

A. CALL TO ORDER

An Adjourned Regular Meeting of the Charter Review Advisory Committee was called to order by Chair Strutzenberg at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present:	Dawidziak, Solomon, Maroko, Narain, Pinzler, Chair Strutzenberg
Alternate Members Present:	Tabares
Members Absent:	Wunderli
Officials Present:	Mike Witzansky, City Manager Eleanor Manzano, City Clerk Mike Webb, City Attorney Andy Winje, City Engineer

C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

At the request of Chair Strutzenberg, Member Maroko led the Committee in the Salute to the Flag.

D. APPROVE ORDER OF AGENDA

Motion by Chair Strutzenberg, seconded by Member Maroko, approve the Order of Agenda.
Motion carried unanimously.

E. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS – ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS

E.1. For Blue Folder Documents Approved at the City Council Meeting

Motion by Member Solomon, seconded by Member Dawidziak, to receive and file Blue Folder Items for I.2 and J.1. Motion carried unanimously.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F.1. APPROVE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE CHARTER REVIEW ADVISORY COMMITTEE ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 5, 2022

Motion by Member Dawidziak, seconded by Member Narain to approve the Consent Calendar.
Motion carried unanimously.

G. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

H. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Strutzenberg called for public comments.

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

Records Management Coordinator Diaz read the comment submitted via eComment by Mark Nelson.

I. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS

I.1. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING ARTICLE XI, SECTION 11.2, CITY ATTORNEY

Chair Strutzenberg informed the Members there will not be any additional outside speakers presenting on this item and opened the discussion for the Committee Members.

Member Pinzler stated that either the City limits the potential candidates to residents only or makes the position available on a broader base.

Chair Strutzenberg added that when he spoke to other appointed City Attorneys, the number of applicants who respond to a typical RFP is approximately 30.

Member Dawidziak commented that while City Council are the elected representatives, it's up to the people to decide. It should be put on the ballot.

Member Narain stated that times have changed in the last 22 years and the people should be given the chance to either vote for it or not.

Member Solomon reported there has been an evolution within the City, many of which are with the elected positions including the City Attorney's position going from a part-time role to a full-time role with the number of staff increasing over time. The current structure needs to be reviewed, and the residents should have the opportunity to provide input. Other cities and counties have exercised that prerogative and put it to the voters.

Member Maroko said with no apples-to-apples analysis, he questioned if the City would be saving money if the City Attorney was an appointed position. Other reasons to have an appointed position would be to avoid politically ; and residing in Redondo Beach provides for a limited pool of people for the elected position. He said in 1999, an advisory vote did not pass and nothing has changed since.

Member Maroko reviewed past election results when the City sought voter direction in moving the position from elected to appointed. Each time, the results were in favor of leaving the position as an elected position. In 1999, an advisory vote was on the ballot because full support of the City Council could not be obtained for a full-blown measure, in which 1359 voted yes and 4490 voted no, with not one precinct in the City voting in favor of a change to appointive office. Previously, in 1957, 2189 voted yes and 5307 voted no to make City attorney appointive. When the charter was adopted in 1949, 1717 voted yes, 366 voted no to keep the City Attorney as elected; and in 1947, 518 voted yes and 2841 voted no to make the City Attorney an appointive process and no single precinct favored the change. Lastly, in 1934, 1104 voted to adopt a charter that had an elected

City Attorney, with 638 voting against adopting that Charter. Prior to then, the position of City Attorney was a part-time appointed position.

Additional comments included the expense of an appointed full-time attorney, accessibility and accountability to the public of an elected City Attorney. Member Maroko concluded that he has not heard a good argument as to why the existing structure is not servicing the community well.

Member Pinzler commented that at least two or three cities have moved from elected to appointed City Attorneys since 1999 and stated that the people who see the working of the city intimately is the city council. They deal with the City Attorney in situations where the public is not allowed and believes they are the best arbiters of how good the City Attorney is or isn't. Alternate Member Tabares reported this should be brought to the voters for the ultimate decision and to not make the recommendation would not be fair to the people. She also stated the City would be better served by casting a wider net in search for the City Attorney and it's best to leave the past behind and move forward.

Member Narain also commented that a lot has changed in the last 20 years, including the demographics.

Member Solomon added that recalls of a position are very costly to the citizens who initiate the recalls and when looking at the role of the City Attorney and politicization, when there are endorsements, that can create problematic situations. With regards to expenses, Member Solomon reported the City Attorney's budget is \$4.9 million which does not include some of the City's outside litigation. He compared the budget to other cities, including:

City	Population	Amount
Anaheim	347,000	\$7.679 million (in-house City Attorney)
Carson	95,000	\$2.6 million
Costa Mesa	100,000	\$3.8 million (contract attorney)
Riverside	319,000	\$5 million (in-house City Attorney)
Torrance	147,000	\$2.9 million (in-house City Attorney)

In response to Member Dawidziak's question if they are all P & O or include settlements, Member Solomon stated that his perception is it did include settlements for all of them and it would include the operations. Member Solomon also suggested submitting the figures as part of the report.

Chair Strutzenberg commented he is unsure if past voter performance indicates future results, and in his opinion, expects the role of the City Attorney to be focused on matters of the law and not to lean on policy on either direction other than by guidance of City Council. Chair Strutzenberg also reported that currently the role of the City Clerk has worked well but has concerns of a different scenario in the future where the position would be able to shut things down and City Council would be powerless to do anything outside of a recall, which would be difficult.

Member Maroko reported that the League of California Cities states that the client is the municipal corporation. With any corporation there will be a spokesperson that is going to influence the direction that the corporation's council takes, but there is a process that the city is the client, not city council. The ethical duty belongs to the municipal corporation and council has an ethical duty to act in the best interest of the municipal corporation. Whether the position is appointed or elected, the duty still belongs with the corporation itself.

Regarding the budget numbers, Member Maroko inquired if any of the cities are dual function cities with a criminal prosecution component.

City Attorney Webb responded that Torrance and Anaheim are dual function cities and added there are special things in Redondo Beach's budget such as the homeless effort, which is only being done by the City of Redondo Beach.

Member Maroko recommended that if the Committee is going to ask City Council to make the Charter change, do not do it as an appointed position but do it by removing all the references of the City Attorney from the Charter as that will resolve the full time versus part time issue. There doesn't appear to be a requirement in the California government code that the City Attorney be in the Charter.

Member Solomon commented how the costs of recalls and campaigns have changed over the years and would like to hear public comment.

Chair Strutzenberg called for public comment.

Former retired Police Chief Keith Kauffman commented that the availability of having an elected City Attorney from the Police Chief's position was extremely positive for both the community and the Police Department. He said the relationship between the City Attorney's office and the Police Department instilled confidence in the community because both entities worked closely with one another on various programs such as homelessness and domestic violence advocates. District attorneys will come and go, but the community should have confidence in the City and the Police Department. When the City has an elected City Attorney that is able to prosecute those state misdemeanors and step up and fill in the void, it helps breed confidence with the public safety agencies as well as the City.

Member Dawidziak motioned, seconded by Member Maroko, to extend the speaker time for former Police Chief Kauffman. Motion carried unanimously.

Chief Kauffman reported the important role the City Attorney played that during Covid. During Covid, the County was making rules without collaboration from cities and how to enforce those rules. This put the agency at a disadvantage. With our elected City Attorney, we were able to collaborate and come up with a balance where we could keep people safe in the City but also not acquiesce to doing certain enforcement that would have damaged the relationship with the Redondo Beach citizens and the Police Department. The City Attorney was able to assist with this because there is no undue influence from the people who hired the City Attorney since he was hired by the public.

Chief Kauffman concluded by stating that it was important for him to have a separate elected official who provided somewhat of a balance in the system and having an elected City Attorney who handles misdemeanor prosecutions is important to the community.

In response to Member Pinzler's inquiry, former Police Chief Kauffman clarified that the statement regarding a close relationship with the elected City Attorney comes from his own experience as the Police Chief of Redondo Beach having more collaboration with the City Attorney than other surrounding municipalities. As an example, cities like Manhattan Beach does not have internal

prosecution. When it comes to prosecuting their own state misdemeanors--when it's not being conducted by the district attorney--it raises all kinds of problems in the community, and the community can lose confidence in the police department. There are prosecutors from City Attorney Webb's office that work directly inside the police department and those relationships that they build with detectives is important to the community. The public safety departments in Redondo Beach have a very close relationship with the community. They are able to answer to what those community needs are and many of them were served by having an elected City Attorney. Everything is political. It's not that an elected official would be necessarily doing something wrong, but it puts people in bad positions, and when you have someone elected, it helps remove that. I can potentially see that not being the case with someone appointed.

In response to Chair Strutzenberg's question regarding Chief Kauffman's comment about working with the elected City Attorney during Covid on what to prosecute and what should not be prosecuted, Chief Kauffman clarified that during Covid, he worked with City Attorney Webb to review the mandates that were coming from the County and then developed a system of how to address such mandates. The County decided what need to be enforced, and it put the Police Chief and the Police Department in a difficult position. Much of it pertained to the business community. If enforcement was done the way the County wanted, it would have decimated the relationship between the Police Department and the businesses. We had to find a way to strike that balance. Through an independent City Attorney, we were able to come up with a system where we would do the full documentation, send it to the attorney's office and it would be forwarded to the County, but a lot of agencies weren't able to do that.

Member Pinzler commented that it works in both situations with elected or appointed positions.

Member Dawidziak stated his opinion of what Police Chief Kauffman was saying which is that politics at the lowest level works best. The community is best served while they have some semblance of control. It was noted that during Covid, nobody was happy, including the business community, politicians, and individuals.

Chair Strutzenberg called for further public comments.

Records Management Coordinator Diaz read the comment submitted via eComment by Lezlie Campeggi.

Records Management Coordinator Diaz read the comment submitted via eComment by Lisa Youngworth.

In response to Member Maroko's question regarding Council's ability to bring this up on their own if the Committee doesn't recommend having an appointed position, or removing section 11.2, Member Pinzler reported Council is able to bring this up on their own.

Member Solomon commented that not having an elected City Attorney does not mean that the City has to give up prosecutions. The City can look at a hybrid model. It would be up to Council and the voters. The voters can be asked if they want to retain prosecutorial services with an elected City Attorney and have the civil litigations with a contract attorney. The Committee is not deciding what the model will be going forward but asking the Council to discuss it and put it on the ballot for the voters to decide.

In response to alternate Member Tabares' inquiries if the recommendation to City Council is to also include a suggested framework and if there has been a discussion to amend Section 11.2, Chair Strutzenberg stated the first thing the Committee needs to do is to decide if the Committee recommends to the City Council the matter of elected versus appointed be put to a vote of the public. The pros and cons would also be presented to City Council. Chair Strutzenberg also commented that the discussion of Section 11.2 has only been anecdotal.

Alternate Member Tabares reported that if the Committee is voting on it as a threshold motion, she would like to make sure that it is further considered as an alternative.

Chair Strutzenberg stated it is his intent to go further with that at the Committee's discretion.

Member Dawidziak motioned, seconded by Member Pinzler, to forward to City Council the recommendation to put on the ballot the matter of elected versus appointed City Attorney and the pros and cons will be presented to City Council. Motion carried by majority, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Dawidziak, Solomon, Narain, Pinzler, Tabares, Chair Strutzenberg
NOES: Maroko
ABSENT: Wunderli

Chair Strutzenberg inquired if the Committee is making recommendations on a firm being appointed or a single person with a firm backing them, different model options, and who would do the appointing.

Member Dawidziak stated the Committee should just forward the recommendation to put it on the ballot and provide strikeout language or language to put in the Charter.

Member Solomon commented it would be valuable to inform the City Council that the Committee has had many discussions and received presentations from City Attorney Webb and an appointed City Attorney regarding this topic. It is up to Council's discretion how to format the ballot language.

Member Maroko commented on deleting the reference to the City Attorney which is under Article 10, Section 10 which defines as elected officer and then Section 11.2 City Attorney. It would be Council's decision to determine by ordinance or resolution how to do it.

Member Pinzler reported that Section 10 is relatively simple. City Attorney would be stricken as an elected officer of the City.

I.2. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE FOLLOWING ARTICLES RELATED TO CONTRACTS AND PURCHASES:

1. ARTICLE XX, SECTION 20.1, APPROVAL OF DEMANDS
2. ARTICLE VIII, SECTION 8.3 (C), MAYOR, PRESIDING ON CONTRACT SIGNATURES
3. ARTICLE XIX, GENERAL PROVISIONS, FOCUSING ON THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS:

- SECTION 19, PUBLIC WORKS, CONTRACTS ON BID LIMITS
- SECTION 19.1, COMPETITIVE BIDDING WHEN NOT REQUIRED ON MAINTENANCE-REPAIR AND MATERIALS UNDER \$5K
- SECTION 19.7, CONTRACTS, PROGRESS PAYMENTS ON RETENTION PERCENTAGE
- SECTION 19.9, MUNICIPAL PURCHASES

City Attorney Webb reported following the direction the Charter Committee requested of him which was to wordsmith using the original Charter language and not add a third set of redlines.

Starting with Section 8.3, it is exactly what the Committee had in simplifying it having fewer cross outs. Also included was ballot language for Measure F which includes the argument against and the impartial analysis. It was mentioned that there wasn't an argument in favor. The election results were requested which showed a 70/30 result in opposition. City Attorney Webb reported speaking with Robert Norman, the City Manager, Ted Semaan and Andy Winje.

Included in the materials to the Committee is a letter from the State that was received from City Engineer Andy Winje. It would keep intact the three tiers the City currently has but update the amounts. That is an alternative but not City Attorney Webb's preference.

City Attorney Webb stated nothing was removed in Section 8.3. While no decision needs to be made now, there should be discussion if, only by ordinance, the City Council should authorize the City Manager or other officer employed to sign it. An ordinance may not apply in every case where it is warranted for the mayor to sign it or not. It can be done by resolution of a certain amount or by contract.

Regarding Section 19, City Attorney Webb reported the job order contract is of concern to Andy Winje, but the dollar figures are of more concern to Ted Semaan. It was written in a way with an exception that would basically nullify the rest of the ordinance because it gave a third option where if the City Council set up an alternate plan via ordinance or resolution, it wouldn't matter if it goes above the threshold. That was stricken because that was causing a big concern.

City Attorney Webb commented that in Section 19.1, the big issue is (e) isn't necessary. Paragraph (e) is an exception to a rule that no longer exists, which is why that was stricken out. The exception was for supplies and materials under \$5,000.00, but a bid is not necessary on supplies and purchases under \$15,000 since that was changed in Section 19 previously.

City Manager Witzansky discussed the two objectives which included updating the indices and creating a process that makes sense which would be to include an ordinance that describes all the rules since the Charter does not change often.

Further discussion continued regarding proposing an ordinance that would periodically change with a four-fifths (4/5) City Council vote. This would resolve the dollar figure issues over time and allow for an inflation escalator. There was also discussion regarding recommended indexing if the Charter is amended,

City Engineer Andy Winje reported alternate numbers are included that are recommended by the state controller, which general law cities are required enter into with an agreement with the state.

Charter cities are not required to enter into an agreement, but the City can follow their indices which are the \$200,000 and the \$60,000 numbers that are currently being used. The law requires the figures be reviewed every five years and if those figures change, the change must be a minimum of \$15,000.

Discussion followed regarding the concern of being tied to an amount that may not change for several years. City Manager Witzansky commented that it would be appropriate to assign limits via ordinance.

City Attorney Webb reported that Council can have authority to review and approve an amount not to exceed the amount provided by the state.

City Engineer Winje stated that the CPI is not a true index of construction costs. Member Dawidziak commented that tying the figures to the state agency is tying the City to a different government.

Member Pinzler suggested creating a bi-annual structure where the numbers can be revised based upon whatever indices exist at the time and allow the change with a four-fifths (4/5) vote.

Member Maroko commented since the City Manager has discretion as the executive, add language that upon recommendation of the City Manager, with 60 days' notice and per Council approval, the number can be increased.

Member Solomon suggested the language contain thresholds that can change no more frequently than every five years but in no greater increments than 25% of the existing limit. With the four-fifths (4/5) vote of the council, the numbers would be in there. This provides an opportunity to grow, with a reasonable timeframe and a high threshold for it to happen.

City Manager Witzansky commented it would be beneficial to consider language that reads in a way that doesn't limit the City to a specific timeframe.

There was further discussion regarding placing a cap on the amount, the review frequency, the escalator increase, the adjustment cycle, and language.

Chair Strutzenberg called for public comments.

Records Management Coordinator Diaz read the comment submitted via eComment by Lezlie Campeggi.

Member Solomon motioned, seconded by alternate member Tabares, the recommendation to amend the threshold limits of every expenditure of more than \$200,000.00 for public works projects, \$60,000.00 or less may be performed by the employees of the City. These threshold figures may be changed no more than once every five years in increments of no greater than 25% of the thresholds contained in the Charter and must be approved by a four-fifths (4/5) vote of the City Council by ordinance. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Strutzenberg continued with Section 8.3 and inquired if the goal is that ordinances, resolutions, and warrants would be required to be signed by the Mayor because the wording appears to be only referencing contracts.

City Attorney Webb stated it would be inappropriate to add it to an ordinance or resolution because the Mayor cannot veto those. One of the Mayor's few powers other than appointing Commissioners, is the power of veto.

City Manager Witzansky commented that the only way the City Council could act to allow the City Manager to sign an agreement would be by Council acting through an agenda meeting, unless Council creates a process with pre-authorization for contracts of certain amounts.

Chair Strutzenberg proposed separating the changes for gender neutrality and include those in the ballot measure and keep Section 8.3 purely to the language regarding the signatures.

Discussion followed regarding changes to the language such as the word "he" be replaced with the word "mayor." In addition, it was determined by City Attorney Webb that the word "shall" needs to remain in the language since it means mandatory. With regards to the implication that the contracts are approved, it was suggested to insert language that states the contracts and ordinance are adopted or approved.

Chair Strutzenberg called for public comment. There being no comments, the public comment period was closed.

Member Maroko motioned, seconded by Member Dawidziak, that the Committee adopt Section 8.3 as it is with the redlines, and remove the comma and "by ordinance," and keep it the way it is presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Regarding Section 19.1, Chair Strutzenberg reported there was a proposal to change the language under item (e).

City Attorney Webb stated the language was an exception to a rule that no longer applies.

Member Dawidziak motioned, seconded by Member Pinzler, to approve what has been presented with the strikeouts and the addition as defined by the City Council by ordinance or resolution and strike section (e) in its entirety. Motion carried unanimously.

Discussion continued with Section 19.7. City Manager Witzansky mentioned creating efficiency in the process by creating a new category in the agenda process, similar to contracts under \$35,000.00. Completed projects can be accepted through an inventory list that doesn't have a subsequent or supporting staff report. Council would effectively approve that release.

Chair Strutzenberg called for public comment. There being no comments, the public comment period was closed.

Member Maroko motioned, seconded by Member Pinzler, to adopt Section 19.7 as redlined. Motion carried unanimously.

With regards to Section 19.9, Member Solomon reported inquiring if the professional services procurement can be included in this section and submitted a Blue Folder item that includes a portion of the Carson ordinance that discusses procurement of professional services by the City of Carson. The purpose of bringing this to attention is that City department heads have fewer guardrails in place than in other portions of the procurement process, whereby the professional

services do not often go out to bid and are continued for an extensive period without review. There should be some language that those professional services have some type of periodic review, and the contracts should not extend five or seven years without competitive bidding.

The Committee continued the discussion with the following suggestions: revising the existing ordinance, adding professional services to the Charter, adding language to the report to City Council suggesting an amendment to the Charter, and suggest Council address more competitive bidding as it pertains to professional services.

Member Pinzler motioned, seconded by Member Dawidziak, to accept the redlined version of Section 19.9. Motion carried unanimously.

The Committee discussed the different draft versions of Section 20.1.

Chair Strutzenberg called for public comment. There being none, the public comment period was closed.

Member Maroko motioned, seconded by Member Dawidziak, to adopt the draft from the September 22, 2022, meeting, not the Blue Folder Item. Motion carried unanimously.

I.3. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE FOLLOWING ARTICLES RELATED TO ENUMERATION AND TERMS:

1. ARTICLE VI (CITY COUNCIL), SECTION 6, NUMBER AND TERM
2. ARTICLE VIII, SECTION 8, MAYOR, ELECTION, TERM AND COMPENSATION
3. ARTICLE X, SECTION 10, ENUMERATION AND TERM OF ELECTIVE OFFICERS (CITY CLERK, CITY TREASURER, CITY ATTORNEY)

Member Maroko withdrew his request for Article VI with regards to the number. There was a brief discussion regarding 12-year terms limits for the elected officers who are not City Council or the Mayor. However, Member Maroko thought 12 years would include the City Clerk, City Treasurer and City Attorney since those are the only officers that don't have term limits.

Chair Strutzenberg called for public comments. There being none, the public comment period was closed.

Member Pinzler reported that he is more focused on the City Attorney being appointed than the City Treasurer or the City Clerk and the issue with the City Clerk is not electability but the inclusion of the accounting as a requirement. Term limits should be the same for all of the elected positions.

Member Solomon restated his opinion regarding the City Treasurer's position being part time with the deputy City Treasurer handling most of the responsibilities and many of the other responsibilities are delegated to the finance department. Member Solomon commented that it makes the most sense to have an appointed or hired City Treasurer. The responsibilities or requirements to be the City Treasurer are you must be over 18 years of age and live in the city for more than 30 days. There is no requirement of any financial background, or skill set

whatsoever other than being able to vote. If the City is going to have an elected City Treasurer, there should be requirements regarding financial acumen or devolve the role to the next step and no longer have an elected City Treasurer.

Chair Strutzenberg called for public comment. There being none, the public comment period was closed.

Member Solomon motioned, seconded by Member Dawidziak, to continue this item to the meeting of October 27, 2022, to discuss further and ask questions of the representative from Moss Adams. Motion carried by the majority. Motion passed 6-1; Maroko dissenting.

J. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION

J.1. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING FORMATTING THE REPORT THAT WILL BE PRESENTED TO CITY COUNCIL

Chair Strutzenberg reported creating a draft preamble title sheet to the document that will be presented to City Council and noted the wording in Item 8.3 will change per the current discussion. The individual articles would be prepared similarly with regards to the contract, but the more extensive one would be the City Attorney recommendation.

Member Pinzler inquired if all the pros and cons should be included in the report.

Member Maroko stated that the report of the Charter Committee from 1994-1995 provides a section called Measure Submitted to the Vote of the Electorate which includes measures approved by the Committee but rejected by the City Council. This will assist in providing a report on the Committee's activities.

Discussion continued with what to include in the immediate report due to the timeframe, and items not as time sensitive can be discussed and presented to City Council at a later time.

Member Maroko stated the gender-neutral topic has report that was written and should be included.

Chair Strutzenberg reported the gender-neutral topic is the one thing that was not originally prescribed on the list that will be included in the report. Chair Strutzenberg added that the focus is on the original list which was taken from the amended resolution. We are not currently addressing the City Treasurer or City Clerk which will be explained.

Member Solomon stated if he or anyone else disagreed with a vote (on a time sensitive issue), that person should be given the opportunity to explain in the report their reason.

In response to Member Maroko's inquiry if the report will come back to the Committee or be submitted directly to City Council, Chair Strutzenberg commented the report should be rightfully approved by the Committee.

Member Tabares requested if consistent headings or bullet points can be used for the categories to make it easier to follow.

Chair Strutzenberg stated the subcommittee consisting of Members Maroko, Solomon and Chair Strutzenberg will work together to add certain headings in a prescribed arrangement for each item and submit it to the City Clerk by noon on October 24. It will be inclusive of the enumerated items with regards to contracts, the City Attorney, and the gender-neutral language.

Chair Strutzenberg called for public comment. There being none, the public comment period was closed.

Motion by Maroko, seconded by Member Dawidziak, to continue Item J.1 to October 27, 2022. Motion passed unanimously.

K. MEMBER ITEMS AND REFERRALS TO STAFF


L. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Redondo Beach Charter Review Advisory Committee, motion by Member Solomon, seconded by alternate Member Tabares, to adjourn the meeting to October 27, 2022, at 7:00 p.m., in the Redondo Beach Council Chambers, at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California. There being no objections, the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,



Eleanor Manzano, City Clerk