

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

MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FOR THE CITY OF LONG BEACH

TRANSCRIPT OF DISCUSSION
STUDY SESSION REGARDING THE
PROPOSED SEASP PROJECT

AUGUST 18, 2016

5:03 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS
333 W. OCEAN BOULEVARD
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA

MARY E. PIERCE, CSR 6143

JOB NO.: 16-122

**MEETING OF PLANNING COMMISSION TRANSCRIPT OF DISCUSSION STUDY SESSION REGARDING
TEAM, THE on 08/18/2016**

1 COMMISSION MEMBERS:

2 MARK CHRISTOFFELS, Chairman
3 DONITA VAN HORIK, Vice Chairwoman
4 RON CRUZ, Commissioner
5 ALAN FOX, Commissioner
6 JANE TEMPLIN, Commissioner
7 ERICK VERDUZCO-VEGA, Commissioner

8 CITY REPRESENTATIVES:

9 AMY BODEK, Director of Development Services
10 LINDA TATUM, Planning Manager
11 MICHAEL J. MAIS, Assistant City Attorney
12 CHRISTOPHER KOONTZ, Advance Planning Officer

13 CONSULTANTS:

14 WENDY NOWAK, Placeworks
15 NICOLE DAVIS, Placeworks
16 JASON PACK, Fehr & Peers

17 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHO ADDRESSED THE COMMISSIONERS:

18 JAN HALL
19 BOB LADD
20 KEN CROFT
21 HOWARD DAVIS
22 DOUGLAS SPRAGUE
23 JANICE DAHL
24 DUSTIN BATTEN
25 LINDA PEMBERTON
JULIE DEAN
ANN CANTRELL
DAVE SCHUKLAND
RICHARD ROTH
JEFF MILLER
MEL NUTTER
CARRIE ALEY
ALAN SONGER
SUSAN MILLER
ANNA CHRISTENSEN
MELINDA COTTON
GORDONA CAGER
ELIZABETH LAMB
PAT TOWNER
ANDY McAFEE
REBECCA CAUDILLO JONES
LARRY GOODHUE
MIKE BUHBE
DIANE SUNDSTROM

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

THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 2016; 5:03 P.M.

LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: For those of you who are present, if you're going to speak this evening, I need you to rise and swear you in. So please rise if you're going to speak this evening.

Raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the evidence you shall give in this Planning Commission meeting shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: I do.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you very much. You may be seated.

Could we have the first item, please, the study session?

MS. TATUM: The first item on the agenda, I would like to introduce Christopher Koontz, who will give a brief introduction to the consultant team, and I'd also like to acknowledge that on this item we he have the City's former Deputy Director for Economic Development, Angela Reynolds, who spent many, many years on this project, and Angela came to see the Commission action on this.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Before staff starts their

PC1
CONT'D

1 presentation, I have a comment for staff, as well as the
2 audience that's present that may come forward and speak.
3 A special favor to this lovely lady up front, if you
4 speak slowly and clearly, she is manually trying to
5 record everything that's being said, and if you're
6 really fast -- trust me, she's told me this many times
7 -- she can't catch it all. So that would really be
8 appreciated. Thank you.

9 MR. KOONTZ: Good evening, Commissioners. Again,
10 it's Christopher Koontz, and just to give you a preview
11 of the order of proceedings this evening, I'm going to
12 introduce the consultant team that the City retained to
13 prepare this Draft Specific Plan and EIR.

14 After that time I'd suggest we take the
15 public testimony, and after that staff would like to
16 give some comments based on both those, public testimony
17 and the presentation of the consultant team, give some
18 comments and then proceed to questions from the
19 Commissioners.

20 So if you're agreeable, that's the
21 procedure for this evening. And in introducing the team
22 here, just to remind everyone, what we're talking about
23 is PD-1, the oldest Planned Development District in the
24 City.

25 So the original planning for this area

1 occurred in the 1970s, and we're looking to update those
2 efforts. So with that, I'm going to introduce the
3 Placeworks team, Wendy, Nicole and Suzanne, and we also
4 have Jason Pack from Fehr & Peers, who is the City's
5 traffic consultant on this particular project. And with
6 that, I'm going to let Wendy start her presentation.

7 MS. NOWAK: Good evening. I can't believe we're
8 back here. It's been a year, a little over a year since
9 the last time I was here to present the general ideas
10 and concepts for the land use plan, and over this past
11 year there has been a lot of work put together that was
12 kind of the what, but we were really working with all of
13 the technical studies, with the public, with staff to
14 put meat on the bones of the Specific Plan and start to
15 show you what the how is for the SEADIP area.

16 So a little bit of background, as
17 Christopher mentioned. The plan is from 1977, and in
18 2012, the Council directed staff to move forward and
19 seek funds and pursue preparing a specific plan for the
20 area, to come up with a comprehensive plan.

21 This project was funded by sustainability
22 grant from the State of California, so it helps include
23 the studies that we've done for wetlands delineation or
24 habitat assessment, mobility analysis and traffic
25 analysis, creating the development standards.

1 So all of those things were an initiative
2 the City sought funding and was granted a grant and is
3 helping to pay for the project that you see before you.

4 One of the most important things that the
5 Council had asked for as part of this effort was an
6 extensive outreach effort. One of the things that they
7 felt was very important was that the public had ample
8 opportunity to comment on, weigh in, talk about,
9 influence, shape a future plan for the area and so we
10 could really understand those things that were important
11 to the community and make sure those were integrated
12 into the plan.

13 So as you'll see up on the screen, there
14 are multiple ways that throughout this process we
15 reached out to the public. There was a Citizens
16 Advisory Committee that was made of 22 members and some
17 of which are in the audience this evening, and they were
18 -- that Advisory Committee was made up of property
19 owners, homeowners association representatives, Cal
20 Trans representatives, folks that represented the land
21 trust and other wetlands interests, and we held six
22 meetings with them to really be a sounding board and
23 help work through some of the big ideas in the plan.

24 There were pop-up events where we would go
25 out in different kind of shopping centers in the area

1 and talk with the public as they were coming in and out
2 of doing their shopping.

3 We've conducted Council -- or meetings at
4 Council District workshops. Most recently there was an
5 open house in March which had stations for all of the
6 topics that are in the Specific Plan and where folks
7 could come in and talk to us about their questions or
8 get a better understanding about the project because at
9 that time the Specific Plan had actually been drafted
10 and we had a lot more information to share with the
11 community before we were here with you tonight.

12 We also did online outreach and
13 E-notification. So we're really trying to get out there
14 and talk to the community in the way that they work and
15 what's most convenient for them.

16 So where we are in the process -- it's been
17 a couple years now. We did all of the background
18 research, really starting to understand what the market
19 conditions were, developed a vision statement for the
20 area, because that is what's really driving the plan,
21 came up with the Land Use Plan, which I presented to you
22 over a year ago.

23 And so now we're in the final stages of the
24 City process for the Specific Plan and EIR, which are
25 before you this evening.

1 Once there is action taken on the Specific
2 Plan by the City, there will be a next step, which is
3 taking it forward for review and the process through the
4 Coastal Commission.

5 So a brief overview of the project. I
6 think most everyone is familiar with it, but those in
7 the audience that may not be, the boundaries of the
8 Specific Plan area to the north are the 22 or 7th
9 Street. On the south end it's the County line, and
10 essentially we're looking at PCH, which is the
11 north-south -- the left side, the north-south running
12 street, and then we also have Studebaker, which is the
13 other north-south running street on the right side.

14 The project is about 1500 acres. That's
15 the total size of it. So the foundation, the capstone
16 of this project was the vision. We worked with the
17 community, we worked with the Citizens Advisory
18 Committee to understand what this area should look like
19 in the future, what do you want to see here, and the
20 overarching statement was that the community wanted a
21 livable, thriving and sustainable gateway destination in
22 Long Beach and Southern California.

23 But what does that mean? That could mean a
24 lot of things. So I'm not going to read through all the
25 bullet points, but the ones below are the supporting

1 ideas that go with it. It's a more walkable, more
2 active area, more pedestrian friendly, less reliance on
3 the automobile, a relationship with the surrounding
4 natural uses that you have, the wetlands, protecting and
5 encouraging views -- there's a lot of views right now
6 that are not being capitalized on -- and a place that
7 serves both locals and visitors.

8 One of the things we wanted to make sure we
9 did, because this is a very extensive effort, it's an
10 investement by the community, it's an investment by the
11 City, is to create a sustainable plan. No one wants a
12 planning document that sits on the shelf and can't be
13 used or can't be implemented.

14 So what was really important is when we
15 were having all of the conversations about how we
16 achieve the vision and different strategies that we
17 could imply in the Specific Plan, we kept in mind what
18 we call the three pillars of sustainability.

19 And really what these are are kind of the
20 three legs of the stool of the Specific Plan to make
21 sure it can be implemented.

22 So equally in the process we needed to
23 consider the physical benefits, so what the place looked
24 like, planning, how we get around, and we had to look at
25 the environmental benefits, how does it affect the

1 wetlands and the uses adjacent to it.

2 We also needed to look at the economic
3 benefits, meaning we don't want to put together a plan
4 or recommendations in the plan that couldn't actually be
5 realized.

6 So all of these things were components of
7 what we talked about and made -- or really equally
8 considered as we're moving forward in the plan. You
9 can't have one without the other.

10 So some of the differences between the new
11 plan and the existing PD is that we -- right now we
12 propose no mid rise -- there's no high rise development
13 here. It's mid rise development. We're not proposing
14 an extension of Studebaker in the plan.

15 This Specific Plan reflects the ideas that
16 have come about through the feedback that we received,
17 but most importantly, it creates a comprehensive plan
18 for the area.

19 Inevitably, the City would probably
20 experience some ongoing applications and requests for
21 new uses within the SEADIP area over time. One thing
22 that this does is it really gives a comprehensive vision
23 and approach for land use, for circulation, for
24 preserving natural resources, and it works as a
25 comprehensive whole.

1 And one of the ways that already it's been
2 demonstrated that it's been useful is that recently Cal
3 Trans has been looking at ways to improve the Los
4 Alamitos bridge, and they were looking at different
5 alternatives and designs for that bridge construction,
6 and a fourth alternative was added to their analysis
7 based upon the feedback that the community gave and
8 said, hey, did you know we were doing this SEADIP and
9 here are some of the big ideas.

10 So a new alternative was added to that
11 analysis, so it's starting to do what we were hoping it
12 would do and really create a global conversation about
13 what this entire area should look like and not one
14 project at a time.

15 So obviously, we want to emphasize the
16 walkability, the emphasis on pedestrians creating space
17 and creating new spaces for people to gather.

18 In the 1977 plan, there was a mix of
19 residential, commercial, open space, wetlands,
20 industrial and public uses, and in that plan it was very
21 auto-oriented, as I'm sure you've seen with most of the
22 commercial uses. The lanes on the roads are very wide,
23 parking lots are oriented towards the streets, and that
24 was just the nature of development at the time.

25 Everything was pretty much auto-oriented as development

1 was occurring.

2 One of the other things to note in this
3 plan, the original PD, was if you look at -- if you look
4 at the corner of, say, Second and PCH, the northeast
5 corner where the wetlands and Steamshovel Slough are,
6 it's showing yellow, which means there was residential
7 allowed in the area behind In-N-Out. It's also showing
8 on the south side of Second Street behind the
9 Marketplace that commercial uses were allowed.

10 So these are some of things -- and then on
11 the north side when you look at all the yellow, that's
12 all the existing and established residential
13 neighborhoods that you all are familiar with.

14 The proposed SEADIP plan, really 80 percent
15 of the uses in the area are staying exactly the same.
16 We have about 20 percent of the area that is looking at
17 any change whatsoever, and most of those areas that have
18 changed -- actually, all the areas that we're
19 recommending change for already have some sort of
20 existing development plan on them, and that we would be
21 looking at ways to make that more efficient, more user
22 friendly for the community and bring some of those
23 amenities that were desired and the vision.

24 So one of the features of the new plan is
25 the addition of a designation called mixed use. So

1 there are a handful of properties right at Second and
2 PCH which are designated in red, and then there's also a
3 property that is located a little bit further north in
4 purple, and these are our mixed areas. The purple area
5 is where the Golden Sails property is.

6 These mixed use areas is where the most
7 amount of change is being shown. This is where we would
8 allow for a mix of commercial uses, hospitality uses,
9 residential uses to create those gathering places and a
10 new mix of housing opportunities for people in the area.
11 And shopping opportunities, for that matter.

12 This plan also shows that those areas that
13 were originally designated commercial and residential in
14 the wetlands are now designated in a new land use
15 category, which is called Coastal Habitat Wetlands and
16 Recreation. Say that five times fast.

17 But what that means is that allows for
18 wetlands restoration, it allows for interpretive
19 centers, and it also allows for visitor-serving and
20 coastal-related uses.

21 So, for instance, if somebody wanted to
22 open a space and they were renting kayaks or other
23 things that would provide people access to the water,
24 those are the type of uses that are allowed in the
25 coastal habitat, wetland and recreation.

1 We have retained the industrial uses for
2 your energy uses, and we've retained all of the
3 residential, the established residential. So the
4 majority of the uses are really and the changes are in
5 those mixed use and mixed use -- it's a community core
6 and mix used marina areas.

7 This is a very detailed table, but I'll get
8 to a summary on the next slide, but this shows the total
9 acres of all the uses, the amount of dwelling units, the
10 square footage and the estimated population that would
11 be allowed within the Specific Plan area.

12 Some of the areas have -- when it says
13 "dwelling units," those include dwelling units that
14 already are on the ground and are presumed not to
15 change. This also is the maximum that would be allowed
16 in the Specific Plan.

17 So it doesn't mean necessarily that because
18 these numbers are allowed in the Specific Plan for these
19 totals that all development will achieve those numbers.
20 Lots of time development comes in at a lot less than
21 that, but this is what the maximum is allowed in the
22 Specific Plan, and this is what has been analyzed in the
23 Environmental Impact Report.

24 So total dwelling units in the area is 9500
25 units. It's a population of about 15,000 people.

1 Nonresidential square footage, we have about 2.7 million
2 square feet, and that is a combination of commercial,
3 office, industrial and public space, and public is,
4 like, Kettering Elementary and some of the other public
5 uses we have in the project area. It allows for up to
6 425 hotel rooms. And then we also look at employee
7 generation. So it's anticipated to generate about 4,000
8 employees.

9 There is a small area, as well, that is on
10 the east side of the -- or I'm sorry -- the west side of
11 the project area that is going to be removed from the
12 Specific Plan and converted to traditional zoning, so
13 those numbers are not included in the Specific Plan
14 projection numbers.

15 So the difference between the existing and
16 the new plan. About 118 acres that were originally
17 designated as commercial or residential are now being
18 converted to coastal habitat, wetlands and recreation.

19 We have about 440,000 square feet less of
20 commercial uses than what is actually allowed in the
21 existing PD, but there are 4,000 more units and about
22 6300 more people than what the existing SEADIP would
23 have had.

24 So as part of the conversation about
25 creating place and making this an area that's special,

1 there was a lot of conversation about how do we do that,
2 what opportunities are we missing out on that we should
3 be capitalizing on, and one of the things that
4 consistently came up was creating additional views,
5 capitalizing on views right now that may be blocked by
6 existing buildings and structures.

7 So one of the ideas is to be able to -- and
8 this is an example where say, for instance, on the
9 bottom left you have wetlands, and then this could be
10 Pacific Coast Highway, and then you would have new
11 development, new change and then views connecting to the
12 water.

13 So finding ways that as you are driving
14 through and as new projects come in that there are views
15 and that the community can see the assets that they
16 enjoy and that are currently blocked by existing
17 structures.

18 This is another example of a view corridor,
19 say, looking from the inside. This is an example of the
20 concept if it was taken from the Marketplace. So if
21 you're looking from the Marketplace across to PCH to the
22 water, there could be opportunities to connect all the
23 way through, how buildings could frame these views.

24 But probably the biggest opportunity to
25 create place and something special in the SEADIP area is

1 what we're calling the waterway promenade, and that's an
2 area of opportunity that is seen behind the Marina
3 Pacifica project.

4 Right now the way that the buildings are
5 oriented, they turn their backs on this amenity, and no
6 one has access to it, and there are not opportunities to
7 walk along it, see it.

8 So this is a concept of how you could turn
9 new development to face that amenity and provide
10 additional spaces, activity centers, outdoor dining
11 opportunities and really build upon an amenity that's
12 there right now.

13 So as we were talking about the three legs
14 of the stool for the pillars of sustainability,
15 obviously, one of the biggest assets in the area is the
16 opportunity for wetlands restoration.

17 So biological considerations were a very
18 important part of this Specific Plan, and so, obviously,
19 we included that coastal habitat, wetlands and
20 recreation use as a new use to start to acknowledge the
21 presence of those resources there.

22 There's discussions about buffers. We've
23 coordinated with and gotten feedback from different
24 members from the wetlands community about different
25 things that could be done for bird safe treatments that

1 include specialized landscaping so that it's noninvasive
2 into the wetlands and looking at different native
3 treatments.

4 We also have migratory birds, so trying to
5 understand the best places to plant trees and other
6 things for that. Lighting is something that's
7 considered and looking at different ways to shield the
8 lighting so that it minimizes impacts to the wetlands,
9 and then special building materials, too, because
10 animals are attracted to different types of materials.
11 So that way if we could integrate those, that would
12 deter them, you know, from running into the buildings,
13 and that would be something that would be a benefit.

14 So that's what we're talking about. It's
15 an urban interface with the wetlands, how does that
16 look, what are the transitions. We don't have any
17 site-specific projects planned right now, but there is
18 plenty of high level guidance in the Specific Plan to
19 start to talk about what that interface should look like
20 so that the wetlands can exist in harmony with any
21 development that's adjacent to it.

22 Mobility. Obviously, that was one of the
23 top issues for the community as we were moving through
24 the project. The area is congested. There's no doubt
25 about that. So one of the priorities was improving

1 circulation and providing enhanced opportunities to walk
2 and bike as an alternative to the car.

3 The challenge of the SEADIP area is that
4 not only does it serve local vehicular traffic, but it
5 also serves regional traffic. So the balance we were
6 trying to create here is looking at finding as many of
7 the tools available that we have to minimize the traffic
8 impacts while also respecting some of the what we would
9 say is a constraint, but it's also a benefit as far as
10 this project goes, for instance, the wetlands.

11 So if this was a traffic-oriented plan
12 solely, we could widen all the roads and accommodate
13 traffic, but that was not the vision of the community.
14 So the recommendations that are in this plan are
15 improvements that are proposed within the existing
16 rights of way and add new bike lane miles and new mid
17 block crossings so that we have exhausted all of the
18 avenues that we have to add new circulation and
19 connectivity opportunities within the area without
20 adding new roadways.

21 So this is an example of one of the
22 graphics that's in the Specific Plan that shows the
23 bicycle network. All of the existing bike facilities
24 are in the solid lines and the proposed are in dashed.
25 And so I won't go through all of these, but I just

1 wanted to show you the extent of how this bike
2 connectivity is planned for in the plan.

3 One of the concepts we also looked at was
4 this idea of narrowing the lane that's on PCH, creating
5 a new protected bike lane, creating new walkability, new
6 landscaping and really enhancing this as a complete
7 street, one that responds to all modes of transportation
8 and also serves as a visual gateway and, you know, just
9 improving the appearance as people arrive from the
10 south.

11 I talked a little bit about the internal
12 and mid block connectivity. This one is really
13 important because right now there aren't a lot of ways
14 for people to get around other than using PCH or the
15 Shopkeeper Road, and so finding ways that new projects
16 as they are designed can create new internal roadways
17 that provide access for the same, for pedestrians and
18 bikes and vehicles, is going to be really important.

19 One of the things that you will note on
20 this exhibit is the dashed line by Shopkeeper Road, and
21 currently there is a -- there's a paper dedication for
22 Shopkeeper Road in this area, but it has not been built.

23 We as part of the Specific Plan are not
24 suggesting any particular alignment for Shopkeeper Road.
25 What the Specific Plan is emphasizing is that there

1 needs to be some sort of connection down the line from
2 Shopkeeper Road to that end of Studebaker so that people
3 have an alternative to get around there.

4 So while the Specific Plan doesn't resolve
5 the location of that, it does say that it's important,
6 that it's something that should be addressed as new
7 projects come in and discussions, detailed discussions
8 happen about the area in the future.

9 So overall what the project area does for
10 improvability in Southeast Long Beach is almost -- we
11 add seven additional miles of bike facilities. So
12 that's almost an 80 percent increase in bike lane miles
13 in this area, which is really important, and especially
14 because that's one of the objectives of the City as a
15 whole overall, as well, is to become a very bike
16 friendly community.

17 The pedestrian facilities, we have almost a
18 30 percent increase in additional miles for pedestrians.
19 And then as far as cars go, it's minimal. We've added
20 centerline miles of almost two miles, but it's 9
21 percent, and that's really kind of the internal roadways
22 and the connectivity of Shopkeeper to Studebaker.

23 So overall, what does the Specific Plan do
24 for Southeast Long Beach and all the properties that are
25 in this area? As I mentioned earlier, it really

1 provides a comprehensive look and a way to approach the
2 way the community should evolve, how new plazas and
3 gathering spaces can be provided, how connectivity can
4 occur and really how you can create place in a
5 comprehensive way.

6 It gives a strategy for all of these
7 things, and it reflects all of the values and
8 aspirations that the community has expressed through the
9 process. And now is it perfect? Will it satisfy
10 everyone? Probably not. But it is the best effort
11 using the opportunities and constraints that we have to
12 balance those community priorities.

13 The City did go through great lengths to
14 really understand all the different options and
15 alternatives, and what you see before you is that best
16 representation of that information.

17 And so one of the other things that this
18 does is that as new projects come in, you could talk to
19 property owners and really show them the concepts that
20 are in there, and it gives you more leverage to be able
21 to say this is what the community wants, this is the
22 comprehensive plan, and how can new projects help to
23 make that happen.

24 So with that brief overview of the plan,
25 what I'd like to do now is to talk you through -- or

1 turn it over to Nicole Morse, who prepared the
2 Environmental Impact Report, and she will explain the
3 EIR and the contents of it and then the next steps.

4 MS. MORSE: Thank you, Wendy.

5 My name is Nicole Morse. My job was to
6 take all that information that you just received from
7 Wendy on the Specific Plan and to analyze and evaluate
8 the environmental impact of that project.

9 So I'm going to walk you through what was
10 the key main features, why do we prepare EIRs, what's
11 the purpose of CEQA or the California Environmental
12 Quality Act, and then I'll walk you through the
13 environmental impacts that were found as we did our
14 analysis.

15 The California Environmental Quality Act --
16 I will call it CEQA -- it's primarily a disclosure
17 document so that decision makers and the public
18 understand what the environmental impacts are. It's not
19 meant to comment on the merits of the project. It's
20 more of a disclosure document.

21 And once we determine what the
22 environmental impacts are, we have to find ways to avoid
23 or reduce those impacts. So we do that through
24 mitigation measures and looking at alternatives to the
25 project.

1 Another thing that it does is it helps us
2 to coordinate with other agencies. So responsible
3 agencies are contacted that have jurisdiction over the
4 area, such as Cal Trans, the Army Corps of Engineers as
5 an example or California Department of Fish & Wildlife,
6 and we reach out to them to get their input on the
7 environmental impacts, as well.

8 There are a number of different types of
9 EIRs, and we prepared a program-level document. The
10 program EIRs are typical for a specific plan where
11 you're looking at development over time and you don't
12 have a site-specific development application in front of
13 you.

14 That would be different if you had projects
15 coming in one at a time for this area. They would be
16 preparing project-level EIRs for their sites. And what
17 this does is gives an overall analysis of the impacts
18 for the entire project site, the whole SEADIP area,
19 which is about 1500 acres.

20 So this is a more general discussion of
21 impacts. It considers mitigation measures and
22 alternatives for the area as a whole, and then it
23 establishes a path forward for evaluating future
24 projects as they come in.

25 So what is it exactly that we analyzed? In

1 the EIR we looked at -- the Specific Plan, we're looking
2 at the land uses that are being proposed, boundary
3 changes that occurred, any infrastructure improvements.

4 So any physical change to the environment
5 is what needs to be analyzed. And we also are required
6 to analyze build-out of the plan. So we look at the
7 difference between the existing on the ground land uses
8 to the maximum potential build-out of the Specific Plan.

9 So even though projects could come in and
10 they would be at a less intense level than that overall
11 build-out, we still need to do the most conservative
12 analysis in the EIR.

13 And what that means in terms of net
14 increase, Wendy before gave you the total build-out, but
15 compared to the existing on the ground uses, it's a net
16 increase of 5,439 dwelling units, approximately 575,000
17 square feet of commercial and other employment uses, as
18 well as an additional 50 hotel rooms.

19 So the EIR looked at all of the different
20 environmental topic areas. There's 17 different topic
21 areas, and I'm going to walk through how those were
22 analyzed.

23 One thing to keep in mind is that the
24 Specific Plan includes design guidelines and development
25 standards and other project design features that act as

1 mitigation in and of itself. So it's somewhat of a
2 self-mitigating plan, and that's what I'm referring to
3 also. As when Wendy talked about wetland buffers, bird
4 safe treatments, that's all considered when we're
5 analyzing these impacts.

6 So the impacts that were determined to be
7 less than significant are listed here. I don't need to
8 read all of them, but they include aesthetics,
9 geological resources, population housing, public
10 resources, recreation and utilities.

11 Impacts that were found to be less than
12 significant after mitigation measures were included were
13 biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and
14 hydrology and water quality.

15 Some of the mitigation measure types that
16 were included were future studies that are required for
17 site-specific development once development footprints
18 are known. As projects come in, they'll have to do a
19 wetlands study, or it's called a jurisdictional
20 delineation, and biological resources analysis.

21 We have monitors that are required during
22 grading for the cultural resources, and then, like, best
23 management practices would be required to -- for water
24 quality and hydrology.

25 Impacts that were found to be significant

1 and unavoidable include air quality, historical
2 resources, greenhouse gas emissions, noise related to
3 construction and transportation and traffic.

4 So I'm going to walk through each of those
5 so you can understand what we analyzed, what were the
6 types of mitigation measures we included and why they're
7 considered significant and unavoidable.

8 So for air quality, we looked at local and
9 regional air quality, and we used the build-out of the
10 proposed land uses, as well as vehicle miles traveled
11 and natural gas usage, and we plugged that into a model,
12 and it was determined that the project would exceed the
13 AQMD, or Air Quality Management District, thresholds.

14 So we applied mitigation measures for both
15 construction and operation. Construction measures
16 included, for example, Tier 4 efficiency equipment
17 during construction.

18 And then project design features, depends
19 on the type of use being proposed, but examples included
20 electric vehicle charging stations, a preference for
21 parking fuel efficient vehicles or developers are
22 required to use Energy Star appliances.

23 So even with the application of those
24 mitigation measures, the impact is still considered
25 significant.

1 With regard to historical resources, we
2 surveyed the entire project area. We looked at -- we
3 had a study prepared that looked at the eligibility of
4 structures and buildings that had the potential to
5 become historical resources and then those that were
6 over 50 years old.

7 And the one thing with this plan is that
8 it's a 20-year plus plan. So as development comes in
9 over this period of time, there will be buildings that
10 become 50 years of age or older that may become
11 eligible, so that's why we determined this to be a
12 significant impact.

13 And when if a developer comes in that were
14 to develop on or adjacent to a 50-year-old building,
15 they would be required to do an intensive-level
16 historical evaluation.

17 With regard to greenhouse gas emissions, we
18 looked at the total emissions at build-out by evaluating
19 transportation, energy, the amount of water and
20 wastewater that is being used, and the thresholds were
21 exceeded.

22 There is a plan in place and efficiency
23 metric for the year 2020. It exceeded that amount. But
24 there's also a 2050 goal that requires input from the
25 State on how to achieve those reductions.

1 So part of the reason why this is an
2 unavoidable impact is that we're creating for CARB to
3 update their scoping plan so that we can have State
4 measures to help guide how to reduce impacts for
5 efficiency measures beyond 2020.

6 For noise impacts we looked at both
7 short-term and long-term noise, short-term meaning
8 construction impacts, and then long-term would result
9 from either a use such as an industrial use that could
10 result in higher levels of noise, or overall we have an
11 increase in traffic, and so that increases noise in the
12 area.

13 We included mitigation measures to reduce
14 all those impacts to less than significant levels except
15 with regard to construction. Because this is a plan, we
16 don't know when these future projects are going to come
17 on board, how large they are, what number of equipment
18 they're going to need and how long a period of time they
19 need to construct.

20 So there can be some significant noise that
21 occur during that time, so we're going to require that
22 those applicants prepare site-specific noise and
23 vibration studies.

24 With regard to transportation and traffic,
25 there's six intersections in the study area we're

1 currently deficient with build-out of the project.
2 There will be 15 intersections that are deficient, and
3 we included all available mitigation measures. Wendy
4 went over some of them, but they also include signal
5 timing, fees, additional site-specific traffic studies
6 and intersection improvements.

7 One of the main reasons that we need to do
8 an override for -- and I'll explain what that is in a
9 second, but when you have an unavoidable impact, you
10 have to do a statement of overriding considerations for
11 that impact.

12 It's because a lot of these intersections
13 are in the jurisdiction of Cal Trans and it's outside of
14 the City's control, and therefore, you know, the City is
15 not able to determine when or where that improvement can
16 happen.

17 So we analyzed four different project
18 alternatives. As required by CEQA, we have to look at a
19 no project alternative. We chose two. One was a no
20 project/no development, meaning that everything that's
21 being -- that's going on today is the same thing that
22 would happen, and we compared the project to that.

23 And then we looked at a no project adopted
24 PD-1 that looks at the build-out of the adopted SEADIP
25 plan. We included a reduced intensity alternative, and

1 that was for the purpose of reducing some of these
2 significant impacts that I just mentioned regarding
3 traffic, air quality and noise.

4 And this assumes that a similar mix would
5 occur as in the proposed Specific Plan. It's just an
6 overall reduction in intensity.

7 And then the last alternative we looked at
8 was a reduced building height alternative. This one
9 would eliminate the incentive that is in the Specific
10 Plan for hotel and residential that allows seven stories
11 under certain conditions, and it would max the building
12 height out at five stories for the mixed use area.

13 So because there are significant
14 unavoidable impacts, the City will have to prepare a
15 statement of overriding considerations and to weigh the
16 impact of the -- to weigh the project benefits against
17 the environmental impacts before deciding whether or not
18 to approve the project.

19 We normally do a 45-day public review
20 period, but in this case we wanted to give some extra
21 time for people to review all of the materials, and the
22 review period is 60 days. It started on July 20th, and
23 it ends on September 19th.

24 We will be providing written comments to
25 everyone who submits comments. We've received maybe 20

1 comments so far, but we expect more. And tonight we're
2 recording all the comments, and all comments that are
3 made with regard to the environmental impacts and the
4 Environmental Impact Report will also be responded to in
5 that response to comments document.

6 I have the contact information for Craig
7 Chalfant, who is collecting all the comments, but it's
8 also on the City's web site.

9 So the next time we come before you, we're
10 going to have those response to comments available and
11 any changes that were made to the Draft EIR as a result
12 of those comments.

13 So I thank you very much. I appreciate you
14 listening, and I'm here to answer questions later.
15 Wendy is going to kind of wrap it up and tell you next
16 steps.

17 MS. NOWAK: Just one quick slide.

18 So where do we go from here? So once we
19 come back to you -- it will be some time. We have some
20 tentative hearing dates scheduled. The next time we come
21 before you is scheduled for November 3rd, and that would
22 be with everything all pulled together, we have the
23 Specific Plan, we have the EIR, the response to
24 comments, all of that.

25 So the intent is that at that meeting, that

1 would be discussion for action. And then once we have
2 gotten direction from the Planning Commission, then
3 tentatively right now we've got a hearing date scheduled
4 for City Council for December 6th.

5 There's still a lot of work. Obviously, we
6 still have the review period to close out here, so we
7 have some time, and then we need some time to respond to
8 the comments, but then we'll be back to you for
9 direction and action.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. KOONTZ: So with that, I think we would advise
12 taking public testimony.

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Sure. So the
14 Commissioners know, we will hold our questions until the
15 end, and we'll take public testimony.

16 What you'll do is you'll come up, please,
17 and state your name and address for the record. You
18 will have three minutes to make your comments. There
19 will be a timer behind me on the screen that will help
20 you, let you know.

21 Please be courteous and hold to the three
22 minutes. We have a lot of individuals that want to
23 speak tonight, and if you go over, it tends to drag out
24 and not be fair to those that are waiting behind you.

25 If you are going to be making comments

1 relative to the EIR, it's helpful for the reporter to
2 know that because then that comment can be segregated
3 out and responded to, as was indicated by staff in their
4 report.

5 Also, if you are going to be asking any
6 questions, just so you know, we won't be entering into a
7 dialogue at this point. We will simply accept the
8 question from you, it will be recorded, and then it will
9 be answered subsequently. The Planning Commission will
10 not be responding to that question.

11 With that, our first speaker.

12 MS. HALL: Yes, sir. Thank you.

13 Members of the Planning Commission, my name
14 is Jan Hall, and I chaired the original SEADIP community
15 that recommended the -- basically what we have now in
16 this SEADIP area, a master plan.

17 I'm very concerned about the height limit,
18 number one, as it relates to the buildings mainly
19 because of the fact that most of the east end of Long
20 Beach and many other parts of Long Beach have a
21 three-story height limit.

22 When you add that much more density and
23 blocking of views -- I know they talk about views, but
24 I'm concerned if it's a five-, six- and perhaps a
25 seven-story building, that that would really impact the

PC1
CONT'D

PC2
CONT'D

1 view corridors and the look on Pacific Coast Highway in
2 particular, as well as the traffic congestion, which is
3 acknowledged that we can't make it better.

4 My question is we can't make it better, why
5 would we add this much more density to it?

6 And plus, I'm going to add a side note. As
7 the mother of four children, I think it's nice to
8 continue to build the bike path system in the City, but
9 there's no way I would be able to go to the grocery
10 store and bring my groceries home on a bike. That's
11 just practically speaking.

12 Secondly or next, I'm very concerned. We
13 have a drought in the State of California. Adding this
14 much density will require more demands on the water, and
15 I don't see any mitigation or any discussion of what
16 we're facing as a state, as a county and as a city as it
17 relates to the ability to supply much needed water for
18 that many more residents and commercial buildings
19 depending on what the size and mix is.

20 I'm also concerned with the fact that the
21 original SEADIP plan protects the wetlands. There's
22 never been a discussion that that shouldn't be done, and
23 I think that's important.

24 Police and fire protection. Police and
25 fire and the ability to get to a fire, to an incident

PC2
CONT'D

PC3

PC4

PC5

PC6

1 with the congestion that you're going to add will make
2 it very, very difficult to promptly reply to an
3 emergency. And Second Street/PCH, PCH/Bellflower
4 Boulevard and 7th Street are very congested. The public
5 safety component is, I think, critical, and I don't feel
6 like it's been properly addressed.

7 And then my question is why do we need to
8 change? We're not a no-growth NIMBY group. We're
9 saying that you have to match and balance the community,
10 and I don't believe personally that this matches nor
11 balances the community.

12 I know they say this is development -- not
13 development -- economically driven, and I understand
14 that, but the economics of the existing housing, the
15 economics of the existing Second Street Belmont Shore
16 area business, they're going to have impacts, too.

17 If you can't get to Second Street to shop
18 and dine, you're going to have a problem. If your
19 housing goes down in value, that's another problem. And
20 I don't see those things addressed either.

21 And I know I'm out of time, but thank you
22 very much, and good luck on your challenge. And I also
23 would like to say that I was on the City Council for 12
24 years, on the Long Beach City Council, and these
25 decisions aren't easy, but I trust you'll take all of us

PC6
CONT'D

PC7

1 seriously.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. LADD: Chairman and Commissioners, my name is
4 Bob Ladd. I'm a landscape architect, and I live at
5 555 Maine Avenue here in Long Beach.

6 I'm in favor of this project, the plan,
7 with some changes which I think would affect the
8 Environmental Impact Report.

9 But I think it's very important to have a
10 street extension of Studebaker Road to connect with PCH
11 from Westminster Boulevard, but I would -- and I have a
12 picture. I'll give it to the ladies over here. But
13 it's of an off ramp of U.S. 101 at Highway 25 in --
14 south of Gilroy, and it's a bridge over a wetland, and I
15 think you could have a minimal impact on the wetland by
16 having a bridge. Smaller footprint physically, and it
17 would also allow more intuitive traffic circulation
18 rather than Shopkeeper Road, which is kind of like a
19 bunch of zig-zags around the area.

20 Just connecting Studebaker Road would be
21 more intuitive. It would be kind of a lopsided half
22 circle around that really badly congested intersection
23 of Second and PCH, kind of like the outer Traffic Circle
24 would do, and it would reduce the habitat fragmentation.
25 It's very important in a wetland.

PC8

1 The existing traffic pattern yields no
2 reduction in miles traveled or fuel burned, and I think
3 extending Studebaker Road to give people an alternative
4 to that intersection would help an awful lot and improve
5 the air quality for the downwind wetland.

PC9

6 It provides an opportunity near PCH for an
7 interpretive center, a bicycle rest area, and you can
8 share the parking for the Marketplace. Well, if you
9 could get them to agree to something like that.

PC10

10 And I also am in favor of the density that
11 this plan has because it would reduce the pressure to
12 develop the open space and agricultural land at the edge
13 of our metropolis, and I think it would also help
14 improve affordability for housing.

15 And I like the picture of Marina Pacifica.
16 We tried, but good luck with that, getting the Ralph's
17 market and all those stores to turn around and look at
18 the water.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. CROFT: My name is Ken Croft. I live and have
21 lived in Seal Beach in Orange County for the last 40
22 years. In that period of time, we've seen a lot of
23 change. Not so much in Seal Beach because there's not a
24 lot of room for change there. It's only Pacific Coast
25 Highway, but Main Street's all filled in and stuff like

PC11

1 that. Nor do I believe that -- there's College Park
2 West and College Park East, but they're minimal in size,
3 as well.

4 So one thing that has blessed Seal Beach is
5 the fact that it has been constrained in its growth, and
6 there's not necessarily a lot of travel, retirees and
7 stuff like that. The population demographics are
8 different than Long Beach. And so we're a sheltered
9 sweet spot on the California coast, I believe.

10 No disparity on Long Beach and its
11 wonderful beaches, et cetera, but I do have some
12 concerns, and the concerns primarily of this projected
13 plan in Long Beach, my extreme concerns are traffic.

14 On Father's Day this last -- past Father's
15 Day, I was in kind of a funk and I said, hey, my wife
16 and I, let's go down, travel down to San Diego, okay,
17 there's a nice fish restaurant out in Point Loma, so we
18 drove PCH.

19 Huh-uh. It was a bad weekend, of course.
20 What are good weekends on the coast? But traffic was
21 just impossible.

22 And what brings me back to Long Beach,
23 Belmont Shore and Seal Beach is that traffic at times is
24 quite difficult. There are not a lot of options for
25 access around the area. You're faced by the coast.

1 There's no help there.

2 So the traffic component of the potential
3 growth that you're talking about in Long Beach, I
4 believe, based on the fact that usually there's an
5 income earner, okay, there's kids going to school taking
6 some sort of traffic vehicle, whether it's a car, buses
7 or whatever, I think that this is a recipe for disaster
8 for the plan that you're putting forward both to the
9 surrounding communities and for the project in itself.

10 Until the traffic -- and you've mentioned
11 in this presentation that there really weren't gonna be
12 any arterial upgrades planned. You can't add, what was
13 it, 15,000 new people to the project area or 5,000 or
14 whatever. You have the numbers behind you.

15 Think about yourself and how the traffic is
16 for you right now and the audience out here. It's
17 difficult, and yet we are all in a sweet spot, you know.
18 This isn't going to help it. This is not going to help
19 property values. This is not going to help the target
20 individuals for all the housing that you're putting in.

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: I'll need you to summarize
22 because your time is up.

23 MR. CROFT: Thank you. I think you understand
24 where I'm going with this. I appreciate you looking
25 into this and modify the development as appropriate.

1 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

2 Next speaker, please.

3 MR. DAVIS: Good evening. My name is Howard
4 Davis, and I represent the Naples Improvement
5 Association, and as chairman of the SEASP committee of
6 that organization. So thank you for allowing me to
7 speak.

8 I'm pleased that you are here to guide the
9 City with some very difficult choices. You're aware of
10 many proposals that were beneficial, but there is one
11 almost tragic consequence which would be irreparable.
12 It would be irreparable.

13 So the Naples Improvement Association as
14 representative of the residents of Naples has a keen
15 interest in enhancement of the SeaPort Marina area
16 property, the hotel that's kind of, you know, and as
17 well as the southeast area of the City of Long Beach.

18 The project in the recent Draft
19 Environmental Impact Report addresses this property and
20 also documents the severe traffic congestion adjacent to
21 this property.

22 And here is a little reminder of what it's
23 like at the peak traffic hour. The bottleneck is the
24 Second Street bridge. Everything you do around it, you
25 always get back to the Second Street bridge.

PC11
CONT'D

PC12
CONT'D

1 So as you know, the City traffic now at
2 peak hours and at the Second Street and Pacific Coast
3 Highway is way over the City's elements. The City had
4 an element study done that's added to the general
5 environmental product of the City, and that element said
6 that you should have a D level or better. That is A, B,
7 C, D, E, F. Should be D or above.

8 The element goes on to state that,
9 quotation from the element's report, A level of service
10 E or F can be severely impacted by even the smallest
11 amount of additional traffic.

12 We are now faced with much more than,
13 quotation, The smallest amount of additional traffic by
14 the current proposal.

15 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: I'll need you to wrap up
16 your comments, too.

17 MR. DAVIS: I'm sorry.

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: I'll need you to wrap
19 up --

20 MR. DAVIS: Thank you. All right. I have a
21 couple more sentences.

22 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Please.

23 MR. DAVIS: Although we cannot come close to
24 totally offsetting the coming traffic increase, we hope
25 you will agree that we should as a priority implement

1 the two most notable mitigations available. One is the
2 connection of Shopkeeper Road to Studebaker Road via the
3 parking area of the Marketplace, and the other is the
4 signal timing at Second Street and Pacific Coast
5 Highway.

6 Therefore, the Naples Improvement
7 Association strongly urges that these mitigations be
8 implemented before any build-out is permitted.

9 I thank you for your attention.

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

11 Again, I'll remind the speakers as a
12 courtesy to all the people behind you, please adhere to
13 the three-minute time limit. Thank you.

14 MR. SPRAGUE: Thank you. Douglas Sprague. I live
15 at 58 Savona Walk, Long Beach I have three comments on
16 the Draft EIR for the Spec^{CP12} Plan and more
17 specifically on the traffic impacts at PCH and Second
18 Street.

19 I think we're already seeing partial
20 gridlock at this intersection, and this occurs when
21 people in frustration attempt going north on PCH,
22 turning left onto Second Street, and I think the
23 situation will probably get worse.

24 My second comment is with regard to the
25 comparison of the no project alternative to the project

PC12
CONT'D

PC13

PC14

1 alternative with regard to traffic impacts, and both
2 alternatives have a level of service F, which is the
3 lowest it can go.

4 I don't think that correctly characterizes
5 the impacts of the project, and that maybe it should
6 take -- look a little more -- a further look at it.

7 The mitigation proposed, which basically is
8 extension of Shopkeeper -- and I'm assuming that that
9 would be also widening of it -- I think is a good
10 attempt. Synchronization of the signals is also a good
11 mitigation attempt.

12 I think also a consideration of traffic
13 control during peak hours, and I'm not sure exactly what
14 that is other than to prevent people running the yellow
15 light and clogging the intersection.

16 I think that before these -- before there's
17 a build-out of the Specific Plan that these mitigations
18 and whatever other ones that are necessary should be
19 done beforehand, and I think that the developers of the
20 project should basically pay for them rather than the
21 taxpayers.

22 Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Next speaker, please.

24 Feel free to pull the microphone down.

25 MS. DAHL: Thank you.

1 I am Janice Dahl. I'm a resident of the
2 SEADIP area, University Park Estates, past president of
3 the neighborhood and currently president of El Dorado
4 Audobon and the founder of Los Cerritos Wetlands Land
5 Trust.

6 Because we only have three minutes, I was
7 going to take one item out of DEIR and speak about it,
8 but there are so many issues that impact quality of life
9 that I'm asking that this new planning known as SEASP be
10 abandoned.

11 I'm really shocked that I'm actually asking
12 this because I was one of the original advocates for
13 looking at SEADIP and updating it. I just never
14 imagined that the City would come to this outlandish
15 plan.

16 The public knows that regardless of what we
17 say today, you'll probably go forward. I don't know if
18 you'll rubber stamp it, but you'll go through the formal
19 process of notifying us and having public meetings, but
20 in the end you're going to wind up pretty much approving
21 the plan, and then we'll have to fight it and probably
22 have lawsuits, and this will drag on for years and
23 years.

24 You may tweak the plan a little bit, but
25 ultimately, you're going to approve that we go from 35

1 feet in height to seven stories, you're going to approve
2 two and a half times more population, two and a half
3 times more traffic.

4 The intersections are already rated F --
5 it's in the DEIR -- and you'll approve that we need
6 worse intersections.

7 This failing of this plan, I know you're
8 going to say it's good for Long Beach and for southeast
9 Long Beach, but I don't believe you live here if that's
10 what you think. Or at least if you do live here, you
11 don't care. Or if you do live here and don't care, I
12 don't know what to assume then.

13 There has to be a logical explanation why
14 you would think that this is a good idea, and I really
15 search and search, and I just can't find it. You have
16 the voting power to stop this before it goes any
17 further, before more money is wasted, before our
18 community is destroyed.

19 To me, I see that this current plan is a
20 mess. That's the best word I can describe it. I'm just
21 shocked at what you have.

22 And then speaking on part of El Dorado
23 Audubon, you don't -- I don't want to say "you." This
24 plan does not address the fact that this neighborhood is
25 under a wildlife corridor known as the Pacific Flyway.

1 There's wildlife from South America to Alaska that
2 depends on each of these little habitats along the
3 coast.

4 And I know my time is up, but I want you to
5 really go home, think about this and understand that the
6 community does not agree with this. Those that live in
7 the Third District, we do not agree with this, and
8 there's really going to be a battle if this plan is put
9 forth.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Let's not applaud or boo
12 or anything. It's very intimidating to come forward and
13 speak, and it's really hard if we have that kind of
14 reaction from the audience^{CP16} in consideration of the
15 people coming forward, let's not do that, please. Thank
16 you.

17 MR. BATTEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 Chairman, Members of the Commission, my
19 name is Dustin Batten, and I am here speaking on behalf
20 of the Los Angeles County Business Federation or Bizfed.
21 We represent over 275,000 employers, 3 million employees
22 across the county and 165 business organizations.

23 We are a diverse grass roots alliance, and
24 we are here tonight in support of the Southeast Area
25 Development Plan Update.

PC16
CONT'D

PC17

1 As proposed, the Development Plan offers a
2 thoughtful and balanced approach to land use planning to
3 this vital and energetic community. It will not only
4 enhance the area and quality of life for Long Beach
5 residents, but also gives the business community the
6 ability to reinvest in the area with updated design
7 guidelines and infrastructure.

8 Specifically, the new mixed use land
9 designations will give property owners and retailers the
10 opportunity and flexibility to reimagine and improve
11 commercial centers.

12 This update is very long overdue and hopes
13 to replace outdated land planning with a specific plan
14 that helps to balance sustainability, economic
15 development and livability.

16 And one final note. Our board of
17 directors, who represents all those numbers that I
18 stated earlier, approved this unanimously at our board
19 of directors meeting earlier this week. So one note
20 there.

21 Thank you for your time.

22 MS. PEMBERTON: Good evening. My name is Linda
23 Pemberton, and I live in Belmont Heights, and -- what is
24 my address? 243 Roycroft.

25 Thank you for giving me an opportunity to

1 speak tonight. I'm here to talk about traffic and
2 potential solutions.

3 According to the City's draft plan, as we
4 have heard tonight, traffic is the number one community
5 concern, yet the plan does not effectively address it.

6 The EIR shows that traffic to be
7 significant and unavoidable impact. Poorly rated
8 intersections will increase from six to 15 out of 21.
9 That means 71 percent of the area's intersections and
10 four freeway on and off ramps will have very long
11 delays.

12 The Draft plan tells us that traffic will
13 continue to be congested even with the improved --
14 proposed improvements. I'm astonished by the statement.
15 Doesn't it seem to you that the development plan is
16 unapologetically out of sync with our infrastructure?

17 The plan tries to balance social,
18 environment and economic benefits, but doesn't the City
19 realize that traffic is also an economic issue for
20 residents? Time is money.

21 The National Transportation Research Group
22 reported in 2014 that Los Angeles drivers lose over
23 \$2,000 a year due to traffic congestion.

24 The plan estimates over a hundred thousand
25 daily trips through the area, 50,000 people coming and

1 going daily. Together, all these people already lose
2 \$100 million a year due to traffic congestion. Is it
3 fair to ask these taxpaying residents to carry the costs
4 of additional traffic congestion for an overly ambitious
5 development plan?

6 You might ask "overly ambitious"? Well, do
7 we need to build 5,439 new residential units? It seems
8 like a lot of burden for a small area that doesn't have
9 mass transit or the possibility of it. The City's
10 marketing studies show only a demand of 1600 to 2900
11 units, less than half of what is in the plan.

12 How dense is the plan? By comparison, it
13 represents a larger population than Belmont Shore with
14 four times the density, and Bolsa on either side of that
15 worse traffic intersection in the area.

16 Are there solutions? Some are asking that
17 the development be postponed until the infrastructure
18 can accommodate it, but perhaps there's another
19 alternative.

20 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: I need you to wrap up, if
21 you don't mind.

22 MS. PEMBERTON: Okay.

23 The EIR calls for an alternative plan that
24 calls for a 30 percent reduction in high density, but it
25 doesn't go far enough to alleviate traffic. It only

1 improves one intersection, and that's in Seal Beach.

2 I would like to see the City look at a 35
3 to 55 percent reduction in housing and study the impact
4 on traffic. There might be a sweet spot between
5 development and traffic that would provide a better
6 outcome for everyone.

7 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Can you wrap this up,
8 please? It's not fair to the people behind you.

9 MS. PEMBERTON: Thank you. I'm done.

10 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

11 MS. DEAN: Hi. My name is Julie Dean, and I live
12 at 215 Pomona, and my concern is traffic density.

13 I attended a number of SEASP meetings and
14 was quite discouraged at the lack of response to the
15 traffic concern coming from the residents. Just a basic
16 thing that occurs today and hasn't been corrected as far
17 as I can see is the signal synchronization at -- going
18 northbound on PCH turning westbound onto Second Street.

19 I frequently run into a situation where I
20 can't get into the turn because the light at Marina
21 Drive is red, and that's been years. That's been going
22 on for years, and we still haven't synchronized that.
23 So how do we expect to be able to handle additional
24 traffic coming through that intersection?

25 The traffic, as I said, is already

PC19
CONT'D

PC20

1 impacted, and now we're going to allow a lower level of
2 service for traffic, which mixed use will allow.

3 It's always emphasized that the max numbers
4 are simply maximums, not definitely to occur, but
5 developers want to make money, and they very well may
6 build to the max, for example, up to 425 hotel rooms,
7 4,000 more units and 6300 more people. That could be an
8 increase in density that's just not manageable in that
9 small of a space.

10 There's nothing requiring those living in
11 these new developments to walk, bike, take public
12 transportation, shop and dine and enjoy entertainment
13 locally, which is always emphasized. But, of course,
14 there's no way to require that of those people.

15 These negatives will highly impact Naples,
16 Belmont Shore and Peninsula residents. However, we
17 weren't part of the SEASP planning committee. No one
18 invited us to be part of that committee.

19 In addition, highly negative impacts to
20 existing residents, non-residents coming to the city to
21 shop and for dining and entertainment are going to
22 become more and more discouraged due to traffic at one
23 of the main entryways to the city through PCH and
24 Second.

25 We do not want our home property values

1 going down, so please consider this. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

3 MS. CANTRELL: Good afternoon. Ann Cantrell. And
4 I agree with all of the people that have talked about
5 the traffic and the density, and I hope that you will
6 look carefully at the alternatives that will reduce
7 density and especially height, although reducing it to
8 five stories to me is not reducing the height density.
9 I would ask that we retain the three-story limit that we
10 have now.

11 The hotel at Second and PCH is only two
12 stories, and I sit at that intersection forever and
13 watch the birds flying over that hotel, and they barely
14 get over the top, especially the great blue herons that
15 are flying from their nesting trees in the marina over
16 to the wetlands to hunt for food.

17 Raising these buildings is going to be a
18 problem for not only the herons, but all the other birds
19 that fly between the wetlands and the marina.

20 And it says in the EIOR it is well
21 established that buildings can pose a significant hazard
22 to flying birds from collision.

23 They attempt to mitigate this by saying,
24 well, we'll make these buildings five to seven stories
25 high, but we'll set them back, like that's going to make

PC20
CONT'D

PC21

1 a difference with a bird.

2 They also say they're going to put
3 bird-safe glass on it, which I agree with, but if you
4 have buildings that are seven stories high, you're going
5 to have collisions.

6 Again, I ask you please to consider the
7 alternatives and especially lower the height and the
8 density of this area. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Next speaker, please.

10 MR. SCHUKLAND: Hello. My name is Dave Schukland,
11 and I live at 6333 East Elliot Street.

12 I grew up in the University Park Estates
13 neighborhood and expect to remain there through the next
14 update of SEADIP/SEASP 30 years from now. So I suppose
15 this is all good practice.

16 I wish to comment narrowly about one aspect
17 of the comprehensive plan, and that's the industrial
18 sector. As you heard and saw earlier, the total acreage
19 for industrial uses is equal to that of the other
20 largest segment, which is the wetlands, and both are 293
21 acres. Much of that industrial acreage is the Alamitos
22 generating station.

23 As someone who grew up literally in the
24 shadow of that power plant, I'm very concerned that
25 there has been very little visibility or integration of

PC21
CONT'D

PC22

1 the rebuild process with the SEADIP/SEASP process and
2 community input.

3 SEASP is supposed to be a comprehensive
4 plan. Now, as you may know, the California Energy
5 Commission has regulatory authority under CEQA for all
6 environmental considerations, for permitting and
7 construction of large generating facilities. As such,
8 generating facilities are not subject to a full EIR, but
9 review and approval by CEC staff.

10 On August 9th, the CEC held a public
11 workshop with the applicant for rebuilding the power
12 plant, Applied Energy Systems, or AES. In that meeting
13 and in subsequent documented comments, AES has asked the
14 CEC to remove staff recommendations that the rebuild of
15 the power plant be subject to community concerns, SEASP
16 and other public processes and be subject to memorandum
17 of understanding of the City of Long Beach for an
18 expedited construction timeline.

19 As such, all aspects of tearing down the
20 old stacks and putting up new ones or what mix of gas,
21 fire, energy generation versus battery electric storage
22 would be subject to weaker environmental protections.

23 I respectfully ask that the City of Long
24 Beach reserve its right to review the power plant
25 rebuild as part of this SEADIP/SEASP process and that

1 you strongly consider community concerns as extant with
2 the process and that you be in contact with California
3 Energy Commission staff on how to do so.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Next speaker, please.

6 MR. ROTH: Hello. My name is Richard Roth. I
7 live at 56 Sicilian Walk in Long Beach, and I'm
8 obviously concerned -- not obviously, but concerned
9 about the incredible density and increase in this.

10 When Second and PCH first came up, we
11 talked about the -- well, we had large discussions about
12 the project being too dense, and now we're looking
13 basically at tripling the density, and I believe the
14 major driver for this is allowing the people who rebuild
15 and develop in order to make more money.

16 We were told when Second and PCH was being
17 debated that it just wouldn't pencil out at the lower
18 numbers, and yet right now there's a project in front of
19 you that conforms to the old SEADIP standards and
20 apparently is going to pencil out because nobody would
21 have ever proposed it if they didn't think they were
22 going to make money on it.

23 So plainly, you don't really need this kind
24 of density in the plan, and yet it's in there for what I
25 have to assume is just to make money.

PC22
CONT'D

PC23

1 The other thing that strikes me is there's
2 a big emphasis on, oh, we're going to get all this
3 commercial in there. Really? You take a look at what
4 we have right now in the Marina Pacific area and then
5 across the street in the Marketplace and we see low
6 quality shops. We see empty shops. What miracle is
7 going to drive this in?

8 Thank you.

9 MR. MILLER: Good evening, Commissioners. I am
10 Jeff Miller. I'm a 33-year resident of Long Beach. I'm
11 going to add my voice to those you've already heard
12 from, residents who have some problems with this
13 proposal and mainly in areas of height and density.

14 Yet the consultants the City hired for this
15 have said in their comments that there was ample
16 opportunity for the public to comment, that they worked
17 with the community, that this plan reflects the feedback
18 of the community.

19 Are you kidding me? You're hearing
20 something different tonight. So there's obviously a
21 disconnect, I think, between what they're proposing and
22 telling you and what you're hearing from the residents
23 of the community.

24 I bicycle around the City of Long Beach,
25 and one of the things stated here was to add circulation

1 and mid block connectivity for pedestrians and for
2 bicyclists, and I appreciate that. I'm a bicyclist.

3 But I also drive a car, and as someone did
4 point out, you can't take your groceries home from the
5 store on your bicycle. People are going to drive
6 through the intersection, and traffic will only get
7 worse, not better, and yet they say that's okay. Again,
8 that doesn't sound credible.

9 Also, they speak about the benefits of this
10 project even though you're hearing about all the
11 deficiencies, the benefits of economic benefits and
12 physical benefits, "how we get around" was the phrase
13 given. Well, we aren't going to get around any better
14 if it's made worse. So this does not make sense.

15 The economic benefits really don't accrue
16 to the people of Long Beach, and I believe your charter
17 or your mandate is to look out for the interests of the
18 City of Long Beach, the residents, the business owners,
19 the people who work here, and I don't see those benefits
20 accruing to any of us.

21 Sure, there may be some benefits for the
22 owners of the commercial property and the developers who
23 would build on them, but that does not add up to the
24 closing statement that the consultant gave, which is
25 that this is the best effort to balance community

1 priorities.

2 There's no balance there when the project
3 benefits only those developers.

4 So I urge you to reject this project, don't
5 support this. Instead, support something that protects
6 us, the residents and the business people of this
7 community and that protects our city. Retain the
8 three-story 35-foot height limit.

9 As I drive over the bridge now, as I'm
10 waiting in line with all of the other people to get over
11 that bridge, I can look in the distance, and I see the
12 palm trees on the other side of PCH. I see the
13 mountains in the distance.

14 How is adding a five- or seven-story
15 building going to enhance that? Are you kidding me? I
16 think you can see the flaws here.

17 Thank you for your time.

18 MR. NUTTER: I'm Mel Nutter, and you need an
19 address? I have been used to giving you one downtown at
20 my office, but 5730 East Deborah Street will have to do
21 now.

22 I think this is probably the first time
23 I've been in this chamber when I haven't directly wished
24 to address local coastal program matters specifically.

25 Tonight what I want to do is focus on a

1 rather narrow piece of your Draft Environmental Impact
2 Report. I am concerned about the adequacy of the draft
3 document and particularly its analysis of existing
4 traffic conditions.

5 If you look at Section 5.16.1.3, it bases
6 its conclusion on the results of a single day's count
7 conducted on Tuesday, July 14th of 2015 to determine
8 what the current traffic situation is.

9 Now, the Cal Trans guide for preparing such
10 a study indicates that seasonal and weekend variations
11 in traffic should be considered and specifically when
12 you're dealing with recreational routes, as would be the
13 case here.

14 Now, in 2011, the Second and PCH study for
15 the EIR included traffic counts on multiple days, both
16 weekends and weekdays, and selected different months of
17 the year in which to do it. The Cal Trans guidelines
18 provide that weekday counts should not be conducted
19 during weeks containing a holiday.

20 I'm going to concede that on July the 14th
21 there is this minor holiday called Bastille Day, and I'm
22 not going to suggest that's one you ought to take into
23 consideration, but there really is something of
24 significance about July 14th of 2015.

25 It turns out that the news was full on that

1 particular day of the Auto Club's judgment that gasoline
2 prices during the prior week had increased by 67 cents.

3 Now, I want to suggest to you that that
4 made for a rather strange circumstance, and I think you
5 need more than one study, and I think you need something
6 a bit more credible because, in fact, gasoline prices do
7 affect what people do with their automobiles.

8 So I appreciate the ability to make a
9 comment. Thank you.

10 MS. ALEY: My name is Carrie Aley.

11 My concern is with the changes to CEQA
12 regarding SB 743. This EIR focuses on level of service,
13 and it's my understanding that the new guidelines focus
14 on vehicle miles as a primary meter. Level of service
15 will no longer constitute a significant environmental
16 effect under CEQA.

17 If a mixed use project is within a half a
18 mile of a bus stop, the addition of those homes no
19 longer triggers significant impact.

20 So if someone takes, say, Marina Pacifica,
21 that center, and puts a thousand homes on it, it would
22 not trigger any significant impact at all. The only
23 impact would probably be environmental on the wetlands.

24 Similarly with the Marketplace, with the
25 areas that have commercial, all they have to do is take

1 the existing square footage of their commercial space,
2 stack as much residential on it, and they will have no
3 -- no impact according to CEQA. The only property that
4 I see that could trigger it would be the SeaPort Marina
5 Hotel.

6 I've reviewed the original SEADIP
7 implementation plan. It's not available online at the
8 City. There's no copies of it. I happened to get one
9 from one of the original SEADIP committee members.

10 I don't understand why this document is not
11 available. In this document it says that traffic
12 congestion limits density.

13 You're proposing the same amount of density
14 that you have proposed downtown. It makes no sense.
15 We're a suburban family environment. I don't want to
16 ride my bike to Ralph's. We're extremely busy.

17 The idea that I'm going to ride my bike or
18 take a bus into Orange County or LA -- I've tried taking
19 public transportation into Hollywood. It takes two and
20 a half hours one way. To take a bus into Orange County
21 would probably take three hours. And to expect people
22 to do this I think is ridiculous.

23 I looked at the original environmental
24 document for Pacific Marina. I'm running out of time.
25 It promised mitigation. Long Beach has a long history

PC26
CONT'D

PC27

1 of not doing mitigation. The Marketplace/Shopkeeper
2 Road extension was for that section, and I don't believe
3 you should recycle mitigation.

4 Thank you very much.

5 MR. SONGER: My name is Alan Songer, S-o-n-g-e-r,
6 279 Park Avenue in Belmont Heights.

7 I came here to talk about density and
8 traffic, as well, but that's been well covered, but
9 while I'm here, I might as well say a few things.

10 I was born here in the middle of the
11 Eisenhower administration. My father was born here when
12 Herbert Hoover was president, and my grandfather was
13 born here when Grover Cleveland was president.
14 Actually, it wasn't even Long Beach then. It was a farm
15 in what is now North Long Beach.

16 So I've been here a long time, and I've
17 watched the Planning Commission make one blunder after
18 another for years and years and years and years. We
19 have just evidence of it everywhere out here, the
20 mistakes we've made, and there's no reason to compound
21 that and keep doing it.

22 The one thing in this plan that really
23 bothers me is the emphasis on mixed use. You can walk
24 right out here and look across the street at a building
25 that was built seven, eight years ago, mixed use. One,

PC27
CONT'D

PC28

1 one commercial space is leased. Everything else is
2 still empty and will remain empty.

3 I work in Hollywood. I drive by mixed use
4 projects in downtown Los Angeles and in West Hollywood
5 all the time. 30 percent occupancy at best.

6 We have so much trouble attracting
7 retailers right now in this area that we give tax breaks
8 and rebates and free rent and all kinds of incentives to
9 drive people in here, and they still go broke. Now
10 we're going to build all this commercial space that
11 nobody's going to want to rent because it doesn't work.
12 It doesn't pencil out.

13 Look. Everywhere and anywhere on this city
14 on mixed use, the retail part of it fails every time.
15 So we have this huge project, and one of the calling
16 cards is this mixed use thing, and it never works. It
17 won't work. It will never work.

18 So I could go on and on about traffic, but
19 we've been here long enough. Just shoot this down.
20 Start over. This is really a bad idea, and if you
21 really polled scientifically the people that live in
22 this area, I would bet you'd have 75 to 85 percent of
23 the people that live there saying this is ridiculous.

24 That doesn't matter to you, that's fine. I
25 know you're here to push development and economic growth

PC28
CONT'D

PC29

1 and all that, but, you know, why don't you listen to us
2 for a change? It would be really refreshing, and you
3 might sleep better at night, too.

4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Next speaker, please.

5 MS. MILLER: Good evening, Commissioners and
6 staff. My name is Susan Miller. I live at 4217 East
7 Ocean Boulevard. I've been a resident of Long Beach for
8 23 years.

9 Through all of these meetings, I have yet
10 to hear the term "sea level rise" or "seismic" or
11 "liquefaction." The haz maps that I've looked at, this
12 area is in sea level rise and liquefaction.

13 Where are the mitigations for that? Are
14 all of these buildings going to be on a plith that will
15 elevate them beyond the seven stories? I haven't heard
16 anything about that consideration or issue.

17 And if that's going to be elevated, are all
18 the walkways going to be elevated? What does that do
19 for the environment and the wildlife? That does not
20 give them an environment that's conducive to maintain or
21 thrive. That will diminish.

22 I thought that was the focus of this entire
23 area was its wetlands and preserve the nature. These
24 are wildlife. It's not domestic animals that you put
25 little nice walkways by them and they're going to

1 thrive. You've missed the point completely on this.

2 And again, a huge element is missing by not
3 talking about the sea level rise, the liquefaction and
4 the seismic. Thank you.

5 MS. CHRISTENSEN: Good afternoon. My name is Anna
6 Christensen, 259 Termino, born in Long Beach and now
7 forced to relive over 25 years of activism thanks to
8 you. I'm at this point somewhere between the guy with
9 the sign that says "The end is near" and the Red Queen,
10 just to let you know.

11 I couldn't help but note that presenter did
12 mention cultural resources only briefly with this quote:
13 "Monitors are required during grading" for the cultural
14 resources."

15 That's a pretty big tell. So cultural
16 resources are only mentioned in terms of what will go
17 under the bulldozer as usual. All right? I wrote this.
18 I will pass it to everyone, but regarding the past being
19 forever present, I would like to read to you from a
20 document that I wrote over 20 years ago regarding
21 anthropologists, which are the only people invited to
22 write this document and the document that concerns also
23 the 120 new oil wells, which apparently will be
24 incorporated.

25 Not only homes and the things that Indian

PC30
CONT'D

PC31

1 peoples created --

2 COURT REPORTER: You need to read slower.

3 MS. CHRISTENSEN: No, I can't. I can't. I'll
4 give it to you because I'm going lose my minutes.

5 Not only homes but -- and the things that
6 Indian people created, but over 500,000 Indian burials
7 have been dug up and carried away, making this,
8 according to Native American Rights Fund lawyer Walter
9 Echohawk, the paramount human rights problem for
10 American Indians today.

11 More than 500,000 relatives, our human
12 relations, have been displaced from some final place of
13 rest supposedly to learn something about ancient man,
14 even though in 501 years -- that's when I wrote it -- we
15 haven't yet learned to ask permission.

16 There is -- I'll just finish.

17 One has to wonder about science and this
18 kind of science and its connection to the continued
19 conquest of tribal lands and peoples, the agenda of
20 digging up everything Indian, removing the people's
21 history from the land, redefining it in the context of
22 the invading culture.

23 It's not hard to understand why Indians
24 have, from the times of the Pilgrims, opposed such
25 desecration and why if there's going to be any kind of

1 multi-culturalism on this continent, it's got to stop.
2 These things, these places, these human remains do not
3 belong to anyone other than the survivors.

4 So the reality is you can dance around all
5 you want. Even AB 52, the so-called Save Your Lands
6 bill, gives you a way out. You only have to talk to one
7 Indian, you can send your letters like you did and not
8 get them returned, you can say it doesn't matter, but
9 what you never, ever, ever have done is do what you've
10 been asked to do over and over again by me, long term
11 citizen, and which many, many people, is talk to Indian
12 people from the get-go. Include them in your designs,
13 include them on your planning committee.

14 Look at this planning committee. I'm just
15 saying you just don't do it, you never do it, and you
16 don't get it because you don't care. And it's really
17 plain. But you could. That's the part where I stop
18 just short of hacking off your heads as the Red Queen.
19 You could because you still have your heads. So why
20 don't you use them?

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: The reason we're asking
22 the speakers to speak slowly and clearly is so that
23 those comments can get transcribed for your benefit so
24 they can be responded to. So respect our need to record
25 your comments so that we can respond to them.

PC31
CONT'D

PC32

1 MS. COTTON: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My
2 name is Melinda Cotton. I live on Park Avenue in
3 Belmont Shore, and I moved to Long Beach when Jan Hall
4 was our Councilmember, and I would ask you, first of
5 all, to listen to the things that she highlighted that
6 were density, that were traffic, that were the view
7 corridors.

8 What you're hearing this afternoon -- and I
9 know it seems unfair to say the Planning Commission,
10 that you are the problem -- is that for the past 30
11 years we have dealt with issue after issue that deals
12 with these same locations.

13 The Lennar project wanted to go at SeaPort
14 Marina. It was finally rejected because it was too big
15 for the area. SeaPort Marina, the Second and PCH
16 project, was proposed at 12 stories. It passed this
17 Planning Commission, got to Council and, fortunately,
18 was not allowed.

19 So you folks are stuck with our
20 frustration, and I'm sorry about that, but we'll hope
21 that you take time, as I know many of you do, talking
22 about your homework and the times that you look over
23 projects, and we hope that you will do that again.

24 I'm going to speak to two items on the
25 population increase and housing density. That's all

1 going to be in that area from the Seal Beach border to
2 Loynes. So it's proposed that we're going to have 5,439
3 more dwelling units, 8,548 more people all jammed in
4 there, and that's going to be market rate housing.

5 We're not hearing affordable housing.
6 These are going to be very expensive units with not
7 enough parking and further jam those intersections.

8 Secondly, I'd like to speak to the addition
9 of intersections that are proposed. What we have in the
10 area now is where one intersection is the main problem.
11 The traffic, what's proposed in this plan is adding two
12 more intersections on PCH to go through, provide what
13 are called view corridors.

14 I'm not sure anybody stands on a corner and
15 views down three blocks to the beach, but those
16 intersections will add congestion. People walk across
17 the street. People turn corners. They jam yellow
18 lights. They don't do the things they're supposed to
19 do, like try to cross the street and get there in ten
20 seconds.

21 It's going to add to the congestion. So
22 you're going to have three congested intersections on
23 PCH. I kid you not. It's going to happen.

24 And then the Studebaker, what's proposed to
25 add from the Trader Joe location to PCH, again it's

PC33
CONT'D

PC34

1 going to add congestion because you're going to lengthen
2 that because you're going to let a lot more cars
3 through.

4 So please consider that, listen to Jan
5 Hall, and I'm going to finish up my time. Thank you.

6 MS. CAGER: Good evening. My name is Gordona
7 Cager. I live at 235 Loma Avenue in Belmont Heights,
8 and I'm here to speak to you on the question of process
9 and community involvement in this project.

10 I'm here to tell you at the time this
11 project was announced in 2012, I was the proud
12 representative of the Third District on the City's
13 Sustainable City Commission, and this project resonated
14 with me.

PC35

15 I was delighted and (Amy
16 Bodek made the announcement that the City had been
17 granted this money in order to move forward with an area
18 of Long Beach that had been the subject of so much,
19 shall we say, disagreement.

20 I have given you a screen shot of the
21 City's Development Services page that describes the
22 community input on this project. And for the benefit of
23 the attendees in the audience, I'd like to tell you that
24 the City announced that 180 people attended the CAC
25 meetings, 76 people attended the public forum and made

1 statements, 55 people were involved in the public
2 meetings, and 187 people attended the workshops. And I
3 am absolutely disgusted by those numbers.

4 I believe that your consultant on this
5 project sadly did a disservice to the City of Long Beach
6 in their public outreach for this project. This project
7 with the scale and scope and the impact that it will
8 have on this community deserves thousands of people
9 participating in this process.

10 And most of you live in the neighborhood,
11 so you could probably on one hand count the number of
12 neighborhood groups, business groups, community
13 associations that adjoin this area.

14 Say it with me. Belmont Shore Residents
15 Association, the business association, Naples
16 Improvement, the Upinna, Belmont Heights Community
17 Association. I mean, the list goes on.

18 Those people represent thousands of
19 informed community members who should have had an
20 opportunity to participate, and they did not. So I'd
21 like to state that I think it's shameful. The City has
22 been given an opportunity to allow people to participate
23 in a very simple manner, and they did not. And I think
24 that the process has been flawed, the results are
25 flawed, and you should consider that in your overall

1 consideration of the information that's contained in
2 this project.

3 Thank you.

4 MS. LAMB: Hello, Commissioners. My name is
5 Elizabeth Lamb. I'm the Executive Director of the Los
6 Cerritos Wetlands Land Trust.

7 I want to start off by saying that we have
8 been in lengthy communication with the City and the
9 consultants about our interests and our concerns. We
10 sent a preliminary memo early on in the process before
11 any of the planning had been convened laying out
12 biological issues, habitat issues that we would want
13 studied and that we were concerned about, as well as
14 sharing studies that we had in our possession.

15 We sent a very detailed memo to the City
16 when the NOP was released, and we sent another detailed
17 memo when the Draft Specific Plan was released.

18 I don't know. I don't have enough time
19 here to go through that with you, but if you haven't
20 seen those memos, I encourage you to read them because
21 we felt that what we owed from the get-go was that our
22 concerns be clearly outlined, and they are concerns that
23 you would expect about protecting and restoring this
24 fragile resource that is important to the community, as
25 I was heartened to find out during those advisory

PC35
CONT'D

PC36

1 meetings and, obviously, important to the biodiversity
2 in Southern California given that the vast portions of
3 Southern California's wetlands are gone forever.

4 One of the comments that I did want to make
5 to you though was that the City of Long Beach for quite
6 some time saw this area as an area that should be of low
7 density because they valued the fragile natural
8 resources in that area, and for years the City of Long
9 Beach has rightly and understandably approved
10 development where there's adequate infrastructure, which
11 is in downtown Long Beach.

12 And the City has made those arguments to
13 the Coastal Commission when they've asked for permission
14 to do building in the coastal areas of Long Beach that
15 are in the downtown area.

16 So I think it's a pretty significant shift
17 to start to look at the SEASP/SEADIP area as an area
18 that should be so dense, and we are concerned,
19 obviously, about what that means for the wetlands.

20 Something that's very important to us is
21 specificity, that science be used and that protections
22 be written in for Los Cerritos wetlands, and we're
23 concerned that with the program EIR, there may be a lack
24 of specificity in that area.

25 The other thing I just have to tell you is

1 as lovely as the people were that I met on the Community
2 Advisory Community, more than one person earnestly took
3 me aside to explain to me how what we needed was an
4 environmentally sensitive road through Los Cerritos
5 wetlands.

6 As I've stated before, it is our position
7 that with so few wetlands left, that any incursions,
8 even the smallest amounts, are unacceptable given how
9 few we are left with. So I wanted to share that with
10 you, as well.

11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

12 Next speaker, please.

13 MS. TOWNER: Thank you for letting me speak. My
14 name is Pat Towner. I live on 6th Street in University
15 Park Estates.

16 I just wanted to say that I brought with me
17 my doubloon because when I first came back to the city,
18 from Dodge City, Kansas, of course, I just felt like I
19 needed to believe in our people who, in fact, made the
20 rules.

21 So I then got involved in politics and
22 stayed as president of the University Park Estates
23 intermittently for ten years. I was land use chair of
24 the local coastal program, and in that effort we learned
25 how to meet with the residents of the area. We walked

PC36
CONT'D

PC37

1 the streets, we knew what was going on, and we also
2 incorporated SEADIP into our plan.

3 In addition to that, I was on the South
4 Coast Regional Coastal Commission. What can I say? And
5 I was a sitting member when the LCP was approved, and it
6 was really lauded as one of those things that the City
7 and the public got together on.

8 When I was elected to SEASP or SEADIP or
9 whatever you call that thing, I felt kind of excited,
10 but right now I really kind of called it the San Diego
11 Plan. I was really disappointed, and on my first
12 meeting there I said to them, I said, well, when are we
13 going to get to talk to the developers and the other
14 public, and how are we going to accommodate all of our
15 needs. And I was told we are not, we are not in that
16 position. They will do all of it.

17 So that's why I call it the San Diego plan.
18 Sorry, guys. I do.

19 Anyhow, the east side is and always will be
20 a valuable commodity. It's not a place for six- to
21 eight-foot story buildings. It's not a place for
22 upscale shopping, unless, of course, you consider
23 Gelson's to be upscale shopping.

24 Stop trying to drop everything on this side
25 of the City just because it has some open land. We are

1 now experiencing the worst traffic, and it seems like
2 the only entry and exit viable are those that work in
3 our city because they're coming and they're going.

4 The Orange County freeway now will dump
5 from five lanes to four lanes to get on the freeway
6 going north, and, of course, you know what that means
7 for us. We'll be sitting underneath their exhaust right
8 at our corner.

9 The airport now is considering a major
10 renovation, which could increase flights. And, of
11 course, that means more stuff being dumped on us.

12 CSULB and the VA have plans to expand,
13 never taking into consideration do you know what 7th
14 Street is like in the morning and in the evenings?

15 And Edison now is looking with big eyes
16 because they're moving their plant over, and that leaves
17 this whole big light industrial site for them to fill
18 up. Guess what? Someone already tried to do it.

19 So it's not -- it's not appropriate to keep
20 impacting us with stuff from the port and then stuff
21 from over our heads. So we ask you to reconsider the
22 increase in height and density. And I'm going home.

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

24 Next speaker, please.

25 MR. McAFEE: Good evening. My name is Andy

1 McAfee. I live at 260 Claremont Avenue.

2 About three months ago I was watching TV,
3 and Hillary Clinton came on and she said something that
4 kind of rang true to me. She said that in a democracy,
5 residents and activists are just as important as
6 government.

7 That's the reason I'm here. The government
8 generally has all the power. The only way the residents
9 can have any influence is to have a critical mass in
10 speaking out against a project. So I specifically came
11 down because of that.

12 I agree with what people are saying. I'm
13 going to specifically talk about the EIR since that's
14 what this meeting is for. Section 5, environmental
15 analysis, Section 5.8, hazards and hazardous materials.

16 I've noticed that the consultant that
17 prepared this is called Placeworks, and we all know who
18 Placeworks is. I'm not aware that Placeworks is an
19 industrial hygienist or petroleum engineer.

20 Their result here is the proposed project
21 will not create significant hazards to public through
22 the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous
23 material.

24 There is an oil field right in the middle
25 of this area we're talking about. It's been there since

1 1920, which is in the report. It's going to be there
2 another 40 years.

3 This area is an environmental disaster
4 right now, and it is a poorly maintained facility. I
5 know that. I'm a chemical engineer. I understand
6 these. I've worked in the chemical arena and the
7 petroleum arena.

8 You drive by, it's just disgusting that
9 this operator, Synergy, is allowed to operate this oil
10 field in the condition. They have tanks that are
11 abandoned that have no manways on them that are against
12 OSHA regulations to have that. It's totally unsafe.

13 Anyway, because of that, this -- there are
14 fugitive emissions coming off of this, and there is not
15 one thing said in this EIR about that. We're talking
16 about having 6,000 residents right adjacent to this
17 hazardous disaster, and there's not one thing said in
18 the Environmental Impact Report.

19 So I think that this specifically needs to
20 be redone by an industrial hygienist company. All you
21 have to do is Google "oil operations in an urban," and
22 you get all sorts of lawsuits, newspaper articles. You
23 get, you know, cancer. You get asthma. You get watery
24 eyes. You get all of this stuff. Not one thing in the
25 Environmental Impact Report.

1 So this needs to go back, and it needs to
2 be redone in that area. You need to have a proper
3 consultant do this.

4 Thank you very much.

5 MS. CAUDILLO JONES: Good evening. My name is
6 Rebecca Caudillo Jones. I'll spell that last name,
7 middle last name for you. C-a-u-d-i-l-l-o. I live at
8 233 Attica Drive, and I have been a Long Beach resident
9 for 30 years.

10 The issue I want to talk about one more
11 time is traffic, but the more important thing that came
12 about about this discussion on traffic was the almost
13 instantaneous group that I put together on short notice.

14 So on Monday, August 15th, 2016 -- I see I
15 have a typo -- approximately 30 Naples and Belmont Shore
16 residents met to discuss SEASP EIR.

17 The consensus of the group is as follows:
18 Unmitigated traffic along Pacific Coast Highway, Second
19 Street, Studebaker Road, Loynes Avenue and 7th Street
20 already exists. Commuters traveling to and from Orange
21 County most frequently use 7th Street or the Davey's
22 Bridge to downtown Long Beach.

23 Movement at peak times, weekends,
24 especially summertime and during special events, such as
25 but not limited to Grand Prix, 3rd of July fireworks,

PC39
CONT'D

PC40

1 4th of July, dragon boat competitions, speed boat races,
2 sea festivals, Long Beach marathon, Halloween, Naples
3 boat parade and other events makes ingress and egress
4 difficult to residents, visitors, and most important,
5 emergency vehicles.

6 Any new development, residential and
7 especially commercial, will greatly exacerbate the
8 existing unmitigated traffic.

9 Do not move forward with further
10 development. Developer funding is unpredictable, and
11 developer fees are not sufficient to produce the plans
12 as stated in the EIR.

13 Do improve timing of signaling, public
14 transportation and public parking. And attached are the
15 names of the attendees of that just impromptu meeting.
16 I was going to give these to you, but I discovered a
17 typo. I will fix this and return this corrected.

18 Please listen to these people. We can come
19 together. Unfortunately, the process did not really
20 allow for public input.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. GOODHUE: Larry Goodhue. Clerk has the
23 address.

24 Let me begin by saying --

25 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Your name?

1 MR. GOODHUE: Everybody, I think I agree with
2 every single person that spoke except for the one
3 individual that said he represented a business
4 association from LA County, and I asked him where he
5 lives, and he lives in West Hollywood.

6 My initial reaction was similar to be --
7 this plan was similar to that when dealing with Marine
8 Stadium 8N, and a friend of mine on the other side of
9 the stadium said, "Don't worry, Larry, the City's plan
10 is divorced from intelligence."

11 And, of course, I had to disagree with it
12 because inherent in the statement that it was divorced
13 from intelligence meant that at some point it had some
14 sort of nexus to intelligence, and clearly this plan
15 does not at all.

16 One of the things -- first things that
17 captured my mind -- and I can't figure out exactly where
18 the line is, but there's a plan to remove a number of
19 homes beginning at the entrance of the Marine Stadium,
20 the newer homes, from the aegis of SEADIP.

21 I think that's a very nefarious plan. I
22 can see somebody putting up -- a Gary Delong putting up
23 10-, 15-story buildings there. In fact, I'm surprised
24 he didn't put up one there at the -- across from
25 Colorado Lagoon in that spot.

1 So this -- under no circumstances should
2 any existing area that's now under SEADIP be removed
3 from that aegis.

4 The biggest traffic area, the problem, of
5 course, is the iron triangle, and that's certainly a
6 State issue, and the way to address that I would say --
7 I would refer to it as Storrow Drive or as Storrow
8 Avenue, Storrow Drive, which is in Boston, essentially a
9 tunnel. Starting about right after you approach the VA,
10 it goes underneath and then will come out somewhere down
11 around the golf course and so forth. That's the only
12 way to address that.

13 But I would listen very carefully to what
14 these people say. That represents the viewpoints of the
15 people. I know the City didn't want that. That's why
16 the whole format was, you know, there wasn't a public
17 forum when people gathered.

18 You were supposed to go to this corner,
19 this corner or this corner, and you will hear what the
20 City was going to tell us what was going to be the plan,
21 and, of course, it backfired. Doesn't work.

22 Send it back to the drawing board, listen
23 to the people, and make sure nothing, nothing is removed
24 from the aegis of the existing SEADIP area.

25 Thank you.

1 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Larry. Your last
2 name?

3 MR. GOODHUE: Goodhue, h-u-e. Resident since
4 1977, when this good lady came in as -- was a
5 Councilperson.

6 MR. BUHBE: Good evening. I'm your neighbor. My
7 name is Mike Buhbe, B-u-h-b-e, in Seal Beach,
8 412 Central Way.

9 In 2008 -- here's some numbers for you --
10 the citizens of Seal Beach faced a public vote over the
11 two-story or two-story height limit that currently
12 exists in old town Seal Beach. There used to be a
13 three-story height limit.

14 So in 2008, thousands and thousands and
15 thousands and thousands of Seal Beach residents voted
16 against a three-story height limit. They voted in favor
17 of a two-story height limit, lowering the heights, and
18 this was in a campaign where I -- I was the chairman of
19 this campaign. We were outspent five to one.

20 The opposition had a professional campaign
21 manager. They paid professional people. We had on our
22 side to lower the height limits 50 to 100 volunteers,
23 nobody got paid, and the final vote was 73 percent vote
24 citywide in all five districts to limit the heights in
25 old town Seal Beach to two stories.

PC41
CONT'D

PC42

1 And, in fact, just recently you may have
2 driven down Pacific Coast Highway and seen on the corner
3 of Pacific Coast Highway and Main Street what we call
4 the Gad building. This building was oversized, and it
5 actually created a movement, and now the City Council in
6 a unanimous vote recently voted to lower the height
7 limit on Main Street from 30 feet to 25 feet.

8 So the reason I'm here is that I think I
9 represent the thousands and thousands and thousands of
10 people in Seal Beach that are against this project, and
11 I think also the people that I represent similarly
12 reflect the people of Long Beach.

13 I ride a bike additionally. I would never,
14 ever ride my bike on Pacific Coast Highway to get
15 anywhere. With all the distracted drivers, it's just
16 too unsafe. Drivers -- bike riders get regularly killed
17 on Pacific Coast Highway.

18 A third point would be that you have
19 existing retail at the Marketplace that's underutilized,
20 and I think that should be developed and paid attention
21 to before we add any more congestion, traffic,
22 additional retail.

23 I think you're looking at this in the short
24 term, but ignore the long-term benefit. In the long
25 term you make a healthy wetlands, you have a beautiful

1 low density development, you're going to have more
2 people, you're going to have more income, you're going
3 to have something that the City of Long Beach can be
4 proud of.

5 Thank you.

6 MS. SUNDSTROM: Good evening. My name is Diane
7 Sundstrom. I live 4507 East Barker Way in Belmont
8 Heights, and I will be submitting a letter, so I just
9 wanted to make a few comments tonight and don't expect a
10 response to this.

11 But I think there are many positive
12 elements about this draft plan, but I'm very concerned
13 about the impact on air quality and greenhouse gas
14 emissions from the attendant increase in housing and
15 traffic. And there are several comments in this report
16 that the project is inconsistent with the South Coast
17 Air Quality Management District plan and also that the
18 air quality, even with mitigation, impacts are
19 significant.

20 About -- according to this study, about
21 77 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions in SEADIP
22 currently come from transportation. So with the
23 increased number of car trips that will result from the
24 build-out of this plan, this is going to really have a
25 significant impact on air quality.

PC42
CONT'D

PC43

1 And my concern is that I understand that
2 you can write a statement of overriding considerations
3 where the benefits outweigh the impacts, the negative
4 impacts, but I have a hard time coming up with any
5 positive impacts that would compromise clean air. I
6 mean, we already live in a part of the country that has
7 the worst air quality; correct?

8 So the impacts of this proposed plan on air
9 quality and greenhouse gas emissions are significant,
10 cannot be mitigated, and I think require some careful
11 consideration.

12 Further, I wanted to say that the City's
13 2010 sustainable action plan had some goals that I would
14 like a status report on. One is that bike ridership
15 would increase from 1 percent to 10 percent by 2016,
16 which is this year, that there would be an increase in
17 public ridership on transportation by 25 percent by
18 2010, that vehicle emissions would be reduced by 30
19 percent by 2020. And actually, the public ridership was
20 by 2016, this year.

21 So this goal of decreasing vehicle
22 emissions by 30 percent by 2020 really is in
23 contradiction to the outcome of this particular plan.

24 So again, air quality, greenhouse gas
25 emissions are a major concern of mine, and I hope you

1 give careful consideration to them.

2 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

3 Seeing no other speakers lined up, we'll
4 close the public comment period and bring it back.

5 Staff, I believe you wanted to make some
6 comments first.

7 MR. KOONTZ: Sure.

8 So we have a number of facts based on the
9 issues that were brought up by the speakers I'd like to
10 go through. If I could have the PowerPoint back and
11 slide 41, that would be great.

12 So there were some comments regarding
13 wetlands and buffers and biological impacts in the
14 Pacific Flyway, and that is covered in detail in the
15 EIR, as well as in the plan, but just one point for the
16 Commission to be aware is that the existing plan does
17 not have language regarding buffers, regarding bird safe
18 treatments, regarding any of those issues.

19 So while it's certainly up for discussion
20 whether we got it perfect in the proposed plan, I think
21 it's important for the Commission to understand the
22 distinction from where we're starting from.

23 So in terms of traffic, there are traffic
24 mitigations in the plan, but I think it's also important
25 when we hear the comments that it's not enough to take a

PC44
CONT'D

PC45

1 look at what was discarded as possible.

2 So what would dramatically improve traffic
3 in this area, because it's subject to a lot of regional
4 traffic movement, would be improvements to the freeway
5 system, specifically 91 and the 405.

6 That's in the jurisdiction of Cal Trans,
7 and certainly the City has had a robust discussion with
8 Cal Trans about the wisdom of adding capacity in Orange
9 County and not in LA County.

10 But those particular improvements which
11 would bring regional improvements to traffic flow are
12 not within the control of the City.

13 The second big picture item that we looked
14 at but dismissed was we could create, in essence, a
15 freeway intersection at Second and PCH by compressing
16 Second Street or doing some kind of flyover. It would
17 require property takes on all four corners, and it would
18 result in a movement of traffic that benefits cars but
19 basically kills the movement of pedestrians and the use
20 of the four corners at that property. So that's to be
21 aware of.

22 So what's in this EIR are mitigations
23 specific to this plan, but that's not to say that the
24 City is not working on traffic improvements.

25 So improvements to east-west connections,

1 improvements to Second Street, these corridors don't
2 have right-of-way without removing the existing
3 improvements and in some cases homes along them, but our
4 Public Works Department in partnership with Development
5 Services, we are always looking at those improvements to
6 regional traffic flow, but that doesn't fall within the
7 context of this area study and what we're going to pass
8 on as a mitigation. And all of the mitigations are
9 funded by the development.

10 There was a discussion of the extension of
11 Studebaker, and we made a judgment call based, one, on
12 public input and, two, on just suitability, physical
13 suitability, that we were not going to fill in wetlands
14 to build a road extension.

15 It is correct that building that road
16 extension would -- it's not a panacea, but it would
17 result in a traffic improvement. But that compromise
18 was not seen as appropriate, nor would the regulatory
19 agencies, Coastal Commission and Fish & Wildlife, allow
20 us to construct such a road.

21 And then the final improvement that would
22 result in improved traffic flow would be to construct a
23 bridge at the end of Ocean Boulevard into Seal Beach
24 that would also result in dramatically high cut-through
25 traffic for the residents of the peninsula and increase

1 traffic into Seal Beach.

2 So we don't anticipate that the City of
3 Seal Beach would be interested in that improvement.

4 So this is just a review of the
5 intersections that we're talking about, and I'd really
6 invite everyone to look at -- under CEQA we have to do
7 an analysis of the physical environment today versus the
8 future with the project, but in our study we also show
9 what will happen if we don't do this project, and
10 traffic levels will continue to grow. Intersection
11 impacts will continue to increase.

12 While there is added traffic from this
13 project, there is increased traffic through the entire
14 region and through this location in specific regardless
15 of whether we do this plan or not.

16 So the question is really how we want to
17 cope with that improved -- increased traffic and what
18 type of physical environment we want to create for
19 people.

20 So that's a little bit on traffic. There's
21 also a lot of discussion this evening about height, and
22 I know this is a topic we've spoken with this Commission
23 on before. So I just want to be clear that height and
24 density are not the same thing.

25 So height actually allows for greater

1 amounts of usable open space on the ground level. So if
2 we think of a 10,000 square foot building, a one-story
3 10,000 square foot building takes up 10,000 square feet
4 of land. A two-story square building takes up 5,000
5 square feet of land with 5,000 square feet for open
6 space. And then at five stories, that same 10,000
7 square foot building takes up 2,250 square feet of
8 ground, of land.

9 So it's important to understand that height
10 and density are not the same thing, and what we heard at
11 community meeting after community meeting was that they
12 wanted plaza spaces, open spaces, gathering spaces,
13 landscaped areas and those view corridors and those new
14 streets.

15 And the way that you create enough leftover
16 land for those spaces where you create community and
17 where you create dynamic environment is that you allow
18 for height. If you allow one- and two-story
19 development, between parking and that development there
20 is no space left. So that's just something to be aware
21 of.

22 Again, this plan is a 40-year plan, so
23 there was a lot of discussion about the numbers, and our
24 goal was to deliver a plan that was feasible and
25 responded to public requests.

1 So, for example, when we heard that we
2 wanted a waterfront that you could access that was an
3 amenity but we also heard we'd like to have no traffic
4 and no new development, it was not possible for us as
5 staff to deliver that because based on the economic
6 studies and based on our common understanding of
7 development, one is not going to tear down a building or
8 go rent on that building for three years, go to the
9 expense of building a new building and build the same
10 amount of square footage or actually less because
11 they're now providing public open space. That's not how
12 the development process works.

13 So we did a market study with market
14 experts to understand what levels of development would
15 be required in order to receive the public benefits of
16 open area, and that shows quite clearly there is no
17 market for three-story development. So that -- that's
18 just the fact.

19 So there was also a comment about downtown
20 and that this was a reversal of a coastal policy that
21 density only goes downtown. Concentrated density, there
22 is a line in the LCP is limited to downtown.

23 The highest FAR proposed in this plan with
24 an incentive for doing hotel use is 2.25. That's at a
25 height of five stories with up to 15 percent of the

1 building hitting seven stories.

2 The height limit in downtown is up to 500
3 feet with an FAR of between 8 and 11.1. So in orders of
4 magnitude, between 400 and 600 percent of what we're
5 proposing here in SEADIP.

6 So the analogy that what's presented, that
7 this is of comparable density to downtown is factually
8 incorrect.

9 The other thing to understand is just there
10 are alternatives in this plan, and we did that based on
11 public input, and one of the things we wanted to tease
12 out was because there's so much interest in height, are
13 there different impacts based on height, and there's a
14 reduced height alternative which does not reduce the
15 impacts.

16 There is a reduced intensity alternative
17 that does reduce the impact, so that may be of interest
18 to the Commission when they hear this item in November.

19 So those are my overriding comments, and
20 we're glad to answer your questions.

21 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

22 Commissioners, with that we'll bring it
23 back to the Commission for comments or questions.

24 Commissioner Templin.

25 COMMISSIONER TEMPLIN: I appreciate all the

1 comments and the additional feelings that was shared.
2 Obviously, as you responded, there was hardly a person
3 that spoke that didn't mention traffic or density or
4 height, but one of the things that struck me and I was
5 rather concerned about was the disparity between the
6 people that show up and talk about they didn't know
7 about, they were not involved about public awareness and
8 able to participate and what was reported and the
9 numbers and some other things.

10 I was wondering if you could expand on that
11 a little bit, how that was handled.

12 MR. KOONTZ: Sure.

13 So as was mentioned, there, over the course
14 of years, were multiple public meetings. We did have a
15 core group which was an advisory group, but all of the
16 meetings were public meetings. They were posted on our
17 web site. We did press releases. We worked with area
18 groups.

19 I know that some of the speakers that spoke
20 tonight, their respective groups sent out emails letting
21 people know about those meetings.

22 So I agree with the speaker that said there
23 should have been thousands of people participating, and
24 we would have welcomed thousands of people to
25 participate. But what we did was an extensive outreach

1 program, and the number of people that participated was
2 the number of people that participated.

3 But all those meetings were public. They
4 were advertised. Folks who aren't able to come to
5 meetings were able to participate online for the online
6 town hall program, which we used specifically for this
7 project that we don't always use in order to reach more
8 people. I also myself have an open door. I take
9 appointments. I met with several of the folks in this
10 room.

11 So while I agree it would be wonderful to
12 have more participation, from a staff standpoint, we
13 feel that we did a good outreach effort for this
14 project.

15 COMMISSIONER TEMPLIN: Thank you for that.

16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Any other comments from
17 the Commissioners?

18 I do have a question which is related to
19 the alternatives, your low, medium and then your
20 preferred alternative in terms of the density and
21 numbers.

22 Where did those come from? You mentioned
23 that you had an economic study, and I'm assuming that
24 the preferred project, which is the one that you
25 designated, is the one that is your economic break

PC46
CONT'D

PC47

1 point, which is what you determined.

2 Where did the other two come from?

3 MR. KOONTZ: So going through the alternatives,
4 there is the proposed project which is based on the
5 market study, as well as what the staff, in consultation
6 with the different community meetings, felt was the best
7 plan, and that's what we're recommending.

8 The second alternative is the no project
9 alternative. So that's if we kept the plan on the
10 books.

11 So if we were to take no action or take a
12 negative action on the proposed plan, the development
13 rights on the ground do not go away. So someone could
14 come in tomorrow and demolish the Marketplace and build
15 a new retail establishment, be that a Costco or a new
16 shopping center. They have certain rights. And that
17 total build-out is studied under that alternative.

18 The third alternative is really required
19 that we disclose is the no development at all
20 alternative. But if we were to deprive all the property
21 owners of their property rights, the City would have to
22 conceivably acquire those properties.

23 So that just shows you the existing
24 conditions and assumes that nothing is built on any
25 parcel into the future.

PC47
CONT'D

1 The reduced intensity alternative, what we
2 did is we kept reducing the amount of development until
3 we hit a reduction in the number of impacted
4 intersections.

5 It was meant to be the point at which the
6 traffic impacts are diminished, but not to the extreme
7 of representing a number less than what exists on the
8 ground today because that would not be a helpful
9 alternative, at least not within the realm of
10 possibilities.

11 And then final alternative was based on all
12 the public interests in height, and that was a reduced
13 building height alternative where a similar amount of
14 development to the proposed project is built, but it's
15 built at a lower height with less open space and the use
16 of service parking instead of structured parking.

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Can you provide any
18 information relative to what we all lovingly refer to as
19 the pumpkin patch and what ultimately might become of
20 that property?

21 MR. KOONTZ: So under the proposed SEASP plan,
22 that's an industrial use. There is a proposed project
23 which has an industrial use on that site. There is a
24 Notice of Preparation regarding that project. It's a
25 Beach Oil Mineral Partners project.

PC47
CONT'D

PC48

1 Beyond that, since it's not on the agenda,
2 I'd prefer not to go into it.

3 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: But I guess that's where I
4 was going with the industrial use of that little parcel
5 that we're looking at.

6 MR. KOONTZ: That's correct. So you could see a
7 light industrial building, you could see mineral
8 extraction equipment, you could see the storage of
9 building supplies, or you could see a light industrial
10 building on that site.

11 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Okay. Just to add a
12 comment for those that referenced extending Studebaker,
13 historical perspective from at least myself, Marketplace
14 was actually required to contribute funds at the time it
15 was developed to the City to actually extend Studebaker
16 all the way through.

17 The City made several attempts both
18 environmentally and with the Coastal Commission to
19 actually construct that roadway, and all were rejected.

20 As indicated by staff, I sincerely doubt
21 that that attitude has changed. And even if we were to
22 include that in the plan, I don't think we'd be very
23 successful in pushing Studebaker through.

24 I just wanted the folks here to know it was
25 attempted at one point. It didn't make it.

PC48
CONT'D

PC49

1 Commissioner Verduzco-Vega.

2 COMMISSIONER VERDUZCO-VEGA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

3 I share in Commissioner Templin's concern
4 that the disparity between what we're shown in this memo
5 here that there were over 180 people that participated
6 in advisory meetings versus what we're hearing from the
7 audience in that there was a lack of participation.

8 So moving forward, I know we reached this
9 very critical point, but there is still time for public
10 comment. Moving forward with the process, what
11 opportunity does the public have now to not just comment
12 but make changes, or is there an opportunity to make
13 changes and participate in such changes by the public,
14 and how do they go about doing that?

15 MR. KOONTZ: Sure.

16 So the Environmental Impact Report is out
17 right now. It's on our web site. So now is the time to
18 make written comments on that document.

19 What happens after that is we review all of
20 those comments. Each comment is responded to in
21 writing. But more importantly, if it's a suggestion for
22 improvement, we do attempt to take those suggestions.

23 So one of the speakers, Miss Lamb, was from
24 the wetlands organization, and they did provide two
25 memos in lead-up to where we are today, and we made

1 specific changes in regards to the plant palette that's
2 allowed in landscape areas in regards to the interface
3 between wetland areas and development areas in specific
4 response to those comments.

5 So where we're able to make those changes,
6 we do make those changes. So we welcome those comments.
7 There are folks that have participated, and we would
8 invite them to continue to participate, and then when
9 this will -- in the formal approval process, when this
10 item does come back to you in November, that will be a
11 noticed public hearing, and folks are welcome to provide
12 testimony to this Commission, and you will make a
13 recommendation to the City Council that you feel is
14 best. And then the City Council, that process will
15 involve public testimony, as well.

16 And then whatever the City, if anything,
17 moves forward, it will go over to the Coastal
18 Commission, who will hold a public process as part of
19 their consideration at this point.

20 COMMISSIONER VERDUZCO-VEGA: Now, can you be a
21 little bit more specific as to who should they approach?
22 Should they approach you specifically? Should they
23 approach the consultants that we heard from?

24 And the second part of that comment or
25 question is assuming that there's an overwhelming want

1 to participate from not just the folks here in the
2 audience but the public in general, do we have to close
3 this response time? Which I think is sometime soon, in
4 the next couple weeks. Can we extend that time for
5 public comment?

6 MR. KOONTZ: Sure. So let's take those issues one
7 by one.

8 Folks should be contacting City staff, and
9 Mr. Craig Chalfant is the point of contact for the
10 environmental impact document, but I'm also available,
11 as well, if folks want to reach out to me.

12 The review period under CEQA, because it's
13 a legal disclosure document, there's a set period of
14 time. It's either 30, 45 or 60 days. We went for the
15 longest period of time, which was the 60 days. So
16 that's not available for extension.

17 But if comments do come in after that time,
18 while they won't be responded to as part of the
19 environmental document, that doesn't mean that they go
20 in the shredder. We're still available, and until the
21 final hour, we're going to be working to make sure that
22 the best plan possible is presented to this Commission,
23 and we welcome public input at any time.

24 COMMISSIONER VERDUZCO-VEGA: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Commissioner Van Horik.

1 COMMISSIONER VAN HORIK: Thank you.

2 Well, I have to start -- I have a question
3 for staff, but I have to start by saying I was very much
4 a proponent of this second look at SEADIP because
5 there's been a lot of pressure for land use changes in
6 that area, and I really felt that we needed a current
7 guiding resource to use in our decision regarding land
8 use applications and projects in that area.

9 One of my concerns all along has been
10 mobility in that intersection of Second and PCH, and I
11 have a question -- and I -- picture is fairly bleak
12 right now as painted by staff in terms of the options
13 available. If nothing gets done, the traffic is still
14 going to be worse according to staff. And given the
15 population growth in California, I imagine that that is
16 correct.

17 And I do have a question for staff
18 regarding the addition of the intersections on PCH that
19 are presented in the draft plan, and that is we don't --
20 what's the chance of getting those -- all those
21 intersections coordinated correctly?

22 It's under the control of Cal Trans, so is
23 that -- do we have to wait until they feel like they're
24 ready to coordinate the intersections because already
25 there's a problem with the signals between PCH and

1 Marina Drive, and if we add two more, is that just going
2 to be worse? Are we going to compound it?

3 MR. KOONTZ: So let me take those point by point.

4 So it would have to find a solution because
5 it would be a condition of approval of a developer's
6 project, and until they obtained clearance from both the
7 City and Cal Trans, they would not be able to proceed
8 with their project. And signal timing improvement is a
9 mitigation in this plan.

10 We have had some initial discussions with
11 Cal Trans, and they're interested in many of the changes
12 that we contemplate for PCH.

13 And then the internal street sections and
14 those additional intersections, the purpose of those is
15 to improve local circulation. So if I'm coming from
16 Naples Island and I'm trying to go to Ralph's, today I
17 have to go through the Second and PCH intersection.

18 If there were a point of entry prior to
19 that that connected all the way over to the far side of
20 that parcel, I'm able to avoid that intersection.
21 That's the reason for that internal circulation is so
22 that you're not routing traffic on Second and PCH
23 unnecessarily.

24 So based on our studies and based on the
25 opinion of the traffic engineer, I mean, the answer is

1 no, it won't just make it worse. Is it challenging
2 working with Cal Trans? Yes, it is. Is there an
3 existing signal timing problem? Yes, there is.

4 But when we propose a mitigation, it
5 doesn't mean that you can't just not do it. It becomes
6 a condition of approval. And unless they can obtain the
7 clearance to do that signal timing improvement, the
8 project does not proceed forward.

9 Without any new development, I can't say
10 whether that signal timing improvement will happen
11 tomorrow or the next day or years from now because the
12 truth is while we do our best, the City isn't
13 necessarily as pushy and lawyered as a developer whose
14 building permit is held up.

15 COMMISSIONER VAN HORIK: And there's other
16 problematic intersections, as well. So who has
17 oversight on, for instance, Westminster Boulevard and
18 the intersection at Westminster Boulevard and
19 Studebaker?

20 MR. KOONTZ: I'm going to ask our traffic
21 consultant to come to the central microphone at this
22 time.

23 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: It's Long Beach, by the
24 way.

25 MR. PACK: Good evening. My name's Jason Pack.

PC51
CONT'D

PC52

1 I'm with the firm of Fehr & Peers Associates.

2 So your question was specifically related
3 to Second Street, Westminster Boulevard and Studebaker
4 Drive?

5 COMMISSIONER VAN HORIK: Well, just let me be a
6 little more general.

7 MR. PACK: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER VAN HORIK: As part of the Douglas
9 Park project, one of the conditions of approval was that
10 the developer coordinate the signals, all of the streets
11 that were identified as being affected by the project,
12 and that's where I'm trying to get with this.

13 Can the same practical solution or
14 requirement -- I guess I should say requirement actually
15 be successfully implemented?

16 MR. PACK: It can be. Certain intersections right
17 now throughout the entire plan area are controlled by
18 the City. Others are controlled by Cal Trans.

19 So there is complexity between two
20 organizations and their need to communicate with each
21 other and the signal software to communicate with each
22 other, but there are many jurisdictions out there that
23 have been able to successfully complete that
24 communication and have their signals work together.

25 So can it be done? Absolutely. Is it

1 something that's extremely easy to implement? No. It
2 does take quite a bit of coordination to get it
3 implemented.

4 Does that answer your question?

5 COMMISSIONER VAN HORIK: Yes. Thank you.

6 MR. PACK: Sure.

7 COMMISSIONER VAN HORIK: But when there's pressure
8 from a development that's waiting, then it's easier than
9 if there's really nothing on the books is what I think
10 Chris was saying.

11 MR. PACK: I think that's accurate, yes.

12 COMMISSIONER VAN HORIK: All right. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Commissioner Fox?

14 COMMISSIONER FOX: The purpose of these study
15 sessions is to exchange educational thoughts, as well as
16 questions. I don't have so much questions as I do some
17 thoughts which I think are pertinent.

18 And I say this with a smile, the way it is,
19 that Mr. Goodhue said that he agreed with virtually
20 everybody that spoke tonight, and I found I also agreed
21 with virtually everyone that spoke tonight.

22 And I agreed with everything that Jan Hall
23 raised by way of question and thoughts. Kind of the
24 signature statement in her comments were why do we need
25 change, and I think that is pertinent.

PC52
CONT'D

PC53

1 And I'm addressing this to the staff and to
2 Mr. Koontz in particular. Sundstrom said inevitably
3 there's some positive aspects to these plans, and
4 everyone said this, and I absolutely think that is
5 accurate. There's no question about it. But there's so
6 many different aspects to the plan, there's got to be
7 something positive about it.

8 With regard to density and with regard to
9 traffic, my instinct as a Planning Commissioner between
10 now and November would be to ask every possible question
11 I could on the impact on this area of the city and the
12 city as a whole as it relates to both density and
13 traffic with a very cynical eye to it and with a thought
14 that the likelihood is that this plan is not going to
15 benefit those areas.

16 And Mr. Koontz said, well, the whole
17 community is expanding, and we have to expand and we
18 have to anticipate these problems.

19 I am just saying these are major issues,
20 and I as a Planning Commissioner would not be inclined
21 to favor the plan's impact as it relates in those areas.

22 With regard to the Los Cerritos Wetlands
23 Trust, I would be very inclined to talk to that group,
24 to talk to Ms. Lamb in detail and to know absolutely in
25 specific every possible detail of the plan as it relates

1 to the Wetlands Trust and to try to ensure that there is
2 no impact whatsoever as it relates to the wetlands.

3 That all said, with regard to height -- and
4 I'm a short timer, so I won't be voting in November, but
5 my vote would be absolutely negative as it relates to
6 height increases of any kind.

7 And I understand the arguments, but at some
8 point this has to be said. There will be arguments for
9 three stories. Notwithstanding what's been said
10 tonight, there will be arguments for five stories.
11 There will be all the various arguments that have been
12 made.

13 But when you're counting votes -- and
14 again, I'm speaking theoretically, but this Planning
15 Commissioner would vote absolutely against height
16 increases.

17 Enough said.

18 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Commissioner Cruz.

19 COMMISSIONER CRUZ: Thank you.

20 Question about the alternatives analysis.

21 So under the no project maintain SEADIP,
22 there would be no mitigation measures; is that correct?

23 MR. KOONTZ: That is correct.

24 COMMISSIONER CRUZ: And if a reduced intensity
25 alternative was approved, there would be mitigation

1 measures?

2 MR. KOONTZ: That's also correct.

3 COMMISSIONER CRUZ: That's all I have.

4 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Any other comments or
5 questions from the Commissioners?

6 Commissioner Templin.

7 COMMISSIONER TEMPLIN: Just one other concern.

8 The one gentleman, the chemical engineer
9 who brought up safety issues in that industrial area,
10 I'm sure that will be forwarded to the proper department
11 and there will be follow-through on that?

12 MR. KOONTZ: Sure.

13 So I would direct the public to the hazards
14 section of the EIR. We followed the specific guidance
15 of the State of California -- it's the Office of
16 Planning and Research -- that gives you CEQA guidelines.
17 We prepared that section specific to that guidance.

18 CEQA is an examination of the project's
19 impact on the environment. It's not an evaluation of
20 the environment's impact on the future residents of the
21 project.

22 But nonetheless, we followed the correct
23 procedure, and it's the City's factual view that those
24 individuals that prepared that section were qualified.
25 They meet the qualifications that the State established.

PC54
CONT'D

PC55

1 So I hear the concern from the member of
2 the public, but there are very specific rules. Some are
3 addressed in the EIR, but some are addressed by the
4 regulatory agencies that oversee hazardous materials,
5 one of which is our City's own Health Department, which
6 does -- you know, thankfully we have that City Health
7 Department and we're not relying on the County because
8 they do inspections four to seven times more often than
9 the County does. And they do a great job.

10 As far as the oil extraction, DOGGR, which
11 is a State agency, is the regulator, and they have
12 specific regulations for those facilities. And we've
13 set that forth in the EIR, so I'd invite the public to
14 review that section.

15 COMMISSIONER TEMPLIN: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: If you could make one
17 final clarification, there was a comment made regarding
18 the vehicle miles traveled and the legislation that
19 brought that forward.

20 I'm assuming those guidelines are still
21 being written and they are not included in our document?

22 MR. KOONTZ: Sure.

23 So our document is based on the rules and
24 regulations that existed when we started, when we sent
25 out what's called the Notice of Preparation.

PC55
CONT'D

PC56

1 Subsequent to that, the State Office of
2 Planning & Research released a draft guideline for how
3 you would address traffic impacts under CEQA moving from
4 what's called a level of service standard to a vehicle
5 miles traveled standard, which looks more at how much
6 car movement in total is happening and looks less at the
7 specific amount of delay at any one given intersection.

8 That proposal is still draft, and when it
9 does become final by the State, the way it's written
10 today, jurisdictions then have two years after that date
11 to comply.

12 So while that is something that's an
13 interesting topic coming up, changes to CEQA, it
14 actually has no relevance to this particular document
15 because we're following the rules and regulations that
16 exist at this time.

17 CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

18 With that I'm going to close this item out,
19 and for all of you that came out tonight, thank you.
20 This Commission does seriously take the comments that
21 you have provided this evening. We appreciate it. I
22 have many, many notes personally, and I watched my
23 fellow commissioners do likewise. So we do appreciate
24 you coming out and sharing your comments with us.

25 Thank you.

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

(Whereupon the discussion of the
SEASP study session concluded at 7:45 p.m.)

o-o-o

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
2 COUNTY OF ORANGE)

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

I, MARY E. PIERCE, Certified Shorthand Reporter
No. 6143 in and for the State of California, hereby
certify:

That I attended the foregoing hearing and that
all testimony, argument and comments made at the time of
the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and
that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings
and all comments made at the time thereof.

I hereby certify that I am not interested in the
event of the action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name
this 5th day of September, 2016.

Certified Shorthand Reporter in and
for the State of California