction. The CRMP shall be submitted to the City of Redondo Beach and to the tribal monitor/consultant retained under Mitigation Measure TCR-1 for review and approval. The CRMP shall provide a description of the methods to be undertaken during monitoring and the steps to be taken in the event of an archaeological discovery during construction, including, at minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Development of research questions and goals to be addressed by the investigation in the event of a find▪ Detailed field strategy used to record, recover, or avoid the finds and address research goals▪ Analytical methods to be employed for identified resources▪ Requirements for report structure and outline of document contents▪ Disposition of the artifacts	Review and approve the CRMP. Verify that the CRMP is prepared by a qualified archaeologist. Verify that the CRMP is also provided to the tribal monitor/consultant retained under Mitigation Measure TCR-1.	Prior to project construction	Once	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
CUL-2b: Cultural Resources Monitoring							
Archaeological monitoring shall be conducted for all project-related ground disturbing activities by a qualified archaeologist. Principal personnel shall meet Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (National Park Service 1983) and have a minimum of 10 years of experience as a principal investigator working with Native American archaeological sites in southern California. The Qualified Archaeologist shall ensure that all other personnel are appropriately trained and qualified. Monitor(s) will have the authority to halt and redirect work should any archaeological resources be identified during monitoring.	Field verify that a qualified archaeologist is providing monitoring during ground-disturbing activities. If archaeological resources are encountered, field verify that work has stopped in the area and verify that the treatments under CRMP (under CUL-2a) are adequately implemented.	During grading and ground disturbing activities	Continuous	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			
If archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area must halt and the find evaluated for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources and the National Register of Historic Places according to the steps outlined in the Cultural Resources Management Plan required by Mitigation Measure CUL-2a. Archaeological monitoring efforts shall be coordinated with Native American monitoring efforts required by Mitigation Measure TCR-1. Archaeological monitoring may be reduced to spot-checking or eliminated at the discretion of the monitors, in consultation with the lead agency, as warranted by conditions such as encountering bedrock, sediments being excavated are fill, or negative findings during the first 60 percent of rough grading. If monitoring is reduced to spot-checking, spot-checking shall occur when ground-disturbance moves to a new location within the project site and when ground disturbance will extend to depths not previously reached (unless those depths are within bedrock).							

City of Redondo Beach
100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
CUL-2c: Unanticipated Archaeological Resources							
If archaeological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area should be halted and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (National Park Service 1983) shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the find in accordance with the steps and methods outlined in the Cultural Resources Management Plan (Mitigation Measure CUL-2a). If the resource is of Native American origin, all treatment shall be determined through consultation with the tribal monitor/consultant required by Mitigation Measure TCR-1 in accordance with the requirements of Mitigation Measure TCR-2. If the discovery proves to be CRHR eligible, preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment. If the resource cannot be avoided by the project, additional work, such as data recovery excavation, may be warranted to mitigate any significant impacts.	If an artifact is encountered during construction, field verify that all work is suspended in the area. Verify that an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s PQS for either prehistoric or historic archaeology is contacted immediately to evaluate any unanticipated discovery.	During grading and ground disturbing activities	Continuous	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			
CUL-3: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains							
If human remains are found, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98 (d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in PRC 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute. Upon discovery	If human remains are encountered during construction, field verify work is suspended in the area, and verify that the County Coroner has been notified.	During grading and ground disturbing activities	Continuous	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
of human remains and associated funerary objects, the tribal and/or archaeological monitor/consultant will immediately divert work at minimum of 150 feet and place an exclusion zone around the discovery location. All feasible care to avoid any unnecessary disturbance, physical modification, or separation of human remains and associated funerary objects shall be taken. The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site and provide recommendations for treatment to the landowner within 48 hours of being granted access. The discovery is to be kept confidential and secure to prevent any further disturbance. In the case where discovered human remains cannot be fully documented and recovered on the same day, the remains shall be covered with muslin cloth and a steel plate that can be moved by heavy equipment placed over the excavation opening to protect the remains. If this type of steel plate is not available, a 24-hour guard shall be posted outside of working hours. There shall be no publicity regarding any cultural materials recovered.							
Geology and Soils							
GEO-1: Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Recommendations							
The developer and all contractors shall follow all recommendations related to building foundations and floor slab design included in the 2019 Geotechnical Engineering Investigation prepared by Geotechnologies Inc. in April 2019. Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the Building and Safety Division shall review and approve the detailed construction plans to ensure such plans implement the following measures:	Review and approve the detailed construction plans to ensure such plans implement the measures outlined in Mitigation Measure GEO-1.	Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits	Once	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A structural engineer shall be retained to determine the floor slab reinforcement required for the proposed buildings based on the imposed slab loading and the potential settlements. 	Verify that the developer and all contractors follow all recommendations related to building foundations and floor slab design included in the 2019 Geotechnical Engineering Investigation prepared by Geotechnologies Inc. in April 2019. Review and approve the report that documents compliance with the						

City of Redondo Beach
100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The minimum floor slab reinforcement shall consist of No. 3 steel bars at 24-inches on center in both directions to account for the presence of low expansive soils. Structural floor slab supported on the deep foundation system shall be at minimum four inches thick. All existing fill materials and upper native soils shall be removed and recompact to a minimum depth of five feet below the proposed grade, or three feet below the bottom of the proposed foundation, whichever is deeper. Materials with high expansion potential, low strength, poor gradation or containing organic materials may require removal from the site or proper compaction to the satisfaction of the Geotechnical Engineer (i.e., approximately 90 percent relative compaction). Additional expansion index testing shall be conducted at the completion of rough grading to verify the expansion potential of the as-graded building pad. All soils shall be evaluated and tested by the Geotechnical Engineer. A report documenting compliance with the implemented building foundation and floor slab design measures shall be submitted to the City for subsequent review and approval. 	building foundation and floor slab design measures.						
GEO-2a: Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan (PRIMP)							
Prior to the commencement of ground disturbing activities, a qualified professional paleontologist shall be retained to prepare and implement a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Plan (PRIMP) for the project. A Qualified Paleontologist is an individual who meets the education and professional experience standards as set forth by the SVP (2010), which recommends the paleontologist shall have at least a Master's Degree or equivalent work experience in paleontology, shall have knowledge of the local paleontology, and shall be familiar with paleontological procedures and	<p>Verify that a qualified professional paleontologist prepares and implements a PRIMP for the project.</p> <p>Verify compliance with the PRIMP, including paleontological monitoring procedures, communication protocols, and preparation, curation, and reporting requirements. Review and approve reporting documents.</p>	Prior to the start of ground disturbing activities	Once	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
techniques. The PRIMP shall consist of the following components, which include paleontological monitoring procedures; communication protocols to be followed in the event that an unanticipated fossil discovery is made during project development; and preparation, curation, and reporting requirements.							
GEO-2b: Paleontological Monitoring							
Prior to the start of construction, the following mitigation measures shall be required to avoid potential impacts to significant paleontological resources if they are encountered during construction activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A trained and qualified paleontological monitor shall perform full-time monitoring of any excavations on the project that have the potential to impact paleontological resources in undisturbed native sediments below ten feet in depth. The monitor shall have the ability to redirect construction activities to ensure avoidance of adverse impacts to paleontological resources.The project paleontologist may re-evaluate the necessity for paleontological monitoring after examination of the affected sediments during excavation, with approval from Lead Agency and Client representatives.Any potentially significant fossils observed shall be collected and recorded in conjunction with best management practices and Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) professional standards.Any fossils recovered during mitigation shall be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution for the benefit of current and future generations.A report documenting the results of the monitoring, including any salvage activities and the significance of any fossils, will be prepared and submitted to the appropriate personnel.	Field verify that a trained and qualified paleontological monitor is providing full-time monitoring during excavation activities. If fossils are collected and recorded, review and approve the monitoring report.	Prior to and during construction activities	Continuous	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			

City of Redondo Beach
100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
Hazards and Hazardous Materials							
HAZ-1a: Shallow Soil Remediation							
<p>The applicant shall implement the following measures prior to soil disturbance at the project site:</p> <p>1. The applicant shall further evaluate applicability of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1466 to proposed site Workplan and soil grading activities. If applicable, the applicant shall implement all monitoring and reporting requirements as defined in SCAQMD Rule 1466.</p> <p>2. The applicant shall submit a soil management plan (SMP) that can be implemented at the site to address the monitoring, characterization, assessment, delineation, and/or remediation of known on-site environmental impacts and potential “unknown” on-site impacts. In addition, the SMP shall evaluate potential human health risk/hazards posed to future construction workers</p>	<p>Field verify that monitoring is occurring, if necessary.</p> <p>Review and approve monitoring reports, as necessary, and the SMP.</p>	Prior to soil disturbance	Once	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			
HAZ-1b: Soil and Soil Vapor							
<p>The applicant shall incorporate all requirements in the design of the project as set forth by the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACoFD) for issuance of building permits, which include the following measures:</p> <p>1. The boundary of the vapor barrier and sub-slab ventilation shall extend beneath the entire building footprint.</p> <p>2. Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in shallow soil vapor shall be mitigated to levels that are protective of human health for the proposed residential and commercial uses.</p> <p>3. Mass removal of VOCs in deep soil shall continue until influent concentrations from the proposed soil vapor treatment reach low and sustainable</p>	<p>Review project plans to verify that all requirements as set forth by the LACoFD and outlined in Mitigation Measure HAZ-1b are incorporated into the design of the project.</p>	Prior to issuance of building permits	Once	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
asymptotic levels that are protective of groundwater.							
4. Vapor barrier design will include horizontal pipes that shall be connected to vertical solid vent pipes extending through the building to a minimum of 10 feet above grade and a minimum of 10 feet from any air inlet or operable door or window.							
HAZ-1c: Operation Maintenance and Monitoring							
The applicant shall conduct operation, maintenance, and monitoring of the vapor barrier and sub-slab ventilation system, which will include the following measures:	Review and approve the plans to verify that the operation, maintenance, and monitoring of the vapor barrier and sub-slab ventilation system are conducted following the measures outlined in Mitigation Measure HAZ-1c. Verify that the OMM plan for the vapor barrier system has been approved by the LACoFD.	Following the completion of construction and prior to building occupation	Continuous	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			
1. Following the completion of construction and before the buildings are occupied, indoor air monitoring shall be conducted. The monitoring shall be limited to the COPCs and results shall be compared to the DTSC SL for PCE and EPA RSLs for TCE, or the applicable health risk-based screening levels in effect at the time of the indoor air assessment.							
2. An OMM plan shall be developed for the vapor barrier system and approved by the LACoFD. The plan shall include indoor air monitoring that would be conducted on a routine basis.							

City of Redondo Beach
100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
HAZ-1d: Lead and Asbestos							
<p>Prior to demolition of any on-site structure, an asbestos survey shall be conducted and all identified lead-based paint (LBP) or asbestos containing materials (ACMs) shall be removed from site structures in accordance with applicable regulations.</p> <p>In the event that any suspected LBP is discovered during construction activities, the materials shall be sampled and analyzed for lead content prior to any disturbance. 8 CCR Section 1532.1 <i>California Construction Safety Orders for Lead</i> shall be followed for the demolition of all existing structures requiring exposure assessment and compliance measures to keep worker exposure below action levels. The proposed project is also subject to Title 22 requirements for the disposal of solid waste containing concentrations of lead in exceedance of State and federal hazardous waste requirements. Testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based materials shall comply with all Cal/OSHA standards and regulations under California Construction Safety Orders for Lead Section 1532. Impacts due to lead exposure and contamination would be less than significant with adherence to 8 CCR Section 1532.1 and Title 22 requirements.</p> <p>In the event that any suspected ACMs are discovered during construction activities, the materials shall be sampled and analyzed for asbestos content prior to any disturbance. Prior to the issuance of the demolition permit, the applicant shall provide a letter from a qualified asbestos abatement consultant that no ACMs are present in any on-site structures. If additional ACMs are found to be present, a qualified asbestos abatement consultant shall abate ACMs in compliance with the SCAQMD Rule 1403 as well as all other State and federal rules and regulations.</p>	<p>Review and approve the survey reports to verify that surveys have been conducted and all identified LBP or ACMs have been removed from site structures in accordance with applicable regulations. If LBP or ACMs are discovered, verify that the sample(s) have been analyzed prior to any disturbance on site.</p> <p>Review any final reports to verify compliance with 8 CCR Section 1532.1 <i>California Construction Safety Orders for Lead</i>, Title 22 requirements, and Cal/OSHA standards and regulations.</p>	Prior to the demolition of on-site structures	Once	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
Noise							
N-1: Construction Noise Reduction							
The project contractor shall be required to reduce construction noise below the FTA daytime noise criterion of 80 dBA L_{eq} for residential uses and 85 dBA L_{eq} for commercial uses. This shall be accomplished through the following required measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Installation of temporary sound barriers/blankets along the north and eastern project boundary line adjacent to the commercial and multi-family receivers. The temporary barriers/blankets shall have a minimum sound transmission loss of 21 and noise reduction coefficient of 0.75. The temporary barriers/blankets shall be of sufficient height to extend from the top of the temporary construction fence and drape on the ground or be sealed at the ground. The temporary barriers/blankets shall have grommets along the top edge with exterior grade hooks, and loop fasteners along the vertical edges with overlapping seams, with a minimum overlap of two inches.Provide a sign at the yard entrance, or other conspicuous location, that includes a 24-hour telephone number for project information, and a procedure where a field engineer/construction manager shall respond to and investigate noise complaints and take corrective action if necessary, in a timely manner. The sign shall have a minimum dimension of 48 inches wide by 24 inches high. The sign shall be placed five feet above ground level.If a noise complaint(s) is registered, the contractor shall retain a City-approved noise consultant to conduct noise measurements at the use(s) that registered the complaint. The	Field verify that sound barriers are installed and signage with contact information is posted. If noise complaints are received, verify that noise measurements and any additional measures are implemented. Review and approve the associated reporting documentation.	Prior to and during project construction	Continuous	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			

City of Redondo Beach
100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
<p>noise measurements shall be conducted for a minimum of one hour and will include one-minute intervals. The approved noise consultant shall prepare a letter report for code enforcement summarizing the measurements, calculation data used in determining impacts, and potential measures to reduce noise levels to the maximum extent feasible.</p> <p>The following measures may also be used to reduce noise levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The use of bells, whistles, alarms, and horns shall be restricted to safety warning purposes only. ▪ Noise-reducing enclosures shall be used around stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., compressors and generators) or located as far from sensitive receivers, as feasible. 							
N-5: Construction Equipment Operations Near Historic Buildings							
Large dozers, loaded trucks, and other construction equipment with similar vibration levels shall not operate within 20 feet of on-site buildings with potential historic significance located at 112, 124, 126, and 132 North Catalina Avenue.	Field verify that large dozers, loaded trucks, and other construction equipment with similar vibration levels do not operate within 20 feet of on-site buildings with potential historical significance.	During project construction	Continuous	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			
Transportation							
Mitigation Measures							
Mitigation for VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) impacts consists of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures that result in shorter average trip lengths and/or reduce the demand for automobile trips altogether. In order to mitigate the project's residential VMT impact, Home-Based VMT per Capita would need to be reduced by approximately 24 percent. To mitigate the project's work VMT impact, Home-Based Work VMT per Employee would need to be reduced by approximately 1.3 percent. In order to achieve these reductions, a	<p>Agree upon the appropriate, TDM measures, outlined in the Transportation Mitigation Measures, prior to project approval.</p> <p>Review final project plans and programs to verify that agreed upon TDM measures are included.</p> <p>Verify that plans and programs are implemented, as necessary, during construction and operation of the project.</p>	Prior to project approval, during project construction and operation	Continuous	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
<p>range of TDM measures was considered for the project, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transit subsidies for project residents ▪ Pedestrian-oriented project design (affects residential and commercial VMT) ▪ Commuter Incentives for project employees valued at \$150 per month ▪ Commute marketing program (affects residential and commercial VMT) ▪ Bikeshare System and subsidies (affects residential and commercial VMT) ▪ Local hire considerations 							
Tribal Cultural Resources							
TCR-1a: Native American Monitoring							
<p>The City of Redondo Beach shall retain a Native American monitor/consultant locally affiliated with the project area for all project-related ground disturbing activities. The monitor/consultant will only be present on-site during the construction phases that involve ground disturbing activities. Ground disturbing activities are defined as activities that may include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, potholing or auguring, grubbing, tree removals, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching, within the project area. The Tribal Monitor/consultant will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the day's activities, including construction activities, locations, soil, and any cultural materials identified. The on-site monitoring shall end when the project site grading and excavation activities are completed, or when the Tribal Representatives and monitor/consultant have indicated that the site has a low potential for impacting Tribal Cultural Resources.</p>	<p>Verify that a Native American monitor/consultant locally affiliated with the project area is retained for all project-related ground disturbing activities.</p> <p>Review daily monitoring logs.</p>	<p>During project construction</p>	<p>Continuous</p>	<p>City of Redondo Beach Planning Division</p>			

City of Redondo Beach
100-132 North Catalina Avenue Project

Mitigation Measure/ Condition of Approval	Action Required	Monitoring Timing	Monitoring Frequency	Responsible Agency	Compliance Verification		
					Initial	Date	Comments
TCR-1b: Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural Resources							
Upon discovery of any potential tribal cultural or archaeological resources of Native American origin, construction activities within a 100-foot radius of the find shall cease until the find can be assessed. All tribal cultural and archaeological resources of Native American origin unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by the qualified archaeologist and tribal monitor/consultant. If the resources are Native American in origin, the tribal monitor/consultant shall coordinate with the landowner regarding treatment and curation of these resources. Work may continue on other parts of the project while evaluation and, if necessary, recommended treatment measures take place. As appropriate and based on consultation with the tribal monitor/consultant, treatment of any unanticipated tribal cultural resources shall occur consistent with the Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan required under Mitigation Measure CUL-1. The tribal monitor/consultant may request preservation in place or recovery for educational purposes. The disposition of any artifacts of Native American origin shall be determined in consultation with the tribal monitor/consultant.	If potential tribal cultural or archaeological resources of Native American origin are discovered during demolition and construction, field verify that all construction activities within a 100-foot radius of a potential tribal cultural or archaeological find are ceased until the find can be assessed. Verify that the qualified archaeologist and tribal monitor/consultant are retained under Mitigation Measures CUL-2a and TCR-1a, respectively.	During project construction	Continuous	City of Redondo Beach Planning Division			