CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH
WATER QUALITY/COASTAL TIDELANDS COMMITTEE
AGENDA
Crystal Cove Conference Room

Thursday, October 2, 2025 - 3:00 PM

Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands Committee Members:
  Councilmember Michelle Barto, Chair
  Mayor Joe Stapleton, Vice Chair
  Peter Belden, Member
  Curtis Black, Member
  Charles Fancher, Member
  Craig Hudson, Member
  Sharon Ray, Member
  George Robertson, Member
  John Wadsworth, Member

  Staff Members:
  Jim Houlihan,Deputy Public Works Director/City Engineer
  John Kappeler, Senior Engineer
  Bob Stein, Assistant City Engineer
  Karen Gallagher, Administrative Assistant

The Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands Committee meeting is subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act. Among other things, the Brown Act requires that the Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands Committee agenda be posted at least seventy-two (72) hours in advance of each regular meeting and that the public be allowed to comment on agenda items before the Committee and items not on the agenda but are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands Committee. The Chair may limit public comments to a reasonable amount of time, generally three (3) minutes per person.

The City of Newport Beach's goal is to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in all respects. If, as an attendee or a participant at this meeting, you will need special assistance beyond what is normally provided, we will attempt to accommodate you in every reasonable manner. Please contact John Kappeler, Water Quality Enforcement Manager, at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting to inform us of your particular needs and to determine if accommodation is feasible at (949) 644-3218 or jkappeler@newportbeachca.gov.

NOTICE REGARDING PRESENTATIONS REQUIRING USE OF CITY EQUIPMENT
Any presentation requiring the use of the City of Newport Beach's equipment must be submitted to the Public Works Department 24 hours prior to the scheduled meeting.

1) **CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

2) **ROLL CALL AND INTRODUCTIONS**

3) **PUBLIC COMMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS (10 min)**

   Public comments are invited on agenda items. Speakers must limit comments to five minutes. Before speaking, we invite, but do not require, you to state your name for the record. The Committee has the discretion to extend or shorten the speakers' time limit on agenda items, provided the time limit adjustment is applied equally to all speakers. As a courtesy, please turn cell phones off or set them in the silent mode.

4) **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES (5 min)**

   Recommendation: Approve minutes as presented

   090425_NPB_WQCT_Draft

5) **CURRENT BUSINESS (55 min)**

(a) Committee Goals/Objectives (Bob Stein) (25 min) Update from each subcommittee.

Recommendation: Committee Discussion

(b) City of Newport Beach's General Plan - Harbor, Bay and Beaches Element Subcommittee (Curtis Black) (20 min) Update from the subcommittee.

Recommendation: Committee Discussion

(c) Newport Beach Trash Interceptor Viewing Platform (Mark Ward) (10 min) Presentation on a proposed (future) viewing platform.

Recommendation: Committee Discussion

6) <u>**COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS OR MATTERS WHICH MEMBERS WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION OR REPORT (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM) (10 min)**</u>

(a) **Committee Goals/Objectives Sub-committees Final Reports (November - TBD)**

(b) **Santa Ana River Trash Mitigation Project Field Trip (November 2025 - TBD)**

(c) **Draft Copper Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) (Winter 2026 - TBD)**

(d) **Newport Bay Trash Interceptor - Trash Characterization (Winter 2026 - Ellis Peterson)**

(e) **Newport Beach Trash Interceptor Public Outreach Campaign (Winter 2026 - TBD)**

7) <u>**PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS (5 min)**</u>

Public comments are invited on non-agenda items generally considered to be within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers must limit comments to three minutes. Before speaking, we invite, but do not require, you to state your name for the record. The Committee has the discretion to extend or shorten the speakers' time limit on non-agenda items, provided the time limit adjustment is applied equally to all speakers. As a courtesy, please turn cell phones off or set them in the silent mode.

8) <u>**SET NEXT MEETING DATE (5 min)**</u>

Recommendation: November 6, 2025

9) <u>**ADJOURNMENT**</u>

Date: September 4, 2025
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Location: Newport Coast Conference Room, Newport Beach Civic Center
Meeting Minutes prepared by:

1. **Call meeting to order**

   The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

   Vice Chair Stapleton ran the meeting in Chair Barto's absence.

2. **Roll Call and Introductions**

   Committee Members Present:
   Mayor/Vice Chair Joe Stapleton
   Committee Member Peter Belden
   Committee Member Curtis Black
   Committee Member Charles Fancher
   Committee Member Craig Hudson
   Committee Member Sharon Ray
   Committee Member George Robertson
   Committee Member John Wadsworth

   Committee Members Absent:
   Councilmember/Chair Michelle Barto

   Staff Present: David Webb, Director of Public Works
                     Karen Gallagher, Administrative Assistant
                     Bob Stein, Assistant City Engineer
                     Ellis Petersen, Associate Civil Engineer
                     Kayla Nyberg, Management Analyst
                     Ben Zdeba, Planning Manager
                     Brian O'Rourke, NBFD Assistant Chief, Lifeguard Operations
                     Marcus Tang, Public Works Intern

   Guests Present: Austin Heimark, Surfline Coastal Intelligence
                     Jim Mosher, Resident
                     Nancy Gardner, Orange Coast River Park
                     Nancy Skinner, SPON
                     Virginia Anders-Ellmore, Resident
                     Rudy Svreck, Harbor Commissioner
                     Adam Leverenz, Resident
                     Wade Womack, Resident

3. **Public Comment on Agenda Items**

   None.

4. **Review and approval of minutes**
   Recommendation: Approve minutes as presented

   Motion: A motion was made by Committee Member Black to approve the July 10, 2025, minutes as presented, seconded by Committee Member Belden. The motion passed unanimously.

5. **Current Business**

    a. Surfline Coastal Intelligence (Peter Belden/Austin Heimark)
       Presentation by Surfline on how they leverage AI in their live webcasting cameras to track beach erosion, map the nearshore bathymetry, provide accurate beach attendance, and other benefits for municipalities throughout California and Australia.
       Recommendation: Committee Discussion/Approval

Committee Member Belden stated that Surfline Coastal Intelligence is world-renowned and has a network of cameras globally, including 18 in Newport Beach, using Artificial Intelligence (AI) for daily sand berm erosion monitoring and mapping near shore imagery of the sea floor.

Austin Heimark, Surfline Account Executive, reported that the City has 6.2 miles of beach, generating tremendous economic value, but also facing erosion issues. He stated that Surfline can provide bathymetry data, monitor the shoreline for a better understanding of storm impacts, and perform overtopping work in real-time, also allowing for optimal lifeguard staffing. He noted that Surfline has over three decades of data on Newport Beach, including AI-infused data since 2017.

Mr. Heimark reported that the main aspect of their model is camera installation in addition to the ones they already maintain, adding that the City would have access to Surfline's cameras for use either publicly or internally. He added that the other benefits of Surfline's system are data on how the shoreline is changing from erosion, and predictive modelling of high-risk events to impact lifeguard staffing. He reported on how their cameras monitor surfer volumes and the size of the waves, along with how Surfline also uses their technology with the City of San Clemente to detect Panga boats.

In response to Committee Member Hudson's inquiry, Mr. Heimark clarified that the City of San Clemente has found a high volume of Panga boats coming ashore and wants to know when and where it frequently happens.

In response to Vice Chair Stapelton's inquiry, Mr. Heimark reported that Surfline has about 1,400 cameras globally, with the AI system running on about 200. He added that AI can be applied to any of their cameras. He reported that Surfline has all its historical video footage saved, and Newport Beach's footage can be added to the AI system.

In response to Committee Member Black's inquiry, Mr. Heimark clarified that their system can be trained to identify surfers, waves, and other objects so long as they are visible to the human eye.

In response to resident Adam Leverenz's inquiry, Mr. Heimark confirmed that the data is collected during daylight hours.

In response to Associate Engineer Ellis Petersen's inquiry, Mr. Heimark clarified that some of their cameras have been upgraded from their original technology and that most of them are 4K, able to capture high-fidelity images. He noted that they often change the location and angle of their cameras to help fill in gaps in their coverage.

Mr. Heimark reported that Surfline already has data on the City's beaches and noted that Newport Beach is a surfing hotspot with over 45,000 people checking Newport Beach cameras monthly as consumers. He used a video clip from the City of San Diego to demonstrate how Surfline can detect overtopping into a parking lot, adding that Surfline can notify the City so Public Works can further investigate the area backed with historical data to better predict future overtopping events.

Committee Member Belden noted that the Balboa Pier's parking lot has flooded multiple times.

Mr. Heimark reported on how Surfline's technology can study bathymetry without conducting a costly drone or Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) survey by studying where waves break. He added that bathymetry data is critical to determine where to place sand in coastal engineering projects.

Mr. Heimark noted that the cameras can pan to monitor beach attendance trends in a cost-effective manner.

In response to Associate Engineer Petersen's inquiry, Mr. Heimark clarified that the lifeguards would have a live feed from the cameras and be able to see if a swimmer has disappeared for too long a window.

In response to Committee Member Hudson's inquiry, Mr. Heimark clarified that Surfline does not perform facial recognition out of privacy concerns. He added that there have been requests for footage with facial blurring and stated that their cameras are government compliant.

In response to resident Wade Womack's inquiry, Mr. Heimark confirmed that Surfline's bathymetry technology uses deductive logic and that it can be reconciled with LiDAR.

In response to Committee Member Black's inquiry, Mr. Heimark clarified that the height of the cameras and their distance from the shore matter depending on what data the City would want. He added that he would not expect Newport Beach's potential position options to be a problem, as beachfront high-rise structures are not necessary.

Mr. Heimark reported on Surfline's work with lifeguards in New South Wales, Australia, and New Zealand. He noted that Surfline provides attendance data so lifeguards do not have to perform a less-accurate head count and can spend more time watching the water. He added that Surfline can predict high-risk events like riptides based on factors such as swells, wave heights, tides, and weather, so lifeguard managers can adjust staffing needs accordingly. He noted that all video is saved, including rescues, so it can be useful for training and auditing.

In response to Committee Member Robertson's inquiry, Mr. Heimark confirmed that Surfline does not predict wildlife and pondered if their technology can use past visual sightings to predict future appearances by sharks, rays, or other creatures.

In response to Mr. Leverenz's inquiry, Mr. Heimark stated that their bathymetry is primarily based on breaking wave height and that Surfline is working with the Coastal Frontiers Corporation and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography on LiDAR validation.

In response to Public Works Director Dave Webb's inquiry, Mr. Heimark stated that Surfline's bathymetry information only extends out to the farthest breaking waves.

Mr. Heimark reported on Surfline's pricing, with clients generally paying per camera on an annual term, noting that the cost is lower for existing cameras. He stated that Surfline would offer the City a 30% discount on their typical cost of $20,000 for a three-camera pilot program. He reported that he discussed locations with Committee Member Belden, and 56th St., 46th St., and 36th St. seem like good places to operate a three-camera pilot program for Newport Beach.

In response to Associate Engineer Petersen's inquiry, Committee Member Belden stated that the camera locations were intended to capture the middle of the groins where the most erosion occurs and the greatest need for sand replenishment is found.

In response to Public Works Director Webb's inquiry, Mr. Heimark clarified that most of Surfline's existing cameras are optimized for surfers. He reported that they are installing a camera on the City of Oceanside's Municipal Pier specifically to collect longitudinal shoreline data. He added that Surfline could do something similar in Newport Beach.

Still Protecting Our Newport's (SPON) Nancy Skinner stated that longitudinal data could be valuable.

In response to Associate Engineer Petersen's inquiry, Mr. Heimark clarified that pilot program pricing would include one year of historical data. He added that he would have to speak with Surfline staff

about that status and the cost of Newport Beach's full data history and stated that he would get that cost information to Committee Member Belden.

Committee Member Fancher encouraged the Committee and City to move towards active beach management to best maintain and improve the quality and depth of the beaches while buttressing its climate. He stated Surfline's technology would be a tool that a larger effort could utilize, but it would not ultimately tell the City what to do about identified issues.

Committee Member Belden stated that the goal is to collect data and map the sea floor. He added that coastal engineers need this sort of data to generate more accurate models for the future of the beaches to determine the appropriate solutions.

Committee Member Fancher stated that to build the beaches, they need data and implementation, with the implementation determining what data is needed and how to employ it. He agreed this would be a good tool for day-to-day management of the beaches, benefiting lifeguards and others.

In response to Committee Member Black's inquiry, Mr. Heimark stated that the most relevant local work Surfline has performed is with the City of Oceanside and the City of San Clemente. He stated that Oceanside has a problem maintaining sand south of the Oceanside Municipal Pier, where there is no self-sustaining system, so the City is building an artificial reef with Surfline doing the coastal monitoring. He noted that Oceanside is wondering, if the beach is built deeper, how many more beach goers will the City attract, generating local revenue. He noted that Surfline is contracting through GHD Group Ltd., and not the City. He reported that the City of San Clemente is more interested in proactive, persistent monitoring akin to Newport Beach to better understand their beaches and their usage as opposed to using the data for a construction project like Oceanside. He added that San Clemente is less interested in its coastline and more interested in its beach use and surf conditions.

In response to Committee Member Wadsworth's inquiry, Mr. Heimark clarified that the City of Oceanside is still designing the solution and working on matters such as the shape of the reef.

In response to Associate Engineer Petersen's inquiry, Mr. Heimark reported that the City of Oceanside is still working on the new design, noting that the design is out of his field of expertise.

Vice Chair Stapleton recommended having a coastal camera on Balboa Pier to help pick up changes to the shoreline.

Committee Member Black noted that the area from the Balboa Pier to the west also has erosion risk and recommended a camera to monitor this area, pondering how the shore changes seasonally.

Committee Member Robertson called for a more formalized objective for the cameras, noting the potential focus on public safety in areas like identifying rip currents to benefit lifeguards. He stated that he would be uncomfortable approving the expense without a formalized list of objectives and deliverables.

Committee Member Black stated that they are only looking at a pilot program, adding that they can start with a larger list of data points and pare it down. He inquired how this project would interrelate with work potentially done for the City by the Southern California Coastal Ocean Observing System (SCCOOS).

Committee Member Belden stated that Surfline's data and SCCOOS' could be complementary. He added that once the bathymetry data is gathered, there would be sets of information to compare for better assessment. He added that his concept of a three-camera pilot program is also intended to keep the project less expensive, so it is less of a risk.

In response to Committee Member Fancher's inquiry, Committee Member Belden confirmed that the bathymetry could also be done under a proposal by Scripps. He added that Scripps would only

provide a snapshot in time and not constant monitoring, noting that Scripps would also be much more expensive.

Committee Member Robertson clarified that the Surfline proposal would provide rolling averages as opposed to a single set of statistics comparing two static points in time.

Committee Member Fancher stated that Surfline's system could be a tool the City could theoretically use forever, as opposed to capturing a single snapshot.

Committee Member Belden stated that the idea is to use SCCOOS's bathymetry data to confirm Surfline's.

Committee Member Fancher stated this is not akin to taking a traffic count before deciding if a road needs to be repaved or if an intersection needs a traffic light. He clarified that the Committee is considering a long-term plan to analyze the nearshore sand activity with a tool, and it is not considering a solution.

Committee Member Black stated that the program has a good risk-to-cost ratio because they will have a deliverable to study. He stated that he is hearing the Committee would like to use Surfline and have SCCOOS confirm Surfline's data and endorsed consideration for using both organizations at the same time. He stated that he can support the proposal with the presumption it is being conducted on a large enough scale to provide useful data.

Committee Member Fancher endorsed the proposal's three camera locations in addition to a fourth one mounted on Balboa Pier.

Committee Member Robertson stated that they must have a more formal proposal with a series of goals listed, such as monitoring shoreline changes, and specifics about the expected deliverables, ranging from coastal erosion to beach attendance.

Committee Member Belden agreed about having the goals and deliverables more clearly defined. He agreed that a Balboa Pier camera can be beneficial.

Committee Member Robertson agreed, noting that overtopping is a different concern than shoreline changes but studying both could be goals of this project.

Committee Member Wadsworth noted that they were pitched a pilot program of three cameras, but the Committee seems inclined already to go all-in. He stated that 18 cameras would provide far better data than just three or four but acknowledged that it would cost much more.

Committee Member Belden recommended bringing the item back for a discussion of just how much they want to get out of the Surfline proposal.

Committee Member Robertson recommended obtaining Surfline's historical data collected over their 15 years of operation.

In response to Committee Member Fancher's inquiries, Committee Member Belden clarified that Surfline owns the cameras and that the City would only have use of them for the duration of the agreement.

Committee Member Robertson clarified that they are being presented with an annual subscription-style proposal.

Public Works Director Webb expressed concerns over whether three cameras can provide enough coverage, noting the lateral sand drift, which will likely see sand leave the cameras' views.

Committee Member Robertson stated that Public Works Director Webb's comments speak to a need for defined goals, in this case, tracking sand over long distances, requiring more cameras.

Public Works Director Webb stated that they need to learn if the sand is going down the beach or off the beach, and this will take more than three cameras. He echoed Committee Member Robertson's comments about needing to define objectives.

In response to Vice Chair Stapleton's inquiry, Public Works Director Webb stated that there is some funding currently available, but the project could grow to the point where they need to ask for more from the City Council.

Vice Chair Stapleton recommended starting small.

Committee Member Fancher pondered whether there would be sufficient value in performing a small window of work and whether there would only be value from performing a larger project with many more cameras.

Committee Member Hudson stated they need to test out the system to see if it works in real life and not just theoretically.

Committee Member Black stated that one of the more interesting elements of this project, as opposed to others the Committee has seen, is the ability to also gather economic data relative to beach use. He added that the Surfline proposal could also help lifeguards and provide other ancillary benefits compared to other proposals with a more limited scope.

Committee Member Belden stated that he has heard the Committee's feedback and has more to discuss with Mr. Heimark because there are so many options between three and 20 cameras, depending on what they wish to do. He added they will craft a more clarified proposal with different options for a future Committee discussion.

In response to Mr. Womack's inquiry, Mr. Heimark clarified that clients pay per camera because the Surfline team must configure it to best acquire the desired data. He added that Surfline can always add new cameras at an additional cost.

In response to Associate Engineer Petersen's inquiry, Mr. Heimark clarified that the pilot program proposal featured two existing cameras and one new one.

In response to Mr. Leverenz's inquiry, Committee Member Belden stated that bookending the groins is why this proposal was presented in its current manner. He added that the feedback has been beneficial to him in understanding what else the Committee may want, including a camera on Balboa Pier. He encouraged all in attendance to visit Surfline's website to view angles from the 18 existing cameras.

Ms. Skinner pondered where the City's sand goes and how it may affect Newport Canyon.

Committee Member Belden stated that the matter of Newport Canyon is a better discussion item for SCCOOS because it is offshore from where the waves break. He agreed that Newport Canyon should be monitored, as it has neither been validated nor invalidated as a cause of sand loss. He clarified how Surfline can only track bathymetry closer to the shoreline where the waves break.

Ms. Skinner stated that the sand in Newport Canyon could be beneficial at some point.

Committee Member Belden stated that extracting sand from Newport Canyon is likely to be expensive due to its depth.

Vice Chair Stapleton stated that there is no reason for a motion on the subject, but noted that everyone is close to a consensus, and there is some homework to do before the proposal returns to the Committee in the future.

In response to an inquiry, Committee Member Belden agreed it would be beneficial to hear from the City of Oceanside and the City of San Clemente about their coastline issues, which Surfline will be helping study. He stated that he will return with a tightened-up proposal.

b. City of Newport Beach's General Plan – Harbor, Bay and Beaches Element (Curtis Black)
    Update on the draft plan elements.
    Recommendation: Committee Discussion

Planning Manager Ben Zdeba reported on how a General Plan creates a framework for decision-making by creating a vision for the City's future. He reported that the City's General Plan was last comprehensively updated in 2006, with the City currently working on a full update to the document through a resident-led General Plan Update Steering Committee (GPUSC) and a resident-led General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC). He added that the Surfline presentation fits perfectly into General Plan discussions as they ponder how to incorporate AI and other new technologies. He reported on community outreach efforts to date and added that the goal is to have the City Council adopt the new General Plan in early 2026. He stated that the current stage of the process includes bringing Draft Elements to relevant Boards, Committees, and Commissions prior to advertising for public input ahead of an October Open House.

In response to Committee Member Black's inquiries, Planning Manager Zdeba stated that the City is hoping to obtain feedback on the initial drafts being released publicly by November 17th, adding that his hopes are to also have formal feedback from the Committee by November 17th. He stated that public feedback is expected from the City's website, and he expects to have perhaps a formal memorandum with comments from the various Boards, Commissions, and Committees. He added that the GPAC and its various subcommittees will determine which revisions are implemented after discussions with City staff and consultants to ensure the General Plan follows good practices.

Committee Member Black noted that the Committee's scope is relatively broad and touches on three Elements of the General Plan – the Natural Resources Element, the Safety Element, and the Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element. He added that the Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element focused on near-water policies, navigation, access, sand, and harbor operations, with a deeper inclusion of sand and coastal resilience than the current General Plan. He reported that the Natural Resources Element focuses on water quality, habitats, and invasive species removal, while the Safety Element includes coastal hazards, shoreline management, and monitoring. He noted that having a Sea-Level Rise (SLR) Plan is a mandatory component of the Safety Element due to Senate Bill 272, adding that it must align with the Local Coastal Plan (LCP).

Committee Member Black reported on key General Plan themes relevant to the Committee, including coastal resilience, sand replenishment, shoreline management, water quality, habitat and ecosystem restoration, harbor and tidelines infrastructure, and education and community engagement. He stated that there is ample work to perform in reviewing the Draft Elements, and the Committee would have good feedback to offer. He reported that other City Boards, Committees, and Commissions have opted to form an Ad Hoc Subcommittee to review their relevant Draft Elements and report back to the full membership with their thoughts. He noted that the Committee's November meeting goal happens early in the month and could be an ideal time to formalize a response on the Draft Elements ahead of Planning Manager Zdeba's November 17th goal.

In response to Committee Member Hudson's inquiry, Committee Member Black agreed that the Draft Elements are dense and full of information and policies. He noted that the Committee's scope includes coastal resilience on the beaches but added that multiple groups are involved in beaches. He noted that the Harbor Commission was created after the 2006 General Plan update. He stated that it could be a good idea to ask the City Council to clarify which entity is primarily responsible for the beaches and if another committee should be formed. He noted that the beaches also serve as an

economic driver for the City. He reported that the current Draft Elements call for an SLR Plan by 2034, but they could consider performing this task sooner.

Committee Member Black expressed his hopes that today they could settle on whether an Ad Hoc Subcommittee is necessary, and, if so, determine its membership.

Committee Member Fancher reported that he has been a GPAC participant as a member of the public since its inception. He added that the GPAC lacks expertise in the areas under the Committee's purview aside from Committee Member Black's service. He stated that the Committee, through its feedback, can help bring focus to the GPAC and GPUSC.

In response to Committee Member Wadsworth's inquiries, Committee Member Black confirmed that he is looking to form an Ad Hoc Subcommittee. He added that it would have to be comprised of no more than three Committee members.

Committee Member Fancher volunteered to serve on the Subcommittee.

Committee Member Black noted that Committee Member Fancher has been to many of the GPAC meetings, providing him with a context about the General Plan updating process.

Committee Member Fancher stated that the Subcommittee needs someone who knows the natural resources side of the beaches, creek, and river.

Committee Member Wadsworth volunteered to serve on the Subcommittee.

Motion: A motion was made by Committee Member Hudson to appoint Committee Members Black, Fancher, and Wadsworth to a General Plan Update Ad Hoc Subcommittee, seconded by Committee Member Robertson. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Gardner stated that the General Plan updating process would work better if the Subcommittee could report back to the Committee at the October meeting, permitting the GPAC more time to consider the Committee's feedback.

Vice Chair Stapleton agreed with this ideal timeframe.

Resident Jim Mosher, clarifying that he is speaking as an individual and not as a GPAC Member, echoed Committee Member Black's comments about defining where beach advisory roles would come from over the forthcoming General Plan's life cycle. He noted that the Committee has increasingly been focused on beaches while the Parks, Beaches, and Recreation Commission is chartered to advise the City Council on beach-related matters. He added that any structural changes recommended by the Subcommittee could involve an amendment to the City Charter. He lamented that the Charter could limit the scope of what the Committee can suggest.

Mr. Womack reported that the City has a Harbor and Beaches Master Plan, but it is thin and spreadsheet-based, adding that the City is falling short without a Harbor Master Plan. He added that the General Plan updating process could include ways to separate beach and harbor management. He stated that a Harbor Master Plan could help residents understand the City's long-term harbor thinking.

Committee Member Fancher encouraged Mr. Womack to work with the Harbor Commission on this.

Mr. Womack lamented that part of the General Plan update will not be to produce a clear Harbor Master Plan.

Committee Member Black agreed that the General Plan can be revisited to better establish how the beaches and harbor interface.

Assistant City Engineer Bob Stein lamented that the City has five departments involved with beach management, and occasionally things fall through the cracks due to confusion over which department should handle a given matter.

Public Works Director Webb clarified that the spreadsheet Mr. Womack alluded to is a capital plan and not a comprehensive Master Plan. He noted that the Harbor Commission provides input to the City Council on potential projects, not unlike other City Boards, Commissions, and Committees.

Mr. Womack stated that a formal Harbor Master Plan would let the whole community know in advance what the City's long-term thoughts are as opposed to piecemealing projects as needed.

Public Works Director Webb confirmed that a Harbor Master Plan would be visionary.

6. **COMMITTEE ANNOUNCEMENTS OR MATTERS WHICH MEMBERS WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION, OR REPORT (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM)**

(a) Santa Ana River Trash Mitigation Project Field Trip (October 2025 – TBD)
(b) Newport Bay Trash Interceptor Viewing Platform (October 2025 – Mark Ward)
(c) Draft Copper Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) (October – John Kappeler)
(d) Seal Beach Naval Station Sand Replenishment Field Trip (October – Bob Stein)
(e) Committee Goals/Objectives Sub-committees Final Reports (November – TBD)
(f) Newport Bay Trash Interceptor – Trash Characterization (Winter 2026 – Ellis Peterson)
(g) Newport Beach Trash Interceptor Public Outreach Campaign (Winter 2026 – John Pope)

Committee Member Black called for 25 minutes at the next meeting to discuss the General Plan Ad Hoc Subcommittee's input on the three Draft Elements.

Assistant City Engineer Stein reported his intention to speak with each of the three goals and objectives subcommittees to ensure they will have a presentation for the November meeting.

7. **PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Mr. Womack reported that the City has a Request For Proposal (RFP) out for the Lower Castaways without knowing yet what the land will be used for. He lamented the small opportunity for public input, with the process going in reverse. He added that, depending on what is selected for the site, there could be water quality impacts from the development, making it relevant to this Committee.

Vice Chair Stapleton stated that, as the Chair of the Lower Castaways Committee, the RFP is not coming out of nowhere. He reported that the City has been working on a Lower Castaways development for at least two decades. He reported on the history of exploration for the site between the Harbor Commission, the Parks, Beaches, and Recreation Commission, and others. He added that the current Committee is searching for a public-private partnership and is trying to see what options may be out there. He noted that the Committee could conceivably reject all the RFP responses but wants to use the space for something other than a dirt lot. He lamented the failed vote for the proposed aquatic center. He added that there will be many opportunities for the public to offer opinions on any development at the site.

In response to Committee Member Hudson's inquiry, Vice Chair Stapleton stated that the aquatic center concept failed because it could not get four City Council votes.

Mr. Leverenz reported that traffic concerns were a popular contention among the opposition, along with the cost.

Vice Chair Stapleton stated that something should be built there at a world-class level that the public will be proud of, expressing hopes that it can be done without costing the City any money.

Mr. Womack stated that it is a valuable piece of property and criticized how an RFP will be approved for someone looking to make money off it as opposed to using the land to promote access to the harbor. He expressed his hope that the public will receive a solid opportunity to provide input.

Vice Chair Stapleton agreed. He added that it will be a legacy project difficult to profit from based upon the size and location, noting that there will have to be a public access component on the last undeveloped property in the city. He added that a project would have to be in the entire community's best interests.

Mr. Leverenz urged the Committee to encourage the Harbor Commission to put restrooms back on its goals and objectives. He added that not having restrooms impacts water quality and stated that it is improper for the Harbor Commission to remove restrooms from its priorities list simply because it is a difficult subject.

Committee Member Black agreed that the lack of public restrooms creates a problem but stated that it is probably out of the Committee's reach. He added that he has seen many people urinating off their boats.

Vice Chair Stapleton reported that the City has looked multiple times into putting a dock at Lower Castaways but has not yet been successful due to environmental protections.

Virginia Anders-Ellmore encouraged a monitoring system in the event of a once-in-a-century level flood running down the Santa Ana River, revisiting her comments made at the July meeting. She also called for clarity on escape routes in the event of an inland flood as opposed to a coastal one. She suggested that an inland flood warning system could be like the one used for tsunamis.

Ms. Skinner stated that alleviating the risk of a Santa Ana River flood is why the Prado Dam was built.

8. **SET NEXT MEETING DATE**

Recommendation: October 2, 2025

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

_____
Chair / Michelle Barto