



A. CALL TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Redondo Beach Public Works, Safety, and Sustainability Commission was called to order by Chair Arrata at 7:00 P.M., in the City Hall Council Chambers, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California, and teleconference.

B. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Simpson, Bajaj, Anderson, Nafissi, Beeli, Tsao, Chair Arrata

Commissioners Absent: None

Officials Present: Andy Winje, Public Works Director
Andrea Delap, Public Works
Jesse Reyes, Capital Projects Program Manager

C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Commissioner Anderson led the Commissioners in a salute to the flag.

D. APPROVE ORDER OF AGENDA

Motion by Commissioner Nafissi, seconded by Commissioner Tsao, to approve the order of the agenda as presented.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

E. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS - ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS

E.1. BLUE FOLDER

Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes reported no Blue Folder items.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F.1. APPROVE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE PUBLIC WORKS, SAFETY, AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSION MEETING

F.2. APPROVE THE PUBLIC WORKS, SAFETY, AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES FOR THE DECEMBER 15, 2025 SPECIAL MEETING

F.3. RECEIVE AND FILE STATUS UPDATES ON PROJECTS DISCUSSED AT THE PUBLIC WORKS AND SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSION

F.4. RECEIVE AND FILE THE MONTHLY UPDATE TO THE CITY'S STRATEGIC PLAN THREE YEAR PRIORITY AREAS AND TEN-MONTH OBJECTIVES ADOPTED BY COUNCIL ON JUNE 10, 2025

Motion by Commissioner Simpson, seconded by Commissioner Bajaj, to approve the Consent Calendar.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

Chair Arrata invited public comments.

Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes reported no eComments and no hands raised on Zoom.

G. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS - None

H. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

H.1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Jim Mueller, District 5, referenced the Commission's December 15th meeting where he spoke about the need for traffic calming measures on Artesia Blvd.; noted that more commercial business would take place and it would generate more revenue for the City; reported that LeBasse consultants completed a consumer survey of the residents around Artesia as part of the art project which sought to find out how residents felt about being on foot around the area; said the results found more would walk or bike if the corridor felt safer, and noted issues of speeding traffic, disturbing noise levels, narrow sidewalks that put them closer to traffic, and limited crossings; stated residents asked for improvements that promote walkability and a sense of place; suggested reducing the speed limit from 35 MPH to 20 MPH as the Riviera Village has and add modifications that encourage slower speeds and prioritize pedestrians over vehicles; referenced the AACAP which called for crosswalks in 2026 as well as other improvements for pedestrian safety; suggested working with the Planning Commission to ensure new buildings or renovations use setbacks in a way that expands the pedestrian space; asked that the calming efforts be done before the new farmers' market starts up.

Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes reported no eComments and no hands raised on Zoom.

I. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS - None

J. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION

J.1. RECEIVE AND FILE UPDATE ON THE CITY'S SOLID WASTE PROGRAMS

Public Works Director Winje reported that the City Council had elected to pursue a second amendment with Athens Services so they wanted to give the Commission an update, details of the contract, and the requirements the City is obliged to fulfill in that regard; stated it is mainly a "receive and file" for the Commission but they are also there to answer

any questions.

Andrea Delap, Public Works, stated that the waste management in Redondo Beach is a long and complex topic so would be narrowly focusing on their program and the second amendment that evening; explained that the City collects three streams: trash, recycling, and organics; stated that they serve a variety of different classifications and went into more detail regarding residential, commercial, and multi-family units; stated the reason they are there that evening is because the City Council through the City's municipal code determined that it is in the public interest for the City to provide solid waste handling services; reported that for the vast majority of the City's residents and businesses the City have chosen an exclusive franchise hauler agreement with Athens Services; explained that the City's municipal code also states that the solid waste services are supervised by the Director of Public Works; noted that the City has been in contract with Athens since 2011, the first amendment was signed in 2019, and currently the City is in its 7 of 9 years of the extended contract; reported it is the City's largest service vendor contract; stated there are special waste programs that keep the City's public right of ways clear:

- Bulky Item Pick-Up: Free collection of 4 items per week, which residents call to set up.
- Paper Shred Events: Secure document destruction that is publicized on the City's website.
- Household Hazardous Waste Events: Collection for paints, chemicals, and batteries, which makes sure all that waste is appropriately disposed of.
- Community Compost Giveaways – Free compost

Andrea Delap noted that the events only happen twice a year and for other times of the year people can go to the Hyperion S.A.F.E. Center which is open all year round and information can be found on the City's website; showed everyone what the compost bucket looks like and offered it to anyone that doesn't have one; stated they are asking everyone to separate inside their house and anyone that needs a bucket can reach out to the Public Works Department to receive one, noted that they have acquired them through a local assistance grant program from the state; spoke in more detail about the bulky item pick-up and illegal dumping; reported that Athens, in 2025, picked up 14,488 bulky items, 1,315 electronic waste items, and just under 2,000 white goods (kitchen appliances); stated that Public Works and Athens work together to make sure the City is free of illegal dumping and in 2025 picked up 1,291 illegally dumped items; spoke of changing state regulations and requirements needed to be implemented in the City and the latest one being SB 1383 which requires organic waste recycling to reduce methane emission from landfills; stated it is mandatory for residents and businesses and the City is required by the state to enforce it and they have been in a "rollout" or education mode for the past two years and are now in enforcement mode; spoke about a program called "lid flipping" where an Athens rep monitors contamination of residents and businesses to make sure they are following the three streams of separation required and, if that is not being followed, a notification may be left on the bin; stated, as the program evolves and mandates are not followed, fines or penalties will be issued as required by the state; stated businesses, such as grocery stores, are required as part of SB 1383 to take anything still usable but past the "sell by date" to a non-profit in the City; reported that she went out with CalRecycle since they are undergoing compliance review and it was great

to see how local grocery stores are participating in the program; reported that the Salvation Army is a recipient of the donated food and they also visited that location to see how they utilized the donated food; spoke about how the state mandates impact the programming in the City, how they do the outreach, and how they meet their requirements; stated with the industry disruptions Athens approached the City to begin conversations on the second amendment, and City Council directed staff to proceed with the second amendment conversations; reported that SERRF closed recently so the language needed to be removed from the contract and considerations for landfill closures and landfill tip fee increases were needed; highlighted the key provisions to be included in the second amendment:

- Three streams for all customers
- Rate structure adjustment (multi-family & commercial)
- Bundled service
- Contract extension

Andrea Delap stated the proposal is for an extension of eight years on the current contract; noted that there is no impact proposed for single-family or multi-family units less than four; pointed out that the City has 100% coverage across the community whereas other cities do not and the City has been successful in compliance; noted that there have been struggles with multi-family units especially with the “lid lifts” and move-outs where people put excessive amounts out for pick up without notification; stated they do bring in code enforcement where there are repeated violations to the City’s code; provided resources for people that have questions about waste management such as the City’s website, Athen’s website, and CalRecycle’s website and contact information.

Commissioner Tsao asked for more explanation and details on the “lid flipping”.

Andrea Delap responded that primarily uniformed Athens Services personnel will handle it but if the state auditors are around she or her colleague Mitch Kasse may be shadowing them; explained, with residential trash, personnel would flip the lid of the trash bin located on the curb before the truck picks up, take a photo, and if there is a violation will leave a tag with an explanation; stated that, with businesses and multi-family units, they contact the businesses, store owner, or property manager for them to inspect together.

Commissioner Tsao asked if it is similar to a random spot check.

Andrea Delap stated it is and it happens normally twice a year; reported it is a requirement as part of SB 1383.

Commissioner Bajaj asked whether the paper shredding and hazardous waste events are stand-alone or combined and dates for them and if residents call for e-Waste pickups to be scheduled.

Andrea Delap stated the events can be both stand-alone or combined and they tend to be twice a year and the information can be found on the City’s website for dates; explained

the process for e-Waste and noted that Athens will ask questions to determine if it is actually e-Waste or white goods so they know which truck to send since they are two different disposal streams.

Commissioner Anderson asked why the second amendment has such a long extension to the contract since she spoke about disruptions and things that happen with services.

Andrea Delap explained that it is an industry standard but it was a key point that was brought up several times during the Council meeting; stated that during the Council meeting it was noted that due to capital depreciation, need to plan, and time and expense to roll out new programs in cities (purchases of new carts, bins, and trucks) the duration is standard in the solid waste industry.

Public Works Director Winje confirmed that it is about the depreciation of the capital assets and investment made by the haulers; noted that some haulers have long-term contracts with landfill and need to plan to be able to provide the service and return a profit on their investments.

Some discussion followed.

Commissioner Anderson asked if it is primarily funded through the property tax.

Andrea Delap responded that for residential and multi-family with four or less units it is built into their property tax bill and it is listed as refuse rate but for multi-family of five or more and commercial businesses they set up the service; explained that they need to choose what type of services they need and then are billed directly on a monthly basis by Athens Services.

Commissioner Anderson spoke of trash bins around his neighborhood always sitting out and asked if there is any type of enforcement or protocol for that.

Andrea Delap stated the protocol is built into the City's municipal code and he was correct in saying the bins should only be left out from sunset to sunset; said if anyone identifies carts left out longer than necessary then their office could be contacted; stated they will go out to the location a few times to make sure it was not a one-time occurrence and if they identify a consistent routine, they take photos and document, and they will contact the resident to advise them of the code; noted that there can be exceptions which would be determined by the Public Works Director.

Commissioner Bajaj asked if there is a competitive bid process that is done or if the amendments or contract extensions were built into the first contract.

Public Works Director Winje stated that it takes about two years for the bid process, one year to do the RFP and then another year for that selected firm to prep to bring in new equipment; reported that last Tuesday's City Council meeting's conversation was regarding whether to go out to bid or continue negotiations with Athens; reported that City

Council took their strong recommendation to stay with Athens based on the market, comparisons they studied, and due to the great relationship the City has with Athens; noted that Athens has continued to receive high marks for its service from residents and they are always very responsive when there is a problem.

Chair Arrata invited public comments.

Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes reported no eComments and no hands raised on Zoom.

Chair Arrata offered some positive comments about Athens Services and thanked Andrea Delap for the presentation.

Motion by Commissioner Bajaj, seconded by Commissioner Simpson, to receive and file the update on the City's Solid Waste Programs.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

J.2. DISCUSSION OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT'S PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

Public Works Director Winje introduced the item and reported that staff have heard some criticism from the public on their CIP's process and procedures; noted that they have already been making changes internally that predate the recent letters they have seen; stated that they wanted to make the Commission aware of their process regarding CIPs, how they get selected, and how they are added to the capital budget every year; added that they will also talk about their contract management practices and their procurement practices, which have been the target of recent criticism; noted the City follows all the state laws, city laws, and remain transparent and fully trackable by the public; stated that they would welcome any feedback the Commission has for them; turned the floor over to Jesse Reyes, noted that he is the Capital Projects Program Manager and is in charge of it for the City.

Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes provided an outline of what he would be discussing that evening which included: Five-Year History, CIP Project Stages, Project Identification Process, Project Funding, Project Execution, Project Management, and Project Close-Out; showed a slide detailing the five-year history that was presented to Council which showed the growth of their program from 2020 to the present on project size, on expenditure size, and projection completion; spoke of the CIP project stages and how they define them as they look at the City's projects that are in the CIP; provided a CIP Project Stages slide that listed the stages as: programmed, pre-design, design, procurement, construction, completed, and ongoing; defined and detailed out each of the stages; stated that the project identification process begins with how projects are identified, which comes from requests made from various departments and through City Council, then they are reviewed by the CIP team which consists of the City Manager's office, Finance Department, and Public Works; explained the request must fit one of the following categories as they explore what to include in the recommended CIP:

- Is it necessary to Public Health or Safety?
- Is it a state or federal mandate?
- Does it complete an existing project?
- Are there operational savings in the future if the project is completed?
- Is there significant funding for the project?
- Does it promote economic development for the City?

Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes stated that the projects selected for the recommended CIP are then presented for City Council's consideration; reported that they do not add anything unless the City has some level of project funding for a project; noted that they also have funding priorities: Imperative, Essential, Important, or Desirable and those determine which projects they fund first; reported that they also have different types of funding that dictate what will potentially move forward: Discretionary (City Council), Restrictive (street projects), and Grants; stated that staff has been working through a flowchart (provided an example on the screen) for the budget process which goes from identifying project all the way to the final adoption by the City Council; stated once they have that, they go to project execution where they prioritize them by looking at many factors such as date, seniority of a project, funding availability, regulatory requirements, continuation of a phased project, Strategic Plan priorities from City Council, complexity of a project, and availability of staff, resources, and expertise; then they move to the procurement phase which is guided by the state's contract code, City charter and municipal code; stated after procurement they move into the design phase and reported that professional services are dictated in the City's municipal code which are procured either by an RFP or through their on-call contracts; stated RFPs are normally done for their larger traditional CIPs and for the City's smaller projects, such as maintenance projects, they use their on-call contracts; noted that the on-call contracts help with some of the smaller designs and really move along maintenance projects; reported that a couple of years ago the Redondo Beach voters passed a charter amendment that added maintenance or repair to the City's charter and about a year ago City Council approved an ordinance that detailed and defined maintenance and repair projects, thresholds, and what falls under maintenance and repair in the ordinance that allows staff to accomplish and procure those services and those projects; spoke of the more traditional CIP projects being more involved and explained they go through a much more formal process; spoke of how the process they have put together for the smaller maintenance projects has really helped them streamline the process and move some of the CIPs forward in a more timely fashion.

Public Works Director Winje pointed out that the presentation showed the traditional CIP design, bid, build process, which usually involves a consulting contract for the design and a separate contractor procurement for the build portion, and stated that they are moving more into design build as a process where the same entity is contracted to do both the design side and the build side; spoke of a variation called Progressive Design Build, which is a more improved situation for certain types of projects; reported that the Measure FP projects, which were approved by the City Council recently, are pursuing a Progressive Design Build process.

Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes noted there have been some concern from the

public and from the Budget & Finance Commission regarding staff's process and stressed that City staff are governed by Public Contract Code, by the City's charter, and by City ordinance and they must operate within those parameters and laws; moved on to the next level which was Project Management which was the contract administration, construction schedule, Notice to Proceed (sets the clock on the project), progress payments (where he reviews it to ensure it is being paid from the correct funds, the City Engineer signs off on the progress payment, and it is approved by Finance and the City Council), construction management/inspections (in-house or outside consultant which depends on the size and scope of the project), and then they have change orders (APP 14.1); reported that change orders are dictated by the City's Administrative Policies and Procedures (APP), which was established in 1993 and has not been adjusted since then; went over the thresholds allowed by the City Engineer to sign off on for change orders; explained that change orders are unforeseen conditions or additions needed to rectify situations; stated that anything above and beyond what the APP allows as a discretion from the City Engineer will go back to the City Council for their approval; continued with the Project Close-Out which includes: Final inspection, commissioning (if applicable), Council acceptance that it is complete which is done through Administrative Report and includes any approved change orders, project recordation where it is recorded with the County, and then retention release after 35 days if there are no claims on the project; stated that concluded the life cycle of a project and recommended that the Commission receive and file the report and provide any feedback on their process.

Commissioner Anderson commented that he was surprised to hear that staff is using alternative project delivery methods; stated that it was his understanding that the state charter allow commissioners or councilmembers to approve a certain number of alternative project delivery contracts as defined and that gives staff the opportunity to use that many; asked if they have looked into job order contracts.

Public Works Director Winje stated that is part of the City's ordinance for maintenance and repair; reported they are experimenting with a company called Gordian but have yet to determine whether it is a suitable delivery method for them, but it is allowed through the ordinance and the City's municipal code.

Commissioner Nafissi asked if the City has an unbiased criteria process where multiple people review and select based on the information that comes in.

Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes responded that, as stated in the presentation, they have a team that consists of the City Manager's office, Finance, and himself, Lauren Sablan, and Director Winje from Public Works that review the projects, look at the priorities, funding, and other factors.

Commissioner Nafissi asked if they have an actual rubric or is it an ad hoc where they go through their process map.

Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes stated they have not since he has been there but they are moving to a new system for their budget called ClearGov this year; explained ClearGov would have the ability to build out a rubric and a review process that would go

to individual people that would score them but they currently don't have the resources to add it.

Public Works Director Winje stated that in the larger cities where decisions are made far from the political decision makers the ClearGov is an excellent way to do it but in Redondo Beach much of what is recommended happens on the staff level and gets overridden at the dais by City Council; commented that staff is very sensitive to feedback they receive in meetings leading up to the CIP event at the budget; noted that Council uses BRRs and staff come up with the number to present at the next City Council meeting with a short report but Council may or may not choose to add it to the CIP; spoke more about the process, explained some of the challenges they face, that all of it is presented to Council, and that the City Manager visits all the Commissions for their input during the budget process.

Commissioner Nafissi suggested that Public Works share with the community that they put these projects through a thorough and unbiased process and that projects are looked at in totality and not north vs south.

Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes stated that since 2022 Council has added 40 to 50 CIP projects that were not led by staff and Council ultimately decides what is approved.

Commissioner Nafissi asked that staff consider stakeholder engagement, more communication that informs the residents that will be impacted before the project takes place and also allows them to feel part of the process.

Jim Mueller, District 5, wanted to make it clear that he was not the person that initiated the question regarding change orders but that it was a member of the Budget & Finance Commission; stated that the Commissioner was looking at the percent that change orders were of the original estimate and reported that there are guidelines for that and gave some examples; stated he was able to get the numbers provided by the City's Finance Director and there are a couple of projects that stand out for him; voiced his concern that the City Manager and City Council don't seem to have budget amounts or estimates that hold water to form budgets and the City ends up spending a lot more, which is a financial problem; highlighted the change orders for the Anita at PCH project was 233%, the Inglewood/Manhattan Beach right turn lane was 83%, and the Torrance Blvd resurfacing was 12% and said people wonder if the estimates Council receives are accurate enough for them to make a budget.

Jasmine Allen, Budget & Finance Commission, referenced the spreadsheet that Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes created for the Budget & Finance Commission per their request; reported that the Commissioner who initiated the idea analyzed and found that numbers increased in some cases more than 50% than planned; stated they are concerned that the City is overspending, that they are not estimating correctly, and that vendors are taking advantage of the City once they are awarded a bid; commented that the Budget & Finance Commission felt it starts from the beginning with the RFP and they have discussed that the City needs more options in case something happens; stated that

vendors are taking advantage of the City because once they start a project they continue to add items and they don't have to compete for the added work; reported that the Budget & Finance Commission will continue to discuss the topic at their next meeting in February and invited everyone to attend.

Commissioner Tsao asked if the contracts have stipulations for cost overruns and percentage of cost overruns held liable by the vendors.

Public Works Director Winje clarified that the term "change order" only specifically applies to a contract and it doesn't apply to the budgeting process; explained that there are four reasons for change orders according to the City's APP which are: change of scope, unforeseen conditions, similar work in a different area and he could not remember the fourth one but stated they are limited by the numeric limits that were shared in the presentation given; stated that staff works within the limits that were blessed by Council and, if staff needs to exceed the limits, they have to go back to the Council and ask for more money; wanted to address the three projects Jim Mueller mentioned:

- Anita and PCH project – stated the project was to look at the westbound approach of PCH along Anita, they went to Metro for funding to do the work before any real design was done but because the City knew there was a problem at that location and reported that they asked for \$2.5 million which Metro granted to the City; stated as they got further into the project they realized they did not need to go as expensive as they originally thought, they scaled the project back but then realized they could address more work on that street and they reached out to the three vendors that were already working in the City; stated that an existing contractor, who had already gone through the low bid process, gave them quotes on the quantities at the same unit cost; noted that of the other two vendors asked, one did not want to do the additional work, and the other came in much higher; explained that they had the budget, went to Council with the additional project work, and Council approved it.
- Inglewood/Manhattan Beach Blvd. – stated that this project was also Metro funded and the City was widening the southbound right turn lane on Inglewood, noted it is the worst intersection in the City in terms of level of service; went into more detail on the scope of the project and reported that during the project the City realized they could improve the project further if they modified the signal at a third corner so they paused the project, got additional funding, went back to Council, got a quote from the existing vendor using the same unit price, and received Council approval.
- Torrance Blvd. – stated this paving project had been on the books for a long time and turned into a bike lane and signal improvement project at Francisca; commented that the change orders were related to the additional scope that the City desired to do as part of their adopted goals and programs for bike lanes and improving signals; stated that if it was a 12% change they went back to Council to ask for the additional funding or they combined two projects that were already approved by Council into one contract.

Public Works Director Winje stated that they have rules that they follow and get approvals from Council as needed and recommend good strategies for the City to get more work done faster, at unit costs that are bid in a competitive process; said that the other conversation they are hearing concerns capital projects and reported that they have a meeting with the subcommittee for that Commission the following day to discuss it and to provide answers to questions they have; stated that the concern is about projects being budgeted in one fiscal year, and then over time additional funding is being added to those projects as they grow, so it appears they are not doing a good job of budgeting for their projects; responded that is rarely the case but it does happen and that it certainly happened during Covid when prices were rising 7% to 10% annually in the construction industry.

Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes reported that he did the analysis, and it was 41% over those five years.

Public Works Director Winje explained the estimates created by their engineers were based on bids they had two to three years prior, which is normally reliable but when the curve is that steep it causes increases in construction prices; noted that other disruptions took place such as not being able to get concrete or timber; provided an example using the Aviation Park pickleball court project; stated Council funded it the first year (seed money), did a feasibility study, added more funding once they chose to continue, did the design work, after a year or two they fund it more, and then they start the build; explained that that process is by design because Council does not want to tie up a lot of money into the future and they provide funds just to get the project started; opined that he sees no problem with that process; addressed the concern about vendors taking advantage of the City and used the Pier parking project as an example; explained how unforeseen problems and situations occur which can change the scope and cost; stated in that instance the engineer missed the cost of bringing machinery in by barge and the City missed it too and felt they were not taken advantage of and had control the whole time; provided another example of the Portofino Pump Station and explained what happened in that situation and that they were able to pull out of part of the contract because they were not happy with the experience they were having with that vendor; noted that their process can be messy, it is difficult to know exactly what the people would like to know to provide all the transparency, but that they do have 4 or 5 sets of eyes looking at the pay items; commented that the City does know there are areas in their process where they can improve and are looking into software that has the ability to track the CIPs which will provide more transparency to the public; felt that the City does not have a huge problem in their process except for the communication to the public.

Chair Arrata stated she felt the City is advanced in communication since they opened up the website as a communication tool for the community; remembered years ago the City could not do anything.

Public Works Director Winje said the best tool the City has currently is the GIS based map on the City's website; stated anybody can go to it, look up a project on the map or by name and find information regarding that project.

Chair Arrata felt that the bidding and vetting process that the City uses is very fair.

Commissioner Anderson thanked Director Winje for explaining the process; commented that he works with a lot of agencies and is mindful that they can get a grant for a project which doesn't get bid for four years and a lot can change in unit price; stated that when he performs cost estimates he tries to be realistic and mentioned factors he tries to take into account; said sometimes if a project worries them and they know unforeseen site conditions will happen they have done optional cost listings for certain items and just one unit so that they can hold a contractor to that if something comes into play and reported it has worked to do that.

Public Works Director Winje stated they sometimes use add alternates or delete alternates on the City's bid packages to give them flexibility; explained so if a bid comes in low, they can add something and if they come in too high, they can reduce the scope without having to re-bid.

Commissioner Anderson suggested if they are really worried about the contractor, they can use the word "allocation" versus just providing the full payment for that future use.

Chair Arrata invited public comments.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Bajaj, to receive and file the Capital Improvement Project process and procedures.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

K. COMMISSION MEMBER ITEMS AND FUTURE COMMISSION AGENDA TOPICS

Commissioner Bajaj asked for an update on Dominguez Park.

Public Works Director Winje provided some background on the situation at Dominguez Park; reported that the City appealed the permit the county's health department required, have gone through several appeals which were all denied, noted that the playground has been closed because of that; stated that he has been working with the head of the enforcement group at CalRecycle and reported that staff had their first conversation with CalRecycle mid-January and were told they are working on a way to re-open the park while still having the City comply with all their rules; stated they expect some communication from them later that week; explained that in the meantime, the City is working on complying with other rules which will involve some study of the methane levels in the soil and an expense of six figures to do it, noted they will need to find a way to get that done.

Commissioner Nafissi recalled that Dominguez Park was identified as a possible location for a skate park and staff reported that the City could not use that as a location because there were soil issues and other problems; asked why the City chose to redo the park when they already knew there were problems there.

Public Works Director Winje explained that the Dominguez Park Project had been put on the CIP in 2016 or 2017, it was stalled by the Parks Commission because they couldn't decide what they wanted, it was stalled when the City's Community Services Director vacated the position, and Covid prevented them from getting replacement parts which forced them to shut the playgrounds down because it was too dangerous; spoke of the foundation needs for a skate park and at that location it would cost too much to put piles 50 ft. into the ground to build it but that the playground doesn't need deep foundations so Council advanced the playground project.

Capital Projects Program Manager Reyes added that SoCal Gas had a huge project in a different part of the park that had no issues.

More discussion followed regarding the SoCal Gas project.

L. ADJOURNMENT – 8:39 P.M.

Motion by Chair Arrata, seconded by Commissioner Nafissi, to adjourn to the next meeting of the Redondo Beach Public Works, Safety, and Sustainability Commission, which will be a Regular Meeting to be held at 7:00 p.m. on February 23, 2026, in the Redondo Beach Council Chambers, at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

All written comments submitted via eComment are included in the record and available for public review on the City website.

Respectfully submitted:

Andrew Winje
Public Works Director