



Minutes
Redondo Beach – Harbor Commission
Monday, June 9, 2025
Regular Meeting – 6:30 P.M.

6:30 PM - REGULAR MEETING OF THE HARBOR COMMISSION

A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Harbor Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by W.E.D. Director Kapovich in the City Hall Council Chambers, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich announced that Chair Callahan would not be in the meeting and that Vice Abelman would function as Chair.

B. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Falk, Collier, Chrzan, Bauer, Carlson, Vice Chair Abelman

Councilmembers Absent: Chair Callahan

Officials Present: Greg Kapovich, W.E.D. Director
Katherine Buck, W.E.D. Manager
Steven Giang, Senior Planner
Mio Iwasaki, Administrative Analyst

C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Commissioner Falk led in the Salute to the Flag.

D. APPROVE ORDER OF AGENDA

W.E.D. Director Kapovich recommended to move Item No. L.1 prior to Item No. J.1 as there are guest speakers.

Motion by Commissioner Carlson, seconded by Commissioner Bauer, to approve the order of the agenda as amended, moving Item No. L.1 prior to Item No. J.1. Hearing no objections, Vice Chair Abelman so ordered.

E. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS – ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS

E.1 For Blue Folder Documents Approved at the Harbor Commission Meeting

W.E.D. Director Kapovich reported there are no Blue Folder Items.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F.1. APPROVAL OF AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE HARBOR COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 9, 2025

F.2. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING MINUTES: MAY 12, 2025

Motion by Commissioner Carlson, seconded by Commissioner Chrzan, to approve the Consent Calendar as presented. Hearing no objections, Vice Chair Abelman so ordered.

Motion carried 6-0-1. Chair Callahan was absent.

G. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS - None

H. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

H.1. For eComments and Emails Received from the Public

There were no public comments.

I. EX PARTE COMMUNICATION

Commissioner Chrzan reported speaking with Director Kapovich, before the meeting, who occupies the location that they will be discussing in J.1.

Commissioner Carlson reported speaking with Craig Stanton, Basin 3 property manager.

J. PUBLIC HEARINGS

J.1. DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON AN EXEMPTION DECLARATION AND A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW THE OPERATION OF COMMERCIAL RECREATIONAL BUSINESSES WITHIN AN EXISTING 1,491 SQUARE FOOT FIRST FLOOR OFFICE SPACE LOCATED AT 181 N. HARBOR DRIVE AND ASSOCIATED MARINE-RELATED FACILITIES INCLUSIVE OF A MAXIMUM OF 15 BOAT SLIPS/DOCK AREAS LOCATED IN BASIN 3 ON PROPERTY WITHIN A COASTAL-COMMERCIAL (CC-3) ZONE, IN THE CITY'S ZONING ORDINANCE FOR THE COASTAL ZONE

Item moved after L.1.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich introduced the item and deferred to staff for a presentation.

Senior Planner Steven Giang narrated a PowerPoint presentation with the following details:

- Background
 - o First-floor office (1,491 sf) historically used for marina management
 - o City has managed leasing of the 15 both slips/docks since 2015
 - o Operators of the existing slips are existing businesses with active business licenses
- Project Site
 - o Existing two-story commercial building (built in 1986)
 - o Coastal-Commercial (CC-3) Zoning
 - o Basin 3 has 58 total slips and 4 docks
 - o Parking site contains 1,347 spaces

Noted: 3 businesses have more than one slip; no site improvements or structural changes are being proposed; per Redondo Beach municipal code, only 16 parking spaces are required for everything combined.

- Project Request
 - o Authorize operation of the commercial recreational office space (1,491 sf)
 - o Authorize up to 15 boat slips/dock areas for charter/rental services
- CUP Findings
 - o Plan Consistency: Use aligns with General Plan & Coastal LUP; supports water-oriented recreation within CC-3 zone.
 - o Site Adequacy & Access: Existing building accommodates offices & 15 slips; frontage on Harbor Drive and Torrance Blvd provides safe, pedestrian-friendly circulation.
 - o No Adverse Impacts: Continues long-standing marina operations with no new structures, noise, traffic, or parking impacts beyond current levels.
 - o Protective Conditions: Existing setbacks, landscaping, ingress/egress, parking, signage, and noise/vibration controls ensure public health, safety, and welfare are maintained.
- Recommendation
 - o Staff recommends that the Harbor Commission approve the exemption declaration and grant the Conditional Use Permit subject to the findings and conditions within the attached draft resolution.

Commissioner Collier asked if the permit's scope covers the building, the slips, and the businesses in the slips.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich responded that all the businesses operate out of the slips; stated that all the patrons go directly to the slips but noted that you can not obtain a business license for a business without a physical address and the slips do not have addresses; mentioned they base their address on the marina operator's office space located at 181 N. Harbor.

Commissioner Collier asked if that means the businesses are renting slips that are covered by the CUP.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich responded affirmatively; added it covers the 11 businesses and the 15 slips.

Commissioner Coller referenced Item 7 that read the charter boat operation shall involve vessels operated by a professional captain; noted that it should be corrected to "licensed captain".

Discussion following regarding memorializing existing uses, having one CUP for all operators, avoiding CUP modifications, and parking/slip ratio.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich clarified that the intent was to memorialize existing operators and if an additional one came in, to amend the CUP if they go into this specific office space; added if an operator were locating within their own storefront, like Paddle House, they would go for their own CUP and not underneath this umbrella.

Senior Planner Giang clarified that there are 11 operators, but the parking requirement is based on the number of slips itself, so the parking ratio is 0.5 spaces required per slip; noted that the conditions of approval for #12 is to allow the office and staff to manage some of the uses that are more administrative but gives the Harbor Commission and City staff the option to require a CUP if the use is deemed a significant impact; gave more explanation as to the intent of the condition and noted it depends on the significance of the intensity.

Commissioner Chrzan questioned the hours of operation; noted that 8:30 a.m. might be a problem for some.

Senior Planner Giang stated that the Staff Report talks about the hours of operation are as it stands but it is not a condition of the approval, and it would give some flexibility to operate as needed; stated the hours are not tied to the slips but to the building.

More discussion followed regarding the building, swapping of companies as long as they did not go above 16 and if they wanted to, they would need to amend the CUP.

Commissioner Carlson asked if an additional boat shows up, do they need to amend the CUP, do a parking study, and come to the Commission and City Council, which is about 3 to 4 months.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich stated that is correct and they follow the same process as a new CUP.

Senior Planner Giang answered Commissioner Carlson's question of cost stating it is \$1,600 for amended CUP and \$3,000 plus for a new CUP and takes about 3 to 4 months.

Discussion followed regarding the focus only on the Marina office; noted that it is because it represents all of them and not just one operator.

Commissioner Carlson asked what would drive a parking or traffic study or make this more expensive.

Steven Giang stated that engineering will require a traffic study for any new use that would exceed 110 trips a day and would make it more expensive; reported that the parking surplus for this project was massive and gave more explanation.

More discussion ensued.

Commissioner Carlson voiced his worry of traffic in the future when the hoist goes away; noted a traffic study will be needed then; referenced Page 6 of the presentation and questioned the property line and zoning area shown on the map.

Discussion followed.

Commissioner Carlson noted wanting to increase Harbor use by bringing more people into it and suggested building in flexibility to allow for additional boats to allow for more than fifteen slips, until the boat ramp is completed.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich explained his thought process: legalize the current operators there, work on the current Boat Launch project and Seaside Lagoon renovation project and see how that changes the landscape of the parking situation; spoke of wanting to make sure there is enough parking for all uses in the next 2 to 3 years; stated after all those are sorted out, if there is a wish, he could come back with a City-sponsored amendment to increase beyond the 15 slips currently proposed with this CUP.

Commissioner Carlson stated he understood the dilemma in what the City is trying to do; stated he would rather it be more flexible and have the cap be 16 to 20 until the boat ramp or Seaside Lagoon are complete.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich reported that once a CUP is approved it stays with the land unless it is brought back for a formal amendment.

Vice Chair Abelman suggested creating a contract that does not reference a number but references an exhibit to the CUP whereby that exhibit could be more easily changed; noted the document would be more fluid but the terms and conditions set forth in the CUP would stay concrete.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich stated if the exhibit is attached to the CUP, it is a part of the CUP; opined the suggestion given by Vice Chair Abelman would not work because the required parking associated with each business use could change if it was going up and the analysis surrounding the number of slips could increase the intensity of use thus triggering an amendment to the CUP, which typically takes 3-4 months to traverse.

More discussion followed.

Commissioner Chrzan noted that in the analysis the office space requires 5 parking spaces, the ancillary slips and docks require an additional 11 but the math does not compute correctly at 0.5 each.

Steven Giang reported it should be 0.75 each per slip.

Commissioner Chrzan voiced her concern over the number of slips and that she felt it should be more as well.

Discussion followed regarding State Law CUP requirements and the possibility of expediting the CUP process for the Harbor.

Commissioner Carlson asked, if a commercial boat was discovered in a different basin, would they have to come up with a physical address and go through a CUP process.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich stated that is the intent, and they would have to obtain a business license and get their CUP.

Commissioner Carlson stated the duration and cost of the CUP drives people to stay underground, which is the current problem.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich mentioned they have another Strategic Plan item, coming this year, that talks about creating certain rules and regulations around this topic in the Municipal Code penalty section; noted this would allow Harbor Patrol to issue fines and encourage people to contact the Planning Division, to follow the right process.

Commissioner Chrzan asked what the concerns were in a CUP for the entire Harbor, rather than just Basin 3.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich responded that because the City manages and operates Basin 3, we know which businesses need a CUP. In contrast, private entities manage the remaining slips in Basins 1 and 2, which has less City oversight. It will take inspections by Harbor Patrol staff to figure out which slips in Basins 1 and 2 are operating illegal commercial vessels. The creation of future fines will encourage those businesses to become legal.

Vice Chair Abelman opened the public hearing and invited public comment.

Mark Hansen stated he is in support of staff's recommendation; spoke of being comfortable that all the businesses are commercial boat operators and liked the flexibility in being able to move those 11 businesses around.

There were no other public comments on this item.

Motion by Commissioner Carlson, seconded by Commissioner Collier, to close the public hearing. Hearing no objections, Vice Chair Abelman so ordered.

Motion by Commissioner Carlson, seconded by Commissioner Collier, to change the wording "professional Captain" to "U.S. Coast Guard Licensed Captain". Hearing no objections, Vice Chair Abelman so ordered.

Commissioner Carlson wanted to make a motion to have the flexibility of adding one or two more boats.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich stated it is in the Commission's purview to decide if 15 is the right number or not; mentioned he did not want to overcommit parking spaces.

Commissioner Falk stated she would be fine with one fishing boat but what if a person wants to put 10 jet skis into a slip; noted that is a whole different impact.

More discussion followed regarding the use of slips, the ability to manage what goes in the slip, and the risks in adding more.

Commissioner Carlson asked if one of the current operators went out of business, would the replacement need to come before the Commission and get a CUP.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich nodded that this is correct; stated the Commission would not be able to grant the request for one margin tonight; noted it would have to go back to the Traffic Engineer for analysis; clarified that they are solidifying the existing situation tonight.

More discussion followed regarding a traffic analysis, the cost involved, the amount of time it takes, and reasons why this cannot just be changed.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich spoke about the difference between a parking study and a traffic analysis; explained what each involves.

More discussion ensued.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich recommended to approve the 15, let the Boat Launch and Seaside Lagoon further materialize, and he would monitor the interest level on said 16, 17, and 18 slips in the next few months but asked for them to memorialize the operators that are there right now.

More discussion ensued with the Commission's concerns regarding the rules.

Commissioner Carlson stated he will vote for the 15 but wondered how they could have the ability to approve someone without it taking thousands of dollars and taking 3 to 4 months.

Steven Giang spoke of the CUP process being inherently onerous and it being citywide; mentioned complaints they receive about the process; noted that the Community Development Director is looking into ways to change the CUP process such as changing what requires the CUP to be reviewed by the Harbor Commission in the first place; suggested those are methods

the Commission could consider looking into and gave other suggestions that they can look into but would require Council approval.

More discussion followed regarding improving internal processes, updating zoning codes, and other concerns regarding the CUP and illegal operators.

Motion by Commissioner Carlson, seconded by Commissioner Bauer, to approve the CUP as recommended to approve an Exemption Declaration and a Conditional Use Permit to allow the operation of commercial recreational businesses within an existing 1,491 square foot first floor office space located at 181 N. Harbor Drive and associated marine-related facilities inclusive of a maximum of 15 boat slips/dock areas located in Basin 3 on property within a Coastal-Commercial (CC-3) zone, in the City's Zoning Ordinance for the Coastal Zone. Without objections, Vice Chair Abelman so ordered.

K. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS - None

L. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION

L.1. RECEIVE AND FILE A PRESENTATION FROM THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF BEACHES AND HARBORS REGARDING THEIR LIVING SHORELINE PROJECT

This item was moved ahead of J.1 by W.E.D. Director Kapovich.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich announced they would have a couple of speakers; introduced Emiko Innes, LA County, and Chris Webb, Moffatt and Nichol; noted they would walk the Commission through this future project and answer any questions they may have.

Emiko Innes stated she is a Coastal Resilience Project Manager for the LA County Department of Beaches and Harbors; provided a PowerPoint presentation.

Innes stated in their Coastal Resilience study in 2023, they identified three beach locations for their purpose and Redondo Beach was one of them.

Innes stated the project area is located in between the Pier and Topaz Growing; noted that sediment tends to move from south to north; reported the beach has been renourished twice (last time in 2012) and needs to be renourished again; thought about installing a sediment retention device underneath the Pier but stated their analysis has shown that not much sand is migrating to north of the Pier so they abandoned that idea; spoke of finding that most of the sediment on the beach is ending up on the Redondo Submarine Canyon; provided a slide of the selected project and showed where they are going to place 300,000 cubic yards of beach quality sand, which will make the beach width 90 ft wider; noted they will add 0.5 acre of dune habitat; stated the project will cost \$27 million with a recreational value of \$202 million over 20 years and the benefit cost ratio is 7.5; provided a slide with their "Next Steps":

Innes provided a slide on the "big picture" on the County's Coastal Resilience Initiative; stated

their goal is to protect public beaches and access from erosion caused by storms and sea level rise; mentioned that she already covered the Living Shoreline Demonstration Project and moved on to talk about the Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP), which will establish five pre-approved sites for relatively small beach nourishment projects using opportunistically available sand sources; noted that Redondo Beach is one of those five pre-approved sites and will be able to receive sand from sand sources such as construction sites; stated that the program would be ready mid-2026; lastly, explained the LA County Regional Coastal Strategic Adaptation Plan, which will develop a regional coalition of stakeholders and prepare a strategic plan to facilitate the implementation of Regional Shoreline Management activities for the LA County coast; reported they just had their first workshop in May with the Coastal jurisdictions to discuss coalition structures to prepare the Master Plan to manage sand on the beach; mentioned at that meeting, they heard from RB staff that King Harbor has sediment accumulations and said part of this plan can address that issue; wrapped up her presentation and invited questions.

Commissioner Carlson spoke positively regarding the area of beach Innes spoke about in her presentation; noted that the City just went through a dredging program in the Harbor; noted that having the canyon and all the stonework in the Harbor area is the cause of the loss of sand and due to the porous break wall there is a beach inside the wall; continued to describe the path of the sand from south to north and the work needed to preserve the beach; reported that during the dredging project, the Army Corps and all the experts commented on the extra sand that they were picking up and felt they did not need to put it back; stated they all thought the beach was stable; wondered if Innes knew that the City had done a dredging project and have sand available locally, noting the Topaz Jetty has sand to give; reported that they were told the beach was stable and asked Innes if she could show them the County data that shows the stability of the beach.

Innes stated that they are aware of the dredging project; stated the Feasibility Study Report shows an increasing trend over time in the last 20-25 years because the beach went through two beach nourishment activities; reported they want to add double the volume of sediment onto the beach so that it will last for at least 20 years.

Commissioner Carlson talked about another study done by Noble & Associates, which showed the whole area has subsided several inches due to oil drilling and extraction; felt they are fighting a losing battle; commented that she mentioned Marina Del Rey and the dredging there as a possible source and stated, when that was done in 2012, it was made up of mostly trash and plastic; strongly stated they do not want that sand in Redondo Beach; spoke of this project making him nervous; noted that they have a unique habitat and this will impact scuba divers and the valuable ecological and recreational area.

Innes responded to the comment about the dirty sand from Marina Del Rey, stated that they have learned their lesson since the 2012 incident and completely agree that it was not acceptable; reported that they have standards to meet for beach nourishment activities and are only using beach quality sand.

Commissioner Carlson asked about DDT and PCP.

Innes reported they perform a chemical test of the sediment and went into more detail of where the sand comes from and that it is clean.

Commissioner Carlson stated that is where the sand came from last time and it had a lot of plastic which came out of Ballona Creek.

Commissioner Bauer commented that there was a lot of DDT in the sand that was dumped from their dredging and noted that Innes stated they would not be using that sand.

Commissioner Chrzan asked Innes if doubling the sand meant doubling the width or doubling the replenishment.

Innes replied it is doubling the volume of sand; mentioned last time they added 100,000 to 150,000 cubic yards and this time they are adding 300,000 cubic yards.

Commissioner Chrzan voiced her concerns over the environmental impact study, the infrastructure, the upkeep and the amount of traffic that beach receives and wondered how this story is different from two years ago; asked if there is a filtering standard published publicly.

Chris Webb, Moffatt & Nichol, stated it is not filtered, sieved or separated; noted if it comes from upland, such as a construction site or a debris basin, it is typically screened at that site; further explained, if it comes from off-shore, it comes from a large sandy area that was former sea bed and an area that has a depth of 50 feet and look about 20 feet below that, and explained their process of visually inspecting the core from samples; noted that the grain match and chemistry is important; mentioned that the closest off-shore deposit would be Topaz but that he is not that familiar with the character or quality of it; reported that his company heads have been looking at some sites off Los Angeles International Airport that were investigated, in 2012, by the coastal engineering firm that is leading the study; stated they found really high quality sand that is a bit coarser, which has propensity to stay up on the beach longer; explained why this type of sand would be better for the beach and the area; mentioned it would be a slightly different color; reported that a San Diego group called San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) performed a project such as he has described and went into greater detail about that project; reverted back to Commissioner Chrzan's question and reported that they do not sieve the sand when it comes from the ocean because there is nothing typically in it; spoke about the San Diego project having Indian grinding bowls actually come out of the pipe and stated that might happen in this project and explained why; stated that what they are trying to do with Redondo is provide an opportunity for a more resilient piece of shoreline between the Pier and Topaz groin; spoke more on the reasons for their work and intended goals for the project; welcomed the Commission's input and ideas.

More discussion followed.

Commissioner Chrzan noted that the big point she got from what Webb said is that the reason it makes sense for the County to put all this money in is simply the larger grain size of sand gives it more longevity.

Webb stated he can bring the Commission samples, and mentioned there would be an off-shore investigation and he would be able to bring physical samples of the various sand locations; gave more description and details on the sand locations and where collections would be made; noted that they found a lot of sand along the length of the coast that will be able to supply this job and many others.

Commissioner Collier mentioned he was diving in 2012, off Veteran's Park, when the dredging at Marina Del Rey took place; stated that he witnessed sand being dumped into the water and then being pumped onto the sand with pieces of plastic in it; suggested they search the YouTube video "The Trashing of Veteran's Park" documenting the incident; echoed Commissioner Carlson's statement that they do not want sand from the end of Ballona Creek in Marina Del Rey.

Webb stated he would watch the video; mentioned that the floating debris tends to collect in depressions and goes right toward the canyon; went on to describe what he has seen from other sites.

Commissioner Falk asked if Moffatt & Nichol has engaged with South Bay Parkland Conservancy because they have been doing the Esplanade Bluff Restoration Project and may be able to provide insight to them.

Discussion followed on how to contact South Bay Parkland Conservancy and how to view what they have been doing on their website.

Innes noted they have been in contact with the Bay Foundation and USCC Grant Academia staff and they have been helpful.

Commissioner Falk spoke of the South Bay Parkland Conservancy working with the California Coastal Conservancy and Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission using funds from California Prop 12 and a grant from their city to restore the bluffs to its original native habitat.

Vice Chair Abelman echoed the concerns of Commissioners Carlson and Collier and asked in the event there are particulates in the sand, what happens next.

Webb reported that the Southern California Dredge Material Management Team (DMMT) meets once a month to determine what requirements projects must go through; listed all the agencies involved and explained the screening process in more detail; spoke about analysis, testing, comparisons, and thresholds; stated once they have test results they need to present those to the DMMT and if there is anything the DMMT finds they will most likely deny the material for use; stated there are guardrails in place that will keep the County in the right lane; mentioned anyone can attend the DMMT meetings.

Vice Chair Abelman asked, of the \$28 million, is there a cost for sand and does it make a difference where it comes from.

Chris Webb stated it does make a difference in cost on where it comes from; explained that the cost depends on the transportation and the labor involved; added that the type of dredging also affects the cost and for this type of project a hopper dredge is needed; noted that hopper dredges are not kept on the west coast and need to be brought in from the east coast via the Panama Canal and is about a \$10 to \$15 million cost; mentioned that the hopper dredge is brought out to the west coast for other projects and they try to time these types of projects for when the "hopper" is brought out in order to save cost; spoke about another dredge option called a cutterhead suction dredge and went into further details on the pros and cons of that type of dredge; mentioned that the cutterhead dredge is about half the cost of the hopper dredge; noted the pros and cons of the hopper dredge including that it uses a lot of fuel; reported that the cost to do a project per cubic yard can be \$15 to \$20 per cubic yard for the cutterhead dredge and double that cost for the hopper dredge.

Vice Chair Abelman stated the reason he asked is he wanted to make sure there was no incentive for someone to get rid of their junky sand and pass it along.

Chris Webb responded that there is no issue like that he is aware of; said the actual mineral sand or grain is free and that the cost is in the delivery but that they always build in a 25% contingency, which should go down as the project advances.

Commissioner Carlson apologized for his earlier hostile questioning; mentioned he loves this beach and said he would like to work with them to make this project as good as it can be; noted he has been in front of the DMMT, dredging and the Army Corps; stated they consistently heard a different story on the quality of sand; described his past experiences; stated that there is still too much sand in the Harbor and spoke about that being a large grain sand source; noted that the City is working on a maintenance dredging permit because that sand is in their way.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich added that the City would like to do something every 5 years instead of every 20 years in terms of dredging.

Vice Chair Abelman reported that they moved the Army Corps storage site from north of the Topaz Groin to the south of Topaz Groin to get it further away from the canyon and the dive site and get it closer to an existing County work building; stated the idea was to store sand there and it could be brought onshore with small pump and pumped down to the beach; suggested they could possibly do a smaller project with local dredging in the Harbor or from that storage site and put 10,000 or 20,000 cubic feet of sand every year onto the beach and be far less than \$27 million.

Innes stated that type of creative thinking can be incorporated into their regional plan with different jurisdictions to come up with a long-term coastal resilience plan for the whole coast of LA County and thanked Commissioner Carlson for that idea; asked that the Commission talk to City staff about those ideas so they can include it into their plan.

Vice Chair Abelman invited public comment.

Mark Hansen, King Harbor boater, strongly echoed the last comments made by Commissioner

Carlson and asked that the consultants listen to the Commission and remove existing sand out of the Harbor.

There were no other public comments on this matter.

Commissioner Chrzan asked W.E.D. Director Kapovich how the relationship work with the County and the City.

Innes responded instead of Director Kapovich; reported they have had stakeholder meetings, and the City of Redondo Beach has been a valuable partner in this project; noted they keep the City staff updated on the status of the project at all times and staff can update the Commission so they can be involved.

W.E.D. Director Kapovich added that he, the Public Works Director and the City Manager hold monthly meetings with the representatives of LA County Beaches and Harbor to discuss a plethora of projects including this one.

Discussion followed on whether the comments and concerns of the Commission stated tonight have been included in discussions, noted that written comments were given on the dredging project, and the written comments can be found in the dredging project's EIR.

Motion by Commissioner Coller, seconded by Commissioner Chrzan, to receive and file the report. Hearing no objections, Vice Chair Abelman so ordered.

Motion carried 6-0 by voice vote.

Vice Chair Abelman returned to Item No. J.1.

M. ITEMS FROM STAFF - None

M.1. LIAISON'S REPORT

W.E.D. Director Kapovich provided updates on the Boat Launch Project, the International Boardwalk blade signs, the breakwall repair; the sea bass grow pens, and Seaside Lagoon. announced the next meeting is scheduled for July 14th and will have representatives from Fire and Police to answer questions, provide stats and updates.

Discussion followed regarding the car show, employee parking, Measure C, boat trailers, delays in the breakwall project, installing bike racks north of Portofino Way and the Skate Park.

N. COMMISSION MEMBER ITEMS AND FUTURE COMMISSION AGENDA TOPICS

Commissioner Chrzan announced she will not be in attendance for next month's meeting.

O. ADJOURNMENT – 8:42 p.m.

Motion by Commissioner Collier, seconded by Commissioner Falk, to adjourn the meeting at 8:42 p.m. Hearing no objections, Vice Chair Abelman so ordered.

The next meeting of the Redondo Beach Harbor Commission will be a regular meeting to be held at 6:30 P.M. on July 14, 2025, in the Redondo Beach Council Chambers, at 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:



Greg Kapovich
Waterfront & Economic Development Director