Angela Soo

From: Mekaela Gladden <mekaela@briggslawcorp.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 1:13 PM
To: Laurie B. Jester
Cc: Cory Briggs
Subject: Manhattan Village Mall- City Council Public hearing- Tuesday September 17th
Attachments: Gabriel Elliott's - resume August 2012.pdf; Revised_GE_FINAL.pdf; CC_Alternatives_Traffic_FINAL.pdf

Please see the attached documents, which should be distributed to the City Council and included in the administrative record for tonight's hearing.

Thank you.

Mekaela Gladden
Briggs Law Corporation
San Diego County: 814 Morena Boulevard, Suite 107, San Diego, CA 92110
Inland Empire: 99 East "C" Street, Suite 111, Upland, CA, 91786
Telephone: 619-497-0021
Facsimile: 619-515-6410 (San Diego)
E-mail: Mekaela@briggslawcorp.com

LATE ATTACHMENT 1
CC MTG 9-17-13

THIS PAGE

INTENTIONALLY

LEFT BLANK

Gabriel Elliott
775 W. County Line Road
Calimesa, CA 92320

Professional Experience

Principal **2009 - Present**
***Urban Planning & Consulting Group**, Sole Proprietorship*

- Conduct land research, provide quantitative analysis, and prepare technical analyses and reports for municipalities.
- Manage project and staff and overseeing project budgets of all ranges.
- Create, proof-read, review and present environmental documents such as Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, and Initial Studies.
- Write, edit, review and present planning documents including General and Comprehensive Plans, Specific Plans, Land Use Plans, Subdivision maps, etc.
- Process entitlement projects of all ranges.

Assistant Director of Community and Neighborhood Planning **2008 – 2009**
City of College Station, Texas, 77840, population 100,000, staff of 6, and budget of $330,000

- Directly supervise the community and neighborhood planning process and implement policies and programs relative to long range planning and development administration, including the General Plan, transportation planning administration, Geographical Information System, and land use administration.
- Coordinate, prepare and oversee the departmental operating budget.
- Assist the Director, City Manager, City Council, Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of Zoning Adjustment, Design Review Board, Construction Board of Adjustments and Appeals, Building & Standards Commission, and Historic Preservation Committee in matters of development codes, city planning, building permitting and inspections.

Principal Planner
Willdan Associates, Industry, California **2002- 2007**

Performed business development activities for the environmental services division, and was contracted out to other municipalities in California as Interim Community Development or Planning Director, or other leadership roles in the following capacities:

Interim Community Development Director (as Willdan Consultant) **7/2007 – 12/ 2007**
*City of Lynwood, California***,** 90262**,** *population 120,000, staff of 25, and budget of $2.5 million*

- Manage the Planning, Parking Enforcement, Code Enforcement, Business License, and Building & Safety, Divisions of the Community Development Department by planning and overseeing the day-to-day operation of development activities.
- Prepare comprehensive written and oral reports and make recommendations for presentation to the City Council, Redevelopment Agency, Planning Commission, developers, public agencies and community groups, and represent the department at Redevelopment Agency meetings, public hearings, community meetings, and technical and professional conferences.
- Supervise the professional development of 25 assigned staff and review and evaluate employees' job performances and recommend appropriate personnel action.
- Evaluate, recommend, and implement policies to attract new businesses into the city while protecting and enhancing policies to retain the City's existing client base for development.

- Negotiate, prepare and supervise the processing of documents, such as Disposition and Development Agreements, Owner Participation Agreements, tax-exempt bonds, and consultant contracts. Also supervised the issuance of building and sign permits.
- Assist in establishing annual goals and objectives and in preparing department budget.

Community Development Director (as Willdan Consultant) **2005 – 2007**
City of Calimesa, California, 92320, population 8,000, staff of 8, budget of $620,000

- Manage and direct the Planning, Building & Safety, and Code Enforcement Divisions of the City by overseeing the day-to-day operation of the development activities.
- Supervise the professional development of assigned staff by reviewing and evaluating employees' job performances and recommending appropriate personnel action,
- Negotiate, prepare and supervise the processing of documents, such as project conditions of approval, Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Disposition and Development Agreements, Owner Participation Agreements, contracts, and permits.
- Coordinate the analysis of architectural, urban design, and economic issues in project development, and evaluate real estate financing proposals and development proformas.
- Administer contracts and serve as liaison between the project team, City divisions, outside public agencies and the community and represent the department at public meetings and technical and professional conferences.
- Prepare comprehensive written and oral reports and make recommendations for presentation to the City Council, Redevelopment Agency, developers, public agencies and community groups.
- Conduct special studies and prepare detailed research reports as needed. Assist in establishing the Agency's annual goals and objectives and in preparing the public presentations.

Planning Manager (as Willdan Consultant) ***2002 – 2005***
City of Calimesa, California, 92320, population 8,000, staff of 6, budget of $500,000

- Manage the day-to-day operations of the Planning and Code Enforcement Divisions. Manage and direct the Planning, Building & Safety, and Code Enforcement Divisions of the City.
- Manage and process large residential subdivisions, Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Specific Plans, and General Plan Amendments, including SunCal and Fiesta Homes (7,000 residential units with EIR, specific plans and design guidelines for Mixed-use residential/commercial development (3,600 homes), and 1.2 million square feet of commercial development. Fiesta Development EIR – 3400 residential units and 250,000 square feet of commercial development).
- Represent the department at meetings and technical and professional conferences. Prepare comprehensive written and oral reports and make recommendations for presentation to the City Council and Redevelopment Agency, developers, public agencies and community groups.
- Conduct special studies and prepare detailed research reports as needed.
- Assist in establishing the Agency's annual goals and objectives and in preparing the public presentations. Supervise the professional development of assigned staff.
- Review and evaluate employees' job performance and recommend appropriate personnel action.

Senior Project Manager (as Willdan Consultant **2002 – 2003**
Colonies at San Antonio, City of Upland, population 80,000, staff of 3, budget of $1 million

- Project Manager for the large residential and commercial development (Colonies as San Antonio) in the City adjacent to the 210 Freeway.
- Responsible for coordinating the Environmental Impact Report process, coordinating with project consultants, preparing staff reports for public hearings and making presentations.
- Worked extensively with the development community to assure satisfaction and business retention.

Wrote and managed the following Environmental Impact Reports:

- JP Ranch EIR (TTM 30386 and 30387) and the Holbert Ranch EIR (TTM 30545).
- City of Maywood Neighborhood Park EIR
- City of Ontario Downtown Loft EIR
- City of Pomona Downtown Loft EIR
- Responsible for managing the preparation of CEQA documents and Specific Plans and all other related entitlements

---

Prior to Willdan Associates:

Senior Planner, Civic Solutions, Inc. San Juan Capistrano, California, ***1999 – 2002***

- Project Manager for the firm's public sector clients including the City of Norwalk, Irvine, City of Imperial Beach and private sector clients. Responsibilities included attracting new clients and retaining existing client base, writing and review of Specific Plans, environmental documents (negative declarations, environmental impact reports), project management of discretionary case processing for complex development projects, coastal development permits, General Plan Amendments, zoning ordinances, redevelopment plans, and land use planning

Associate Planner, City of Costa Mesa, California, ***1989 – 1999***

- Provide technical assistance in review of discretionary cases for both current and long-range planning; member of the team that re-wrote the City's zoning code; research and supervise writing of the City's communications antenna ordinance

Education

Master of Urban and Regional Planning, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas

B.A., Journalism, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas

Affiliations

Associate Member, American Planning Association.

THIS PAGE

INTENTIONALLY

LEFT BLANK

September 17, 2013

To: City of Manhattan Beach City Council
1400 Highland Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

From: Gabriel Elliott

RE: TRAFFIC STUDY FOR THE MANHATTAN VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTER (MVSC) MANHATTAN BEACH, CA

I have reviewed the Traffic Study, the Transportation and Circulation Element of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project, the revised traffic tables for the EIR, the project's Draft EIR technical appendices, and the Errata and Clarifications to the Draft EIR. For clarity, my comments are presented at the end headings, sub-headings, or sections identified in the traffic report and in the other documents reviewed and identified above. Comments provided are in **bold Arial font** and are ***italicized*** and numbered for easy reference.

The Project

The project consists of an assessment of the potential traffic and parking impacts associated with the proposed expansion of Manhattan Village Shopping Center (MVSC), located on the southeast corner of Sepulveda Boulevard & Rosecrans Avenue in the City of Manhattan Beach, California.

Description

The proposed expansion would increase the existing retail square footage as well as the existing parking supply in three components: (Village Shops, Northeast Corner, and Northwest Corner, Components I, II, and III, respectively), that could be developed sequentially or cumulatively (the Project). Upon completion, approximately 123,672 net square feet (sf) of retail and restaurant uses, for a total of approximately 696,509 sf of gross leasable area on the combined main shopping center parcel and the Fry's parcel in the northwest corner of the property, and provide an on-site parking supply of approximately 2,915 parking stalls. With the traffic equivalency program, up to 706,266 sf of GLA could be provided on the Project site.

Component I

Component I is anticipated to be accomplished in two stages that together would generate a net increase of approximately 60,000 sf of shops and restaurants to the shopping center. Approximately 33,400 sf of retail and restaurant space may be added in Stage 1 and the remainder in Stage 2. One or two parking decks providing additional parking are anticipated to be located to the immediate north and/or south of Component I. These decks, with approximately 790 combined spaces, plus an additional 291 surface spaces would replace approximately 740 surface parking stalls, for a net gain of 341 parking spaces. The proposed garages would be a combination of grade plus one or two above-grade levels in each location. Based on the City's Master Use Permit (MUP) for the site, the project should provide a parking ratio of 4.1 spaces per 1,000 sf of gross leasable area of development (spaces/ksf) in the shopping center plus 170 spaces for the Fry's site. The Applicant intends to meet that minimum requirement at the completion of each component. Because of the complexity of providing an exact number of parking spaces when parking is provided in a parking deck format (given the need to provide parking increments of full

floors of parking), the applicant is seeking to provide a minimum of 4.1 sp/ksf of development with a maximum of 10% above the minimum required parking supply. The Component I expansion could be completed as early as 2013 for Stage 1 and 2014 for Stage 2. The analysis in this report assumes the earliest possible opening for Component I, Stage 1 would be late 2013. The project assumes that if this opening were delayed by one or even a few years, the traffic and parking conclusions of this report would not change. The existing uses may be replaced with an expansion of the existing Macy's Fashion store on the northeast portion of the site. Alternatively, all or a portion of the new square footage may be developed as other shopping center uses on site. The parking supply in this portion of the shopping center would be decreased by 115 parking stalls.

Comment 1

There is a concern with the use of the 4.1 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet based on the City's Master Use Permit (MUP) for the site. It is not clear when the MUP was approved, however, with the proposed addition of 20,000 square feet more (for a total of 109,00 square feet) of restaurant space, the 4.1 parking ration may be deficient in meeting the site's parking needs.

Component II

Component II improvements could be completed as early as 2018. The proposed Northeast Corner (Component II) expansion of the existing main shopping center would occur near the existing Macy's Fashion store. Component II anticipates an approximate 50,000 sf expansion of shopping center uses and the demolition of approximately 20,000 sf of retail and cinema space, resulting in the net addition of approximately 30,000 sf of net new retail space. The existing uses may be replaced with an expansion of the existing Macy's Fashion store on the northeast portion of the site. The parking supply in this portion of the shopping center would be increased by 100 parking stalls with the addition of a new parking structure north of the Macy's Fashion store (maximum grade plus three levels of parking) and the addition of spaces to the west or northwest of the store.

Component III

The analysis reviewed assumes that the proposed Component III expansion would involve the removal of the existing Fry's building on the northwest corner of the property closest to the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard & Rosecrans Avenue. Component III would replace the existing 46,200 sf Fry's building with 80,000 sf of new retail space, providing a net increase of approximately 33,800 sf for the shopping center. Additional parking would be provided in this component by bridging over the former railroad right-of-way currently used for below-grade surface parking. An underground pedestrian pathway would be maintained from Veterans Parkway through the Project site to Rosecrans Avenue. Together, the Component III development would eliminate 310 surface parking spaces and then add 508 spaces in surface and structured facilities, for a net increase of 198 parking stalls in the Component III expansion. The Component III expansion will include a parking deck (maximum grade plus two levels of parking) in the northwest area of MVSC. This third component could be completed by 2022.

Parking Distribution

There will be times during the construction of the various components that the on-site parking supply will not meet the City Code. The anticipated construction schedule shows that the on-site supply would be adequate to meet the parking demand during every month of the year because, while the construction of parking garages would result in the loss of spaces during the January-November time frame, the parking would increase for the holiday shopping period with the opening of the new garage at the end of each Component. When each Component of construction is

complete, the required parking ratio would be provided and the parking would actually be located closer to the stores than it is today due to the construction of the parking structures.

Comment 2

As good as this may sound, I have yet to come across any documents detailing construction schedules or mandating that construction commences and ends during the January – November time frame. An approved project condition of approval mandating construction for this time period, only because it is tied to parking availability, is necessary.

Study Scope

The scope of work for this study was developed based on field review and input from the City of Manhattan Beach. The study analyzes the potential Project-generated traffic impacts on the adjacent street system. This study makes a conservative assumption that each of these Project components and stages would be built sequentially. The analysis of future year traffic forecasts is based on projected conditions in the Years 2013, 2014, 2018 and 2022 both with and without the addition of the Project traffic. The traffic analysis examined existing conditions, cumulative base (2013, 2014, 2018, and 2022 conditions, and cumulative (2013, 2014, 2018, and 2022) plus Project conditions. The traffic analysis also evaluated 13 intersections as part of the scope of work based on consultation with the City of Manhattan Beach. They are:

1. Sepulveda Boulevard & Rosecrans Avenue

2. Project Driveway 1 (Fry's) & Rosecrans Avenue

3. Project Driveway 2 (railroad right-of-way) & Rosecrans Avenue

4. Village Drive & Rosecrans Avenue

5. Sepulveda Boulevard & Valley Drive

6. Sepulveda Boulevard & 33rd Street

7. Sepulveda Boulevard & 30th Street

8. Sepulveda Boulevard & 27th Street

9. Sepulveda Boulevard & Marine Avenue

10. Cedar Avenue & Marine Avenue

11. Sepulveda Boulevard & El Segundo Boulevard

12. Sepulveda Boulevard & Hughes Way

13. Sepulveda Boulevard & Manhattan Beach Boulevard

Comment 3

Given Rosecrans Avenue's importance as the shortest arterial connector street between Manhattan Beach and the 405 freeway, additional intersections on Rosecrans Avenue at Nash Street, Redondo Avenue and Aviation should be studied in the traffic report.

Existing Levels of Service

The morning peak commute hour was not analyzed in this report because the Project is not expected to have an impact on morning peak traffic conditions because it is assumed that retail projects are not typically open during the traditional morning peak hour commute.

Comment 4

Fast-food restaurants with drive-through windows and coffee shops are destinations for morning commuters and as such, may impact morning commute traffic. Without a concise list of tenants, it is unsafe to assume that morning peak traffic will not be impacted. Alternatively, because of the limited parking analysis, certain types of uses ust be prohibited to validate the parking analysis.

Project Traffic Generation

The report concludes that the proposed Stage 1 of Component I would generate approximately 71 PM and 90 Saturday midday peak hour trips. The new land uses developed for the proposed Stage 2 of Component I is expected to generate approximately 76 PM and 96 Saturday midday peak hour trips. The resulting total trip generation for Component I of the Project is 147 PM and 186 Saturday midday peak hour trips.

Component II would result in an increase of 47 Saturday midday peak hour trips. During the weekday evening peak hour, Component II is expected to generate 29 additional trips than would be generated following the completion of Component I. The resulting total trip generation for combined Components I and II is 176 PM and 233 Saturday midday peak hour trips.

Integral to the proposed Component III expansion is the demolition of the existing Fry's retail space (approximately 46,000 sf). The trips generated by this land use would be removed from the street system and credited to the Project. Based on the traffic counts conducted at the driveways serving the site, the existing Fry's generates 78 AM, 375 PM, and 433 Saturday midday peak hour trips. These trips would be deducted from the total project trip generation when the Fry's closes and Component III is developed. Because the new land uses in Component III would generate fewer trips than the existing Fry's, the trip generation of Component III represents a reduction in total site trip generation.

The report concludes that MVSC would generate fewer vehicle trips with Component III alone than would be generated by the site at the completion of the Component I and/or Component II, resulting in 192 fewer weekday PM peak hour trips and 202 fewer Saturday midday peak hour trips. With all three Components, the Project is expected to generate slightly fewer PM peak hour trips and slightly more Saturday midday peak hour vehicles trips than the existing uses at MVSC: 4 more AM peak hour trips, 16 fewer PM peak hour trips, and 31 more Saturday midday peak trips.

Comment 5

I disagree with this conclusion because it has not factored in the possible construction of more than 89,000 square feet of restaurant space (an additional 20,000 square foot restaurant is proposed) in the project site. Restaurants generate higher parking and trips than retail uses (about 2.5 times more).

Component II Only

The existing plus project peak hour traffic volumes were analyzed to determine the existing plus project operating conditions with the addition of traffic generated by Component II. Upon completion of Components II, all 13 intersections would maintain the same LOS when compared to existing conditions during the weekday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. No intersection exceeds the significant impact thresholds set by the City of Manhattan Beach, and, therefore, Component II does not result in any significant impacts on the street system under either weekday or Saturday peak hour conditions.

Component III Only

The existing plus project peak hour traffic volumes were analyzed to determine the existing plus project operating conditions with the addition of traffic generated by Component III. This analysis assumes Intersection #2 would be signalized with full access. Due to the fact that the traffic projection of Component III predicts a reduction in traffic generation, any configuration of Intersection #2 would result in an improvement of delay/ICU/LOS. As such, only the full access configuration would be analyzed under the Component III-only analysis. Upon completion of the proposed Components III expansion, 12 of the 13 intersections would maintain the same LOS when compared to existing conditions during the weekday PM peak hour. The one intersection with an LOS change, Sepulveda Boulevard & El Segundo Boulevard, actually improves from LOS F to LOS E. Under Saturday midday existing plus project conditions, nine of the 13 study intersections would maintain the same LOS when compared to the existing conditions, the remaining four intersections actually see an improvement in LOS. Due to the limited net increase in retail square footage in this expansion component and the demolition of the existing Fry's, during the weekday PM peak hour and Saturday midday peak hour, all of the 13 study intersections are projected to show a small improvement over existing conditions. No intersection exceeds the significant impact thresholds set by the City of Manhattan Beach, and, therefore, Component III does not result in any significant impacts on the street system under either weekday or Saturday peak hour conditions.

Comment 6

The analysis utilized a land use equivalency table to determine the mix of uses on the project site. According to the significant impact criteria established by the City of Manhattan Beach, the Project would not create significant impacts at any of the 13 study intersections under any of the development scenarios because the Project did not significantly affect the existing LOS at all 13 intersections. In certain instances, the report found that signalization reduces LOS at certain intersection. This conclusion allows the City and the Project developer to not provide direct project mitigation.

Summary Of Project Impacts

Sepulveda Boulevard Bridge Widening

There have been discussions regarding the dedication of right-of-way by MVSC and the Hacienda Building for the purposes of expanding the Sepulveda Boulevard Bridge, approximately 500 feet south of Rosecrans Boulevard. MVSC and the Hacienda Building have agreed to dedicate the necessary right-of-way to the City of Manhattan Beach for the desired expansion of Sepulveda Boulevard. The Sepulveda Boulevard bridge widening is a project proposed by Caltrans that would help improve vehicular circulation locally by providing additional capacity on Sepulveda Boulevard.

Metro's *2010 Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County* (CMP) indicates that a CMP traffic analysis must be conducted for all CMP monitored intersections that experience at least 50 net new trips generated by the project traveling through the intersection. The intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard and Rosecrans Avenue would absorb 54 project-related trips during the Saturday mid-day peak hour during the proposed Component I and II expansion. Even with the added trips from the MVSC expansion during this first and second expansion component, the intersection would not be impacted because of the increased volume. Therefore, there is no CMP impact at this intersection. For all other CMP monitoring intersections during the proposed Component I expansion and for all CMP monitoring intersections during Components I, II, and III, the negligible traffic increase from MVSC does not generate enough project traffic to meet the criteria for CMP analysis. Likewise, the Project would not generate enough freeway traffic nor transit ridership to result in a significant impact on these other components of the CMP system.

Caltrans Analysis

Caltrans requires traffic analysis be performed on all study intersections along state highways using the Highway Congestion Management (HCM) methodology. The section of Sepulveda Boulevard directly west of the Project site is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans as State Highway 1. The Sepulveda Boulevard intersections would experience a slight increase in delay or V/C numbers during the weekday PM peak hour and Saturday midday peak hour. With Components I and II and the existing cinema removed, the intersections along Sepulveda Boulevard would experience slight increases in delay or V/C operations during the weekday PM peak hour and Saturday midday peak hour. With Components I and II when the existing cinema remains and the Fry's is removed, the intersections along Sepulveda Boulevard would experience slight decreases in delay or V/C operations during the weekday PM peak hour and Saturday midday peak hour. With Components I, II, and III, three of the study intersections along Sepulveda Boulevard would experience improvement, with decreases in delay and V/C operations when compared to the without project 2022 conditions. In all cases, the increases in intersection delay are less than one second when Project traffic is added to the Sepulveda corridor. This represents an insignificant increase in intersection delay.

Comment 7

While the Project does not have any significant impacts on any Caltrans facility, the Project has offered to dedicate right-of-way along Sepulveda Boulevard so that the Sepulveda Boulevard bridge over the railroad right-of-way south of Rosecrans Avenue could be widened. For previous versions of the MVSC expansion projects, Caltrans has accepted this voluntary mitigation as payment for the Project's "fair-share contribution" to improvements on State facilities. However, new information in the errata provides an insight into Caltrans' actions regarding this matter.

Construction Impact Analysis

Two construction traffic impacts at MVSC were analyzed in the report. The first investigated the potential traffic and parking impacts of the construction schedule that is currently being pursued by the Applicant. In this construction phasing, each construction component would begin activity immediately after the Christmas holiday shopping period and the construction would finish (with new stores and new parking supplies open and operating) by the following Thanksgiving. In a second analysis, the potential impacts are measured if the construction schedule for any Component extends beyond the Christmas shopping period. The report shows that Component I

would see 100 to 107 construction workers per day during peak activity periods. These same activity periods (when the stores are being finished and outfitted with merchandise) would see 41 to 43 trucks per day. Components II and III would see the maximum number of workers on site increasing to 114 and 122, respectively, with the trucks peaking at 46 and 50 per day. While the total square footage developed is greater in Component I, a greater number of workers and trucks are associated with Components II and III due to a larger demolition effort. It is anticipated that the construction activity would not occur between Thanksgiving and December, the peak shopping season.

Comment 8

This section is of concern because of the conservative estimates of the anticipated number of trucks per day and the number of construction workers. Unfortunately, there are no stipulations to hold construction activity to this level. As with every construction project, one thing or another does not always proceed as planned and there are not enough safeguards in terms of conditions of approval or mitigation measures to ensure that construction activity proceed as anticipated. I would be much happier with conditions of approvals or construction plans that detail construction activities at the site and provides a safeguard for the members of the community who may have concerns with construction noise emissions and vibrations.

Construction Trucks

Depending upon the specific nature of the construction activity (e.g., demolition, excavation, finish construction, landscaping), it is assumed that the majority of truck traffic would be distributed evenly across the non-commuter peak hours of a workday (i.e., 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM). It is anticipated that during peak excavation periods, project construction would generate up to 52 daily haul trips for 26 loads (i.e., average of seven haul trips per hour from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM). During the store finishing portion of the construction project, up to 50 daily trucks would produce 100 truck trips (14 truck trips per hour from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM). Construction activity would be severely curtailed during the month of December in order to avoid conflicts with the peak shopping season.

Comment 9

The City of Manhattan Beach Public Works Department would require approval of a construction traffic management plan prior to commencement of construction. Proposed haul routes for dump trucks, semi-trailers, and truck and trailers in the removal of construction debris and excavated soils and delivery of heavy equipment would occur via one of the following routes: (1) Sepulveda Boulevard north to Rosecrans Boulevard, and Rosecrans Boulevard east to Interstate 405, (2) Village Drive north to Rosecrans Boulevard, and Rosecrans Boulevard east to Interstate 405, and (3) Rosecrans Boulevard east to Interstate 405. Since Village Drive is a narrow street with curb parking along the east side of the street, temporary parking restrictions could be implemented along the east side of Village Drive along the truck haul route in order to accommodate the haul and construction trucks. These parking restrictions, if necessary, would be temporary in nature and would likely occur only during haul days in the first three months of the construction Components that affect the north side of the site (Component I, Stage 2 and Component II). The primary destination for construction debris and excavated soils is Chandler's Pit in Rancho Palos Verdes, although other recycling areas needing the excavation fill may be selected, as appropriate. Again, submittal of, and approval of a construction traffic management plan is critical. It would also be beneficial if the public is granted access to the construction

traffic management plan, or if a notice is required to be sent to all that have commented on this project.

Construction Parking Impacts

Parking for the proposed uses would be provided in surface parking areas and low-rise parking structures and several existing parking areas would be reconfigured. Upon completion of each phase, MVSC would comply with the required MUP parking ratio of 4.1 spaces/1,000 sf GLA to accommodate the new uses. However, during construction, some spaces may be taken out of service to accommodate the construction of new building pads, staging areas, or the construction of new parking facilities. Each Project construction phase will replace any accessible parking spaces lost, if needed to maintain the required number of accessible parking spaces.

Parking Supply vs. MUP Requirements

The construction schedule for each Component assumes a one-year time period for construction with construction of each Component completed by Thanksgiving of each year. This analysis includes the Project's visitors, employees, and construction workers. For each of the Components, the beginning parking supply is shown along with the number of spaces that would be taken out of service for that construction activity. The remaining parking supply represents the number of spaces available to serve the remainder of the project during that construction component. The available parking supply compared to MUP requirements would be as follows:

The available supply would dip below the MUP required parking supply during construction of all scenarios except Component I, Stage 2.

Component I, Stage 1 would fall 242 spaces short of meeting MUP requirements during the initial phase of construction when the first parking garage is being built. Even with the use of the 210-space lower lot, this Component would be short of meeting MUP requirements until the new parking supply for this Component opens.

During the remainder of Component I, Stage 1 and the construction of Component II and Component III construction, the amount of shortfall is less than the number of spaces available in the lower lot abutting the eastern edge of the MVSC site leased by the Applicant from the City. Thus, the MUP required parking supply can be maintained by shifting employees to the lower parking lot during these construction Components. With use of the lower parking lot, MVSC would meet the amount of parking required by the MUP except for the initial construction period for Component I, Stage 1.

Comment 10

We have commented earlier that the MUP parking requirement of 4.1 spaces per 1,000 square feet is insufficient for the proposed development. However, the MUP has been entitled and the Project Applicant is complying with the parking requirements. The MUP parking requirements are based on the amount of parking demand that is expected in December of each year. Like any zoning code requirement, the amount of required parking for a particular land use is intended to make sure that the land use has enough on-site parking supply to meet its peak demand. Since an office building parking demand does not vary much from weekday to weekday or from week to week throughout the year, the required parking as cited by the City Code is essentially needed every weekday of the year. A retail center experiences its peak parking demands during the six-week period between Thanksgiving and New Year's Day. During the remainder of the year, it is not uncommon

to see available parking in a shopping center parking lot. However, the site must be provided with parking consistent with the peak demand period.

Summary

At some points during construction, the parking provided on site would dip below the parking requirements set forth per the MUP. Analysis of the proposed parking demand based on active land uses, customers, employees, and construction employees, shows that the parking supply would be adequate to meet the peak monthly parking demand at MVSC, even during those construction periods when the amount of parking provided temporarily dips below the amount of parking needed to meet the MUP. The Project would have enough parking at all times during construction to accommodate visitors, employees, and construction workers, assuming that each of the four distinct Components can begin in January and finish by mid-November of the same year.

As for the peak December parking demand vs. supply, the proposed parking supply meets the MUP requirements and provides enough parking to meet expected peak demands on the busiest day of the year upon completion of each Component. While all the construction phases will provide adequate parking to accommodate the shopping center's parking demand, during certain periods of construction the parking supply will not be evenly distributed throughout the shopping center, which could force some customers to walk further to reach their destination than they do today. Upon completion of the Project, adequate parking for each section of the shopping center will be provided and, in fact, the provision of parking structures will put more parking closer to the stores than exists in the current shopping center configuration.

Effects Of Extended Construction

Each of the Components described above has been sized to enable construction to begin immediately after the first of the year and to be completed by Thanksgiving of that year. The analysis above shows that if this schedule is met, construction traffic impacts would not be significant, and the on-site parking would be sufficient to meet the anticipated parking demand throughout the construction period. If a particular construction Component starts late or unforeseen complications result in a longer than anticipated construction schedule, the construction activity could last through the holiday shopping period. The Applicant has stated that no substantial construction activity would take place between Thanksgiving and Christmas. However, the construction activity outlined assumes that the new parking supplies and the new stores for each Component would be open and available for the next Christmas shopping period. In the event that the construction period extended beyond Thanksgiving, the new stores may not yet be open, but the new parking could also be delayed.

Traffic Impacts

The report claims that the conclusions regarding the construction traffic (construction worker vehicles and construction trucks) remain valid even if the construction activity period is extended. The number of worker vehicles and truck trips would still not be large enough to cause a significant impact and the off-peak nature of the travel would still be expected to be the case even if the construction period was extended. This conclusion is based on the fact that little or no construction activity would take place in December so that construction traffic interference with peak shopping traffic does not occur.

Comment 11

There needs to be a condition of approval or mitigation measure that more accurately controls the construction schedule. So far, it has been left to the Applicant to determine but the parking and traffic analyses have been determined based on construction occurring between the first of the year and Thanksgiving.

Parking Impacts

If each construction Component took approximately 14 months instead of 11 months, the report indicates there would be holiday shopping periods that would not have sufficient on-site parking supplies to meet the Christmas parking demand. Specifically, Component II would be short of parking in December if the construction activity were not complete by Thanksgiving. If the new Component II parking supply were not open by Thanksgiving, even if the new stores were not yet open, the parking supply would be short by 64 spaces on a busy December weekend. Shortfalls projected for Component III construction conditions would be 100 spaces on a busy December weekend. The Component II and III weekend shortfalls fall within the capacity of the leased lower lot and, therefore, the shortfall could be made up by moving employees to the lower lot. A limited amount of December weekend employee parking (approximately 64 spaces) would have to be moved off-site in order to meet customer demand on-site during Component II. There would also be a slight shortage on a December weekend during Component III construction if the construction activity did not finish by the Thanksgiving deadline. The projected shortage of 100 spaces could be made up by using the lower lot.

Comment 12

A 64 parking space shortage for Component II and 100 parking space shortage for Component III are significant and CANNOT be left to chance. The report indicates the shortfall would be transferred to the leased lower lot. The questions are: what is the status of that lease? What if the lease does not go through? What is the current condition of that parking area? What other alternatives are there should there be a hitch with this arrangement? For anyone who has managed a large project or development, unforeseen problems arise and being prepared for any contingencies is necessary and prudent for a project of this magnitude. While the report shows that the on-site parking supply (in combination with the leased lower lot) would always be able to accommodate the projected parking demand, the uncertainty of construction schedules could result in a temporary condition when a parking shortage would occur. Because of this uncertainty, a Construction Parking Management Plan (CMP) is being proposed for those holiday periods when construction activity is anticipated. Unfortunately, the Construction Management Plan is proposed for a future time just prior to the commencement of construction. I would recommend that the public and all those who have expressed an interest in the project be allowed to review the CMP prior to approval.

Project Access And Circulation Improvements

Veterans Parkway

As part of the project access and circulation improvements, the lower surface parking lot (adjacent to Fry's) would be restriped to provide a separate bicycle and pedestrian connection along Veterans Parkway. Detailed plans highlighting the parking lot configuration and bicycle and pedestrian connections in the interim condition (i.e., prior to development of the Project) would be required to

be provided to the City for review and approval prior to issuance of building permits for the Project and constructed prior to obtaining the first Certificate of Occupancy for Component I of the Project. Further refinement to the lower surface parking lot area and bicycle/pedestrian connections would be required with the development of Component III of the Project, which includes decking the below-grade railroad right-of-way and construction of an access ramp from below grade to the ground level parking area. Detailed plans highlighting the parking lot configuration and bicycle and pedestrian connections with the development of Component III would be required to be provided to the City for review and approval prior to issuance of building permits and constructed prior to Certificate of Occupancy for Component III of the Project.

Comment 13

This is a critical requirement because of the importance of this improvement to the overall project. It is not unusual to use the issuance of building permits and certificate of occupancy as thresholds for satisfying an important project/development improvement. This stipulation must be included as a project condition of approval or mitigation measure. However, the Errata submitted in conjunction with the Draft EIR has modified this condition to require improvements to be done and completed within Component I timeframe.

Easterly Rosecrans Avenue Driveway

The City requested further review of the easterly Rosecrans Avenue Project driveway to assess the feasibility of shifting it westerly to provide greater separation from the Village Drive & Rosecrans Avenue signalized intersection, as well as to modify its design to provide better alignment with Rosecrans Avenue. The easterly Rosecrans Avenue driveway is un-signalized and accommodates right-turn-in and right-turn-out-only turning movements between the lower level parking and Rosecrans Avenue. With the proposed modifications (i.e., shifting its location further to the west and realignment with Rosecrans Avenue), this driveway would remain un-signalized with stop sign control provided for the right-turns out of the driveway. As the driveway modification would maintain the current lane configuration and access controls, the operational analysis for this intersection would be the same.

Comment 14

We agree with the shifting of the easterly Rosecrans Avenue Project driveway and its modification to provide better alignment and greater separation from the Village Drive & Rosecrans Avenue signalized intersections. However, we would like to see a warrant conducted to determine whether or not by realigning it with Rosecrans Avenue, the driveway would remain un-signalized.

Rosecrans Avenue Plaza El Segundo Signal

Portions of the Plaza El Segundo project have been completed and a further expansion of that previously entitled site is being proposed. There have been ongoing discussions between the Cities of Manhattan Beach and El Segundo, as well as the MVSC and Plaza El Segundo project teams regarding the configuration of the driveways of the two projects. As presently proposed, the new MVSC Rosecrans Avenue driveway is located west of Village Drive and east of the existing Fry's upper parking lot driveway. This intersection was analyzed as both a signalized and an un-signalized intersection. The MVSC driveway could potentially be directly aligned with the future Plaza El Segundo driveway. As part of the Plaza El Segundo development, the previously approved

driveway on the north side of Rosecrans Avenue is proposed to be signalized by Plaza El Segundo. The proposed traffic signal at the Project driveway intersection with Rosecrans Avenue would improve future conditions and better facilitate access along Rosecrans Avenue for both MVSC and Plaza El Segundo. The proposed new traffic signal also has the potential to shift some entering/exiting traffic from Village Drive to the new signal. However, the traffic signal timing would be dictated by the heavier traffic levels in/out of the Plaza El Segundo expansion and the performance of a newly signalized intersection would not be adversely affected by MVSC traffic. Since the traffic signal has not yet been approved by the Cities of El Segundo or Manhattan Beach, the intersection was also analyzed as an un-signalized intersection.

Comment 15

We would like to know the timing of the traffic signal agreement between the Cities of El Segundo and Manhattan Beach, and how the signalization of these driveways would affect project traffic.

Site Access

Driveways

Component I and Component II would not change the location or operation of the existing driveways leading to and from MVSC; only Component III would make changes to the site's access driveways. With Component III, the Fry's in the northwest corner of the property would be demolished and new retail and restaurant structures would be built over the northwest corner of the property. At present, the Fry's building and adjacent parking are separated from the rest of the MVSC site by a railroad right-of-way that cuts through the site below grade. This condition effectively creates an individual parcel out of the Fry's site and prevents any direct vehicular interaction between the existing Fry's site and the rest of the shopping center. Component III would construct an at-grade deck across the railroad right-of-way, physically joining the current Fry's parcel to the rest of MVSC, and a two-way ramp from the railroad right-of-way, from below grade up to the shopping center. The westernmost driveway along Rosecrans Avenue would maintain access to the Project site in addition to the newly constructed parking deck at the southeast corner of Rosecrans Avenue & Sepulveda Boulevard. The Sepulveda Boulevard driveway would be relocated approximately 100 feet south but maintain access to the Project site and provide access to the newly constructed ground-level parking area. The easternmost driveway along Rosecrans Avenue would maintain access to the new below-grade parking area. Operations (i.e., turn movements in and out of the center) at each driveway would remain unchanged.

Rosecrans Avenue Deceleration Lane

The City of Manhattan Beach has requested an investigation into the necessity of a deceleration lane for the two Rosecrans Avenue driveways that currently provide access to the Fry's parking lot and to the railroad right-of-way parking aisles. For each roadway classification, right-turn volumes must exceed the value given for the posted speed to qualify for a right-turn deceleration lane. Rosecrans Avenue is classified as a major arterial with a posted speed limit of 45 mph. Therefore, the right-turn volumes along the Rosecrans driveways must exceed 25 vehicles during a weekday peak hour to meet the criteria for a right-turn deceleration lane. Based on the cumulative plus project traffic weekday PM peak hour volumes found in each of the expansion components, the driveway currently providing access to the parking lot adjacent to Fry's is a candidate for a right-turn deceleration lane. The driveway providing access to the existing railroad right-of-way driveway currently does not have sufficient PM peak hour right-turn entries to justify a deceleration lane. The

number of right turns entering this second driveway would likely decrease greatly in the future when the railroad right-of-way parking aisles are covered by a parking deck, bridging the existing Fry's lot with the rest of the MVSC site and much of the lower level parking area would be reserved for MVSC employees.

Comment 16

Making the lower level parking area MVSC employee parking cannot be left to chance. There must be a condition of approval requiring employee parking in the lower level parking area.

The recommended width for deceleration lanes is typically the same as adjacent through lanes, in this case 12 feet. The typical length of the deceleration lane is dictated by the speed of adjacent traffic lanes. The posted speed limit on Rosecrans Avenue is 45 mph; however, the report concludes that the realistic speed of vehicles entering the Project site is closer to 25 mph because the majority of entering vehicles turning at the intersection of Rosecrans Avenue & Sepulveda Boulevard are not traveling at the full design speed. A negligible number of vehicles are expected to arrive from the west. According to the report, a vehicle traveling 25 mph would require approximately 115 feet to slow down. An additional calculation was performed using the right-turn storage equation; the results indicate that another 10 feet of queue length would be necessary. A total of 125 feet would be required for deceleration and storage, and an additional 50-foot transition taper would be needed to ease traffic into the deceleration lane. A 175-foot deceleration lane is recommended for Driveway 1 along Rosecrans Avenue.

Comment 17

We disagree with the 25 mph speed estimated for vehicles entering at the intersection of Rosecrans Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard. By assuming the lower speed limit, a distance of 115 feet is required to slow down with 10 feet of queue length (total 125 feet for the deceleration lane and storage). With the addition 50 feet transition taper, a 175-foot deceleration lane is recommend the driveway along Rosecrans Avenue. Unless a 25-mph speed limit is posted, longer deceleration lane is necessary consistent with speeds faster than 25 mph.

Vehicular Circulation

Component I (2013 or 2014)

During the proposed Component I expansion, a new parking structure may be erected between the Wells Fargo Bank and the Macy's Men and Home store and/or between the Macy's Fashion Store and the Hacienda Building. In addition, new retail structures would be constructed across from the 33rd Street entrance, removing some surface parking aisles. In this component expansion, these developments do not cross existing circulation or "ring" roads inside the shopping center. Component I would also see a minor redesign of the existing ring road and the parking aisle directly across from the 30th Street driveway within the Project site. Specifically, the internal ring road would be restriped to include three lanes, one in each direction and a third lane that would act as a two-way left-turn lane that allows drivers to enter and exit parking aisles with fewer conflicts with through traffic. Additionally, to allow cars to more efficiently enter the Project site, direct access to the parking aisle across the ring road from the 30th Street driveway would be prevented. This would force drivers to utilize the ring road to access parking and eliminate backups entering the Project site at this location. These two improvements would be maintained through the remaining components of the Project.

Comment 18

The removal of surface parking aisles as part of the construction of new retail structures is of concern with the internal circulation for this development and the provision of adequate parking for this site. We would like to see a condition of approval specifically addressing this proposed configuration to ensure compliance and reduction of on-site parking.

Component II (2018)

In the proposed Component II expansion, the existing cinema building and shops linked to the cinema building would be demolished. The existing Macy's Fashion store may be expanded and a parking deck may be constructed to the north of Macy's to the railroad right-of-way culvert. In Component II, the proposed parking deck would go over the existing connection between MVSC's main internal circulation road and Village Drive. The connector road between the west side of MVSC and Village Drive would be maintained under the raised parking deck. The east/west roadway under the parking deck would have adequate height to accommodate delivery trucks and fire equipment. In Component II, vehicular traffic would continue to operate as it does today around the shopping center.

Component III (2022)

In the proposed Component III expansion, circulation on the shopping center site would be very different because of the improvements that would have taken place. Presently, between the existing Fry's site in the northwest of the property and the remainder of the MVSC site, the existing internal circulation is dictated by the below-grade railroad right-of-way; circulation between the existing site and the remainder of the MVSC site is not physically possible. The internal site circulation would be aided by decking the below-grade railroad right-of-way and constructing an access ramp from below grade to the ground level parking area. In addition to construction of the below-grade access ramp, ground level improvements to internal circulation would include extensions of existing main drive aisles to the newly connected driveways along Rosecrans Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard. The extended drive aisles would maintain the approximately 30-foot width of the existing main aisles. Ground-level ramp access would be aligned with the main north/south drive aisle and an existing east/west drive aisle accessing Village Drive. These alignments would allow virtually direct access from the street system to the below-grade parking area. Circulation in the parking aisles would be arranged so that disruption to inbound and outbound traffic is minimized. The Component II expansion would include a parking deck north of Macy's, and the Component III expansion would include ground level improvements improving circulation and resulting in a new surface parking area in the northwest corner of MVSC. The parking deck near Macy's could be constructed with another deck provided to the west, in the area of the Component III surface parking area. Given either design option, these areas are designated for parking and would not alter the proposed vehicular access or circulation at the site. Therefore, these design options minimize impacts to vehicular access and circulation and allow the flexibility to locate the parking facilities where they would be most beneficial to the operation of the site.

Comment 19

It is anticipated that by the year 2022, Components I and II would have been developed and the assumptions in Component III would be valid. We would like to see an approved Development Agreement or Project construction schedule detailing the timing of development and improvements for Components I, II, and III.

Sepulveda Bridge Widening

The Project would construct a deck across the below-grade railroad right-of-way, and a new retail pad would be constructed along the western edge of the Project site, directly adjacent to the Sepulveda Boulevard Bridge. Caltrans is currently exploring alternatives to widen the Sepulveda Boulevard Bridge. The newly constructed building at ground level and the below-grade parking structure would be set back approximately 40 feet from the existing right-of-way along Sepulveda Boulevard. According to Caltrans' preliminary design alternatives for the bridge widening, the most conservative scenario involves widening the existing right-of-way by approximately 21 feet.

Comment 20

Widening the Sepulveda bridge by Caltrans may adversely affect the proposed Project based on shifting Caltrans standards. We would like to see comments provided by Caltrans on this issue.

Service Dock

The addition of new retail locations to the MVSC site would necessitate individual service docks for each retail pad. A service dock would be located in the below-grade parking area and the three other loading docks would be located at grade with the remaining retail locations. The project would be designed in accordance with turning templates from the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) design vehicles: single unit and semi-trucks (where appropriate). The adequacy of the service dock design would be reviewed by the City of Manhattan Beach prior to project approval.

Parking Analysis

The proposed parking supply to be provided on the Project site is compared to the amount of spaces required by the MUP. The existing onsite parking utilized by MVSC is spread over several lots surrounding the MVSC building sites. At present, MVSC provides a total of 2,393 parking spaces for visitors and employees. Applying the MUP's parking ratio of 4.1 spaces/ksf for the main MVSC shopping center and 170 parking stalls for the existing Fry's, MVSC and the Fry's are required to provide a minimum of 2,330 spaces. MVSC currently has a surplus of 63 parking stalls. None of the parking numbers provided includes the leased 210-space parking lot that abuts the eastern edge of the MVSC site, east of Village Drive and south of Parkview Avenue. In 2001, a shared parking analysis (*Renovation of the Manhattan Village Shopping Center Traffic and Parking Analysis* [Kaku Associates, Inc., 2001]) was conducted to measure the peak parking demand during the 20th highest hour of the year in order to identify the parking ratio that should be used to plan shopping center parking ratios as recommended by the Urban Land Institute (ULI) and International Council of Shopping Centers (ICSC). *Shared Parking, 2nd Edition* (ULI and ICSC, 2005) adopted an approach that took into account different daily, hourly, and seasonal parking patterns by different land uses (e.g., office uses and a cinema). Utilizing the ULI shared parking model with Project specific data including parking occupancy counts obtained at the site and on-site existing and proposed land uses, a parking ratio of 4.1 spaces per 1,000 sf of mixed-use development would fully serve MVSC during the peak hour of the peak hour of the peak Saturday of the year.

Comment 21

As stated earlier, we contend that the 4.1 spaces per 1,000 sf of mixed-use development is inadequate to meet parking requirements for the proposed Project. Specifically, the proposal for a restaurant at the site in conjunction with future proposed land uses mot already identified could result in a negative parking scenario. Realistically, a parking ratio of 5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area is recommended.

Proposed Parking

Concurrent with each of the Component expansions of retail space, additional parking spaces would be provided for the MVSC site. At completion of the Project, a parking ratio between a minimum of 4.1 spaces/ksf and maximum of 4.28 spaces/ksf would be provided on site. Parking for the proposed uses would be provided in surface parking areas and low-rise parking structures, and several parking areas would be reconfigured. Upon completion of the Project, a total of approximately 2,915 parking spaces would be provided on site, depending on the Project's final design, resulting in a net surplus of spaces, excluding the 210 parking spaces in the City-owned lot leased by MVSC for overflow parking. Upon completion of the Project, parking would be provided at a minimum rate of 4.1 spaces/ksf to accommodate the new uses.

Comment 22

See comment 21.

Two parking decks are anticipated to be located to the immediate north and south of the Village Shops. Alternatively, three parking decks may be consolidated into one parking deck located north of the Village Shops. A parking facility with up to three above-grade levels may be provided to the north of the Macy's Fashion store and may consist of two levels above grade at another parking deck provided to the west of Macy's. As part of the possible improvements within the northwest corner of the Project site, the former railroad right of-way currently used for lower level surface parking may be bridged over and would provide parking spaces at the existing grade level along with an underground pedestrian and bike pathway from Veteran's Parkway through the Project site to Rosecrans Boulevard. The proposed parking described above is an example of a parking scenario that would meet parking requirements at the completion of construction of each Component and at completion of the Project. Flexibility in the exact location of parking decks and number of spaces in each deck might result in a slightly different parking scenario, but would fall within the building envelopes described herein and would meet MUP parking requirements at the completion of construction of each Component and at completion of the Project.

Component I

In Component I, 60,000 sf would be added to the MVSC site, requiring an additional 246 parking stalls according to the MUP 4.1 spaces/ksf ratio. In addition to the construction of new retail structures, one or two multi-level parking areas are anticipated. The north deck would be between the Macy's Fashion store and the Hacienda Building, and/or the south deck would be between the Macy's Men and Home store and Wells Fargo Bank. During Component I, 900 parking stalls would be removed and 1,126 parking stalls would be added, resulting in a net gain of 226 parking stalls. After the addition of the new spaces and subtraction of those spaces to be removed, the total MVSC parking supply would be 2,619 parking stalls. MVSC would be required, per the MUP, to provide 2,575 parking spaces at the MVSC site following the Component I expansion. MVSC would provide enough parking spaces to exceed the peak December demand of 2,507 by 112

parking spaces. Following the completion of the proposed Component I expansion, MVSC would provide a sufficient number of parking spaces for its retail and restaurant needs.

Component II

In Component II, a total of 29,872 net new sf would be added to the MVSC site, requiring an additional 123 parking stalls according to the 4.1 spaces/ksf ratio. When the shopping area is expanded, the existing cinema building is demolished and a parking deck is constructed north of the existing Macy's Fashion store, 167 surface parking stalls would be replaced. The proposed parking deck would provide 285 parking stalls, resulting in a net gain of 118 parking stalls. After the addition of the new spaces and subtraction of those spaces to be removed, the total MVSC parking supply would be 2,737 parking stalls. MVSC would be required, per the MUP, to provide 2,698 parking spaces; MVSC would provide enough parking spaces to exceed peak December demand of 2,605 by 132 parking spaces. Following the completion of Components I and II, MVSC would provide a sufficient number of parking spaces for its retail and restaurant needs.

Comment 23

Using the 5.0 parking ratio, the Component II addition of approximately 30,000 square feet would require 150 parking spaces rather than the 123 proposed. This results in a shortfall of 27 parking spaces.

Component III

In Component III, a net total of 33,800 sf would be added to the MVSC site, requiring an additional 139 parking stalls according to the 4.1 spaces/ksf ratio. In addition to the construction of a new retail structure over the existing Fry's site, a parking deck would be constructed over the existing railroad right-of-way culvert. Parking would still be available in the culvert lower level and accessed by either the existing driveway along Rosecrans Avenue or from a ramp leading down from grade level to the culvert parking level. During Component III, 310 parking stalls would be removed and 508 parking stalls would be provided, resulting in a net gain of 198 parking stalls. After the addition of all of the added spaces and subtraction of those spaces to be removed, the total MVSC parking supply would be 2,915 parking stalls. MVSC would provide enough parking spaces to exceed peak December demand of 2,752 by 163 parking spaces. Following the completion of the proposed expansion, MVSC would provide a sufficient number of parking spaces for its retail and restaurant needs.

Land Use Sensitivity Test

The developer of MVSC asked that tests be performed to determine the maximum amount of restaurant space that could be supported within the development from a traffic and parking standpoint. Since the overall size of the development would not change, the overall trip generation of the Project would not change as long as the amount of non-retail (i.e., office and restaurant) space remains at less than 20% of the total development, according to *Shared Parking, Second Edition*. The parking demand of the Project, however, could change as the amount of non-retail space increased. Restaurant and cinema space, for example, have higher parking demand rates than retail (on a per sf basis) and, therefore, the addition of floor area in either of these land uses would increase the parking demand for the Project. Since the Project is removing cinema space, it does not seem likely that a new cinema would be added back into the Project. Restaurant space, however, could be added to the Project beyond the level tested in the Project description. Retail space was "traded" for restaurant space and the shared parking model was run to determine the

adequacy of the parking supply. When the total amount of restaurant space in the development exceeded 89,000 sf, the overall parking demand at the center exceeded 95% occupancy (assuming the provision of the proposed 2,915 spaces). While this would only occur during the peak month of the year, a parking occupancy exceeding 95% would result in vehicles having to conduct long searches to find the last remaining spaces. Therefore, the 95% occupancy level has been used as a target rate for this Project. The land use sensitivity tests indicate that the MVSC's total proposed traffic and parking systems could support up to 89,000 sf of restaurant space within the MVSC site.

Comment 24

It is alarming that 89,000 square feet of restaurant space could be developed on the project site based on the scenario described above. An 89,000 square foot stand alone restaurant would require 890 parking spaces. In a mixed use setting, about 495 parking spaces should be required. The number of parking spaces considered to be "extra" is short of the 495 spaces required. Therefore, a limit must be placed on the total number of restaurant square-foot addition to ensure that adequate parking is provided, or more parking spaces would need to be provided. We recommend that prior to the addition of any future restaurant space, a parking analysis must be conducted to determine parking availability.

Larger Restaurant Element

The Applicant is proposing a "restaurant conversion option" to potentially convert up to 20,000 sf of retail space into restaurant space. Based on discussions with City staff, a land use sensitivity test was conducted to assess the effect, from a traffic and parking standpoint, of increasing the maximum amount of restaurant space from 89,000 sf as described above to 109,000 sf. Since the overall size of the development would not change (retail space could be converted to restaurant space), the overall trip generation of the Project would not change as long as the amount of non-retail (i.e., restaurant) space remains at less than 20% of the total development, according to *Shared Parking*, *2nd Edition* (ULI, 2005). Thus, the increase in the maximum amount of restaurant space would not affect the traffic analysis and associated impacts. The parking demand of the Project, however, may change as the amount of restaurant or nonretail space increases and retail space correspondingly decreases. As an example, restaurant and cinema space have higher parking demand rates than retail and, therefore, addition of floor area in either of these land uses would increase the parking demand for the Project. A shared parking analysis that reflects 109,000 sf of restaurant space shows the parking demand during the peak day and month of the year to be 2,739 spaces during a weekday and 2,820 spaces on a weekend day. With a parking supply of 2,915 spaces, the proposed parking supply would be sufficient to meet the parking demands of the site. A target parking occupancy level of 95 percent was identified for the Project. This target correlated to up to 89,000 sf of restaurant space within the shopping center site. An increase in restaurant space to 109,000 sf would results in a parking occupancy of approximately 96%, which exceeds the 95% occupancy target. To maintain the target parking occupancy level of 95%, the converted restaurant space in excess of 89,000 sf (i.e., maximum restaurant space identified above would require additional parking spaces be provided at a rate of 2.6 spaces per 1,000 sf. Thus, the increase in the maximum amount of restaurant space at the site by 20,000 sf (i.e., 89,000 to 109,000 sf of restaurant space and the resulting decrease of retail space) would result in the need for approximately 62 additional spaces to be provided beyond the proposed parking supply of 2,915 spaces.

Comment 25

The most recent shared parking analysis published by the ULI was in 2005. It is recommended that a condition of approval be included to limit the total square footage for non-retail uses, especially restaurants, to a not-to-exceed target of 95% of occupancy.

Errata and Clarifications to the Draft EIR

In response to comments and additional information from the Applicant, the Draft EIR has been revised accordingly to reflect the following general changes.

1. Development Area Boundary

Based on further examination of the property lines in the vicinity of the Hacienda Building, the Development Area has been revised to remove approximately 2,600 square feet of land area comprised of a slope located to the north of the Hacienda Building. This modification does not change any of the impact conclusions reached in the Draft EIR.

Comment 26

This may not change any of the impact conclusions reached in the Draft EIR but changes the configuration of the site plan and some of the assumptions made based on such plan. We would like to see a condition of approval stipulating that current approval of the project is based on the plan submitted for the approval at this stage. Any significant changes or deviations to the submitted plans must be reviewed and approved by the same approval bodies that reviewed and approved the original concept and must be presented for public comment.

2. Development Area Envelope and Concept Plan

The Draft EIR bases the environmental impacts of the proposed Project on the Development Area Envelopes and Maximum Heights. This figure has been modified to remove approximately 2,600 square feet of land area. In addition, this figure has been modified to provide for a building of up to 32 feet in height and/or a parking deck up to 26 feet in height further to the south in the Village Shops component of the Development Area as well as to include minor clarifications regarding the possible placement of a one-level retail building over a parking deck in the Village Shops component of the Development Area and the Northwest Corner component of the Development Area. These minor modifications do not change any of the impact conclusions reached in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR includes a Concept Plan that illustrates proposed access as well as possible locations of buildings that may be developed within the established Development Area Envelope. The Draft EIR specifically notes that the Concept Plan represents just one of the possible ways the Development Area within the Shopping Center may be developed. The ultimate configuration of building locations will be based on market demands and future tenant expansions and contractions. However, the buildings to be developed would comply with the development envelopes established as revised. In addition to the boundary modification described above, subsequent to the release of the Draft EIR, the Applicant revised the Concept Plan to provide for a new building and parking structure configuration within the Northwest Corner of the Shopping Center and to change the location of or eliminate the Sepulveda Driveway within the Northwest Corner.

Comment 27

We totally disagree with the cavalier reference to the importance of a Concept Plan. Bear in mind that important analyses and approvals are conducted based a site plan concept. If the final product is significantly different from what is proposed in a concept Plan, additional time be necessary to study the "new" plan and its possible impacts on the environment. We do empathize with market demands and future tenant expansions. However, adequate time must be given to members of the public and other concerned parties to review and comment on such changes. Also, attention needs to be placed on the extent to which such changes alter the definition of the project under CEQA and thus the validity of the analyses provided. Specifically, in the Concept Plan included in the Draft EIR, the parking facility in the Northwest Corner component of the Development Area was located at the intersection of Sepulveda Boulevard and Rosecrans Avenue and the new Shopping Center buildings were located immediately south of the parking facility. Subsequent to the release of the Draft EIR, in response to concerns from the community and comments from Caltrans, the Applicant has agreed to revise the northwest corner of the Concept Plan to relocate the proposed parking facility further south and to relocate the new Shopping Center buildings further north adjacent to the corner of Sepulveda Boulevard and Rosecrans Avenue. As a result, the driveway on Rosecrans Avenue that currently serves Fry's would be relocated to become the Cedar Way driveway/intersection. In addition, the easternmost driveway on Rosecrans Avenue would connect with the former railroad right-of-way (culvert) parking aisles. The revisions to the location of buildings and the proposed parking facility resulted in modifications to various figures and text throughout the Draft EIR, and could have changes some of the impact conclusions reached in the Draft EIR. See comment 34.

In addition, in the Concept Plan analyzed in the Draft EIR, the northernmost Sepulveda Boulevard driveway was to be relocated approximately 70 feet to the south. Subsequent to the release of the Draft EIR and in response to the concerns of Caltrans, the Applicant has agreed to revise the Concept Plan to relocate the proposed driveway approximately 150 feet south of Rosecrans Avenue, which would provide sufficient room to meet the Caltrans design criteria for the required storage length and taper into the right turn lane. The new driveway is proposed to be right-turn in only. Right turns out of the driveway would be prohibited due to the proximity of the driveway to the Rosecrans Avenue intersection. If the proposed Project is approved by the City Council, the Applicant would be required to go through the encroachment permit process to get the approval of Caltrans to relocate the driveway. Alternatively, this driveway may be eliminated based on input from Caltrans. The revisions to the relocation of the northernmost Sepulveda Boulevard driveway resulted in revisions to various figures and text throughout the Draft EIR, but do not change any of the impact conclusions reached in the Draft
EIR. In addition, due to the small amount of traffic that would be expected to utilize this driveway, it is possible elimination would not change any of the traffic or access conclusions reached in the Draft EIR.

Comment 28

A condition of approval and/or mitigation measure is required to ensure that any changes to the site plan after approval of the Final EIR must be done in conjunction with the California Environmental Quality Act requirements to determine the appropriate method of addressing such changes. See comments 26 and 27.

Neighborhood Intrusion

Neither the City of Manhattan Beach nor the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works has adopted a specific set of criteria for defining a significant impact of project-related traffic on local neighborhood streets. The most commonly used set of significant impact criteria has been developed and used by the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT). The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide: Your Resource for Preparing CEQA Analyses in Los Angeles* (City of Los Angeles, 2006) provides the following recommended thresholds for neighborhood intrusion impacts based on the addition of project-related traffic on the future traffic conditions of neighborhood streets: A project would normally have a significant neighborhood intrusion impact if project-related traffic would increase the average daily traffic (ADT) volume on a local residential street in an amount equal to or greater than the following:

ADT increase > 16 percent trips if final ADT1 < 1,000;
ADT increase > 12 percent if final ADT > 1,000 and < 2,000;
ADT increase > 10 percent if final ADT > 2,000 and < 3,000; or
ADT increase > 8 percent if final ADT > 3,000.

Given the length of the neighborhood streets west of Sepulveda and the fact that the residents of this neighborhood stated that there is already "cut-through" traffic using residential streets, it is unlikely that the current ADT levels are less than 1,000 vehicles per day. Therefore, the next most conservative traffic level would assume that the residential streets west of the Shopping Center site experience between 1,000 and 2,000 trips per day. An increase of 12 percent of 1,000 trips/day (the lower end of that range) would indicate that an increase of 120 project-related trips per day (12 percent of 1,000 ADT = 120 trips/day) would constitute a significant impact on the residential street. That is, for any neighborhood street in which traffic levels would be increased by 120 trips per day or more as a result of project-related trips, a potentially significant impact by the proposed Project, prior to mitigation, was identified.

Comment 29

It is yet to be seen if the City of Manhattan Beach would adopt standards similar to the standards adopted by the City of Los Angeles as stated above. Alternatively, does the City of El Segundo, an adjacent city that may the impacted by this development, have different or stricter standards than Los Angeles that could be utilized for analysis? Also, it was not clear if the Project adopted the Los Angeles standards for the proposed development. It is also anticipated that upon completion of the Project between approximately 2,856 and 3,412 parking spaces would be provided on-site, depending on the Project's final design. This number is different from the 2,915 declared prior to distribution of the Draft EIR, but includes a range higher than 2,915 spaces. Under what conditions would parking demand reach 3,412 spaces?

Additionally, as part of the Project, a 175-foot deceleration lane on the south edge of Rosecrans Avenue would be constructed for the westerly driveway. Design of the deceleration lane would be based on the current edition of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual and shall be subject to final approval by the City of Manhattan Beach Public Works Department. In addition, the northernmost Sepulveda Boulevard driveway, adjacent to the Fry's Electronics building, would be relocated approximately 70 feet to the south and would maintain access to the Shopping Center site through a new east-west private travel way (Fashion Boulevard) connecting Rosecrans Avenue to Village Drive, while also providing access to the newly constructed ground-level and below grade deck parking area to a point closer to Rosecrans Avenue. The relocated driveway would separate the retail building on the immediate southeast corner of the Sepulveda/Rosecrans intersection and the

parking structure immediately north of the Veterans Parkway corridor. The relocated driveway would be constructed approximately 150 feet south of Rosecrans Avenue. Alternatively, this driveway may be eliminated based on input from Caltrans.

Comment 30

Some of our concerns are being addressed through comments received as part of the Draft EIR review process. Our concern here is that the project would go through significant modifications and those modifications would be dismissed as insignificant or not requiring public approval and/or comment. We would like to reiterate that modifications to the project, including location of building, driveways, traffic signals, etc. be circulated for public review and go through adequate approval process for reasons stated earlier under other comments.

The westernmost driveway along Rosecrans Avenue would maintain access to the Shopping Center site in addition to the newly constructed ground-level parking area be relocated to become the Cedar Way driveway/ intersection. In addition, though the Sepulveda Boulevard driveway is proposed to be relocated approximately 150 feet, it would be located south of Rosecrans Avenue to maintain access to the Project site and provide access to the newly constructed ground-level parking area, as a right-in only access. This access is subject to Caltrans review and approval and may also be eliminated based on input from Caltrans. The easternmost driveway along Rosecrans Avenue would maintain access to the new below-grade parking area. Operations (i.e., turn movements in and out of the center) at each driveway would remain unchanged to the former railroad right-of-way (culvert) parking aisles. Therefore, to further separate vehicles turning right into the Shopping Center site from the eastbound Rosecrans Avenue through traffic, the Project includes the development of a 175-foot deceleration lane for the driveway that currently provides access to the parking lot adjacent to the Fry's Electronics Store along Rosecrans Avenue.

Comment 31

The issue with the deceleration lane has been addressed earlier in this report.

Neighborhood Intrusion

(i) Criterion 1—Arterial Congestion

To meet Criterion 1 above, a corridor must contain intersections operating at levels of service (LOS) E or F such that traffic on the corridor would find it faster to divert to the parallel residential streets. This condition exists along Sepulveda Boulevard at the intersections of El Segundo Boulevard, Rosecrans Avenue, Marine Avenue, and Manhattan Beach Boulevard. Thus, there is the potential that the proposed Project could result in a potentially significant impact under Criterion 1, as diversion to residential streets would have the potential to occur along parallel and continuous north-south residential streets between El Segundo Boulevard and Manhattan Beach Boulevard. North and south of the Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor, the cross street traffic is lower and the intersections would operate better than LOS E or F and, therefore, there is no potential for a significant impact under Criterion 1 along these street sections.

(ii) Criterion 2—Added Project Traffic

To meet Criterion 2 above, corridors to which the proposed Project might add 1,200 or more daily trips were examined. The full build-out of the proposed Project would generate 463 net new daily

trips on the street system. The highest accumulation of Project traffic is 23 percent, both north and south of the Shopping Center site on Sepulveda, and east of the site on Rosecrans. The largest accumulation of Project traffic would, therefore, be 23 percent of 463 daily trips, or a maximum of 107 trips/day on any given street approaching the site. Therefore, the proposed Project would not increase the traffic volumes on any section of the Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor by 1,200 daily trips. In fact, even if all of the project-related trips diverted from the arterial street and used local residential streets (a condition very unlikely to occur) the 120 vehicle per day criterion would not be met. Thus, the proposed Project would not result in a potentially significant impact under Criterion 2.

(iii) Criterion 3—Parallel Routes Available

Criterion 3 above states that there must be parallel residential streets adjacent to the congested corridor that could be used as a short-cut for through traffic. In the case of the proposed Project, there are continuous residential streets that run parallel to Sepulveda Boulevard. Specifically, Oak Avenue, Elm Avenue, Pine Avenue, and Valley Drive on the west side of Sepulveda Boulevard and 22nd Street/Magnolia Avenue and N. Meadows Avenue on the east side of Sepulveda Boulevard would offer the most likely cut-through routes. Therefore, there is the potential that the proposed Project would result in a potentially significant impact under Criterion 3.

(iv) Component I Conditions

After the completion of Component I of the proposed Project, the conditions for Criteria 1 and 3 would be met, and there is the potential that the proposed Project could result in a potentially significant impact to local streets in the neighborhood. There is congestion along Sepulveda Boulevard and there are parallel residential streets that offer cut-through opportunities. However, Component I of the proposed Project would not add enough traffic to the Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor that sufficient traffic volumes would divert to these local streets to reach the level of a significant impact.

Comment 32

According to the Draft EIR, Component I of the proposed Project would generate 1,469 daily trips). The maximum accumulation of Component I of the proposed Project traffic would be 378 trips to/from the Shopping Center site along Sepulveda Boulevard north and south of the Shopping Center site and along Rosecrans Boulevard east of the Shopping Center site. Even if the 10 percent diversion estimate was exceeded, over 35 percent of Project traffic would have to divert from Sepulveda Boulevard and use a single residential street to reach the level of a significant impact. During the afternoon peak commute hour, the Component I Project trips would add 40 vehicles to the sections of Sepulveda north and south of the Project site. All 40 of the Project trips during the peak hour and an additional 80 trips during the other hours of the day (when the Sepulveda corridor is less congested and the reason for diversion is less) would have to divert to the same residential street. According to the neighborhood traffic impact policy guidelines described above, Component I of the proposed Project would not have a significant intrusion impact on residential streets because it would not meet Criterion 2 and, therefore, it would not meet all three conditions discussed above.

(v) Component I and II Conditions

After the completion of Components I and II of the proposed Project, the conditions for Criteria 1 and 3 would be met, and, therefore, there is the potential that the proposed Project could result in a potentially significant impact to local streets in the neighborhood. There is congestion along Sepulveda Boulevard and there are parallel residential streets that offer cut-through opportunities. However, Components I and II of the proposed Project would not add enough traffic to the Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor that sufficient traffic volumes would divert to these local streets to reach the level of a significant impact. Components I and II would generate 715 daily trips. Components I and II would generate fewer than the target 1,200 trips per day and, therefore, this condition would not generate sufficient additional traffic to the Sepulveda Boulevard Corridor to divert enough cut-through traffic to create a significant impact. Based on the distribution of Project trips, the highest concentration of Project trips would be 165 trips per day on Sepulveda Boulevard, both north and south of the Project site, and along Rosecrans east of the site. Even if the 10 percent diversion estimate was exceeded, the diversion would have to be over 70 percent of Project traffic using one residential street to reach the level of a significant impact. This situation is not likely to occur. Similar to the discussion above, based on the distribution of Component I Project trips, the highest concentration of Project trips would be 338 trips per day on Sepulveda Boulevard both north and south of the Project site and along Rosecrans east of the site.

(vi) Components I and II and III Conditions

As described above, at the full completion of the proposed Project, the conditions for Criteria 1 and 3 would be met, and, therefore, there is the potential that the proposed Project could result in a potentially significant impact to local streets in the neighborhood. There is congestion along Sepulveda Boulevard and there are parallel residential streets that offer cut-through opportunities. However, Components I through III of the proposed Project would only generate a net total of 463 daily trips on the area street system. Thus, the full build-out of the proposed Project would not add enough traffic to any single corridor in the study area that sufficient traffic volumes would divert to the local streets to reach the level of a significant impact.

Comments 33

The issue of neighborhood intrusion is an important one for those neighborhoods within vicinity of the development that currently experience cut-through traffic, and are concerned with the addition of significant buildable areas and land uses that generate traffic and parking beyond what is currently being experienced. What this report has done is conclude that no significant impacts, as part of project implementation, would occur at all component levels (I, II, and III). However, what we have not seen, and what those residential neighborhoods are seeking, is any requirement or obligation on the part of the applicant, that if the assumptions in the four criteria described above turn out not to be true, what the fall back position would be. With that in mind, we could like to recommend a project condition of approval that should neighborhood intrusion occur as part of this development, the city is obligated to bring the project up for public hearing and discussion. This development has the potential to destroy the peace, life style, and property values of the surrounding neighborhoods without any recourse. We would like to put the City and the developer on the spot, and make them shoulder the responsibility of this occurrence. Without a condition of approval or other form of written, verifiable stipulation, this concern would not be adequately addressed.

Mitigation Measure H-1: Prior to the start of construction, the Applicant shall devise a Construction Traffic Management Plan to be implemented during construction of the Project. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall identify all traffic control measures and devices to be implemented by the construction contractor through the duration of demolition and construction activities associated with the Project. Construction traffic controls should be provided consistent with current California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices standards and include provisions to provide and maintain ADA pedestrian mobility and access consistent with current California requirements. If lane closures are needed, the Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted for review to Caltrans. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall also be submitted for review to the City of El Segundo Public Works Department and the City of El Segundo Planning and Building Safety Department. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be subject to final approval by the City of Manhattan Beach Public Works Department, the City of Manhattan Beach Community Development Department, and the Manhattan Beach Police and Fire Departments. A final copy of the Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to the City of El Segundo.

Comment 34

This mitigation measure has been added to address the concerns about the ambiguity of construction traffic congestion and project construction parking. However, it falls short of identifying the level of review required for this plan. It appears the mitigation measure is calling for a staff level review because of the "temporary" nature of the construction process. However, our concern is that should be construction process not occur within the time-frame identified in the Draft EIR, that the project be taken back to the original approval bodies for thorough analysis. This could result in changes to certain assumptions in the project analysis and approval.

Mitigation Measure H-2: The Applicant shall submit a Construction Parking Management Plan to the City Community Development Department in October or earlier of each year that construction is planned between Thanksgiving through New Year's. The initial October or earlier submittal shall estimate the number of parking spaces to be available during the upcoming holiday shopping period and the peak demand likely during that same period based on the shared parking analysis similar to the analyses performed in the Traffic Study for the Manhattan Village Shopping Center Improvement Project. In the event that a parking shortage is projected, the Construction Parking Management Plan shall include the following points:

A determination of the need for the provision of off-site parking.
An estimate of the number of weekday and weekend off-site parking spaces needed to meet demand.
The identification of the location of an off-site parking location(s) with the appropriate number of available spaces.
Signed agreements with the owners of the off-site parking supply allowing the shopping center to utilize the spaces during the needed time periods.
A transportation plan identifying shuttle operations, frequency, and hours of operation for any off-site spaces beyond a reasonable walking distance.
Modification or reduction in construction hours or days. The annual Construction Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Director of Planning Community Development. A final copy of the Construction Parking Management Plan shall be submitted to the City of El Segundo.

Comment 35

Although we agree with the concept of a construction parking management plan, we disagree with some of the bullet points, especially bullet point #4 regarding signed agreements with the owners of the off-site parking locations to allow the shopping center to use the sites for parking during specified periods. Experience has shown that parking agreements are not legally binding nor are they enforceable unless recorded against the properties in question. Additionally, there is concern that the sites selected may not have "extra" parking to give to allow the project's additional needs. Thirdly, there is an issue with additional traffic impacts if the selected sites are not located within the City of Manhattan Beach. Would these traffic impacts have been analyzed as part of the EIR or would an additional traffic study be needed. So, this mitigation measure raises more questions than it is intended to resolve and the language needs to be clarified to reflect the concerns expressed earlier.

BRIGGS LAW CORPORATION

San Diego Office:
814 Morena Boulevard, Suite 107
San Diego, CA 92110

Telephone: 619-497-0021
Facsimile: 619-515-6410

Inland Empire Office:
99 East "C" Street, Suite 111
Upland, CA 91786

Telephone: 909-949-7115
Facsimile: 909-949-7121

Please respond to: Inland Empire Office

BLC File(s): 1751.00

17 September 2013

Manhattan Beach City Council
City Council Chambers
1400 Highland Avenue
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Re: Item 12 on City Council Agenda for September 17, 2013 (Manhattan Village Shopping Center Enhancement Project)

Dear City Council:

I am writing this letter on behalf of 3500 Sepulveda, LLC, 13th & Crest Associates, LLC and 6220 Spring Associates, LLC. These entities appealed the decisions relating to the Manhattan Village Shopping Center Enhancement Project, including the certification of the environmental impact report and approval of the Master Use Permit, Variance, Sign Exception/Sign Program, and any other associated approvals. My clients believe that an alternative to the project as proposed is better for the community of Manhattan Beach. My clients have had planning and traffic expert Gabriel Elliott examine the impacts of the project, which has confirmed several of the concerns raised by several members of the public and raised several questions.

My clients believe that an alternative to the project as proposed will result in economic benefits to the community at a significantly reduced cost, particularly in terms of traffic impacts to the neighborhood. The environmental impact report ("EIR") does not analyze a reasonable range of alternatives. Alternatives that would reduce the environmental impacts have not been analyzed in the EIR. If there are environmentally superior alternatives, you cannot certify the EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") without making findings under Public Resources Code Section 21081(a) and (b). All findings under CEQA must be supported by substantial evidence. You cannot make the findings based on the evidence before you.

While there are several impacts that have not been adequately analyzed and mitigated in the EIR, one of the most troublesome impact area for the community is traffic and transportation. Public participation is crucial to the CEQA process. *See Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors*, 52 Cal. 3d 553, 564 (1990) (noting that informed decision-making and public participation are fundamental purposes of CEQA). Case law confirms that an EIR must enable the public to understand and consider meaningfully the issues raised by the proposal under review. *Laurel Heights, supra*, 47 Cal. 3d at 405. Consequently, an environmental impact report is not sufficient if it simply includes bare conclusions and opinions; it must contain facts and analysis. *Santiago County Water Dist. v. County of Orange*, 118 Cal. App. 3d 818 (1981); *see also Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay Comm. v. Board of Comm'rs*, 91 Cal. App. 4th 1344, 1370 (2001) ("*Berkeley Jets*")

(finding EIR's approach of simply labeling effect "significant" without accompanying analysis of project's impacts on nearby residents' health does not meet CEQA's environmental assessment requirements). The EIR's traffic analysis is convoluted and difficult to understand. Thus, my client asked a planning and traffic expert to weigh in; his report is attached.

Although the planning and traffic expert's report highlights the problems with the mitigation proposed, there are problems with the mitigation measures proposed from a legal perspective as well. There is no substantial evidence demonstrating that the mitigation measure for construction traffic impacts will reduce the impact to a level of insignificance. Mitigation of construction-related impacts is improperly being deferred. There is no explanation for why the plan cannot be developed now. Furthermore, there is not substantial evidence that mitigation measure H-1 will reduce construction-related impacts to a level of insignificance. There is no way to evaluate the effectiveness of the mitigation measure without analysis of the impact. *See Stanislaus Natural Heritage Project v. County of Stanislaus*, 48 Cal. App. 4th 182, 195 (1996) (determining EIR was inadequate because it did not evaluate impact of supplying water to project, but instead included a mitigation measure that development would not proceed if adequate water was not available.). Furthermore, the mitigation measure does not even include a performance measure to ensure that the impact will in fact be reduced to a level of insignificance. There has to be some criterion for success. *See Communities for a Better Environment v. City of Richmond*, 184 Cal. App. 4th 70, 93 (2010) (rejecting mitigation plan because it lacked criteria for "success"). Here, there is insufficient analysis of the impact and no performance standard. For example, is the goal of the construction traffic management plan to reduce impacts to circulation on-site, circulation off-site, safety impacts, or some combination thereof? Without a performance standard articulated, there is no way to know which of these impacts may be reduced, if any.

The construction-related parking impact analysis and mitigation is also being improperly deferred. Mitigation measure H-2 does not include a performance standard. Furthermore, the implementation of the construction parking management plan is likely to lead to additional impacts that have not been analyzed. If off-site parking is required, then rather than the vehicle destination being the project site, the vehicle destination will be the off-site parking area. With a different destination, different roadways may be used and different intersections impacted. Furthermore, directing the traffic elsewhere will have different localized air quality, aesthetic and noise impacts than have been analyzed in the EIR. In addition, the safety impacts to pedestrians traveling from off-site parking spaces to the site have not been analyzed. For example, will there be sufficient signalized crossing areas between the off-site parking spaces and the project site? Will the off-site parking be located such that more pedestrians will need to travel through or near areas under construction? Thus, not only is the mitigation measure not certain to reduce the impact it is directed towards, but it also has the potential to cause a whole host of additional impacts that have not and cannot be addressed until the plan is developed.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

BRIGGS LAW CORPORATION

Cory J. Briggs

Enclosures/Attachments

Angela Soo

From: Douglas Au <douglasau@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 7:24 PM
To: Laurie B. Jester; List - City Council; City Manager; PlanningComission@citymb.info; rthomson@citymb.info
Subject: Re: Manhattan Village Shopping Center Enhancement Project

Dear Ms. Jester and Members of the Manhattan Beach City Council,

It has been more than a year since we sent you the email attached below regarding the Manhattan Beach Village Shopping Center Enhancement Project. In the intervening period, we have attended numerous meetings with the developer of the project. While the meetings have been cordial, we have not seen any serious effort on the part of the developer to address our primary concern with the project, which is the scale of the proposed development. Based on the plans we have seen , the mall will be transformed from its current "village" character to one which will become a "destination" mall attracting visitors from a larger geographical area. This, of course, is the objective of the mall developer, and regardless of the developer's claims to the contrary, anyone looking at the plans can easily see that the character of the mall will be significantly transformed. Just the presence of three large multilevel parking structures will transform the character of the mall. Additionally, the developer's need for the parking structures implies an expectation for additional traffic. The streets surrounding the current shopping center (Rosecrans, Sepulveda, and Marine) are already crowded with mall traffic, especially during heavy morning and afternoon hours. How will the additional traffic be mitigated?

As you review this project, please consider its long term impact to the residents of this city, and also to the image of Manhattan Beach held by those who currently live outside the city, which certainly impacts property values and hence property taxes.

Respectfully,
Douglas and Nancy Au
3205 Oak Ave.
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

From: Douglas Au <douglasau@yahoo.com>
To: "ljester@citymb.info" <ljester@citymb.info>; "CityCouncil@citymb.info" <CityCouncil@citymb.info>; "cm@citymb.info" <cm@citymb.info>; "PlanningComission@citymb.info" <PlanningComission@citymb.info>; "rthomson@citymb.info" <rthomson@citymb.info>
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2012 1:55 PM
Subject: Manhattan Village Shopping Center Enhancement Project

Dear Ms. Laurie Jester, Mr. Richard Thompson, Members of the Manhattan Beach City Council and Planning Commission,

LATE ATTACHMENT 2
CC MTG 9-17-13

We have resided at our home at 3205 Oak Ave. since 1987. During this period we have seen many changes to our city and to the Los Angeles community as a whole. Through this period, the character and personality of Manhattan Beach has remained essentially intact. It has retained its small town character, a city of families, children, friendly and caring people, and responsible citizens. We welcome visitors, but we also want to preserve what we all treasure about Manhattan Beach.

Others have written to you in detail about their concerns regarding the project, and we share many of those same concerns, but we won't reiterate them in detail here. We only ask that we the citizens of this city get an opportunity to work with you, the developers, and each other in a collaborative manner to address everyone's ideas and concerns in the interest of keeping Manhattan Beach attractive as a place to live and raise a family, and a place to visit and shop. I am sure that this collaboration will require compromise, progress often does. But I believe the community is open to progress, and willing to discuss compromises if they feel they have been given a fair opportunity to participate in and influence the process.

Our general comments are as follows:

1) We like the "Village" atmosphere of the current mall and would like to preserve that atmosphere.

2) We are not averse to improvements, but would prefer that the scale of the improvements not create a "regional mall" atmosphere versus a "village" atmosphere.

3) We would like to see the improvements foster more pedestrian access and accomodation of other modes of transport such as shuttles, bicycles, electric vehicles, etc. We currently often walk to the mall, but the current configuration is not pedestrian friendly. There are no sidewalks in many areas, forcing pedestrians to walk on the street or through the parking areas.

4) We would like to see the visual impact of the parking structures minimized and the heights lowered. Underground parking can help to mitigate this problem.

Thank you for your consideration and we hope to work with you as this project evolves.

Douglas and Nancy Au
3205 Oak Ave.
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
310-546-2615