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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This project was funded by sustainability
grant from the State of California, so it helps include
the studies that we've done for wetlands delineation or
habitat assessment, mobility analysis and traffic
analysis, creating the development standards.
So all of those things were an initiative the City sought funding and was granted a grant and is helping to pay for the project that you see before you.

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

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

There were pop-up events where we would go out in different kind of shopping centers in the area
and talk with the public as they were coming in and out of doing their shopping.

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

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

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

And so now we're in the final stages of the City process for the Specific Plan and EIR, which are before you this evening.
Once there is action taken on the Specific Plan by the City, there will be a next step, which is taking it forward for review and the process through the Coastal Commission.

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

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

But what does that mean? That could mean a lot of things. So I'm not going to read through all the bullet points, but the ones below are the supporting
ideas that go with it. It's a more walkable, more
active area, more pedestrian friendly, less reliance on
the automobile, a relationship with the surrounding
natural uses that you have, the wetlands, protecting and
encouraging views -- there's a lot of views right now
that are not being capitalized on -- and a place that
serves both locals and visitors.

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

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

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

So equally in the process we needed to
consider the physical benefits, so what the place looked
like, planning, how we get around, and we had to look at
the environmental benefits, how does it affect the
wetlands and the uses adjacent to it.

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

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

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

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

Inevitably, the City would probably experience some ongoing applications and requests for new uses within the SEADIP area over time. One thing that this does is it really gives a comprehensive vision and approach for land use, for circulation, for preserving natural resources, and it works as a comprehensive whole.
And one of the ways that already it's been demonstrated that it's been useful is that recently Cal Trans has been looking at ways to improve the Los Alamitos bridge, and they were looking at different alternatives and designs for that bridge construction, and a fourth alternative was added to their analysis based upon the feedback that the community gave and said, hey, did you know we were doing this SEADIP and here are some of the big ideas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

So one of the features of the new plan is the addition of a designation called mixed use. So
there are a handful of properties right at Second and PCH which are designated in red, and then there's also a property that is located a little bit further north in purple, and these are our mixed areas. The purple area is where the Golden Sails property is.

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

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

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

So, for instance, if somebody wanted to open a space and they were renting kayaks or other things that would provide people access to the water, those are the type of uses that are allowed in the coastal habitat, wetland and recreation.
We have retained the industrial uses for your energy uses, and we've retained all of the residential, the established residential. So the majority of the uses are really and the changes are in those mixed use and mixed use -- it's a community core and mix used marina areas.

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

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

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

So total dwelling units in the area is 9500 units. It's a population of about 15,000 people.
Nonresidential square footage, we have about 2.7 million square feet, and that is a combination of commercial, office, industrial and public space, and public is, like, Kettering Elementary and some of the other public uses we have in the project area. It allows for up to 425 hotel rooms. And then we also look at employee generation. So it's anticipated to generate about 4,000 employees.

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

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

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

So as part of the conversation about creating place and making this an area that's special,
there was a lot of conversation about how do we do that, what opportunities are we missing out on that we should be capitalizing on, and one of the things that consistently came up was creating additional views, capitalizing on views right now that may be blocked by existing buildings and structures.

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

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

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

But probably the biggest opportunity to create place and something special in the SEADIP area is
what we're calling the waterway promenade, and that's an area of opportunity that is seen behind the Marina Pacifica project.

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

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

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

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

There's discussions about buffers. We've coordinated with and gotten feedback from different members from the wetlands community about different things that could be done for bird safe treatments that
include specialized landscaping so that it's noninvasive
into the wetlands and looking at different native
treatments.

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

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

Mobility. Obviously, that was one of the
top issues for the community as we were moving through
the project. The area is congested. There's no doubt
about that. So one of the priorities was improving
circulation and providing enhanced opportunities to walk and bike as an alternative to the car.

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

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

So this is an example of one of the graphics that's in the Specific Plan that shows the bicycle network. All of the existing bike facilities are in the solid lines and the proposed are in dashed. And so I won't go through all of these, but I just
wanted to show you the extent of how this bike connectivity is planned for in the plan.

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

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

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

We as part of the Specific Plan are not suggesting any particular alignment for Shopkeeper Road.

What the Specific Plan is emphasizing is that there
needs to be some sort of connection down the line from Shopkeeper Road to that end of Studebaker so that people have an alternative to get around there.

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

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

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

So overall, what does the Specific Plan do for Southeast Long Beach and all the properties that are in this area? As I mentioned earlier, it really
provides a comprehensive look and a way to approach the way the community should evolve, how new plazas and gathering spaces can be provided, how connectivity can occur and really how you can create place in a comprehensive way.

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

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

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

So with that brief overview of the plan, what I'd like to do now is to talk you through -- or
turn it over to Nicole Morse, who prepared the Environmental Impact Report, and she will explain the EIR and the contents of it and then the next steps.

MS. MORSE: Thank you, Wendy.

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

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

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

And once we determine what the environmental impacts are, we have to find ways to avoid or reduce those impacts. So we do that through mitigation measures and looking at alternatives to the project.
Another thing that it does is it helps us to coordinate with other agencies. So responsible agencies are contacted that have jurisdiction over the area, such as Cal Trans, the Army Corps of Engineers as an example or California Department of Fish & Wildlife, and we reach out to them to get their input on the environmental impacts, as well.

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

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

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

So what is it exactly that we analyzed? In
the EIR we looked at -- the Specific Plan, we're looking at the land uses that are being proposed, boundary changes that occurred, any infrastructure improvements.

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

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

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

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

One thing to keep in mind is that the Specific Plan includes design guidelines and development standards and other project design features that act as
mitigation in and of itself. So it's somewhat of a self-mitigating plan, and that's what I'm referring to also. As when Wendy talked about wetland buffers, bird safe treatments, that's all considered when we're analyzing these impacts.

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

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

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

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

Impacts that were found to be significant
and unavoidable include air quality, historical resources, greenhouse gas emissions, noise related to construction and transportation and traffic.

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

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

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

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

So even with the application of those mitigation measures, the impact is still considered significant.
With regard to historical resources, we surveyed the entire project area. We looked at -- we had a study prepared that looked at the eligibility of structures and buildings that had the potential to become historical resources and then those that were over 50 years old.

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

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

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

There is a plan in place and efficiency metric for the year 2020. It exceeded that amount. But there's also a 2050 goal that requires input from the State on how to achieve those reductions.
So part of the reason why this is an unavoidable impact is that we're creating for CARB to update their scoping plan so that we can have State measures to help guide how to reduce impacts for efficiency measures beyond 2020.

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

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

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

With regard to transportation and traffic, there's six intersections in the study area we're
currently deficient with build-out of the project. There will be 15 intersections that are deficient, and we included all available mitigation measures. Wendy went over some of them, but they also include signal timing, fees, additional site-specific traffic studies and intersection improvements.

One of the main reasons that we need to do an override for — and I’ll explain what that is in a second, but when you have an unavoidable impact, you have to do a statement of overriding considerations for that impact.

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

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

And then we looked at a no project adopted PD-1 that looks at the build-out of the adopted SEADIP plan. We included a reduced intensity alternative, and
that was for the purpose of reducing some of these significant impacts that I just mentioned regarding traffic, air quality and noise.

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

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

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

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

We will be providing written comments to everyone who submits comments. We've received maybe 20
comments so far, but we expect more. And tonight we're recording all the comments, and all comments that are made with regard to the environmental impacts and the Environmental Impact Report will also be responded to in that response to comments document.

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

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

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

MS. NOWAK: Just one quick slide.

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

So the intent is that at that meeting, that
would be discussion for action. And then once we have
gotten direction from the Planning Commission, then
tentatively right now we've got a hearing date scheduled
for City Council for December 6th.

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

Thank you.

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

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

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

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

If you are going to be making comments
relative to the EIR, it's helpful for the reporter to
know that because then that comment can be segregated
out and responded to, as was indicated by staff in their
report.

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

With that, our first speaker.

MS. HALL: Yes, sir. Thank you.

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

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

When you add that much more density and
blocking of views -- I know they talk about views, but
I'm concerned if it's a five-, six- and perhaps a
seven-story building, that that would really impact the
view corridors and the look on Pacific Coast Highway in particular, as well as the traffic congestion, which is acknowledged that we can't make it better.

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

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

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

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

Police and fire protection. Police and fire and the ability to get to a fire, to an incident
with the congestion that you're going to add will make it very, very difficult to promptly reply to an emergency. And Second Street/PCH, PCH/Bellflower Boulevard and 7th Street are very congested. The public safety component is, I think, critical, and I don't feel like it's been properly addressed.

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

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

Just connecting Studebaker Road would be more intuitive. It would be kind of a lopsided half circle around that really badly congested intersection of Second and PCH, kind of like the outer Traffic Circle would do, and it would reduce the habitat fragmentation. It's very important in a wetland.
The existing traffic pattern yields no reduction in miles traveled or fuel burned, and I think extending Studebaker Road to give people an alternative to that intersection would help an awful lot and improve the air quality for the downwind wetland.

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

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

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

Thank you.

MR. CROFT: My name is Ken Croft. I live and have lived in Seal Beach in Orange County for the last 40 years. In that period of time, we've seen a lot of change. Not so much in Seal Beach because there's not a lot of room for change there. It's only Pacific Coast Highway, but Main Street's all filled in and stuff like
that. Nor do I believe that -- there's College Park
West and College Park East, but they're minimal in size,
as well.

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

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

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

Huh-uh. It was a bad weekend, of course.

What are good weekends on the coast? But traffic was
just impossible.

And what brings me back to Long Beach,
Belmont Shore and Seal Beach is that traffic at times is
quite difficult. There are not a lot of options for
access around the area. You're faced by the coast.
There's no help there.

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

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

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

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

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

Next speaker, please.

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

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

It would be irreparable.

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

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

And here is a little reminder of what it's like at the peak traffic hour. The bottleneck is the Second Street bridge. Everything you do around it, you always get back to the Second Street bridge.
So as you know, the City traffic now at peak hours and at the Second Street and Pacific Coast Highway is way over the City's elements. The City had an element study done that's added to the general environmental product of the City, and that element said that you should have a D level or better. That is A, B, C, D, E, F. Should be D or above.

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

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

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

MR. DAVIS: I'm sorry.

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

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Please.

MR. DAVIS: Although we cannot come close to totally offsetting the coming traffic increase, we hope you will agree that we should as a priority implement
the two most notable mitigations available. One is the
connection of Shopkeeper Road to Studebaker Road via the
parking area of the Marketplace, and the other is the
signal timing at Second Street and Pacific Coast
Highway.

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

I thank you for your attention.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

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

MR. SPRAGUE: Thank you. Douglas Sprague. I live
at 58 Savona Walk, Long Beach. I have three comments on
the Draft EIR for the Spec Plan and more
specifically on the traffic impacts at PCH and Second
Street.

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

My second comment is with regard to the
comparison of the no project alternative to the project
alternative with regard to traffic impacts, and both alternatives have a level of service F, which is the lowest it can go.

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Next speaker, please.

Feel free to pull the microphone down.

MS. DAHL: Thank you.
I am Janice Dahl. I'm a resident of the SEADIP area, University Park Estates, past president of the neighborhood and currently president of El Dorado Audobon and the founder of Los Cerritos Wetlands Land Trust.

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

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

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

You may tweak the plan a little bit, but ultimately, you're going to approve that we go from 35
feet in height to seven stories, you're going to approve
two and a half times more population, two and a half
times more traffic.

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

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

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

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

And then speaking on part of El Dorado
Audubon, you don't -- I don't want to say "you." This
plan does not address the fact that this neighborhood is
under a wildlife corridor known as the Pacific Flyway.
There's wildlife from South America to Alaska that depends on each of these little habitats along the coast.

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

Thank you.

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

MR. BATTEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

We are a diverse grass roots alliance, and we are here tonight in support of the Southeast Area Development Plan Update.
As proposed, the Development Plan offers a thoughtful and balanced approach to land use planning to this vital and energetic community. It will not only enhance the area and quality of life for Long Beach residents, but also gives the business community the ability to reinvest in the area with updated design guidelines and infrastructure.

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

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

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

Thank you for your time.

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

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to
speak tonight. I'm here to talk about traffic and potential solutions.

According to the City's draft plan, as we have heard tonight, traffic is the number one community concern, yet the plan does not effectively address it. The EIR shows that traffic to be significant and unavoidable impact. Poorly rated intersections will increase from six to 15 out of 21. That means 71 percent of the area's intersections and four freeway on and off ramps will have very long delays.

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

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

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

The plan estimates over a hundred thousand daily trips through the area, 50,000 people coming and
going daily. Together, all these people already lose
$100 million a year due to traffic congestion. Is it
fair to ask these taxpaying residents to carry the costs
of additional traffic congestion for an overly ambitious
development plan?

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

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

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

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

MS. PEMBERTON: Okay.

The EIR calls for an alternative plan that
calls for a 30 percent reduction in high density, but it
doesn't go far enough to alleviate traffic. It only
improves one intersection, and that's in Seal Beach.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

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

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

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

The traffic, as I said, is already
impacted, and now we're going to allow a lower level of
service for traffic, which mixed use will allow.

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

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

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

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

We do not want our home property values
going down, so please consider this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

They attempt to mitigate this by saying, well, we'll make these buildings five to seven stories high, but we'll set them back, like that's going to make
a difference with a bird.

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

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Next speaker, please.

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

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

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

As someone who grew up literally in the shadow of that power plant, I'm very concerned that there has been very little visibility or integration of
the rebuild process with the SEADIP/SEASP process and community input.

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

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

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

I respectfully ask that the City of Long Beach reserve its right to review the power plant rebuild as part of this SEADIP/SEASP process and that
you strongly consider community concerns as extant with
the process and that you be in contact with California
Energy Commission staff on how to do so.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Next speaker, please.

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

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

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

So plainly, you don't really need this kind
of density in the plan, and yet it's in there for what I
have to assume is just to make money.
The other thing that strikes me is there's a big emphasis on, oh, we're going to get all this commercial in there. Really? You take a look at what we have right now in the Marina Pacific area and then across the street in the Marketplace and we see low quality shops. We see empty shops. What miracle is going to drive this in?

Thank you.

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

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

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

I bicycle around the City of Long Beach, and one of the things stated here was to add circulation
and mid block connectivity for pedestrians and for bicyclists, and I appreciate that. I'm a bicyclist.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your time.

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

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

Tonight what I want to do is focus on a
rather narrow piece of your Draft Environmental Impact Report. I am concerned about the adequacy of the draft document and particularly its analysis of existing traffic conditions.

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

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

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

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

It turns out that the news was full on that
particular day of the Auto Club's judgment that gasoline
prices during the prior week had increased by 67 cents.

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

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

MS. ALEY: My name is Carrie Aley.

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

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

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

Similarly with the Marketplace, with the
areas that have commercial, all they have to do is take
the existing square footage of their commercial space, stack as much residential on it, and they will have no -- no impact according to CEQA. The only property that I see that could trigger it would be the SeaPort Marina Hotel.

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

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

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

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

I looked at the original environmental document for Pacific Marina. I'm running out of time.

It promised mitigation. Long Beach has a long history
of not doing mitigation. The Marketplace/Shopkeeper Road extension was for that section, and I don't believe you should recycle mitigation.

    Thank you very much.

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

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

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

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

    The one thing in this plan that really bothers me is the emphasis on mixed use. You can walk right out here and look across the street at a building that was built seven, eight years ago, mixed use. One,
one commercial space is leased. Everything else is
still empty and will remain empty.

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

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

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

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

That doesn't matter to you, that's fine. I
know you're here to push development and economic growth
and all that, but, you know, why don't you listen to us for a change? It would be really refreshing, and you might sleep better at night, too.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Next speaker, please.

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

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

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

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

I thought that was the focus of this entire area was its wetlands and preserve the nature. These are wildlife. It's not domestic animals that you put little nice walkways by them and they're going to
thrive. You've missed the point completely on this.

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

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

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

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

Not only homes and the things that Indian
peoples created --

COURT REPORTER: You need to read slower.

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

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

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

There is -- I'll just finish.

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

It's not hard to understand why Indians have, from the times of the Pilgrims, opposed such desecration and why if there's going to be any kind of
multi-culturalism on this continent, it's got to stop.
These things, these places, these human remains do not
belong to anyone other than the survivors.

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

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: The reason we're asking
the speakers to speak slowly and clearly is so that
those comments can get transcribed for your benefit so
they can be responded to. So respect our need to record
your comments so that we can respond to them.
MS. COTTON: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Melinda Cotton. I live on Park Avenue in Belmont Shore, and I moved to Long Beach when Jan Hall was our Councilmember, and I would ask you, first of all, to listen to the things that she highlighted that were density, that were traffic, that were the view corridors.

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

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

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

I'm going to speak to two items on the population increase and housing density. That's all
going to be in that area from the Seal Beach border to Loynes. So it's proposed that we're going to have 5,439 more dwelling units, 8,548 more people all jammed in there, and that's going to be market rate housing.

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

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

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

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

And then the Studebaker, what's proposed to add from the Trader Joe location to PCH, again it's
going to add congestion because you're going to lengthen that because you're going to let a lot more cars through.

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

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

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

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

I have given you a screen shot of the City's Development Services page that describes the community input on this project. And for the benefit of the attendees in the audience, I'd like to tell you that the City announced that 180 people attended the CAC meetings, 76 people attended the public forum and made
statements, 55 people were involved in the public
meetings, and 187 people attended the workshops. And I
am absolutely disgusted by those numbers.

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

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

I don't know. I don't have enough time here to go through that with you, but if you haven't seen those memos, I encourage you to read them because we felt that what we owed from the get-go was that our concerns be clearly outlined, and they are concerns that you would expect about protecting and restoring this fragile resource that is important to the community, as I was heartened to find out during those advisory
meetings and, obviously, important to the biodiversity in Southern California given that the vast portions of Southern California's wetlands are gone forever.

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

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

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

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

The other thing I just have to tell you is
as lovely as the people were that I met on the Community Advisory Community, more than one person earnestly took me aside to explain to me how what we needed was an environmentally sensitive road through Los Cerritos wetlands.

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

Next speaker, please.

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

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

So I then got involved in politics and stayed as president of the University Park Estates intermittently for ten years. I was land use chair of the local coastal program, and in that effort we learned how to meet with the residents of the area. We walked
the streets, we knew what was going on, and we also incorporated SEADIP into our plan.

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

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

So that's why I call it the San Diego plan.

Sorry, guys. I do.

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

Stop trying to drop everything on this side of the City just because it has some open land. We are
now experiencing the worst traffic, and it seems like
the only entry and exit viable are those that work in
our city because they're coming and they're going.
The Orange County freeway now will dump
from five lanes to four lanes to get on the freeway
going north, and, of course, you know what that means
for us. We'll be sitting underneath their exhaust right
at our corner.
The airport now is considering a major
renovation, which could increase flights. And, of
course, that means more stuff being dumped on us.
CSULB and the VA have plans to expand,
ever taking into consideration do you know what 7th
Street is like in the morning and in the evenings?
And Edison now is looking with big eyes
because they're moving their plant over, and that leaves
this whole big light industrial site for them to fill
up. Guess what? Someone already tried to do it.
So it's not -- it's not appropriate to keep
impacting us with stuff from the port and then stuff
from over our heads. So we ask you to reconsider the
increase in height and density. And I'm going home.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

Next speaker, please.

MR. McAFEE: Good evening. My name is Andy
McAfee. I live at 260 Claremont Avenue.

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

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

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

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

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

There is an oil field right in the middle of this area we're talking about. It's been there since
1920, which is in the report. It's going to be there another 40 years.

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

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

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

So I think that this specifically needs to be redone by an industrial hygienist company. All you have to do is Google "oil operations in an urban," and you get all sorts of lawsuits, newspaper articles. You get, you know, cancer. You get asthma. You get watery eyes. You get all of this stuff. Not one thing in the Environmental Impact Report.
So this needs to go back, and it needs to be redone in that area. You need to have a proper consultant do this.

Thank you very much.

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

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

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

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

Movement at peak times, weekends, especially summertime and during special events, such as but not limited to Grand Prix, 3rd of July fireworks,
4th of July, dragon boat competitions, speed boat races, sea festivals, Long Beach marathon, Halloween, Naples boat parade and other events makes ingress and egress difficult to residents, visitors, and most important, emergency vehicles.

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

Let me begin by saying --

COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Your name?
MR. GOODHUE: Everybody, I think I agree with
every single person that spoke except for the one
individual that said he represented a business
association from LA County, and I asked him where he
lives, and he lives in West Hollywood.

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

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

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

I think that's a very nefarious plan. I
can see somebody putting up -- a Gary Delong putting up
10-, 15-story buildings there. In fact, I'm surprised
he didn't put up one there at the -- across from
Colorado Lagoon in that spot.
So this -- under no circumstances should any existing area that's now under SEADIP be removed from that aegis.

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

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

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

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

Thank you.
COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Larry. Your last name?

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

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

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

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

The opposition had a professional campaign manager. They paid professional people. We had on our side to lower the height limits 50 to 100 volunteers, nobody got paid, and the final vote was 73 percent vote citywide in all five districts to limit the heights in old town Seal Beach to two stories.
And, in fact, just recently you may have driven down Pacific Coast Highway and seen on the corner of Pacific Coast Highway and Main Street what we call the Gad building. This building was oversized, and it actually created a movement, and now the City Council in a unanimous vote recently voted to lower the height limit on Main Street from 30 feet to 25 feet.

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

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

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

I think you're looking at this in the short term, but ignore the long-term benefit. In the long term you make a healthy wetlands, you have a beautiful
low density development, you're going to have more
people, you're going to have more income, you're going
to have something that the City of Long Beach can be
proud of.

Thank you.

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

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

About -- according to this study, about
77 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions in SEADIP
currently come from transportation. So with the
increased number of car trips that will result from the
build-out of this plan, this is going to really have a
significant impact on air quality.
And my concern is that I understand that
you can write a statement of overriding considerations
where the benefits outweigh the impacts, the negative
impacts, but I have a hard time coming up with any
positive impacts that would compromise clean air. I
mean, we already live in a part of the country that has
the worst air quality; correct?

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

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

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

So again, air quality, greenhouse gas
emissions are a major concern of mine, and I hope you
give careful consideration to them.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

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

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

MR. KOONTZ: Sure.

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

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

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

So in terms of traffic, there are traffic mitigations in the plan, but I think it's also important when we hear the comments that it's not enough to take a
look at what was discarded as possible.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Again, this plan is a 40-year plan, so there was a lot of discussion about the numbers, and our goal was to deliver a plan that was feasible and responded to public requests.
So, for example, when we heard that we wanted a waterfront that you could access that was an amenity but we also heard we'd like to have no traffic and no new development, it was not possible for us as staff to deliver that because based on the economic studies and based on our common understanding of development, one is not going to tear down a building or go rent on that building for three years, go to the expense of building a new building and build the same amount of square footage or actually less because they're now providing public open space. That's not how the development process works.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

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

Commissioner Templin.

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

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

MR. KOONTZ: Sure.

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

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

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

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

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

COMMISSIONER TEMPLIN: Thank you for that.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Any other comments from
the Commissioners?

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

Where did those come from? You mentioned
that you had an economic study, and I'm assuming that
the preferred project, which is the one that you
designated, is the one that is your economic break
point, which is what you determined.

Where did the other two come from?

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

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

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

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

So that just shows you the existing conditions and assumes that nothing is built on any parcel into the future.
The reduced intensity alternative, what we did is we kept reducing the amount of development until we hit a reduction in the number of impacted intersections.

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

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

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

MR. KOONTZ: So under the proposed SEASP plan, that's an industrial use. There is a proposed project which has an industrial use on that site. There is a Notice of Preparation regarding that project. It's a Beach Oil Mineral Partners project.
Beyond that, since it's not on the agenda, I'd prefer not to go into it.

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

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

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

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

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

I just wanted the folks here to know it was attempted at one point. It didn't make it.
Commissioner Verduzco-Vega.

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

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

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

MR. KOONTZ: Sure.

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

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

So one of the speakers, Miss Lamb, was from the wetlands organization, and they did provide two memos in lead-up to where we are today, and we made
specific changes in regards to the plant palette that's allowed in landscape areas in regards to the interface between wetland areas and development areas in specific response to those comments.

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

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

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

And the second part of that comment or question is assuming that there's an overwhelming want
to participate from not just the folks here in the audience but the public in general, do we have to close this response time? Which I think is sometime soon, in the next couple weeks. Can we extend that time for public comment?

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

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

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

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

COMMISSIONER VERDUZCO-VEGA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Commissioner Van Horik.
COMMISSIONER VAN HORIK: Thank you.

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

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

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

It's under the control of Cal Trans, so is that -- do we have to wait until they feel like they're ready to coordinate the intersections because already there's a problem with the signals between PCH and
Marina Drive, and if we add two more, is that just going to be worse? Are we going to compound it?

MR. KOONTZ: So let me take those point by point. So it would have to find a solution because it would be a condition of approval of a developer's project, and until they obtained clearance from both the City and Cal Trans, they would not be able to proceed with their project. And signal timing improvement is a mitigation in this plan.

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

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

If there were a point of entry prior to that that connected all the way over to the far side of that parcel, I'm able to avoid that intersection.

That's the reason for that internal circulation is so that you're not routing traffic on Second and PCH unnecessarily.

So based on our studies and based on the opinion of the traffic engineer, I mean, the answer is
no, it won't just make it worse. Is it challenging
working with Cal Trans? Yes, it is. Is there an
existing signal timing problem? Yes, there is.

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

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

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

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

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

MR. PACK: Good evening. My name's Jason Pack.
I'm with the firm of Fehr & Peers Associates.

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

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

MR. PACK: Okay.

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

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

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

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

So can it be done? Absolutely. Is it
something that's extremely easy to implement? No. It does take quite a bit of coordination to get it implemented.

Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER VAN HORIK: Yes. Thank you.

MR. PACK: Sure.

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

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

COMMISSIONER VAN HORIK: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Commissioner Fox?

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

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

And I agreed with everything that Jan Hall raised by way of question and thoughts. Kind of the signature statement in her comments were why do we need change, and I think that is pertinent.
And I'm addressing this to the staff and to Mr. Koontz in particular. Sundstrom said inevitably there's some positive aspects to these plans, and everyone said this, and I absolutely think that is accurate. There's no question about it. But there's so many different aspects to the plan, there's got to be something positive about it.

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

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

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

With regard to the Los Cerritos Wetlands Trust, I would be very inclined to talk to that group, to talk to Ms. Lamb in detail and to know absolutely in specific every possible detail of the plan as it relates
to the Wetlands Trust and to try to ensure that there is no impact whatsoever as it relates to the wetlands.

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

And I understand the arguments, but at some point this has to be said. There will be arguments for three stories. Notwithstanding what's been said tonight, there will be arguments for five stories.

There will be all the various arguments that have been made.

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

Enough said.

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Commissioner Cruz.

COMMISSIONER CRUZ: Thank you.

Question about the alternatives analysis.

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

MR. KOONTZ: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER CRUZ: And if a reduced intensity alternative was approved, there would be mitigation
MR. KOONTZ: That's also correct.

COMMISSIONER CRUZ: That's all I have.

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

Commissioner Templin.

COMMISSIONER TEMPLIN: Just one other concern.

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

MR. KOONTZ: Sure.

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

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

But nonetheless, we followed the correct procedure, and it's the City's factual view that those individuals that prepared that section were qualified. They meet the qualifications that the State established.
So I hear the concern from the member of the public, but there are very specific rules. Some are addressed in the EIR, but some are addressed by the regulatory agencies that oversee hazardous materials, one of which is our City's own Health Department, which does -- you know, thankfully we have that City Health Department and we're not relying on the County because they do inspections four to seven times more often than the County does. And they do a great job.

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

COMMISSIONER TEMPLIN: Thank you.

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

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

MR. KOONTZ: Sure.

So our document is based on the rules and regulations that existed when we started, when we sent out what's called the Notice of Preparation.
Subsequent to that, the State Office of Planning & Research released a draft guideline for how you would address traffic impacts under CEQA moving from what's called a level of service standard to a vehicle miles traveled standard, which looks more at how much car movement in total is happening and looks less at the specific amount of delay at any one given intersection.

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

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

CHAIRMAN CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you.

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

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