



Minutes  
Redondo Beach City Council  
Tuesday, January 20, 2026  
Closed Session – Adjourned Regular Meeting 4:30 p.m.  
Open Session – Regular Meeting 6:00 p.m.

**4:30 PM - CLOSED SESSION – ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING**

**A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

An Adjourned Regular Meeting of the Redondo Beach City Council was called to order at 4:30 p.m. by Mayor Light in the City Hall Council Chambers, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Councilmembers Present: Waller, Castle, Kaluderovic, Behrendt, Mayor Light

Councilmembers Absent: Obagi

Officials Present: Mike Witzansky, City Manager  
Joy Ford, City Attorney  
Emily Bodkin, Administrative Specialist/Liaison

**C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG AND INVOCATION - None**

**D. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS – ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS - None**

**E. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS ON CLOSED SESSION ITEMS AND NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Liaison Bodkin reported no eComments and one Zoom attendee.

**F. RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION – 4:34 P.M.**

**F.1. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR - The Closed Session is authorized by the Government Code Section 54956.8.**

**AGENCY NEGOTIATOR:**

**Mike Witzansky, City Manager**

**Elizabeth Hause, Community Services Director**

**Greg Kapovich, Waterfront & Economic Development Director**

**PROPERTY:**

**Portions of the Redondo Beach Marina Parking Lot and Seaside Lagoon**

(portions of APN #s: 7503-029-900 and 7503-029-903)  
Portions of Harbor Drive, Pacific Avenue, Catalina Avenue, Gertruda Avenue,  
Herondo Street, and Esplanade

**NEGOTIATING PARTIES:**

Kellie Hawkins, Englander Knabe & Allen on Behalf of Nike, Inc.

**UNDER NEGOTIATION:**

Price and Terms

- F.2. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR - The Closed Session is authorized by the Government Code Section 54956.8.**

**AGENCY NEGOTIATOR:**

Mike Witzansky, City Manager

Greg Kapovich, Waterfront & Economic Development Director

Elizabeth Hause, Community Services Director

Jane Chung, Assistant to the City Manager

**PROPERTY:**

Portions of the Redondo Beach Marina Parking Lot and Seaside Lagoon

239 & 245 N. Harbor Drive, Redondo Beach, CA 90277

(portions of APN #s: 7503-029-900 and 7503-029-903)

**NEGOTIATING PARTIES:**

Allen Sanford, BeachLife LLC - LA28 Event

**UNDER NEGOTIATION:**

Terms

- F.3. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - EXISTING LITIGATION - The Closed Session is authorized by the attorney-client privilege, Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1).**

**Name of case:**

Silas Dettelbach by Guardian Ad Litem, Berna Dettelbach, individually and Spencer Dettelbach, individually v. City of Redondo Beach; and DOES 1-50, inclusive

Case Number: 24TRCV01457

- F.4. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL AND LABOR NEGOTIATOR - The Closed Session is authorized by the Government Code Sec. 54957.6.**

**AGENCY NEGOTIATOR:**

Mike Witzansky, City Manager

Diane Strickfaden, Director of Human Resources

**EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS:  
Redondo Beach Police Officers' Association - Police Management Unit.**

Liaison Bodkin read titles to be discussed in Closed Session.

City Manager Witzansky announced the following would be participating in Closed Session: City Manager Mike Witzansky, City Attorney Joy Ford, Assistant City Attorney Cheryl Park, Community Services Director Elizabeth Hause, Assistant to the City Manager Jane Chung, Human Resources Director Diane Strickfaden, and Outside Legal Counsel Dana McCune.

Motion by Councilmember Waller, seconded by Councilmember Castle, to recess to Closed Session at 4:33 p.m.

Motion carried 4-0-1 by voice vote. Councilmember Obagi was absent.

**G. RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION**

Mayor Light reconvened to Open Session at 6:19 p.m.

**H. ROLL CALL**

Councilmembers Present: Waller, Castle, Kaluderovic, Obagi, Behrendt, Mayor Light

Councilmembers Absent: None

Officials Present: Eleanor Manzano, City Clerk  
Mike Witzansky, City Manager  
Joy Ford, City Attorney  
Laura Diaz, Records Mgmt. Supervisor

**I. ANNOUNCEMENT OF CLOSED SESSION ACTIONS**

City Manager Witzansky stated no reportable action but Assistant to the City Manager Jane Chung joined them for items F.1, F.3 and F.4.

**J. ADJOURN TO REGULAR MEETING**

Motion by Councilmember Obagi, seconded by Councilmember Waller, to adjourn to the Open Session at 6:19 p.m.

Motion carried 5-0 by voice vote.

**6:00 PM – OPEN SESSION – REGULAR MEETING**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

A Regular Meeting of the Redondo Beach City Council was called to order at 6:20 p.m. by Mayor Light in the City Hall Council Chambers, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Councilmembers Present: Waller, Castle, Kaluderovic, Obagi, Behrendt, Mayor Light

Councilmembers Absent: None

Officials Present: Eleanor Manzano, City Clerk  
Mike Witzansky, City Manager  
Joy Ford, City Attorney  
Laura Diaz, Records Mgmt. Supervisor

**C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG AND INVOCATION**

Mayor Light invited veterans and active-duty military to stand and be recognized for their service.

Aurora, 2<sup>nd</sup> grader at Birney Elementary School, led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor Light asked all to remain standing for a moment of silent invocation.

**D. PRESENTATIONS/PROCLAMATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS/AB 1234 TRAVEL**

**D.1. MAYOR’S COMMENDATION TO THE REDONDO UNION HIGH SCHOOL BOY’S CROSS COUNTRY TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2025 CIF DIVISION ONE STATE CHAMPIONSHIP**

Mayor Light called up Coach Bob Leetch to recognize the achievement made by the RUHS Boys’ Cross Country Team; stated the team captured the CA State Cross Country Division 1 Championship earning the first State Cross Country Title in RUHS history; noted that the race was held at Woodward Park Course in Fresno and the team posted the sixth fastest time in Division 1 State Meet history, beat their own team record by a minute and 19 seconds, and qualified for one of only 22 invitations to the Nike National Championships; reported that the team placed 13<sup>th</sup> overall in the National Championships, finished as the highest ranked team from California, and marked the first time the RUHS Cross Country Team program qualified for the Nike National Championships since 2012; presented, on behalf of the City Council, himself, and the citizens of Redondo, Certificates of Recognition to the RUHS Boys’ Cross Country Team for their historic State Championship and national performance; reported that it is finals week and only two of the team members could make it that evening: Gavin Hasson and

Mario Montoya.

Coach Bob Leetch spoke of his years growing up and raising his own family in Redondo Beach; voiced his appreciation for the leadership in Redondo Beach, spoke highly of the School District, and provided some statistical information on the amount of training his team had put out during the season and summer; noted that the team maintained GPA's of 4.0 or higher; stated that he is very proud to win their first State Championship and noted it was due to the hard work of the team and the support of the families and City; stated that Mario Montoya is the fastest sophomore in the history of the state and Gavin Hasson is the team captain.

Mayor Light read off the names of the athletes that could not be there that evening.

## **D.2. CEREMONIAL SWEARING IN OF POLICE CHIEF STEPHEN SPRENGEL**

City Clerk Manzano introduced herself and announced she would be swearing in the new Police Chief Stephen Sprengel; asked Chief Sprengel to come to the podium and administered the Oath.

City Manager Witzansky stated Police Chief Sprengel has been on the job for about a month and spoke of his deep ties to the community and the City.

Police Chief Sprengel introduced his wife, Nicole, of 28 years and his father, a retired RBPD lieutenant; thanked the Mayor, City Council, City Manager, City Attorney, and City management for the opportunity and support; spoke of his family's background in civil service; gave special thanks to Captain Mendence, Kirsten and the whole organization for their support; spoke highly of the City and the organization as a whole.

Mayor Light moved onto the announcements and AB1234 Travel expenses; reported he has a trip next week for the US Mayors' Conference in Washington, DC and will be out of town Tuesday through Friday, spoke to 80 kids at Perras Middle School last Friday, attended the In-N-Out Car Cruise that weekend and the MLK celebration at California Surf Club; reported a meeting he had last week with Cal Cities and noted they would be going to Sacramento to support the City's bill regarding the housing situation; announced the Metro C-line extension meeting would be on Thursday.

Councilmember Obagi announced the joint District 3 and District 4 meeting would take place on Saturday at 9:00 a.m. at the North Redondo Branch Library and BCHD and CEO Tom Bakaly would be joining; spoke about the Metro Board of Directors meeting regarding the final determination of the C-line extension to Torrance and asked for everyone's help to fill the bus that would be taking people to the meeting; stated it would be leaving at 7:20 a.m. from the Redondo Beach Transit Center; stated it would be a great opportunity for the City to get the train down Hawthorne Blvd.; reported that Supervisor Holly Mitchell made a written motion to align the train down Hawthorne Blvd and that is what they have been working towards.

Councilmember Kaluderovic echoed Councilmember Obagi regarding the Metro C-line;

reiterated that it is the deciding day on Thursday and asked that people donate their time to go to that meeting to show support.

Councilmember Castle reported attending the In-N-Out Car Show at Seaside Lagoon and north parking lot down at the Pier; stated it was held by a foundation called Slave to Freedom and Fights Against Addiction and Human Trafficking and it raised over \$600,000; reported attending the MLK celebration at the California Surf Club; gave recognition to the Class of 28 and 29 who did a beach cleanup in celebration of MLK Day; announced he is planning a Pier cleanup for later that spring but the date and time are TBD.

Councilmember Waller reported attending a status meeting on the Avenue A ramp with representatives from LA County, the Mayor, and City Manager last week; stated the schedule of the ramp has not changed but the County promised to try to accelerate it, noted the Coastal Commission and CEQA process may take up to 18 months; mentioned that the Coastal Commission is having the County clean up some work that they had done without permitting; summarized the timeline as entitlements would happen in the spring of 2026, plan check in the summer of 2026, bidding in the winter of 2026, and construction 2027 through 2028; commented that it was 2021 when it was shut down and it has gone very slowly; reported attending the NRBBA mixer last week at Trusted Gut, attended the Clean Power Alliance Board of Directors Meeting last week where they approved an approximate 20% reduction in rates; stated if anyone had any questions they could contact Clean Power Alliance on their website at [cleanpoweralliance.org/contactus](http://cleanpoweralliance.org/contactus); reported attending the Cruise Into Freedom show last week; announced he will be attending the California Cities Mayor and Councilmembers Academy from Wednesday through Friday that week and reported he will have expenses to go along with that; stated he would also be a part of the City's Housing Community and Economic Development Committee to advocate for more local control and help with preventing Builders' Remedy projects and other housing issues.

Mayor Light added along with the meeting with the County they mentioned the poor conditions of the other ramps going down the beach and the County said they have a plan but they have not seen it yet.

## **E. APPROVE ORDER OF AGENDA**

Motion by Councilmember Obagi, seconded by Councilmember Waller, to pull up P.1 for discussion right after Blue Folder Items.

Motion carried 5-0 by voice vote.

## **F. AGENCY RECESS - None**

## **G. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS - ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS**

### **G.1. For Blue Folder Documents Approved at the City Council Meeting**

Laura Diaz reported four Blue Folder items for J.1, N.1, and two items for P.1.

Motion by Councilmember Obagi, seconded by Councilmember Castle, to receive and file the Blue Folder items.

Motion carried 5-0 by voice vote.

**P.1. APPROVE LETTER TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (METRO) REGARDING THE CITY'S SUPPORT OF THE HAWTHORNE ALTERNATIVE FOR THE PROPOSED C LINE EXTENSION TO TORRANCE PROJECT**

**CONTACT:** JOY A. FORD, CITY ATTORNEY

Councilmember Behrendt recused himself from the discussion and deliberations (left the Chambers at 6:50 p.m.)

Councilmember Obagi stated that he and Councilmember Kaluderovic drafted a letter with the help of the City Attorney and outside legal counsel; thanked the City Attorney for making herself available to them; spoke about the importance of Redondo Beach demonstrating that they are against the ROW and are in favor of the Hawthorne alignment and will be strong partners in advancing the Hawthorne option; noted that the Hawthorne option does cost more money and that the letter they crafted shares that the City will help expedite any necessary local approvals required to extend the C-line down Hawthorne Blvd, that the City will work with Caltrans, that they will work with neighboring cities on expediting permits for the Hawthorne Blvd alignment, and they will lobby for funding from the state and other jurisdictions for the C-line extension to be built; stated they have heard concerns from Torrance about business interruption and loss when the constructions is taking place and said they want to express that the City would be willing to provide business interruption funds to cover any losses to businesses during construction; reported that they would be pursuing funds for first and last mile improvements to get people expediently to the stop on Hawthorne Blvd. and Artesia Blvd.; hoped that the rest of the Council, except for Councilmember Behrendt, and the Mayor will sign the letter.

Mayor Light pointed out that, on top of saving the residents from the environmental impacts that they would get from a ROW option, Caltrans' own numbers show that ridership goes up by about a million rides a year by going down Hawthorne Blvd.; noted that this is an investment in infrastructure that will last for multiple generations.

Councilmember Kaluderovic stated there has been talk that they don't want the extension but said it is something they want for the residents and they want it in the right place which is on Hawthorne Blvd.

Councilmember Waller stated at the Clean Power Alliance Board meeting he spoke to

Supervisor Horvath and emphasized to her that when people argue against the ROW they are arguing for Hawthorne and that nobody is opposed to the Metro; stated she understands that they are supportive of the Business Interruption Fund money; reported that he will not be able to attend the Thursday meeting.

Councilmember Obagi added that a Lawndale resident went around and interviewed businesses next to where the Metro stop would be on Hawthorne and reported that resident has gotten the support of several businesses for the Hawthorne alignment; stated that Paint N Pour wrote a letter in favor of the Hawthorne alignment.

Motion by Councilmember Obagi, seconded by Councilmember Kaluderovic, to approve the letter.

Mayor Light invited public comments.

Niki Negrete-Mitchell, District 3, noted that she is a ROW stakeholder and wanted to thank the Council and Mayor for being consistent and having a professional presentation; agreed that businesses at Artesia and Hawthorne will benefit greatly from the Metro stop.

Mickey Johnson, President of NRBBA, voiced her support for the Hawthorne Blvd. alignment; stated it is good for the community and good for the businesses.

Laura Diaz reported no speaker cards, four Zoom attendees but no hands raised, and two eComments both in support for the item.

Motion carried 4-0-1 by voice vote. Councilmember Behrendt recused himself from the discussion and vote.

Councilmember Behrendt returned to the Chambers at 6:58 p.m.

## **H. CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **H.1. APPROVE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE CITY COUNCIL ADJOURNED AND REGULAR MEETING OF JANUARY 20, 2026**

**CONTACT:** ELEANOR MANZANO, CITY CLERK

### **H.2. APPROVE MOTION TO READ BY TITLE ONLY AND WAIVE FURTHER READING OF ALL ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS LISTED ON THE AGENDA**

**CONTACT:** ELEANOR MANZANO, CITY CLERK CONTACT

### **H.3. APPROVE THE FOLLOWING CITY COUNCIL MINUTES: NONE**

**CONTACT: ELEANOR MANZANO, CITY CLERK**

**H.4. PAYROLL DEMANDS**

**CHECKS 30510-30524 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$19,522.52, PD. 1/16/26  
DIRECT DEPOSIT 306125-306744 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,507,684.16, PD.  
1/16/26  
EFT/ACH \$9,785.75, PD. 12/19/25 (PP2526)  
EFT/ACH \$471,969.31, PD. 1/12/26 (PP2526)**

**ACCOUNTS PAYABLE DEMANDS**

**CHECKS 123038-123287 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$3,223,569.19  
REPLACEMENT DEMANDS 123036-123037**

**CONTACT: STEPHANIE MEYER, FINANCE DIRECTOR**

**H.5. RECEIVE AND FILE THE ANNUAL SINGLE AUDIT REPORT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2024**

**CONTACT: STEPHANIE MEYER, FINANCE DIRECTOR**

**H.6. ACCEPT AS COMPLETE THE PORTOFINO WAY SEWER PUMP STATION PROJECT, JOB NO. 50210 AND YACHT CLUB WAY SEWER PUMP STATION PROJECT, JOB NO. 50260, AUTHORIZE THE CITY ENGINEER TO FILE A NOTICE OF COMPLETION FOR THE PROJECTS WITH THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGISTRAR-RECORDER, AND AUTHORIZE THE RELEASE OF RETENTION UPON EXPIRATION OF THE 35-DAY LIEN PERIOD AFTER SAID RECORDATION AND NO CLAIMS BEING FILED ON THE PROJECT AND ACKNOWLEDGE THE ASSESSMENT OF LIQUIDATED DAMAGES FOR 277 DAYS**

**CONTACT: ANDREW WINJE, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR**

**H.7. APPROVE A THREE-YEAR AGREEMENT WITH YUNEX LLC TO PROVIDE TRAFFIC SIGNAL MAINTENANCE SERVICES FOR AN ANNUAL COST OF \$200,612 AND A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$601,836**

**CONTACT: ANDREW WINJE, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR**

**H.8. APPROVE A THREE-YEAR AGREEMENT WITH WGJ ENTERPRISES, INC., DBA PCI STRIPING, TO PROVIDE CITYWIDE STREET STRIPING SERVICES FOR A TOTAL COST NOT TO EXCEED \$700,000**

**CONTACT: ANDREW WINJE, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR**

**H.9. APPROVE A SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE ON-CALL CONSULTING SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH DAVID EVANS AND ASSOCIATES, INC. TO**

**EXTEND THE TERM THROUGH JANUARY 22, 2028 AND INCREASE THE CONTRACT AMOUNT BY \$100,000 FOR A NEW NOT TO EXCEED TOTAL OF \$350,000**

**CONTACT: ANDREW WINJE, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR**

- H.10. REJECT ALL BIDS FOR THE PALLET SHELTER EXPANSION 2025 PROJECT, JOB NO. 2200/2201 AND DIRECT STAFF TO REVISE THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT AND RE-ADVERTISE THE UPDATED CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS**

**CONTACT: ANDREW WINJE, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR**

- H.11. APPROVE A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR TOBACCO GRANT PROGRAM FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$43,872 FOR THE TERM NOVEMBER 21, 2025 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2029 FOR TOBACCO RELATED ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES**

**ADOPT BY TITLE ONLY, RESOLUTION NO. CC-2601-004 A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, TO ACCEPT GRANT FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$43,872 FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL, TOBACCO GRANT PROGRAM, APPROVING THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR THE TOBACCO GRANT PROGRAM, AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY**

**ADOPT BY 4/5THS VOTE AND TITLE ONLY, RESOLUTION NO. CC-2601-005 A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING A FISCAL YEAR 2025-2026 BUDGET MODIFICATION TO APPROPRIATE \$43,872 IN STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TOBACCO GRANT PROGRAM AWARD FUNDS TO THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL GRANTS FUND**

**CONTACT: STEPHEN SPRENGEL, CHIEF OF POLICE**

- H.12. APPROVE THE AGREEMENT WITH ZOLL MEDICAL CORPORATION FOR EXTENDED WARRANTY AND PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE FOR NINE ZOLL X SERIES DEFIBRILLATORS/HEART MONITORS FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$39,528 AND THE TERM FEBRUARY 1, 2026 TO JANUARY 31, 2029**

**CONTACT: PATRICK BUTLER, FIRE CHIEF**

**H.13. APPROVE A SIDE LETTER AGREEMENT AMENDING THE JULY 1, 2024 TO JUNE 30, 2028 MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH AND THE REDONDO BEACH FIREFIGHTERS' ASSOCIATION AMENDING ARTICLE XI AND ADDING SECTION 25, TITLED STRIKE TEAM DEPLOYMENTS**

**CONTACT:** DIANE STRICKFADEN, DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES

**H.14. APPROVE LEASES AND ADDENDUMS FOR FIVE (5) SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY UNITS TO SERVE AS BRIDGE HOUSING FOR PEOPLE EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS FROM THE BEACH CITIES FOR THE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$27,321.25 FOR THE TERM OF FEBRUARY 1, 2026 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2026 LOCATED AT 126 WEST D STREET, WILMINGTON, CALIFORNIA 90744 BETWEEN THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH AND SWAMI INTERNATIONAL APPROVE AMENDMENT FOR THIRTEEN (13) LEASES, A LEASE SWAP FOR UNIT 17 TO UNIT 23 ALONG WITH A MUTUAL RESCISSION AND RELEASE AGREEMENT FOR UNIT 17**

**CONTACT:** JOY A. FORD, CITY ATTORNEY  
STEPHANIE JOHNSON, QUALITY OF LIFE PROSECUTOR

**H.15. RECEIVE AND FILE THE MONTHLY UPDATE TO THE STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVES ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON JUNE 10, 2025**

**CONTACT:** LUKE SMUDE, ASSISTANT TO THE CITY MANAGER

Motion by Councilmember Castle, seconded by Councilmember Waller, to approve items H.1 through H.15 on the Consent Calendar.

Mayor Light invited public comments.

Jim Mueller, regarding H.9, stated the contract with Evans is an on-call contract that was initiated in 2024 and being extended until 2028; voiced his concern about the Consent Calendar often being used to get Council to authorize multi-year extensions of sole sourced contracts and for large amounts with very little questioning; stated a survey of local economy reveals many civil engineering firms capable of doing the work Evans is doing and finds no justification for refraining from a new RFP for the services; noted that the Budget & Finance Commission is in the middle of an investigation of change orders on CIP contracts since there seem to be consistent overruns and the use of the Consent Calendar to extend sole source contracts is worth a close look as are all the procurement procedures; asked the Council to reject this Consent Calendar item and direct staff to initiate an RFP for the services.

Laura Diaz reported four Zoom attendees, but no hands raised and two eComments: one opposed on H.8 and one opposed on H.9.

Motion carried 5-0 by voice vote.

Laura Diaz read H.11 adopt by title only Resolution No. CC-2601-004, and adopt by 4/5ths vote and title only Resolution No. CC-2601-005

**I. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS - None**

**J. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

**J.1. For eComments and Emails Received from the Public**

Eugene Solomon spoke about a recent referral to staff, to place as a Charter amendment on the ballot term limit, increases for members of the Council; stated that in recent history that idea was very unpopular and stated in 2014, Measures BE and CM were both proposed amendments to increase term limits for members of the Council, the Mayor, and the School District; reported that Measure CM was defeated 66.67% to 33% and Measure BE was defeated 64% to 35%; noted that it was discussed by the Charter Review Committee and not forwarded to the Council for action; encouraged everyone to go to the January 2024 meeting where the previous City Attorney, Mike Webb, explained the unpopularity of the idea; questioned why, at a time when the City is experiencing fiscal restraints and have other items with greater priority, would the City put it on the agenda for June; noted that several Councilmembers such as Behrendt, Waller, and Castle have served on the School Board/District and Budget and Finance Commission and Mayor Light served on the Planning Commission, the Harbor Commission and in the GPAC; opined that eight years should be enough time to get their priorities done; read a quote from former Redondo Beach Mayor, Steve Aspel, that said once someone is Mayor for life it stifles new ideas and stifles young people; stated he doesn't think it is a good idea to extend term limits or put it on the ballot.

Maria Larisa Yasol asked the Council to consider the established historic landmark principles used by coastal cities throughout California in regards to the King Harbor entrance sign; stated other coastal cities prioritize preserving character defining features of historic gateways; reported Carmel intentionally avoids modern logos and standardized branding on historic structures in order to protect authenticity and sense of place; stated the King Harbor sign is passed under by neighboring cities as part of their shared coastal history and will sense the loss if its historic character is altered; opined that the sign can be rehabilitated instead of redesigned; urged the Council to treat the King Harbor sign as a historic public asset and preserve its original character.

Jim Mueller provided a status update on the Farmers' Market committee; thanked the Mayor for his support and reference to sponsoring organizations; noted that the committee is putting together their sponsoring levels and that public support is very strong; reported that they have over 1400 signatures on their petition and two interested sponsors.

Dr. Andy Lesser, resident and neighborhood watch block captain, stated earlier that day,

a cement truck spilled cement on Pearl St. while working on a job site on Gertruda Ave.; he said he spoke to a person at the job site that acknowledged the spill but didn't send someone immediately over to clean it so he called Public Works and Public Works sent someone over immediately; thanked Public Works for their quick response to the incident; spoke of another incident that happened on Wednesday evening where he witnessed a person driving suspiciously, he called 911 and told the dispatch what he was witnessing, and stated dispatch handled the situation very well and the person was soon pulled over, handcuffed, and taken away for a DUI; spoke of the choices for police chief, noted how difficult the choice was, and gave kudos to the City Council and City Manager for their choice in Steve Sprengel.

Niki Negrete-Mitchell, District 3, referenced the motion by Supervisor Mitchell, Tim Sandoval, and Jackie Dupont-Walker; stated how amazing it was that they have been heard; reported that she received an action alert: Stand up Thursday to support the Hawthorne Blvd alignment; read the message from the action alert; stated that she is blown away that they were actually listening and urged everyone to show up to the Transit Center on Kingsdale on Thursday, January 22<sup>nd</sup> at 7:20 a.m.

Desiree Galassi asked the Council to reconsider the action they have taken to replace the character defining features of the King Harbor sign; stated that, in the Preservation Program for Landmark Properties, the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation requires that elements deteriorated beyond repair must be replaced like for like in color, materials, and design; recalled, in the two times it has been replaced, that a similar preservation process was followed and appears as an intentional act to preserve the original interpretation of the sign; stated if they consider the standard regarding acquired history the current image is undeniably historic; questioned the Council's decision to pursue landmark designation after the fact instead of now and since they would have to submit historical photos of the sign later; stated that the argument for replacing the image with a graphic rather than something that closely resembles the original 1967 sign's image is weak; voiced her concern that the sign will be denied for landmark designation if the City strips the sign of character defining features and would lose the ability to qualify for grants and revenue generating potential of a landmark; asked that one of the Councilmembers consider rescinding the prior motion so that the discussion on how best to save the historic resource can be continued.

Montserrat Ruiz Salvat, 15 year resident, explained that parking between the Esplanade on Catalina all the way down to Nob Hill has become increasingly difficult to find parking when they get home; asked if there is any way to establish 2-hour parking, except for residents, on the Esplanade; stated another problem for her neighborhood is the noise level; spoke of the gunfire like sounds coming from tailpipes and that enforcement of the decibel slots is not being enforced; voiced her concern over her husband's heart condition and that of other elderly residents on Esplanade; wondered what enforcement could be done or what the City could do for the residents of that area.

Mickey Johnson, President of NRBBA, announced that it is the 44<sup>th</sup> year for Springfest and that this year they would be launching a pilot program that integrates high school

students in the planning and execution of the event; reported that the idea came from Robin Garfield who runs Springfest and his goal is to create a Springfest internship where students could earn community service hours, learn real world skills, and strengthen their resumes and college applications; provided some background into the idea, noting that Robin Garfield and RUHS teacher Mr. Soo Hoo partnered together to make it into a full-graded classroom experience involving 175 students; reported that NRBBA members mentored and coached the students in the classrooms, had them present their ideas “Shark Tank” style, and will be implementing the strongest concepts during Springfest in April; stated that Lawndale HS students will also receive credit for their participation on the BeachLife entertainment stage; reported that the NRBBA currently has 19 student interns from RUHS, Mira Costa, Bishop Montgomery, and Lawndale HS and thanked Robin Garfield for her leadership in making it all happen.

Wayne Craig, District 1, referenced his brother’s history on the Council for the city of Torrance and his help as an advisory for transportation issues in the early 90’s; reported that his brother told him they had looked at the ROW and Hawthorne rail line options back then and concluded that the Hawthorne route was the best location; suggested that the Council mention this to their fellow elected and hoped that they could get it approved.

Paul Moses reported he had a receive and file.

Motion by Councilmember Waller, seconded by Councilmember Kaluderovic, to receive and file.

Motion carried 5-0 by voice vote.

Paul Moses, District 2, stated that the City undertook a discretionary action when it voted to approve the final design of the King Harbor Gateway sign replacement project; reported that it triggered the California Environmental Quality Act but there is no evidence in the record that the City conducted any environmental review or preliminary review for the project as required by CEQA guidelines Section 15060; stated there was no discussion of CEQA in the Staff Report or any corresponding documents uploaded to the City’s website for the hearings conducted on November 4<sup>th</sup> and December 9<sup>th</sup> and the City has not prepared or filed a Notice of Exemption for the project; stated the project is not subject to the Common Sense Exemption since it cannot be seen with certainty that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment and provided the definition of substantive adverse change as defined by CEQA; reported that the City is subject to litigation exposure if it does not rescind its action and comply with CEQA.

Darryl Boyd (via Zoom), District 3, asked if fireworks were still illegal for Redondo Beach residents; referenced a non-resident, business owner’s New Year’s Eve fireworks celebration that occurred in the Marina and questioned how that was allowed to take place; asked the Mayor if he spoke to LA County regarding the decibel levels and enforcement at Dominguez Park, stated it is similar to the situation of the 500 to 600 North Prospect Ave area.

Nancy Skiba (via Zoom), District 4, congratulated and thanked Jim Mueller and his group for their work in bringing the farmers' market to North Redondo and the Artesia area; thanked the Mayor and Council for their assistance as well; voiced her support for more classic car shows and cruises in Redondo Beach.

Laura Diaz reported no one else online and no eComments.

**K. EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS – None**

**L. PUBLIC HEARINGS - None**

**M. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS - None**

**N. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION**

**N.1. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE GENERAL PLAN-LAND USE ELEMENT UPDATE WITH A FOCUS ON THE BUILDING INTENSITY (FLOOR AREA RATIO) LIMITS FOR THE PUBLIC/INSTITUTIONAL (PI) AND “OTHER” NON-RESIDENTIAL GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATIONS**

**CONTACT: MARC WIENER, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR**

Community Development Director Marc Wiener provided some background on the item; stated that they are in their final stages to adopt the General Plan Land Use Element; noted they had broken up larger topics into separate individual discussion items and reported they had discussed historic preservation a few weeks ago and prior to that Artesia and Aviation; stated that evening's discussion would be the land use element but focused on the FAR allowances that are identified within the elements and some of the land use designations; turned the presentation over to Planning Manager Sean Scully.

Planning Manager Scully noted that they started working on the General Plan update in 2016 for the land use element, open space and conservation element, safety element, and noise element; stated that, on May 18, 2021, the City Council met to discuss land use and FAR designations for all the properties within the City or all the different land uses and directed FAR to be set at 0.75 for all PI sites including BCHD and 1.25 for City Hall and the Annex; stated in October 2024 staff presented to the City Council the land use element and in November 2024 it was determined to bifurcate the land use element update and move ahead with the housing element implementation; reported that those items were adopted and the EIR was certified; showed a map that featured all the residential changes that were made as part of the housing element implementation; stated that the land use element contains all the policies for land use decisions, sets all the FAR allowances for all the land use designations in the City; reported that all the proposed FAR change areas that evening are for all the PI land use designations and other non-residential special policy areas: AACAP area, industrial areas north of Manhattan Beach Blvd (I-1 and I-3 designated properties), the larger commercial shopping centers along PCH, and all the PI properties Citywide; reported that the AACAP

areas are going from 0.6 to 1.5, both the SPA 5a and 5b are going from 0.5 to 1.0, the Industrial I-1 and I-3 are going from 0.7 to 1.0; stated that currently the General Plan does not have a FAR designation for the PI designation and state law requires every General Plan land use designation to identify either its residential density or its building intensity for non-residential; reported that even though the General Plan doesn't have an FAR some of the City's zoning designations for the PI designations have a FAR; noted the City Hall property has an FAR of 1.25, the public ROW has 0.1 and the P-PRO has 0.25; reported that all the other PI zones do not have an identified FAR.

Community Development Director Wiener clarified that the slide for public zones that have a FAR cap is in the City's zoning code/municipal code but not currently identified in the General Plan.

Planning Manager Scully provided a map of the City showing all the PI designations and reported that the majority of them do not have an FAR and they are proposed to be changed to either a 0.75 or 1.25 FAR.

Some discussion regarding the Kensington property followed.

Planning Manager Scully provided a comparative analysis slide of existing versus proposed and noted that it is in their Administrative Report; provided a separate slide with the breakdown of the current existing conditions on the BCHD property which is 0.58 FAR, 432,000 sq. ft. and the existing building floor area is about 250,000 sq. ft.; stated that Council, as part of the certification of the EIR, directed staff to conduct an additional analysis to see if any additional FAR could be accommodated at the BCHD site; reported that an addendum was certified on December 3, 2024 that studies up to a 1.25 FAR; noted the recommendation is to set the FAR for BCHD property between a 1.0 and 1.25.

Councilmember Obagi commented that December 3, 2024 Staff Report stated City Council adopted an addendum to the final PEIR that approves an option of but does not commit the City to approving up to a 1.25 FAR cap; asked if there was a way to establish a maximum FAR of 1.0 with the ability to go to 1.25 subject to approval by the Planning Commission or design review so they can control the sizing scale to the surrounding neighborhood.

Discussion followed.

Community Development Director Wiener said it could work if the General Plan established the max at 1.25 and set the baseline zoning code at 1.0 and the additional 0.25 would be discretionary and subject to certain standards.

Councilmember Castle asked, for example, if someone came to the City asking for a variance to the zoning from 0.75 to 1.25 would that be possible.

Community Development Director Wiener said with the framework he just mentioned it would not be a variance, it would be an allowance subject to certain criteria or standards;

stated a variance, which is a deviation from the zoning allowance, would not be issued for additional square footage for a building but to get relief from setbacks or some other development standard that poses a challenge.

Planning Manager Scully stated the Planning Commission's recommendations concerning the PI land use designation are:

- Amend the FAR for the PI land uses from 0.75 to 0.5 for all properties except:
  - o City Hall, the Annex site, all City Fire and Police station properties (which would have a FAR of 1.25).
- Eliminate the proposed Public/Utility (U) land use designation for the AES and SCE transmission tower corridor properties and maintain the existing land use designation of "P" Public or Institutional for those properties.
- Amend the land use designation from "OS" (Parks and Open Space) to "PI" (Public/Institutional) at the School District owned properties identified as: 1) Lincoln Elementary School fields and blacktop area, 2) Alta Vista Elementary School fields, and 3) the former Franklin School site

Councilmember Behrendt asked if used under the Surplus Land Act with the construction on those lands would they be allowed to have the higher FAR.

Planning Manager Scully said they would change from an OS designation to the PI designation which, as proposed, be 0.75.

Councilmember Behrendt asked with the .75, if the property ever converted under the Surplus Lands Act, would that subsequent development on that land be able to avail itself of the 0.75 FAR.

Planning Manager Scully responded that they would but through the process and amendment to the land use designation it could change the density or intensity of the building; confirmed, as it stands with the PI proposed designation, they would have a 0.75 FAR.

Councilmember Behrendt noted it seems more in character for parks and open space to stay as such and if so, asked if it would maintain a 0.2 FAR.

Planning Manager Scully stated he was correct.

Community Development Director Wiener added that the recommendations were originally recommended from staff to the Planning Commission; stated the reason for the first one is because the AES site is in flux, staff conferred with the City Attorney and felt it would be best to just retain the current designation for that site.

Discussion followed with Councilmember Obagi asking if the designation would be U, City Manager Witzansky stating it would remain unchanged, and Community Development Director Wiener clarifying that it would remain as P and not changed to U.

Community Development Director Wiener stated school sites are currently designated PI, which only allow school and government type activities; spoke of the concerns raised by the school, regarding their ability under the open space designation, to be able to construct new facilities or build things that would serve the school, reported that the City investigated the issue and pursuant to state law the schools would trump local zoning as it pertains to education; stated it may have to go through a rezoning process because it is affected by state laws such as the Surplus Land Act and others.

City Manager Witzansky added that a rezoning would likely ensue Article 27 vote; stated if the PI zone remains, and the School District declared a particular site surplus and proceeded with a Kensington type project, it would follow an Article 27 vote on the specific nature of the project which would likely include a zoning and other density changes; stated they don't see the PI zone necessarily allowing for housing or some other alternative use so they don't think that caps placed on that PI would be relevant.

Councilmember Behrendt asked Director Wiener if the School District has indicated that they don't think they are subject to the FARs.

Community Development Director Wiener stated they have requested that the designation be maintained as PI because what is proposed in the draft land use element is to convert the designation of those properties to open space; added that the School District's concern is if it is changed it would limit their ability to expand the school or build new facilities.

City Manager Witzansky clarified that staff's recommendation is to maintain the designation of PI in the school zone areas.

More discussion followed regarding the cap. City Manager Witzansky stated that regardless of the designation the FAR cap will not apply in the event that a school-related facility is built.

Mayor Light commented that if the School District ever came up with something the City could switch it back.

More discussion followed. City Manager Witzansky pulled up the map so they could be specific on where the OS would apply.

Planning Manager Scully pulled up the map and pointed out the location of the Alta Vista playgrounds and fields; noted that it is not the school facility site but it is owned by the School District, and the City is proposing it have a PI designation similar to what the school facilities would have next door.

Councilmember Behrendt voiced his concern about converting field space for recreational activity into something other than open space; stated that he felt that they have an obligation to protect the residents who are their constituents.

Community Development Director Wiener stated staff can provide follow up analysis on it at the next discussion of the land use element and provide statutes that allow the school to override zonings.

Councilmember Behrendt felt that would be helpful.

More discussion followed regarding the map and if it each area in question could be blown up for the next discussion.

Councilmember Obagi pointed out that the City is at a deficit for open space and that the School District can do what they want on their property regardless of the changes because they are regulated by state law, questioned why the School District would want the City to convert it to PI rather than preserve it as open space.

City Manager Witzansky stated it is to avoid it going to exclusive designation as open space.

Councilmember Obagi asked why they would want to keep it as PI and not have it converted to open space when it doesn't apply to them.

Community Development Director Wiener stated that the School District has expressed concern about it and that it is not consistent with what is in the General Plan; suggested they table the item and come back with more information.

Mayor Light stated some of the confusion is that the zoning map does not match the General Plan map and even if they did what was being proposed the maps won't match.

Community Development Director Wiener reported that there are two maps, one for the General Plan and the actual zoning map; stated most of the sites are in harmony but there are some that conflict; said if the Council wishes staff could bring the zoning map with the land use map to take a look at the discrepancies.

Mayor Light said the confusion is that they are now introducing OS in the General Plan where it was just formerly PI and wondered how they overlay that.

Planning Manager Scully stated the intent was to create a General Plan designation that better matched what the zoning designation was.

More discussion followed.

Councilmember Obagi asked how often the General Plan is required to be updated.

Community Development Director Wiener reported that there is no statutory requirement for the land use element but that it is recommended that the General Plan be updated every 20 years; stated that the housing element is the only one that has a statutory requirement of every eight years.

Councilmember Obagi commented that they need to think about what the state is doing with the cities and what they are doing to the density that is being added to the cities and how that will impact what institutions they will need to account for all the new residents who will be coming in against their will.

Planning Manager Scully went back to the presentation and presented the rest of the Planning Commission's recommendations on other non-residential land use designations:

- Amend the FAR for the C-4 designated properties along PCH from 1.0 to 0.5 and develop a comprehensive plan for the PCH corridor.
- Within the Mixed-Use zoning district for projects including both commercial and residential uses amend the proposed minimum commercial FAR from 0.35 to 0.4.

Planning Manager Scully presented the major changes in allowable land use regarding Article 27; listed the proposed FAR amendments that were before the Council that evening that require an Article 27 vote, which are:

- The increase from 0.6 to 1/5 in the AACAP
- The increase from 0.7 to 1.0 in the I-1 and I-3 designations north of Manhattan Beach Blvd.
- The change from C-2 to C-4 within the PCH North and Central SPAs
- The identification of a FAR of 0.75 or 1.25 for the proposed PI locations
- All other changes proposed are classified as a "Minor Change in Allowable Land Use" which are not subject to a vote.

Councilmember Behrendt asked Planning Manager Scully to explain how they came up with the 1.0 for the tech district.

Planning Manager Scully responded that in 2021 Council had identified an intention to allow for increased development intensity for the Northrop Grumman area in the industrial areas for potential job growth and to ensure that there was opportunity to expand the industries in that area.

More discussion followed regarding if 1.0 was adequate to allow for growth.

Councilmember Kaluderovic stated before they put it on the ballot some outreach should be done.

City Manager Witzansky cautioned that doing anything beyond one, they would have to study which would be an 18-month effort; recommended they proceed with the one and then come back with subsequent action later at another date.

Mayor Light disagreed with the last bullet point regarding the minor change in allowable land use are not subject to a vote; reported that he and Bill Brand authored it and when they wrote it put a cumulative impacts clause that says that when you bundle the minor

changes with all other changes that have occurred over the last five years that it has to be treated as a major change in land use if it triggers an increase; noted that it is based off “as built” not what it was zoned for and since they are proposing all of it in parallel they are cumulative impacts and they all need to be included in the vote.

Planning Manager Scully did not disagree but stated the changes that they are discussing that are not listed are all name changes and the FAR are exactly the same.

Mayor Light asked that the changes mentioned are not substantive to the General Plan or the underlying zoning.

Planning Manager Scully responded that was correct.

Mayor Light asked if they could see all the other changes, but he didn’t mean that evening.

Planning Manager Scully said yes, they could itemize those.

Community Development Director Wiener wanted to note on the fourth bullet that they did the addendum to the EIR that only studied up to 1.25 at the BCHD property; stated the rest of the PI, that were set at 0.75 in the original land use element draft, would be capped at 0.75 unless they update the EIR.

More discussion followed.

Councilmember Castle noted the study they did on BCHD was up to 1.25 but asked what the Planning Commission recommended.

Community Development Director Wiener reported they recommended 0.5.

Mayor Light commented that would be less than what is there today.

City Manager Witzansky stated they would not suggest the Planning Commission’s recommendation for that reason.

Councilmember Obagi asked if Fire Station 2 is part of the 0.75 PI.

City Manager Witzansky stated that they feel they have adequate coverage at 0.75 at the two Fire Station locations and referenced the table on the slide.

Discussion followed.

Planning Manager Scully provided a slide mapping all the locations of the major changes in allowable land use which included all the C-N in the AACAP area, the C-4 along PCH and the industrial locations north of Manhattan Beach Blvd and the PI; stated staff recommendations for Council action as:

- Set the FAR cap for PI Zones and the BCHD site
- Set the FAR cap for the I-1 and I-3 designations north of Manhattan Beach Blvd.
- Change from C-2 to C-4 within the PCH North and Central special Policy Areas
- Maintain the existing land use designation of “P” Public or Institutional for the AES and SCE transmission tower and amend the land use designation from “OS” to “PI” at the School District owned properties

Mayor Light asked what the build out FAR is for the School District sites; wondered if the recommendation for the 0.75 is for consistency or because of what was discussed in 2021.

Planning Manager Scully stated it is for consistency.

Mayor Light commented that is a lot of growth and if they put 0.75 across all school property that would be the biggest impact on everything since they are down between 0.2 to 0.3.

Councilmember Behrendt said if they put open space at 0.2 that would be consistent with what it is now.

Planning Manager Scully continued with staff’s recommendations to provide direction on the two Article 27 vote options:

- Option 1: Adopt LUE update and conduct a special election in late summer 2026
- Option 2: Bifurcate LUE update. Council approves AACAP FAR on March 3<sup>rd</sup> for a special election in June 2026. Council approves the balance of LUE FAR changes in late summer 2026.

Note: Option 2 would come at an additional election expense of approximately \$300,000 but would allow for an expedited implementation of the AACAP.

City Manager Witzansky added staff knows how important it is to get the AACAP done and they teed up Fehr & Peers to potentially conduct the Article 27 related analysis that would be necessary for them to accelerate and host the election in June but stated the City can’t afford two elections right now; reported that \$280,000 has been set aside for a single City run special election which they can conduct this summer, for them to consolidate the election into June with the County would be \$307,000 and they would still be subject to the secondary actions on the remainder of the General Plan elements (two elections); voiced his concern over the inability to fund two elections and, therefore, bifurcate the two actions.

Mayor Light asked if the cost included the publication of the Measure DD, Article 27 data for two elections versus one.

City Manager Witzansky stated there would be some additional incremental costs to study it separately.

More discussion followed regarding having to publish two separate publications and having two separate Article 27 analyzes, the confusion it would cause to the public having two elections, and AACAP and budgetary considerations and constraints.

Councilmember Behrendt asked the approximate incremental increase would be to having two Article 27 analyzes if they bifurcate out the AACAP.

Community Development Director Wiener stated it would be an additional \$20,000 to \$30,000.

Councilmember Behrendt commented that there seems to be two reasons why they would not bifurcate AACAP for June election: 1) the City does not have the funding set aside for it and it makes sense to consolidate and do all the Article 27 at a later date such as August, and 2) there has to be an Article 27 analysis and workup for AACAP and Director Wiener is involved.

City Manager Witzansky clarified that staff is very involved in helping Fehr & Peers and Placeworks as well; stated it is an intensive effort.

Councilmember Behrendt spoke of wanting the AACAP but not wanting to rush it and the likelihood of having a June election being unlikely; asked that if there was any feasible way to make it all happen fiscally could they proceed.

City Manager Witzansky explained what would need to happen and the steps that would need to follow; noted that the analysis would have to drop effectively on February 1<sup>st</sup>.

Councilmember Behrendt stated based on staff's recommendation and everything he has heard a June election would be difficult.

Mayor Light added that Fehr & Peers felt a vehicle miles traveled analysis would need to be done, which is a CEQA requirement.

City Manager Witzansky stated he has learned that the VMT analysis calls for an intensive AI based model to be done which takes about six weeks for the data to come out.

More discussion followed. City Manager Witzansky stated staff feel better about a summer Article 27 exclusive discussion election.

Councilmember Castle referenced the two different recommendations made by the Planning Commission and staff regarding the BCHD FAR; reported he is receiving numerous concerns from residents that live near the hospital about the scale of the proposed projects; asked how staff got to 1.0 to 1.25.

Community Development Director Wiener responded that the FAR limit is to accommodate the project that BCHD is currently working on.

City Manager Witzansky added that they wanted to make sure they are incentivizing revitalization and reinvestment; noted that they are sensitive to the concerns of the community but that the concerns are best addressed through the design review process for each application; compared the logic to the AACAP and stated BCHD is also trying to revitalize the area; stated if they were to artificially lower the FAR cap it would be a big challenge for BCHD.

Councilmember Waller referred back to the FARs for the school sites and stated he found 0.21 to 0.35; stated he felt it made sense to retain the "P" on AES and whatever is chosen for BCHD should be uniform for the other PI type places; commented that since a study was not done for anything larger than 0.75 that is an issue and an added cost; commented that BCHD has been a good partner to the schools and seniors and have facilities that promote healthy living so giving them extra square footage with a higher FAR makes sense to him.

Councilmember Behrendt noted that people still have an opportunity to vote on it through Article 27.

City Manager Witzansky added that there will be several ballot measure questions associated with Article 27 action.

Mayor Light referred back to the square footage table for PI zones and more discussion followed regarding underlying zoning and General Plan zoning; disagreed with all PIs needing to be the same.

City Manager Witzansky commented that the Civic Center is a unique apparatus and it is fair to isolate and treat the zoning and caps differently than other sites since it serves multiple functions.

Mayor Light noticed Planning Commission members in the audience and asked if any of them would feel comfortable representing the Planning Commission and provide input on the discussion.

Wayne Craig and another member of the Planning Commission came forward.

Shiela Lamb stated the Commission's perspective was that the existing square footage is adequate for the property that is there regardless of if it was the school or BCHD; added that they did not think there is a need to increase the intensity and that projections for growth for the School District is low; stated they were also concerned about the open space and they didn't want to jeopardize the spaces that are being used for sports.

Wayne Craig stated BCHD is at 0.58 and could go larger if they wanted to and the School District could as well; said the Commission wanted to ensure that the public had a say in trying to preserve open space; pointed out that BCHD and the School District could both apply for a larger project, it just needs to go through the proper review process and public hearing.

Mayor Light asked the two Planning Commissioners, after hearing the City staff's rationale on why they don't want to change the site, were they okay with it from a personal standpoint and not speaking on behalf of the whole Commission.

Wayne Craig said the Planning Commission did not look at it because it wouldn't be in play for a long time and it is still in litigation and zoned for parkland with power generation.

Shiela Lamb added that they were discouraged from looking at it.

Mayor Light asked the Commissioners if they felt that Alta Vista should be zoned to the PI.

Wayne Craig explained that there was some property on the map that was incorrectly categorized as open field but belonged to the school and that was why they were changing the designation; recalled it was at Anderson Park and the map put it as part of the City but it was School District property so they changed it.

Mayor Light commented that it was more surgical in nature than what is being discussed that evening.

Shiela Lamb commented that the recommendation by City staff to go with the PI was a quandary to the Commission and they were conflicted because the parks and open space are precious and they didn't want to see them decreased; noted that Redondo Beach is park poor and as the state increases the City's density it is going to get smaller; felt it is important when they have the opportunity to preserve spaces that they do that.

Councilmember Waller commented on the former Franklin Park site being half the Friendship Foundation and half being a park; asked the Commissioners if they were looking at the whole site being open space or parts of it.

Wayne Craig stated it was parts of it and stated back in 2024, they were specifically talking about Anderson Park because there was a park, open field, and a school and that the map had it reversed; provided more explanation and details regarding what was on the map and the discussion they had regarding the sites.

Councilmember Waller stated that staff need to fix some of the school maps; explained that the point of his question was to make sure the Commissioners were talking about the open space of the schools and not the school properties.

City Manager Witzansky felt they should bring the item back with more detailed maps so they can go through what is currently designated, what was conceptualized and proposed, and what is being recommended; stated at the time request was made by the District, they were in the environmental review stage and there were questions about fairness in zoning designations, consistency, and other elements that had been presented; noted that it hadn't been revisited since then and the next Staff Report can include it and they can have a more specific idea of each of the locations.

Mayor Light asked if staff could bring back the underlying zoning.

Councilmember Obagi asked if Mr. Bakaly could speak about the current plan for BCHD and his thoughts on the FAR limit.

Tom Bakaly, BCHD, reported BCHD have selected Continental Development and Mar Ventures as their preferred developer; noted they have proposed something consistent with the EIR and it is under the 1.25 FAR, which was a stipulation in their RFP; stated they have the higher FAR of the three proposals but they provide more community benefit and that is the trade-off; commented that they are struggling with treating square footage as an intensity of use and that all square foot is not created equal; explained that some have more intensity of use and impacts than others and they are going from a medical office building use (high traffic, high impacts) to a residential care for the elderly (low impacts) and that requires more square footage; asked Council, when they look at the current proposal with the higher FAR, that they consider how much it provides: more community benefits, more opportunity for BCHD to deliver wellness programs, health programs, and will create a better campus.

Councilmember Obagi asked what their proposed FAR is for the project.

Tom Bakaly responded that it is approximately 1.0 or slightly under 1.0, which was publicly disclosed; stated that they would like a uniform 1.25 FAR but would expand on that when he makes his comments later.

Mayor Light asked if they had a proposed different measure of intensity than FAR.

Tom Bakaly stated they did suggest, in a letter that was sent to him, that could be covered by height or something that gives a little more room to move; commented that the City is struggling because they are hard coding these things into their General Plan that require a vote; argued that if they went with more general parameters and used what has been working which is a CUP for BCHD that would be great; noted that schools are not subject to a CUP and that is why they have a disparity; suggested the City could do something with height or coverage because currently there is no FAR cap on the BCHD property and the City could come in with some general parameters and address the issue of impacts through the CUP process.

Councilmember Obagi spoke of his experience at BCHD when attending his daughter's pediatric appointments; noted that there are several patient rooms at the site, and with many parents doing the same thing, there are many cars going in and out of the facility daily; stated if that is converted to an elderly care facility he can't imagine the elderly residents generating as much traffic as the current medical uses; stated he is highly sensitive to the concerns people have regarding the potential size and massing on the property to the extent of it becoming very tall.

Mayor Light asked the City Manager to clarify what they are asking from Council that

evening.

City Manager Witzansky stated that is a very fundamental decision, but staff is also looking for direction on the matters as Council is prepared to give, noted that they can come back and continue the discussion if they take the non-bifurcated route.

Mayor Light asked if they could do it in multiple motions.

City Manager Witzansky responded that Council could do that.

Discussion followed regarding the cost of the elections, if a special election is done in the fall or if they wait for the November statewide election, which would be a cost savings of about \$50,000, and on the content of their motions but specifically regarding Article 27.

City Manager Witzansky explained the key for staff is to do the singular election for Article 27 and they need direction on all the major change items; noted the longer it takes staff to get that direction, the longer it takes them to do the analysis.

Councilmember Behrendt asked the City Clerk and City Attorney if Council is able to separate out the individual questions on each of the items; stated there are a lot of different issues, and it would seem to make sense to separate questions on the ballot if permissible.

City Manager Witzansky stated the preliminary response is yes they can; reported that when Council initially gave him the estimates it was up to five ballot measure related questions at the \$280,000 City run election.

City Clerk Manzano concurred.

Mayor Light added as long as the five are capped by the DD analysis.

Mayor Light asked what Council thought of the FAR cap for PI zones.

Councilmember Behrendt suggested putting it at a range of 1.0 to 1.25 for the BCHD site and then letting the voters ultimately decide on it.

Councilmember Obagi asked Mr. Bakaly to come up to answer another question; asked when Mr. Bakaly stated his partner proposed 1.0 for the project are they taking into consideration the floor area of the other buildings that are not affected by the change or is it for the whole property and reconstruction of the whole property.

Tom Bakaly stated 1.0 is for the entire campus but they are requesting a uniform 1.25 to be consistent with the other large property in the City for a lot of the reasons that staff cited that evening and would give them flexibility to address the health needs in the future.

Councilmember Obagi asked staff if they could pair a 1.25 FAR with zoning limitations on

intensity and design review, Planning Commission review, etc. and when it goes to a vote of the residents would it be a 1.25 or a 1.25 subject to the zoning limitations.

Community Development Director Wiener deferred the second question to the City Attorney and City Clerk; answered the first question that they could have a cap of 1.25 in the General Plan, adopt zoning standards that require the project meet certain criteria in terms of setback, neighborhood impacts, etc. to address the additional massing and there could be a reference in the General Plan to codify it; explained further that the City could adopt a zoning ordinance in the General Plan that states they can achieve up to 1.25 depending on how it is couched on the election.

City Attorney Ford stated it depends on what Council's intent is on what they are trying to accomplish and she would have to take a look at everything together to make the determination.

More discussion followed regarding what Council is trying to accomplish.

Community Development Director Wiener offered a suggestion; noted that the zoning ordinances are subject to Article 27 as well, so they could adopt a zoning ordinance that would also be wrapped into it; referenced what they are doing for the AACAP and how the Council reviewed the development standards for the AACAP and stated they could do the same for the BCHD property so it's not just a blanket 1.25 but would include development standards that go with it.

Councilmember Obagi supported that suggestion.

City Manager Witzansky stated that they reviewed the letter and took it under advisement; felt under the law they could adopt a similar approach but FAR cap is how they have studied the issue, how they conducted the environmental, how they have traditionally set standards and cap standards in the City's General Plan and zoning code; stated to deviate from that wouldn't work on the whole but identifying development standards that might help mitigate impact and concerns could be brought to Council as part of a zoning ordinance consideration.

Councilmember Behrendt noted that BCHD is in District 3 adjacent to District 2 and he would like to hear from those Councilmembers.

Councilmember Kaluderovic stated, from her understanding, the proposal is listing it as 1.25 in the General Plan with development standards through a zoning ordinance and wrapped into one question for the residents would be a good compromise; added that it would give the residents security of the intensity and give the City tools to hear from residents and respond as needed.

City Manager Witzansky commented that he likes the idea from a policy standpoint but warned Council, given their direction, that it would take some to draft the ordinance due to the level of work that would be needed to construct it; stated he felt it is worthwhile.

More discussion followed to clarify the direction.

Community Development Director Wiener stated his thought was that the 1.0 would be by right but discretionary and anything above the 1.0 would be subject to stricter criteria if they look to exceed that floor area and any future project at the site; commented that they could also proceed the way the City Manager recommended or explore various options.

Councilmember Castle stated under the current plans they are under the 1.0 threshold, and it is similar to what Director Wiener said making the extra 2.5 almost like a bonus if they meet certain thresholds and have 1.0 as of right so that way it protects them and gives them some options down the road; supported that approach.

City Manager Witzansky clarified that they don't want to set minimums for FAR just maximums on the builds; stated if they go down that route staff will do more research on options.

Mayor Light confirmed that Council agreed on 1.25 for City Hall and the Annex and asked for input on the school properties and everything else.

Councilmember Kaluderovic wanted clarification that it is irrelevant for them to set a FAR for the school properties since the state is the governing body for it.

City Manager Witzansky stated as it relates to school related development, but where it wouldn't is if the school decided to build something under the PI zone or the open space designation and that is where the cap would apply.

More discussion followed.

Mayor Light cautioned, if it is with the housing mandates, the FAR today does matter because that's the point of departure for the bonuses.

City Manager Witzansky stated, if they go through a Surplus Land Act disposition, he didn't think a PI cap for FAR for property turning into a housing project will apply.

Community Development Director Wiener stated it would make more sense to defer the question of the 0.75 until they bring back the analysis on the school properties and the open space.

Council agreed with Community Development Director Wiener suggestion to bring that back.

Councilmember Obagi stated they should go with staff's recommendation for FAR 0.75 for other properties.

Council agreed with that.

Mayor Light asked about the FAR cap for the I-1 and I-3 and asked Councilmember Kaluderovic if she was okay with going through an EIR.

Councilmember Kaluderovic stated she was fine with that and fine with the AES as is.

Councilmember Behrendt commented that he will look into it further and let them know if there is an issue.

City Manager Witzansky asked if there were any concerns on the C-2 to C-4.

Councilmember Obagi stated he didn't recall them discussing it but asked if it was to induce redevelopment similar to Artesia Blvd.

Planning Manager Scully said yes, it is the same principle to allow for intensification and revitalize some of the shopping centers along PCH.

Council agreed with that.

Mayor Light stated everyone was good with AES and SCE to be left alone and confirmed OS would be brought back; summarized the motion as option 1: the BCHD at 1.25 with underlying zoning limits, 1.25 for City Hall and the Annex, 0.75 for the other PI zones, except for the school which they will come back on.

City Manager Witzansky clarified it should be except for those that had been designated OS, the park and open space, which had been designated in the original draft as OS; stated the recommendation for the actual school facility is 0.75.

The Mayor, Council, and staff agreed to table that item until they come back with a full description.

Mayor Light confirmed everyone was good with the 0.7 to 1.0 for the industrial zone, leaving AES and SCE alone, and come back with the OS zoning discussion.

Councilmember Obagi added they are all fine with the C-2 to C-4 and 1.0 FAR.

Councilmember Behrendt stated he would do some research on the Manhattan Beach Blvd item with the people in that area.

Councilmember Behrendt stated he was fine to have the Manhattan Beach Blvd. set at 1.0 FAR.

Councilmember Obagi seconded the motion, but Councilmember Behrendt asked before they vote, what the entire footprint of the Annex encompassed.

Discussion followed and the table of the PI FAR Analysis was put on the screen; noted it is 221,000 sq. ft. which encompasses the Annex, the parking area around the Annex and

other areas under lease or optionally under the lease and the Auditorium; more discussion followed that they would need to have a graphic or research it more to confirm what is included with the Annex.

Planning Manager Scully believed it includes the parking, the grass area, the Annex, and the Auditorium and if it doesn't then they will have to revise it and bring it back.

Councilmember Obagi left the Chambers around 9:08 p.m.

Councilmember Behrendt seconded the motion.

Mayor Light invited public comments.

Maria Larisa Yasol questioned their decision on keeping the AES as public; stated, as they consider updates to the General Plan land use element and building intensity standards for public and non-residential land including the AES site, she wanted to be clear that ownership housing must be explicitly required in the plan; reported that California Government Code 65583 requires cities to affirmatively further Fair Housing by planning for meaningful housing choice, avoiding concentration, and providing access to opportunity; stated that ownership housing is essential to those goals and that ownership access in Redondo Beach has been limited; spoke about public and institutional lands being limited community assets and if these sites are used to satisfy the housing element obligations the City must not eliminate ownership by policy design or by intensity assumptions that make ownership impossible; stated that the AES site is a landmark and its future should be guided by clear General Plan policy that requires a mix of ownership and rental housing.

Tom Bakaly, BCHD, stated they support the motion with the 1.25 and are looking for a uniform FAR; voiced his concern about new zoning requirements or things that are attached to the General Plan, noted they have had discussions about it for years and they don't think the General Plan is the place to put those specific restrictions; stated the City has the CUP process, which has been working, and the site has CUPs; commented that they don't want to build buildings and piss off their neighbors, they want to provide health services through their property and generate revenue that allows them to have programs like Allcove and older adult services; reported that they are in negotiations with a developer and that makes them nervous to hear about what the underlying restrictions might be on the zoning specific to BCHD; reaffirmed that they support the 1.25 and hoped that the existing CUP process would give the public the confidence they need to approve the General Plan; reminded everyone that the BCHD project is not subject to DD but the General Plan is and they have to be careful with that; urged caution and more direction to staff related to how they put in place underlying zoning restrictions.

Councilmember Obagi back in the Chambers around 9:13 p.m.

Mayor Light asked to make a comment before Mr. Bakaly took his seat; stated he felt

Council tried to accommodate Mr. Bakaly's earlier comment by going to a 1.25 because that is what they studied in the EIR and are clean from that perspective but then Mr. Bakaly stated there are other ways to measure intensity or define intensity.

Tom Bakaly stated what they are saying is instead of the FAR, instead of having that firm cap.

Mayor Light said the City has to have some basis for the City's EIR.

City Manager Witzansky stated that is the way the City studied it and that has been the basis in setting the City's standard and what would keep the process consistent for the City; noted that what Mr. Bakaly is saying is true, there are other ways to set a development cap other than FAR but that is not have the City has historically done and that is not what they have studied.

Yash Jha, senior at Mira Costa HS, Co-Chair and peer counselor of the Youth Advisory at Allcove, reported that he is not compensated or paid by the BCHD in any way; stated he believes in the services that BCHD provides and if those services are inaccessible it would be detrimental to the community; said he observes students every day who are chronically overwhelmed, anxious, and exhausted struggling with hygiene, nutrition, and carrying mental health burdens far beyond what anyone should normalize; noted that he has been burdened by them himself and at one point needed institutional treatment; felt that the BCHD is the only agency tangibly fighting the issues on a public health front and at Allcove hundreds of students receive early mental health support that prevents escalation to emergency rooms, psychiatric holds, or to long term impairment; reported that year they have already filled out two safety plans for two students at risk of harming themselves or others; stated that suicide, depression, and anxiety are health issues that are emerging disproportionately in youth and elderly and are two populations that the BCHD uniquely targets in their prevention services in Allcove; felt it is imperative to support a uniform FAR at 1.25.

Mark Nelson stated that that evening's meeting was one of the most disorganized meetings he's been to in a long time; spoke of the FAR being changed, the BCHD FAR being changed, and the certified EIR states 312,000 sq. ft. but now it is 250,000 sq. ft.; agreed with the need to bring more information because they do not have what they need; stated that BCHD services a large out of district audience, Allcove is serving 91% non-resident people, 50% of the services from BCHD is to non-district people, and BCHD's own research shows that 80% of the RCFE will be out of district people; stated all those externalities come and destroy their neighborhoods; pointed out that both the Annex and the Civic Center have 1.25 FAR already, as noted by City Manager Witzansky, so they are not part of Article 27 and that the Annex is P-SF (school facility) and, according to their argument, it should go up to 1.25; commented that BCHD is getting special treatment; mentioned Measure BC needed two thirds and got less than 50% so half the people don't want BCHD to pursue the plan it wants; stated he doesn't feel they should be voting on it.

Geoff Gilbert reported the BCHD campus is next door to his home; stated he and the

residents on his block on Diamond St. oppose any changes to the FAR for the BCHD project; commented that if you give a developer a 1.0 to 1.25 FAR they will go to 1.25 and possibly more or try to change zoning laws; pointed out that BCHD is a lobbyist for the developer and numerous people have tried to develop on the property; stated that long after BCHD is gone the group will still be operating and it is not actually a BCHD thing; reported that Allcove is a good thing but it is a County project and BCHD operates it but are obligated to the County; commented that they could put a Home Depot there because they just want the rent money to operate for their future projects; asked that before Council commits to 1.0 to 1.25 that they see the project; stated that they have angered the residents because of the size and the scope of the development and because they have lied and want to do something that will severely hurt the neighborhood.

Bob Pinzler stated when he sat on the Council there were many days when they would deal with decisions made by previous Councils and wonder what they were thinking; believed that when you consider allowing substantially increased density, permitted by the zoning code, for property owned by public entities a look into the future is worthwhile, and a look into the past can enlighten that search; stated that in the 70's and 80's the City's schools experienced a decline in student population which left the School District with surplus properties; reported that the School District decided to build an independent living facility for seniors in North Redondo and maintain a portion of the land for a park; noted that the senior living building is one of the most densely populated sites in North Redondo but juxtaposed with the park but now the Council are putting the mechanism into place to enable use of that park portion at a density similar to the senior living facility; stated the same density could be permitted in all such public land across the City which will threaten any possible use of those areas for needed open space in a park or City; commented that years from now future Councils, assailed by their constituents about the lack of places for air and sun, will look at each other and ask what this Council was thinking; stated that Council has a choice to not commit unforced errors and asked them not to be a shill for BCHD; stated that the City needs open space and does not need incentives for public agencies to add to rampant densification; commented that at least the voters will get to speak on the zoning changes since the Charter requires it and urged voters to say no so that they don't lose the Redondo Beach they know and love; stated that November is the time to put it on the ballot and not August.

Wayne Craig, District 1, stated they need to be clear about what was being discussed that evening regarding FARs within the General Plan; commented that Police and Fire provide First Responder emergency services and City Hall runs those critical operations and BCHD and the School District do not; stated that those distinctions matter and that is why the Planning Commission classified those entities differently; reported that the state requires that the City adopt a FAR and the Planning Commission arrived at 0.5 for non-City industrial institutional property for one critical reason: to preserve the public's right to be heard and above that level any future project proposal has to come to a public hearing and if raised higher that right disappears; stated that bearing a higher FAR, the General Plan strips residents of meaningful input and forces an all or nothing vote on a Citywide election; commented that if they do that they are just like the legislators in Sacramento imposing housing mandates that take away local control; noted that he provided

examples of what a 1.25 FAR on school property would look like in the Blue Folder; spoke of the constitutional oath they all took to represent the people and agreed with Bob Pinzler that decisions they make today will be questioned by future Councils; stated that nothing in the recommended FAR prevents development, it simply guarantees transparency, accountability, and a public hearing; opined that the choice is clear for them to stand with the Planning Commission's recommendation, public input, and with the residents they took an oath to represent.

Shiela Lamb, District 4 and 30-year resident, stated that the BCHD is requesting the up zoning in order to generate revenue for services that residents have clearly chosen not to fund, as shown in the failed bond measure; commented that when public land is permanently up zoned to compensate for a lack of public support it raises a trust issue with the public; opined, if the purpose of the request that evening was revenue generation for services that the public did not support, it should be stated plainly and weighed carefully before permanently altering public land in a way that cannot be easily undone; asked the Council to consider these questions:

- 1) Are we being asked to change the use of public land in order to generate revenue for services that the public has explicitly chosen not to fund? If so, is that appropriate and trustworthy use of public authority?
- 2) Does this proposal respect the outcome of the public vote or does it functionally work around it?
- 3) Are we making a land use decision based on community need or a financial decision driven by administrative survival?
- 4) If this becomes our model, what kinds of future uses of public land become easier, and which become harder to defend?

Shiela Lamb spoke of uncertainty nationally and people being wary of institutions so the need for transparency is more important; stated that the residents have clearly spoken that they do not support additional revenue generation for BCHD; asked that the Council honor the wishes of the residents.

Ann Wilson (via Zoom) asked how they got from a Planning Commission recommendation of 0.5 and a GPAC recommendation of a 0.75 to a staff recommendation of 1.25 FAR and why the staff recommendation was withheld from the Staff Report; spoke of staff's rationale of BCHD having the same level FAR as City Hall was based on trying to accommodate their supposed project and asked "What is the project?"; stated months ago BCHD sent out a Request for Expression of Interest, not an RFP, and have not shown any plans for their development; said what is known is how the CEO (Tom Bakaly) characterized the project that evening is not how it has been portrayed in BCHD board meetings; spoke of what was mentioned in BCHD's studies but that BCHD's presentation did not match that and that the inherent traffic has not been studied by their EIR or the City's EIR; stated that their two planned 10,000 sq. ft. medical buildings have never been studied and that the General Plan motion sounds half baked; commented that the residents urge the Council to take the time and consideration needed; spoke of the need for public land and open space and stated that once they give up public land to the

massive, out of scale level of density being discussed, they can never get that open space back.

Darryl Boyd (via Zoom), District 3 and 32-year resident of 500 to 600 North Prospect Ave., stated that the residents don't want what he is selling and that BCHD has been a terrible neighbor for years; stated that the residents of Redondo Beach voted no with Measure BC and BCHD needs to respect their wishes; commented that the Mayor and City Council, especially Councilmember Kaluderovic, needs to start standing up for their constituents and taxpaying residents; voiced his opposition to the overdevelopment of BCHD and no to anything above 0.5 or 0.75 FAR.

Marcy Guillermo, District 1, strongly requested that City Council accept the Planning Commission's recommendation for a 0.5 FAR for BCHD and surplus School District properties; stated BCHD planned overdevelopment with 100% private developer should not be supersized and noted that BCHD is a public agency and the Artesia corridor is a business corridor so they do not share the same goals; felt BCHD should be required to dedicate half of their existing acreage to open space and explained why; agreed with the comments made by Sheila Lamb, Wayne Craig, and Bob Pinzler and urged the Council to study the item more before they vote.

Laura Diaz reported no more speakers and 39 eComments: 16 in support and 22 opposed.

Mayor Light stated they have a motion in front of them but asked if anyone wanted to change the motion or add a substitute motion after hearing the public testimony.

Councilmember Obagi said he felt there is merit to both sides of the debate but felt the opposition had it wrong when they say that Measure BC was voted down 47%; clarified that the residents' reason was because they did not want to pay out of their own pockets to fund BCHD and that is specifically why they said they voted for Measure FP and Measure SD; noted that BCHD did not get the bond money so they had to come up with a different way to get the financing they needed; pointed out that BCHD is just running the organization to make economic use of it to fund their services and all three beach cities highly value the services they provide; stated that even if Council goes with a FAR of 1.25, it will still go to the residents for a vote; reported that Tom Bakaly noted BCHD's roll out of the first Healthy Living Campus was too big and felt that they learned their lesson from it and will take that into account along with the concerns of the community with the next campus; stated that people are saying to keep the FAR limit where it is but that there is no FAR limit at this time on the property but one needs to be set and that a balance needs to be weighed between threats of discrimination against this public entity and the demands of concerned residents; pointed out that BCHD is a democratic institution and anyone could run for the Board if they wanted to have some control; explained further that he does not want to limit the value of the publicly owned property by limiting the FAR to 0.7 because ultimately it would hurt the City; felt the right balance would be a 1.0 to 1.25 FAR with some limitations on intensity to protect against size and massing.

Councilmember Behrendt stated that he agreed with a lot of what Councilmember Obagi just said; asked to confirm the motion is 1.0 FAR by right up to 1.25 subject to defined conditions that were addressed that evening and, if staff faces any challenges in crafting it, Council will hear about it and the conditions can be recalibrated.

Community Development Director Wiener said he envisioned bringing a draft back to the City Council similar to what they did with the AACAP standards, then take it back to the Planning Commission, and then bringing it back to Council for adoption; noted that they would be able to receive public input during the process on the standards to ensure that it addresses the concerns of the surrounding neighborhood.

Councilmember Behrendt asked if it was normal to go back to the Planning Commission with the item.

Community Development Director Wiener stated it is required because it is a zoning amendment and that is a statutory requirement under state law.

Councilmember Behrendt asked if they do a straight 1.0 or 1.25 without conditions if that would not need to go to the Planning Commission.

Community Development Director Wiener confirmed it would not need to go back to the Planning Commission in that case because the Planning Commission has already reviewed the General Plan and they had their recommendation on the FAR; felt that the standards that seek to minimize impacts, mass, and scale could be fairly concise to just ensure that there is criteria that is discretionary when reviewing any future projects at the site.

Councilmember Behrendt asked for the City Manager's input.

City Manager Witzansky stated it will add at least two months to the timeline and just depended on whether or not Council want that process complete before the vote or leading up to the vote; stated he didn't believe the land use parameters that would serve to limit the development would be subject to Article 27 so Council could proceed with the cap and move that to ballot, and then work on the parameters until the actual ballot consideration; noted that if Council want the zoning ordinance to be part and parcel to the ballot measure then they will need to take the extra time.

More discussion followed regarding what should be part of the ballot measure and confirmed that there is no cap of any kind currently.

Community Development Director Wiener offered another option and said it is possible that they could include the standards in the general plan under the allowance where it discusses FAR so it may not need to go into the zoning ordinance; stated that staff could take a closer look at it; clarified that, what City Manager Witzansky had referred to is, it doesn't necessarily need the traffic analysis that is based on FAR, so they would be able

to prepare it in time for the election and it should not be impacted by the traffic analysis that Article 27 requires.

City Manager Witzansky said it does depend on if Council wants the traffic analysis to reflect the reduced development opportunity based on the parameters and how Council wants to set up the Article 27 ballot measure.

Councilmember Behrendt asked if they did a 1.15 FAR for BCHD would it still entail the additional analysis, impacts, and other delays.

City Manager Witzansky stated it would allow staff to move directly to the Article 27 traffic analysis associated with the 1.15 FAR cap.

More discussion followed regarding Article 27 related analysis.

City Manager Witzansky stated the easiest way to proceed with Article 27 is to have it apply to simply the FAR cap standard with the traditional CUP process; cautioned if done that way they don't have the benefit of fully understanding, when they get to ballot, how that affects Article 27 impacts; noted that anything that delays the FAR cap decision on the BCHD campus will affect the timeline for the AACAP consideration.

More discussion followed.

Mayor Light stated he thought they picked 1.25 along with applying standards to try to limit intensity.

More discussion followed regarding the decisions they had already discussed.

City Manager Witzansky stated anything that includes subsequent development standards in a zoning ordinance update that would be part and parcel of the ballot measure is going to create time delay.

More discussion ensued.

Mayor Light clarified that the motion is 1.25 with some zoning ordinance changes that otherwise define intensity and asked if Council wanted to change that.

Council said no.

City Attorney Ford stated the question is, do you want those limits with the ballot measure or not and if not, then that is streamlined because they can change the ordinance in parallel, but if Council does want it part of the ballot measure, then they do have to go through the analysis and that would delay it.

Councilmember Obagi asked if the voters vote down the FAR limit of 1.25, or whatever it ends up being, are they subject to no FAR limits.

City Manager Witzansky responded affirmatively and stated it reverts back to the zero cap.

Councilmember Obagi asked if there was any height limit.

City Manager Witzansky stated currently no.

Councilmember Obagi stated it is clear to him that there needs to be some zoning regulations, it does not need to be on the ballot, but any development that comes into existence does need to be subject to some sort of zoning limitation.

Discussion followed that it could be run in parallel or even trail.

Councilmember Behrendt said he is in favor of trailing since AACAP has already been postponed.

Councilmember Kaluderovic asked Director Wiener to confirm he said that they don't need to do zoning but there are other ways of writing the standards into the General Plan as a more streamlined way to do it.

Community Development Director Wiener stated that the land use or the table within the General Plan could have some standards built into it that identifies the FAR limits; noted it would not have the same effect as the zoning ordinance but it would be something and they could direct future work on the zoning code be done to better regulate the intensity of the buildings; stated it made sense to update the zoning code because it is pretty open ended and there should be some parameters built around the FAR; commented that they were trying to get it on the ballot with standards but it could potentially cause delays so they could trail it.

Motion by Councilmember Obagi, seconded by Councilmember Behrendt, to move everything that the Mayor had already read out, to 1.25 FAR on the BCHD site, trail zoning regulations, and provide staff direction to develop zoning regulations and standards to apply to that site.

Mayor Light voiced his concern that if the voters do not pass it then there will be no FAR limit.

Motion carried 5-0 by voice vote.

Motion by Councilmember Behrendt, seconded by Councilmember Obagi, for a seven minute break at 10:00 p.m.

Motion carried 5-0 by voice vote.

Note: The video and sound resumed at 10:09 p.m. Per video Mayor and Councilmembers

are present.

**N.2. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE PROPOSED SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE CITY'S SOLID WASTE HANDLING SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH ARAKELIAN ENTERPRISES, INC., DBA ATHENS SERVICES, TO EXTEND THE TERM AND TO MODIFY RATE STRUCTURES, CERTAIN SOLID WASTE PROGRAMS, AND OTHER TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT**

**CONTACT: ANDREW WINJE, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR**

Public Works Director Winje introduced the item and noted it will specifically cover decisions regarding the rate structure that has been proposed and other topics of concern; announced that Andrea Delap would be giving the presentation and acknowledged that members of HF&H and Athens were in the audience.

Andrea Delap, Public Works Department, provided some background and current status of the Athens Services Agreement which noted that the City has been in partnership with Athens since 2011 and is in its seventh of nine years of a first amendment that was signed in 2019; stated since that signing numerous regulatory and operational changes impacting hauler services including waste to energy facility closures (SERRF), landfill closures, and the requirement of Athens to collect three streams to comply with SB1383; stated initially Athens approached the City advising of the need to consider a second amendment to the agreement due to the closure of SERRF, then Athens came back in March 2025 to acknowledge changes that were needed to accommodate the three stream collection, and reported in May 2025 staff brought a proposed second amendment to Council for their consideration; reported that at that Council meeting they provided Council with some key provisions in the proposal which were included in their Admin Report; said it was important to note that in the proposed changes single-family residential rates and multi-family units less than four units are not impacted by any of the proposed rate structure adjustments; reported that, during that meeting, City Council requested staff to conduct a review and analysis of a revised second amendment which included engaging a consultant to assist in those efforts; stated that Council approved a scope of work with HF&F consultants in July 2025 and went over the scope of work; pointed out that the full HF&F report was attached to that evening's Admin Report and highlighted a few of the key areas; stated that staff recommended Option 2 since it keeps the refuse rates for both multi-family and commercial at the lower end of the rate range across the cities surveyed and streamlines the pricing structure.

Councilmember Behrendt commented that the rates under Option 2 for multi-family units could go up as high as 36% on certain circumstances.

Andrea Delap said as part of the study comparable services of other cities in the region were acquired and HF&F found that Redondo Beach meets or exceeds service levels in all of the reviewed areas; noted that the focus that evening is on the rate restructuring aspects of the proposed amendment but there are other proposed changes to the terms

highlighted in the Admin Report and staff would like direction from Council on any provisions that evening that are to be included in the second amendment to be brought back at a later Council meeting; concluded the presentation with the recommendation for Council to: 1) Direct staff to negotiate second amendment rate changes using Option 2 structure, 2) provide input to staff regarding proposed changes to other terms, and 3) to return to City Council with a draft second amendment and a request to initiate a Proposition 218 process.

City Manager Witzansky stated they have gone through the process and felt it has been validated that their current contract with Athens is among the best in the industry; reported their final analysis and recommendation is to move to the Option 2 structure; commented that it would make their contract rate structure more consistent with other cities in the region and an extended amendment with Athens is in the City's best interest but pointed out that the transition would have some rate impacts on the 8 to 10 unit multi-family structure which would go to the commercial model; encouraged the Athens representatives to speak to the plan they have in place to help address the transitions and help mitigate that impact; stated an amendment with Athens will help secure the City's services into the future and protect rates for residents long term; noted staff has spent 6 to 8 month evaluating the draft agreement and strongly recommended it and they will need to come back with drafting and would like input that evening on any other items the Council would like to focus on outside of the Option 2 rate structure.

Gary Clifford, Senior Executive VP of Athens Services, introduced Senior Executive Christian Warner who is responsible for compliance, John Bierly who runs operations in the Redondo Beach area, and Sharon Shapiro-Fox who is the VP in the City; explained a few ways they could help multi-family customers mitigate the impact by downsizing waste containers to have recycling containers; stated it is their goal to not have people come back to the City Council with issues so they do their best to work out those issues in the field to make sure the customer and the City are taken care of; noted that they do monitor the behaviors and do audits to make sure the right things happen.

Christian Warner added that their recycling coordinators go out to meet with multi-family accounts annually at a minimum and look at the entire waste stream at that account so they can recommend changes to reduce trash, increase organics, and increase recycling to mitigate bills; explained that they found 70% of Redondo Beach's waste stream is recyclable and only 30% should go to landfill, noted that is if everybody hand sorted every piece of trash and they share that information with people to help them put the right thing in the right barrels which would mitigate their overall bill.

Councilmember Obagi noted there is concern about the 10-year exclusive rolloff phase; asked how they can protect against excessive roll off fees and keep them fair and equal.

Christian Warner explained that the City will go through a five-year phase out process of phasing out the current roll off haulers that are there, so for the first five years of the ten years, everyone still has the right to go bid it out to different roll off haulers so really it is only the last five years of the proposed term; reported that they can not set a roll off rate,

they have to meet with the City to decide the roll off rate, and bring it to Council for approval just like all the rate sheets; stated each year thereafter the contract already has a written formula for an annual rate adjustment.

Councilmember Obagi asked if Athen's rate in the exclusive roll off cities less or more than Athen's roll off rate in the non-exclusive cities.

Christian Warner replied it's both, some are higher and some are lower.

Councilmember Obagi asked if they could assign that a roll off rate be the average of the last fifth year, during the wind down of the other roll off players offering services in the City and tie that metric.

Christian Warner felt that was a fair option to explore and said it would be a good idea, if they move forward, to have that discussion now so there would be no surprises in five years.

Councilmember Behrendt commented that the Athens agreement is the biggest franchise agreement that the City has with any vendor and touches almost every person in the City; spoke positively about the services Athens has provided over the years and stated he is confident that Andy Winje and Andrea Delap could handle the negotiations; referenced Option 2 was the more reasonable approach, noted that five units or more have the characteristics of a commercial operation and Option 2 is streamlined, easiest to track, to follow, and ensure that the City is getting the services that they are contracting for; stated he would be comfortable directing staff to engage in negotiations with Athens for additional terms for the second proposed amendment agreement, start the 218 process, and move forward; reported that the agenda packet had 27 items and a summary and wanted to cover a few of them; stated that whatever staff negotiates they need to negotiate and secure the most resident and business friendly terms for the City since people and staff can change; referenced the exclusive roll off rates and explained that, under the current franchise agreement, the big construction containers around the City may not be Athens and voiced his concern over handing exclusive right to one entity; stated he wanted to make sure that the rates negotiated are fair and reasonable to the building community and businesses and suggested building in a mechanism to ensure that the rate is reasonable, fair, at market, and hasn't been manipulated; stated that the Staff Report had a recommendation to not include the South Bay Galleria into the exclusivity that is being asked and agreed with staff that it made sense since they are not currently within their exclusive franchise with Athens; voiced his opinion that the current warning system Athens currently uses to notify customers that everything has to be in the containers works well and stated receiving an extra fee or suspension of service prior to warning residents would not be a good idea; mentioned a few other items that they should go over but his last item of focus was the 10-year term, noted that they have two years left on the current term, and stated they would add seven or eight to the 10-year term with the City having two five-year options at the City's discretion; inquired about doing something where staff has control to evaluate Athens service so they have some control if there are any problems.

Councilmember Obagi stated that he agreed with most, if not all, of what Councilmember Behrendt said; brought up page 623 and 624 of the proposed second amendment terms of the agenda packet; voiced concern about the removal of the notification process prior to the assessment of fees, adjustment of service, and asked staff to push back on that item; stated he understood the liquidated damages on the divergence as the diversion amount is being changed but questioned any other adjustments to other liquidated damages; asked that the City Attorney review the terms of the contract to make sure that the City maintains its position relative to holding Athens accountable for lack of performance; suggested that, regarding the roll off, staff take into account the rates of roll off providers at the time immediately prior to Athens having exclusivity in the City, as well as rates of cities adjacent so they can reach an average; stated he was okay with the exclusivity on the Galleria and asked staff why they were against it.

City Manager Witzansky explained that the Galleria ownership is currently going through several changes with new builders, developers, and owners and each will present different projects; noted there is a lot of uncertainty so forcing them into the agreement with Athens when they don't know what types of terms and services they need would be difficult; hoped that when Athens presents to the Galleria that the Galleria chooses Athens as their preferred hauler but didn't want to push them at that time.

More discussion followed regarding the inclusion of the Galleria.

Councilmember Waller supported Option 2; spoke about his experiences with the warning system as a resident and stated he appreciates the warning; supported the roll off exclusivity and felt the idea of a five-year transition for the Galleria is a good idea to give them time to figure it out.

Councilmember Kaluderovic asked Athens about the warning system and stated she assumed it was a mechanism to change behavior.

Gary Clifford, Athens, stated it is an opportunity to educate their customers and spoke about situations they have to impact customers about the behaviors in treating the earth well and recycling; commented that they like the warning system and they will have the discussion on best practices with City staff.

Councilmember Kaluderovic asked, in regard to points brought up about the proposed terms, if he could speak on what works for Athens.

Gary Clifford stated they have modeled it on a 10 year depreciation and amortization to maximize the City's rate but he would like to go longer; reported that discussions went back and forth with staff and they ended up on a 10 plus five plus five; said his argument is that 10 is about the limit of taking equipment to a location, so the minimum is 10 years for them; pointed out that the City's contract has a lot built in where if Athens doesn't do a good job it doesn't have to be 10 years.

Mayor Light stated he didn't feel setting a date for the Galleria is the best thing to do and that if they want to, and it works for all parties, then they can be added.

Public Works Director Winje added not knowing what the Galleria will be when the City wants to start service puts questions in his mind about the Prop 218 procedure; agreed with the Mayor that it's a bit premature to think about adding them in.

City Manager Witzansky stated a logical time to add a customer is when they have to reboot the Prop 218 process; felt they would have the opportunity to amend when the Galleria has a defined ownership structure and a defined plan.

Councilmember Behrendt asked Public Works Director Winje to mention some of the decision points Public Works will have discretion over in the contract.

Public Works Director Winje clarified that Councilmember Behrendt was referring to disputes about the service levels or service package that might be recommended by Athens and not agreed to by the resident; stated he felt it's important for staff to maintain that control and they will argue for that in the negotiation.

Councilmember Behrendt assured staff that the Council will support them in the negotiations and asked that the City Attorney be involved to ensure that the City is protected.

Motion by Councilmember Behrendt, seconded by Councilmember Obagi, to approve Option 2 and to engage Athens in negotiating the additional terms of their proposed second amendment, start the Prop 218 process and negotiate according to what was heard that evening from the Council regarding exclusive roll off, excluding the Galleria, and the warning system.

Mayor Light invited public comments.

Laura Diaz reported no attendees on Zoom and no eComments.

Motion carried 5-0 by voice vote.

**N.3. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT FOR PROJECT SERVICES WITH GRIFFIN STRUCTURES, INC. TO SERVE AS THE CITY'S OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE AND PROGRAM MANAGER THROUGHOUT PHASE 1 OF THE PROGRESSIVE DESIGN BUILD PROCESS ASSOCIATED WITH MEASURE FP IMPLEMENTATION FOR A COST OF \$877,000, AND A NEW NOT TO EXCEED CONTRACT TOTAL AMOUNT OF \$1,027,000, FOR THE TERM JANUARY 20, 2026 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 2027**

**APPROVE A REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS/PROPOSALS FOR PROGRESSIVE DESIGN BUILD SERVICES TO RECONSTRUCT FIRE**

## **STATIONS 1 AND 2**

### **APPROVE A REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS/PROPOSALS FOR PROGRESSIVE DESIGN BUILD SERVICES TO REBUILD THE POLICE DEPARTMENT HEADQUARTERS AND RENOVATE THE POLICE ANNEX FACILITY**

**CONTACT:** LUKE SMUDE, ASSISTANT TO THE CITY MANAGER

Assistant to the City Manager Smude provided an overview of the item and a presentation; reported that Measure FP was approved in 2024 and authorized \$93,350,000 in General Obligation Bonds to be used to replace Fire Stations 1 and 2, the Main Police Station, and to renovate the Police Annex facility; stated previous actions were in July 2025 when the City approved the agreement with Griffin and then in December 2025 the City had a Measure FP overview and update where Council approved Progressive Design Build (PDB) and Council directed staff to return with revised RFQ/Ps and updated contract documents; provided a brief overview of where the City was at in the project life cycle and stated that they are now getting ready to enter into Phase One which is the pre-construction phase; noted that the pre-construction phase is integral to Measure FP implementation and, if they elect to approve the proposed amendment with Griffin, Griffin will help the City in selecting the PDB entity or entities; explained that in Phase One Griffin would help define the scope for the Measure FP projects and then they will have the PDB entity design, architect, and engineer the projects with staff working with them; noted that staff would refine preliminary designs, establish budgets, schedules, identify potential risks, and then develop the guaranteed maximum price; reported that the cost to have Griffin continue as the City's partner for Phase One would be an additional \$877,000 in addition to their original contract of \$150,000; informed Council that Phase One completion to get to the guaranteed maximum price is estimated to take place in June 2027; explained and provided details on how they refined the RFQ and the draft contract given Council's request; reported that they had a preliminary outside counsel review from RWG further refine the legal template and basis of the documentation; stated that staff's recommendation for Council is that they approve the proposed amendment to the agreement with Griffin for Phase One services and approve the RFQ/P documents and draft contract for release to the market.

City Manager Witzansky thanked staff and the Griffin reps for advancing the documents based on Council's direction; felt they have better templates in place and were ready to advance the documents with the ability to make final revisions as they enter into discussions with prospective candidates.

Mayor Light provided some comments and felt the improvements addressed his main concerns.

Councilmember Behrendt agreed with the Mayor on the improvements made; asked if they could make an adjustment to the location of the Police HQ to give the bidder some flexibility; suggested they could keep the communications depot where it is.

City Manager Witzansky reported hearing from several of the Councilmembers regarding it and that staff brainstormed on adjusting the language to make it clear that they have the ability to do that; asked for Luke Smude's document to be put on the screen and showed staff's proposed red lines under the Police Facility, key goals and objectives area; reported they updated the title to reflect Feasible Consolidation and stated their primary goal is to have as many efficiencies in it as possible and referenced that it could occur in both the Civic Center or Annex site; stated they also added "Respondents shall be prepared to explore alternative scope distributions between the locations" to provide for optimal and integrated facility or facilities; felt it captured what they have heard from Council and are good additions to the RFP and proposed that they include it with the final RFP that is released.

More discussion followed regarding the language of the document; Councilmember Behrendt asked that section 2.2 be looked at closer and City Manager Witzansky stated they could add a caveat to cover his concern.

More discussion followed regarding what could be done at the locations and that the responsive design firms understand what they are looking for within the available resources.

Councilmember Castle asked, regarding the next phase, at what point will the City do the bond offering.

City Manager Witzansky said, tentatively, they are looking at fall or winter of this year for the issuance and whether they do it in a tranche or tranches they will need to evaluate when they get closer.

Councilmember Waller asked at what point do they need to set up the bond oversight committee.

City Manager Witzansky stated they will probably set it up before they issue but it doesn't really need to be in place until the bond proceeds are being spent since their whole role it is to oversee, confirm the expenditures and conform to Measure FP's parameters; noted that would be the third or fourth quarter of this year.

More discussion followed.

Motion by Councilmember Castle, seconded by Councilmember Waller, to approve the amendment as proposed with Griffin and to direct the release of the two RFPs as amended.

Laura Diaz reported no Zoom attendees and no eComments.

Motion carried 5-0 by voice vote.

**O. CITY MANAGER ITEMS - None**

**P. MAYOR AND COUNCIL ITEMS**

**P.1. Pulled by Councilmember Obagi and placed after Blue Folder Items.**

**Q. MAYOR AND COUNCIL REFERRALS TO STAFF**

Councilmember Waller referenced the King Harbor sign, specifically the center icon piece.

Discussion followed regarding the sign contract coming back to Council, what the price would include, and that Council could adjust the scope of work.

Councilmember Obagi asked if they could have a discussion about what form the next Strategic Planning would take.

City Manager Witzansky responded yes, they could discuss the scope of it.

**R. RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION - None**

**R.1. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR - The Closed Session is authorized by the Government Code Section 54956.8.**

**AGENCY NEGOTIATOR:**

**Mike Witzansky, City Manager**

**Elizabeth Hause, Community Services Director**

**Greg Kapovich, Waterfront & Economic Development Director**

**PROPERTY:**

**Portions of the Redondo Beach Marina Parking Lot and Seaside Lagoon (portions of APN #s: 7503-029-900 and 7503-029-903)**

**Portions of Harbor Drive, Pacific Avenue, Catalina Avenue, Gertruda Avenue, Herondo Street, and Esplanade**

**NEGOTIATING PARTIES:**

**Kellie Hawkins, Englander Knabe & Allen on Behalf of Nike, Inc.**

**UNDER NEGOTIATION:**

**Price and Terms**

**R.2. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR - The Closed Session is authorized by the Government Code Section 54956.8.**

**AGENCY NEGOTIATOR:**

**Mike Witzansky, City Manager**

**Greg Kapovich, Waterfront & Economic Development Director**

**Elizabeth Hause, Community Services Director  
Jane Chung, Assistant to the City Manager**

**PROPERTY:**

**Portions of the Redondo Beach Marina Parking Lot and Seaside Lagoon  
239 & 245 N. Harbor Drive, Redondo Beach, CA 90277  
(portions of APN #s: 7503-029-900 and 7503-029-903)**

**NEGOTIATING PARTIES:**

**Allen Sanford, BeachLife LLC - LA28 Event**

**UNDER NEGOTIATION:**

**Terms**

- R.3. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - EXISTING LITIGATION - The Closed Session is authorized by the attorney-client privilege, Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1).**

**Name of case:**

**Silas Dettelbach by Guardian Ad Litem, Berna Dettelbach, individually and Spencer Dettelbach, individually v. City of Redondo Beach; and DOES 1-50, inclusive Case Number: 24TRCV01457**

- R.4. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL AND LABOR NEGOTIATOR - The Closed Session is authorized by the Government Code Sec. 54957.6.**

**AGENCY NEGOTIATOR:**

**Mike Witzansky, City Manager  
Diane Strickfaden, Director of Human Resources**

**EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS:**

**Redondo Beach Police Officers' Association - Police Management Unit**

- S. RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION – None**

- T. ADJOURNMENT – 11:17 P.M.**

Motion by Councilmember Kaluderovic, seconded by Councilmember Castle, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried 5-0 by voice vote.

The next meeting of the City Council of the City of Redondo Beach will be an Adjourned Regular meeting to be held at 4:30 p.m. (Closed Session) and a Regular meeting to be held at 6:00 p.m. (Open Session) on Tuesday, February 3, 2026, in the Redondo Beach City Hall Council Chamber, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

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

Respectfully submitted:

---

Eleanor Manzano, CMC  
City Clerk