

NEWPORT BEACH HARBOR COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
City Council Chambers – 100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach  
Wednesday, August 13, 2025  
5 p.m.

**1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Ira Beer, Chair  
Steve Scully, Secretary  
Bob Miller, Commissioner  
Gary Williams, Commissioner (remote)  
Don Yahn, Commissioner

ABSENT: Marie Marston, Vice Chair  
Rudy Svrcek, Commissioner

Staff Members: Paul Blank, Harbormaster  
Jennifer Biddle, Administrative Assistant  
Chris Miller, Public Works Administrative Manager  
Cynthia Shintaku, Administrative Assistant

**3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – Led by Commissioner Yahn

**4. PUBLIC COMMENTS (NON-AGENDA ITEMS)**

Chair Beer opened public comments. Hearing none, Chair Beer closed public comments.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**1. Draft Minutes of the July 9, 2025 Harbor Commission Regular Meeting**

Chair Beer opened public comments.

Adam Leverenz noted that Commissioners Scully and Beer had submitted written corrections to the minutes. He clarified that during his comments at the previous meeting, references to “experts in the room” by the California Coastal Commission were intended to recognize the knowledge of mooring permittees and to encourage the City to listen to them in the future. He further clarified that his comments regarding wrongful impounds and lock cutting by the Harbor Department were not allegations, but statements of fact, as were his remarks that some individuals had expressed fear of retaliation.

Jim Mosher noted a typographical error in the minutes on page 15 where the name of Deputy Harbormaster Cosylon was misspelled and requested that the error be corrected. He also observed that the public no longer had access to a single downloadable agenda packet and recommended that this format be restored for ease of use.

Chair Beer closed public comments.

Commissioner Scully noted one correction related to the election of officers. He noted that the draft minutes reflected that he seconded his own nomination for Secretary, but the record should instead indicate that Commissioner Williams seconded the nomination. He requested that the minutes be amended to reflect the change, in addition to the comments both commissioners had submitted with the meeting packet.

Chair Beer moved to approve the July 9, 2025 Harbor Commission Regular Meeting minutes, as amended. Seconded by Commissioner Scully. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

**Ayes:** Miller, Williams, Scully, Beer  
**Nays:** None  
**Abstain:** Yahn  
**Absent:** Svrcek, Marston

## 6. PUBLIC HEARING

### 6.1 Variance Request: Dock Reconfiguration at 2100-2102 E. Balboa Blvd.

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Conduct a public hearing; and
2. Find the Project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") pursuant to Section 15060(c)(2) (Preliminary Review) and Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) and Section 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction) of the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3; and
3. Adopt Resolution HC2025-002 of the Harbor Commission of the City of Newport Beach, California approving variance No. HCVAR2025-001 to allow two slips bayward of the merged residential lot located at 2100-2102 E. Balboa Boulevard.

Public Works Manager Chris Miller introduced the variance item. He noted that a memo had been provided to the Harbor Commission and made available to the public at the front counter. He advised that the memo explained a square footage calculation error that had been identified earlier in the day. He noted that although the error required corrections to the documents, the proposed dock remained smaller in square footage than the existing dock. He explained that the overall analysis and conclusions were unchanged. He indicated that the corrected documents were attached to the memo and that he would address the details during his presentation.

Public Works Manager Miller presented the variance request for 2100 and 2102 East Balboa Boulevard, where the applicant sought approval for a double U-shaped dock, providing two slips in front of the merged property. He reported properties are located near the bend of the entrance channel, eastward and beyond the A mooring field. He noted that the parcels are unusual in configuration, as they are not rectangular like most properties in the city. He explained that the side property lines fan outward, resulting in greater harbor frontage than street frontage. He reported that the City had previously approved a lot merger for 2100 and 2102. However, he acknowledged that a unique condition exists on the site. He explained that a 30-foot area landward from the bulkhead line falls within the Coastal Commission's original permit jurisdiction. He further explained that while the Coastal Commission typically maintains jurisdiction over in-water regions, in this case, its jurisdiction extends onto the land. He advised that the lot merger requires approval from the Coastal Commission for the small 30-foot section of both properties.

Public Works Manager Miller reported that the City had approved the lot merger for 2100 and 2102 East Balboa Boulevard, with a small portion of the property still requiring Coastal Commission approval. He stated that the site lies between bulkhead stations 108 and 109, where property owners may build to the pier headline, but any extension beyond requires Harbor Commission approval. He noted that the applicant was not seeking to extend beyond the pier headline.

He explained that the bulkhead line follows the shoreline, the pier headline is approximately 80 feet from the bulkhead, and the project line is 20 feet beyond. At this location, the project line aligns with the main navigation channel, creating an unusual condition.

Public Works Manager Miller described existing conditions as two separate dock systems serving the two lots. The applicant requested to merge these into a single dock system and sought a variance to

maintain, in a modified configuration, the existing double U-shaped floats at 2100 East Balboa Boulevard and combine them with the slip at 2102.

He noted that the current configuration had previously been reviewed and approved in the 1970s. In June 1974, the County Harbor, Beaches, and Parks Commission recommended City Council approval, and later that month, the City Council approved the project with a condition prohibiting vessels with beams over seven feet from tying to the easterly side to prevent encroachment on the neighboring property.

Public Works Manager Miller reported that the same configuration had also been reviewed and approved by the California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission (now the California Coastal Commission) in September 1974 and by the Army Corps of Engineers in October 1974. He referenced the historic staff reports, minutes, resolutions, and permits for context in the current variance request. He stated that the purpose of presenting the historical approvals was to demonstrate that the existing dock configuration had been formally approved in 1974. He noted that, while the Newport Beach Municipal Code has long prohibited more than one slip per residence—a provision in effect since at least the 1950s—the applicant at that time was nonetheless approved for multiple slips.

Public Works Manager Miller reviewed the submitted plans. He reported that the existing dock configuration totals 2,545 square feet. The proposed configuration would result in 1,818 square feet of overwater area without the stationary pier platform, or 2,455 square feet including the platform, which is not being replaced. He clarified that this corrected figure had been identified earlier in the day. He stated that the existing condition includes two approved U-shaped slips at 2100 East Balboa Boulevard and a single side tie at 2102. He explained that the variance request was not to merge the dock systems, which is already permitted, but specifically to allow two U-shaped slips on the combined property.

Public Works Manager Miller recommended an additional special condition for the variance. He explained that the condition would restrict the beam of any vessel berthed at the side tie in front of 2102 East Balboa Boulevard to no more than 27 feet. He explained that the restriction was necessary because the project line at this location aligns with the main navigation channel, leaving seven feet between the side tie and the pier headline and 20 feet between the pier headline and the project line. He stated that the condition would ensure adequate clearance and maintain safe separation from the navigation channel. He reiterated that the variance request sought to continue the site's long-standing approval for two U-shaped slips.

Public Works Manager Miller reported that no complaints had been found in City records, nor had any been received from the public, regarding the existing dock configuration or the variance request. He referenced Municipal Code Section 17.05.140, which guides the Harbor Commission in evaluating variance requests and was developed through the Title 17 update process and Council Policy H-1. He noted that the code requires specific findings to be made, which were detailed in the resolution accompanying the staff report. He stated that he was prepared to review the findings if requested, but did not intend to do so in detail. He summarized his analysis and stated that he supported the request for the variance. He explained that the existing double U-shaped dock configuration had previously been approved and had been in place for approximately 50 years. He further explained that the proposed project was similar to the existing configuration, complied with the harbor design criteria, and would not negatively impact the surrounding harbor community.

Public Works Manager Miller reported that the applicant had received City approval for the lot merger but still required Coastal Commission approval for a portion of the property. He clarified that without Coastal Commission approval, the applicant could not proceed with a single merged dock system even if the variance were granted. In that event, he explained that the applicant could submit a new application for a double U-shaped slip at the westerly property, which would require new processing but would likely resemble the current proposal. He stated that this explanation was intended to clarify potential outcomes if the Coastal Commission denied the lot merger.

Public Works Manager Miller explained that the draft resolution included findings and supporting facts. He noted that the Harbor Commission could amend the findings if supported by factual justification. He cautioned that significant changes would require staff to return with an updated resolution at the September meeting, but minor changes, such as the corrected square footage figures, could be incorporated and allow approval that evening.

Public Works Manager Miller reviewed the proposed special conditions. He noted that Condition No. 10 established a 27-foot beam limit for vessels at the side tie in front of 2102 East Balboa Boulevard. He stated that the remaining conditions were standard, including limits on channel ward extension and prohibitions against encroachment onto neighboring properties. He confirmed that public notice had been provided in accordance with requirements, with notices mailed to surrounding property owners, the notice was published in the newspaper on July 26, and the property itself had been posted. He reiterated that, as of that afternoon, no public comments had been received.

Shawna Schaffner, Chief Executive Officer of CAA Planning and representative of the property owner acknowledged that the proposed W-shaped configuration and requested changes could appear complex but commended Public Works Manager Miller for clearly explaining the rationale for the variance. She noted that she did not have a formal presentation but was available to answer questions from the Commission. She confirmed that the applicant had reviewed the staff report and conditions of approval and expressed full support for all conditions, including Special Condition No. 10, which limits how far a vessel may be berthed.

Secretary Scully inquired whether the Coastal Commission's design approval only applied to the lot merger and whether it had any authority over the dock slips.

Public Works Manager Miller clarified that the Coastal Commission did review slip size and square footage, but generally deferred to the City regarding configuration. He explained that the City's authority extended to determining whether U-shaped, L-shaped, or side-tie configurations were permitted, provided the design complied with property line and boundary requirements.

Secretary Scully inquired whether the applicant intended to build a single residence on the merged property. Ms. Schaffner confirmed that the City's recent approval of the lot merger included both the consolidation of the two lots and the construction of a new residence with an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU).

Secretary Scully inquired about the next steps should the Coastal Commission not approve the merger. Ms. Schaffner stated that if the Coastal Commission did not approve the lot merger, the current application could not proceed. She noted that the applicant would need to confer with the City and pursue a different application.

Secretary Scully further clarified with Public Works Manager Miller that the variance under consideration by the Harbor Commission was limited to approval of the two U-shaped slips, not the entirety of the dock structure.

Public Works Manager Miller confirmed that the proposed dock structure complied with the harbor design criteria. He explained that when residential properties with docks are merged, it is common for the resulting property to have a single dock system, and in this case, the structure itself met the applicable design standards. He clarified that if the applicant had proposed a single U-shaped slip with a design nearly identical to the current proposal, Harbor Commission approval would not be required. He further explained that the sole reason for the variance request was the inclusion of two U-shaped slips.

Secretary Scully noted the importance of ensuring that the Commission's motion and vote correctly reflect the scope of the variance being considered. He inquired whether other nearby properties, particularly those closer to the harbor entrance, had similar end ties or U-shaped slips extending to the project line, given that the proposed variance would allow a 27-foot beam limit adjacent to the main channel.

Public Works Manager Miller responded that not all homeowners had appeared before the City or Harbor Commission in recent decades to reconfigure their docks, and therefore, many properties did not have special conditions attached. He noted that one or two properties in the area had larger vessels berthed, including one adjacent to the M Street public pier, but he had not analyzed how those docks related to the project line and could not provide specific details without further study. He clarified that the side tie condition in this case was not based on a request from the applicant to berth a vessel there, but rather to ensure protection of the navigation channel.

Secretary Scully observed that approval would effectively establish a precedent for extending to the project line in a busy section of the channel. He asked whether the applicant intended to rent any of the slips.

Ms. Schaffner, representing the applicant, confirmed that the slips would not be rented.

Chair Beer commented on the side tie, noting that it was approximately 70 feet in length. He observed that the maximum vessel accommodated there would be limited by the dock length plus its beam. He added that most vessels, other than catamarans, would not typically exceed a 20-foot beam. Secretary Scully further remarked that a 70-foot vessel could potentially have a larger beam, but referenced this point only to provide context for the discussion.

Commissioner Miller commented that previous dock reconfiguration applications often raised concerns about shading impacts on eelgrass. He observed that the proposed project appeared beneficial, as the reduced footprint would allow more light penetration, potentially improving eelgrass growth and overall bay health. He asked whether the orientation of the dock, east, west, north, or south, was considered in the review process, given that sunlight direction might influence shading.

Public Works Manager Miller responded that the City does not consider dock orientation in its review. However, he explained that applicants are required to complete eelgrass surveys before and after construction to ensure no net loss. He explained that if eelgrass is present, as in this case, the Coastal Commission and Army Corps of Engineers, in consultation with other resource agencies, establish conditions for its protection. He noted that while one could argue that orientation and shading from nearby structures might influence eelgrass, resource agencies do not typically evaluate projects at that level of detail.

Commissioner Miller concluded that the project's reduced footprint appeared positive for the bay by providing greater light exposure and supporting eelgrass health.

Commissioner Yahn referenced a historical beam restriction dating back to the original approval of the dock many years ago and asked for clarification on its location.

Public Works Manager Miller responded that he believed the restriction applied to the west side of the west finger of the U-shaped float, near the side property line. He explained that the City's general rule prohibits extending beyond the prolongation of a property line, and the original condition appeared to have been written to reflect that rule, although the details were difficult to read on the screen.

Commissioner Yahn inquired about the distance between the property line and the dock edge, noting that the property owner also owned the adjacent parcel to the west. Public Works Manager Miller confirmed that the owner did control a third parcel, which had its own slip configuration. He clarified that while the new dock system would be reconstructed in a way that separated it from the adjacent slip, property line rules technically still applied. He noted that even when an individual owned both properties, dock structures were not permitted to extend across property lines.

Commissioner Yahn remarked that while it was not the Commission's role to opine on how the property owner managed adjacent parcels, it was notable how the dock configurations came together in this case.

Secretary Scully asked the Harbormaster whether the 27-foot beam restriction, extending to the project line along the main channel, could create issues with vessel traffic or otherwise impede ingress and egress within the harbor.

Harbormaster Paul Blank addressed the Commission and stated that he had no concerns with the proposal. He confirmed that he did not foresee any issues arising from the 27-foot beam restriction and noted that there was sufficient navigational space in the channel.

Chair Beer opened public comments.

Adam Leverenz expressed appreciation for the Commission's questions and Public Works Manager Miller's recommendation of a beam restriction to protect the navigation channel. He commended the applicant for submitting a project that reduced the overall dock footprint rather than expanding it. He observed that in some cases, docks have extended beyond the federally designated pierhead line, but he noted that this proposal did not do so. He stated that, in his experience, the Coastal Commission generally views a reduction in square footage as favorable and believed this project would be well received.

Jim Mosher noted that aerial photographs appeared to show a connection between the subject property and the parcel to the west, but this was not reflected in the existing conditions presented. He expressed concern that the western U-shaped slip appeared substantially wider than the existing configuration, with one figure indicating nearly 34 feet. He questioned whether such a configuration could allow a vessel large enough to protrude into or beyond the navigation channel and raised the issue of how measurements would be applied, given that the two fingers were of different lengths. He also commented on the overall number of vessels that could be accommodated, observing that the project consolidated two single-family lots into one lot with a dock system that could support numerous boats. While acknowledging the presence of an ADU, he questioned whether the proposed intensity was appropriate for a single-family parcel on public tidelands. He cautioned that, while the current owner may not intend to use the dock commercially, a future owner might seek to do so. He encouraged the Commission to consider the long-term implications of granting a variance that could remain in place indefinitely.

Chair Beer closed public comments.

Chair Beer asked Public Works Manager Miller to clarify whether the recommended resolution referenced the Commission's approval of the variance in relation to the special conditions. He noted that the focus appeared to be on the ~~W~~U-shaped configuration and questioned whether the special conditions should also be incorporated into the resolution, given that the dock would function as a single structure.

Public Works Manager Miller responded that it would be reasonable for the motion to include the special conditions as an attachment to the resolution. He stated that, should the Commission choose to approve the variance, the motion should also verbally acknowledge the corrected square footage figures to ensure the record was clear.

Secretary Scully, referencing Mr. Mosher's earlier comments, asked Public Works Manager Miller how far the proposed double U-shaped dock would extend from the dock's end to the project line.

Public Works Manager Miller explained that on the exhibit, the project line was shown in red and transitioned into the blue navigation channel line near the top of the second finger of the dock. He noted that the distance from the pier headline at the tip of the leftmost finger to the project line was 20 feet. He added that he did not have the measurement for the triangular distance between the project line and the navigation channel, but confirmed that a vessel would be permitted to extend beyond the finger by the width of its beam.

Secretary Scully observed that the larger slip on the west side appeared to include a small extension, suggesting it was likely intended to accommodate two vessels. He asked whether this could result in vessels extending beyond the project line and, if so, whether that would be acceptable given the variance would remain in effect indefinitely.

Public Works Manager Miller responded that while a maximum-sized vessel could potentially extend beyond the project line, vessels would not encroach into the main navigation channel. He explained that the project line is a federal dredging boundary rather than a strict navigation limit, and there are many examples in the harbor of vessels or docks extending past it under the Municipal Code. In such cases, he advised that property owners are typically notified ahead of dredging operations and asked to move their vessels to ensure deeper access to their slips.

Chair Beer asked for clarification on the dock dimensions. Public Works Manager Miller confirmed that the length of the westerly finger was 41 feet, 6 inches, but the effective slip length was closer to 30 feet, plus the vessel beam.

Chair Beer moved to adopt Resolution No. HC 2025-002, finding the project exempt from CEQA, including approval of the variance as outlined in the staff report, incorporation of the special conditions, and acknowledgment of the corrected square footage of 2,455 square feet, inclusive of the fixed platform, rather than the 1,818 square feet previously listed. Seconded by Commissioner Yahn. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

**Ayes:** Miller, Williams, Yahn, Scully, Beer  
**Nays:** None  
**Abstain:** None  
**Absent:** Svrcek, Marston

## **7. CURRENT BUSINESS**

### **7.1 General Plan Update: Introducing Refreshed Goals and Policies for the Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element**

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Determine this action is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15060(c)(2) and 15060(c)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines because this action will not result in a physical change to the environment, directly or indirectly; and
2. Receive and file the draft Elements and provide any initial guidance or feedback on their goals and policies. The refined and finalized drafts would return to Harbor Commission for review and formal recommendation of approval to the City Council later this year or first quarter of 2026.

Planning Manager Ben Zbeda provided an overview of the General Plan. He described it as an aspirational vision for the City's future that serves as a decision-making framework through goals and policies guiding subsequent code updates. He explained that general plans typically cover a 20- to 30-year horizon and are not frequently updated due to their cost and complexity. He emphasized that the update process is focused on identifying community values and establishing policies to support them. He noted that during early visioning, a statement suggested Newport Beach would "become an excellent city in 2050." He clarified that the consensus was that Newport Beach is already an excellent city, and the purpose of the plan is to ensure that level of excellence is maintained into the future.

Planning Manager Zbeda reported that the City's General Plan, last updated in 2006, consists of ten elements, seven required by state law and three unique to Newport Beach. He stated that in 2019, the City Council initiated a comprehensive review and potential update of the plan, noting that while the plan was considered strong, it could benefit from refinement, particularly following post-COVID changes. He reported that in 2020, at City Council direction, staff shifted focus to the Housing and Circulation Elements

to address the City's greatly increased Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation. He reported that the City's fifth-cycle allocation was five units, while the sixth-cycle allocation increased nearly one thousandfold, creating an urgent need for action on housing.

Planning Manager Zbeda reported that with the Housing Element effort largely complete, staff resumed work on the broader General Plan Update in 2022 following the City Council's formation of the General Plan Update Steering Committee. He explained that the committee, chaired by Nancy Gardner and supported by two additional members, is a Brown Act-compliant body tasked with guiding the update process. He noted that the Steering Committee works in coordination with the larger General Plan Advisory Committee, which includes 24 community members and reflects the City's community-driven approach. He advised that subcommittees have been formed, including one on Harbor, Bay, and Beaches, in which commissioners have participated. He noted that meetings are conducted in compliance with the Brown Act and are generally held on the first Wednesday of each month as needed.

Planning Manager Zbeda reported that the General Plan Update is nearing the end of Phase 2 of 4. He stated that Phase 1 focused on background analysis and visioning, with a report on existing conditions, prepared by the City's consultant, Dudek, attached to the staff report. He noted that the document provides a baseline for future planning and addresses current conditions and state law compliance related to the Harbor and Bay Element. He explained that Phase 2 centers on developing goals and policies, with an emphasis on refreshing and streamlining the plan for easier public use. He advised that the process will soon transition to Phases 3 and 4, with final City Council review and adoption targeted for the first quarter of 2026.

Planning Manager Zbeda reported that significant community engagement has been conducted throughout the General Plan Update process. He advised that a dedicated project website be created with an interactive map that allowed residents to identify areas of concern, opportunity, or personal value. He noted that City staff also hosted "pop-up" events at community gatherings, including one at the Environmental Nature Center, where residents participated in activities to identify and prioritize community values. He explained that input from these efforts was compiled into an outreach report to inform plan goals and policies. He stated that during Phase 2, outreach expanded to include proposed ideas for each plan element, with community workshops held to gather feedback. He noted that the Land Use and Harbor & Bay workshop was the best attended, reflecting strong public interest in those topics. He encouraged continued community involvement, noting that the project website remains active and open to the public. He also welcomed direct outreach, emphasizing his role as a responsive public servant available to assist with any questions.

Planning Manager Zbeda outlined the steps in developing the General Plan Update elements. He reported that the process began in 2023 with the preparation of existing conditions and background analysis reports, which were reviewed by subcommittees. He noted that digital engagement and community feedback were incorporated, and draft goals and ideas were shared, culminating in the draft document presented. He emphasized that the document remains a draft until formally adopted by the City Council and is intended to serve as a conversation piece to encourage ongoing dialogue with the Harbor Commission and the broader community.

Planning Manager Zbeda reported on the Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element of the General Plan Update. He stated that the Harbor and Bay Subcommittee recommended rebranding the element to include the beaches, recognizing their critical role in the City. He noted that the current General Plan does not adequately address the importance of beaches, and the update seeks to close that gap. He explained that the revised element emphasizes Upper Newport Bay and provides a holistic approach by integrating policies for the harbor, bay, and beaches. He identified key priorities that include improving coastal access, minimizing displacement risk from coastal hazards, and ensuring the harbor's long-term economic vitality.

Planning Manager Zbeda stated that the purpose of the meeting was to receive and file the draft element, with no vote or formal action required. He emphasized that the focus was on gathering initial feedback

from commissioners and reiterated that the document remains a draft until formally adopted by the City Council. He commended the Commission for forming an ad hoc committee in advance of the process. He explained that the draft element will be released for public review and comment, to collect all feedback by the end of October. He noted that the ad hoc committee may provide feedback to the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) by that time. He further noted that Harbor Commission comments would be recorded separately from public feedback and made available for review. He added that, if desired, the ad hoc committee could meet directly with the GPAC subcommittee to discuss the draft in more detail.

Planning Manager Zbeda reported that public open houses will be held in October to gather additional input on the draft elements. He stated that the goal is to refine the document through collaboration with committees and return a more complete version to the Harbor Commission for formal consideration in 2026, targeting the first quarter or mid-year at the latest. In closing, he acknowledged the presence of GPAC member Jim Mosher and Subcommittee Chair Curtis Black, noting that they may wish to provide remarks with the Commission's approval.

Subcommittee Chair Black noted that work on the General Plan has been ongoing since mid-2022 and acknowledged the commissioners' participation in both virtual and in-person meetings. As a member of the Water Quality Coastal Tidelands Committee, he emphasized that community feedback has been incorporated into the draft document. He stated that the Water Quality Coastal Tidelands Committee, like the Harbor Commission, will review the draft, provide feedback, and conduct an analysis to help shape the final version. He thanked the commissioners for their strong involvement, noting their engagement set an example for other commissions, and expressed his anticipation for their feedback.

Chair Beer began by praising the General Plan, describing it as incredibly thorough and well thought out. He also commended the public outreach efforts, particularly highlighting the impressive reach to 45,000 residents. He acknowledged the team's hard work in making that happen and expressed admiration for the scale of the outreach.

Secretary Scully began by acknowledging that getting up to speed on the General Plan has been a bit of a challenge, but attending meetings and reviewing the materials provided in the packet for today's discussion had been helpful. He stated that he has several comments to bring forward, which he plans to present to the subcommittee. With the subcommittee's approval, he would bring the comments would be submitted in writing to the Harbor Commission for consideration, specifically regarding the Harbor, Bay, and Beach Element.

Secretary Scully provided feedback on the General Plan. For Policy HBB-1.4, he recommended adding references to modern mooring technology, such as helix anchors and mooring field optimization, to enhance safety, reduce environmental impact, and improve capacity. For Policy HBB-1.9, he suggested being more proactive in educating rental customers on safe harbor operations. Regarding Policy HBB-4, he noted the importance of the open space initiative but questioned whether it would move forward and suggested further discussion. For Policy HBB-6, he emphasized the need for a long-term sediment management funding plan for dredging, given the high costs involved. With respect to Policies HBB-6.3 and HBB-7.1, he observed an apparent repetition of HBB-7.1 that may be a typo. In the Economic Value of Newport Harbor section, he pointed out that the data cited is from 2018 and asked whether more current data is available, or if a plan to update the section as new data becomes available should be added. For Policy HBB-8.7, regarding live-aboard permits, he questioned whether the City should continue using the current system that ties permits to the percentage of moorings. For Policy HBB-9, he proposed adopting technology for harbor management, including smart buoys, online mooring rentals, and vessel tracking, to improve efficiency and the user experience. For Policy HBB-10.5, he recommended expanding the funding commitment to include Harbor Department code enforcement and on-water fire suppression. For Policy HBB-11, he suggested expanding wayfinding beyond signage to include digital tools such as apps, QR codes, and real-time maps to improve visitor navigation. Under the Harbor Department's general role, he noted that its functions, managing safety, providing on-water support, and generating revenue for the Harbor Department budget and Tidelands Fund, are not explicitly mentioned and should be included to acknowledge the department's significance in daily operations and

long-term sustainability. Finally, regarding collaboration with the Sheriff's Department, he suggested adding a specific policy to formalize coordination between the City and the Orange County Sheriff's Harbor Patrol to ensure consistent and effective on-water law enforcement.

Secretary Scully concluded by acknowledging that the Harbor Commission had not been as vocal in the process, but that they did contribute to the meeting at Marina Park, which was well-received. He assured the group that the Harbor Commission would become more proactive in submitting written comments to the committee regarding their feedback on the General Plan.

Chair Beer opened public comments.

Jim Mosher introduced himself as a member of the General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), but clarified that he was speaking as an individual. He noted that while the Harbor, Bay, and Beaches Element had evolved, an unresolved issue from GPAC discussions was the need for better coordination among City boards, commissions, and committees with jurisdiction or advisory roles to the City Council regarding items related to the harbor and beaches. He identified three bodies with overlapping responsibilities: the Harbor Commission, the Parks, Beaches, and Recreation Commission, and the Water Quality Coastal Tidelands Committee. He questioned whether greater coordination between these groups should be addressed in the General Plan to ensure long-term protection of the City's resources. He cited examples of "fuzzy" jurisdictional issues, including the Harbor Commission's authority over Title 17 and boat storage recommendations, contrasted with the Parks, Beaches, and Recreation Commission's City Charter authority over beach matters. He suggested that recreational aspects of the harbor may not be fully represented in current processes and asked whether the Harbor Commission had ideas on how to improve coordination moving forward.

Mr. Mosher provided a second comment regarding the technical background report for the General Plan Element. He reminded the Commission that the adopted element will cross-reference this report, which serves as the authoritative description of current harbor and beach conditions, though it will not be included directly in the element.

Mr. Mosher urged the Commission to review the background report carefully to ensure its accuracy. He cited as an example a section on vessel launching that referenced a City document from March 2001, noting that some information may be outdated. He emphasized that the Commission, given its familiarity with current harbor conditions, is well-positioned to identify inaccuracies. He concluded by stressing the importance of ensuring accuracy in the background report.

Chair Beer closed public comments.

Chair Beer encouraged the ad hoc committee to reach out and meet as needed, thanking everyone for their assistance with the process.

Planning Manager Zbeda inquired whether it would be acceptable for City staff to share the draft with the public simultaneously while receiving input from the ad hoc committee, potentially with a prominent "draft" watermark on the document to continue the conversation.

Secretary Scully agreed that this approach would help keep the ball rolling.

There was no further action taken on this item, and it was received and filed unanimously.

## **7.2 Discussion of Proposed Revisions to NBMC Title 17**

### **Recommendation:**

1. Determine this action is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15060(c)(2) and 15060(c)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines because this action will not result in a physical change to the environment, directly or indirectly; and

2. Consider a proposal from the subcommittee responsible for the current Harbor Commission Objective one on potential revisions to the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC) related to the harbor; and
3. If desired, provide direction to the objective subcommittee and staff to finalize recommended revisions to be considered at a subsequent Harbor Commission meeting.

Chair Beer noted that the Harbor Commission's 2024 objectives include the annual review of Title 17, with recommendations for updates to be presented to the City Council as necessary. He mentioned that a short staff report was available but suggested that Commissioner Yahn, as chair of the subcommittee, present the subcommittee's updates.

Commissioner Yahn reported on the Title 17 update, noting that he had been leading the review as a functional responsibility of the Harbor Commission. He stated that over the years, significant input had been received from the Harbormaster and staff, resulting in a list of issues now requiring review. He expressed interest in forming an ad hoc committee, as he had been working alone, and proposed involving two additional commissioners to conduct a thorough review with Harbormaster Blank and Deputy Harbormaster Cosylion. He noted that he did not have the detailed list of items available but referenced examples such as public dock safety and rhine wharf usage. He recommended that the session focus on finding two other Harbor Commissioners who would like to join him in the ad hoc committee. He advised that the committee would meet, review the issues, and report back to the Harbor Commission with their findings. He concluded by asking for volunteers to join the ad hoc committee.

Commissioner Miller commented that although he had not yet fully reviewed the Title 17 document, he believed the update was moving in the right direction. He offered his assistance and expressed willingness to become involved in the process if needed.

Commissioner Yahn welcomed Commissioner Miller's offer to assist with the Title 17 review. He recalled that a previous ad hoc committee, which included former Chair Kenny, had worked on revising Title 17 when the Harbor Department was first established. He noted that the process had taken more than a year to complete and that gaps were later identified as the rules were implemented. He emphasized that Title 17 is a living document that will continue to evolve and that the subcommittee's role is to ensure its ongoing refinement.

Secretary Scully asked Commissioner Yahn about the anticipated duration of the proposed ad hoc committee and the timeline for presenting recommendations.

Commissioner Yahn responded that within 30 to 60 days, the committee would meet with the Harbor Department to review and vet findings. He noted that the results would then be presented to the Commission for open discussion of potential revisions. He further advised that once revisions were agreed upon, the Commission would adopt a resolution and forward it to the City Council. He noted that while the Harbor Department was busy during the summer, the goal was to complete a deeper review within the 60 day timeframe.

Secretary Scully expressed willingness to assist unless another commissioner volunteered.

Commissioner Williams expressed his willingness to assist Commissioner Yahn with the work.

Chair Beer requested clarification that they could add subcommittee members without needing to agendize it. Harbormaster Blank clarified that they could add up to two additional subcommittee members under the existing objectives without requiring a new agenda item.

Chair Beer opened public comments.

Adam Leverenz emphasized the importance of transparency and public accessibility in reviewing the Title 17 proposal. He noted that the document, approximately 70 pages in length, is complex and not widely

distributed. He suggested that the proposal and its addendum be posted with the agenda on the City website to increase visibility. He further commented that errors in the proposal might go unnoticed without broader review. He recommended that additional stakeholders, such as licensed captains with live-aboard permits, be allowed to examine the materials before Commission discussion. He urged greater transparency to ensure that those directly impacted can provide informed feedback.

Herman Coomans reflected on the 2016–2017 Title 17 update, noting that the process was open and collaborative, with stakeholder meetings that allowed meaningful public input. He stated that community feedback had been actively considered and incorporated into the revisions. He commended that approach and encouraged a similar process for the current update, emphasizing the importance of clarity and transparency.

Chair Beer closed public comments.

Chair Beer acknowledged that, as Commissioner Yahn had noted, the Title 17 revision process would be lengthy and deliberate, with all feedback carefully considered. He then turned to the appointment of members to the subcommittee. He noted that Commissioners Williams, Miller, and Secretary Scully had volunteered, with Secretary Scully indicating he was willing to step back if necessary.

Chair Beer confirmed that Commissioners Williams and Miller would join Commissioner Yahn on the subcommittee. He noted that no formal motion was required and concluded that the subcommittee membership was finalized.

There was no further action taken on this item.

### **7.3 Create and Appoint Members to a Proposed Ad-Hoc Subcommittee to Review Current and Recommend Revised Harbor Commission Objectives**

#### **Recommendation:**

1. Determine this action is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15060(c)(2) and 15060(c)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines because this action will not result in a physical change to the environment, directly or indirectly; and
2. Consider a proposal from the subcommittee responsible for the current Harbor Commission Objective one on potential revisions to the Newport Beach Municipal Code (NBMC) related to the harbor; and
3. If desired, provide direction to the objective subcommittee and staff to finalize recommended revisions to be considered at a subsequent Harbor Commission meeting.

Chair Beer introduced the proposal to create an ad hoc subcommittee to review and recommend revisions to the Harbor Commission's objectives.

Harbormaster Blank explained that, as a new ad hoc subcommittee, formal action and public input were required. He emphasized that the subcommittee's role would be to evaluate existing objectives and present revised recommendations at a future meeting.

Chair Beer noted that the matter had been discussed at prior meetings and stressed the importance of establishing the subcommittee promptly so that updated objectives could be reviewed within the next few months. He volunteered to serve on the subcommittee and invited Secretary Scully to join as well.

Secretary Scully agreed to serve on the new ad hoc subcommittee and raised a concern regarding the structure of Commission objectives. He recommended that objectives be established as broad, high-level goals, with flexibility to develop supporting action items over time without requiring repeated City Council approval, provided those actions aligned with the broader objectives.

Harbormaster Blank agreed, noting that while it was important to share high-level objectives with the City Council, detailed work plans beneath those objectives did not need formal approval.

Secretary Scully further recommended avoiding rigid annual timelines for objectives, advocating instead for an ongoing framework that could adapt as priorities shifted. Chair Beer supported this approach, pointing out that past structures had worked similarly, allowing objectives to evolve as circumstances changed. He emphasized his commitment to supporting that model through the subcommittee.

Secretary Scully confirmed his interest in serving.

Secretary Scully moved to formally establish the new subcommittee under Item 7.3, with himself, Secretary Scully, and Commissioner Miller appointed as members. Seconded by Commissioner Miller

Chair Beer opened public comments.

Adam Leverenz urged the Commission to prioritize the restoration of restrooms as part of the Harbor Commission objectives, stating that eliminating restroom facilities, whether floating or onshore, conflicted with community goals for cleaner harbor water.

Mike Fleming asked whether members of the public could be appointed to the new ad hoc subcommittee. Chair Beer responded that public input was valued, but noted that the Commission had not previously considered public appointments. Harbormaster Blank clarified that ad hoc committees of the Harbor Commission cannot include public members, but their meetings could be publicized to encourage public participation.

Chair Beer closed public comments.

Chair Beer called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Miller, Williams, Yahn, Scully, Beer  
 Nays: None  
 Abstain: None  
 Absent: Svrcek, Marston

#### **7.4 Ad Hoc Committee Updates**

##### **Recommendation:**

1. Find this action exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15060(c)(2) (the activity will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment) and 15060(c)(3) (the activity is not a project as defined in Section 15378) of the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, because it has no potential for resulting in physical change to the environment, directly or indirectly; and
2. Receive and file.

Balboa Ferry Ad Hoc – Commissioners Scully, Svrcek and Yahn (05-10-2023)

No update.

General Plan Harbor & Bay Element Update Ad Hoc – Commissioners Scully, Marston, and Yahn (10-09-2024)

No update.

Chair Beer opened public comments. Seeing none, Chair Beer closed public comments.

There was no further action taken on this item and it was received and filed unanimously.

### **7.5 Harbor Commission 2025 Objectives**

1. Find this action exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15060(c)(2) (the activity will not result in a direct or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment) and 15060(c)(3) (the activity is not a project as defined in Section 15378) of the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, because it has no potential for resulting in physical change to the environment, directly or indirectly; and
2. Receive and file.

Conduct annual review of Title 17 and recommend updates to City Council where necessary (Commissioner Yahn)  
No update.

Collaborate with the Water Quality/Coastal Tidelands Committee to partner on areas within the Harbor that both Commission/Committees intersect (Commissioners: Svrcek, Scully)  
No update.

Work with staff to identify opportunities to add additional Harbor Services (Restrooms, additional pump out stations, dock space, Shore Boat Service, Boat Launch Ramp, and development of the mobile app) (Commissioners: Marston, Yahn)  
No update.

Continue with the participation of businesses, nonprofits, and the Harbor Department with a Newport Harbor Safety Committee to promote best practices and address safety issues on the water (Commissioner: Scully).  
No update.

Review Harbor Department responsibilities, evaluate the Department's readiness and effectiveness to deliver Harbor services as necessary for normal operations and during emergencies and make recommendations as determined necessary (Commissioner: Scully, Williams).  
No update.

Work with City Staff on an update of the market Rent to be charged for onshore and offshore moorings (Commissioner: Cunningham, Beer).  
No update.

Support staff in all efforts related to the dredge completion of the Federal Navigation channels in addition to the upcoming agency renewals of Regional General Permit (RGP54) shallow water dredging permit. (Commissioners: Cunningham, Svrcek)  
No update.

Chair Beer opened public comments. Seeing none, Chair Beer closed public comments.

There was no further action taken on this item and it was received and filed unanimously.

### **7. Harbormaster Update –July 2025 Activities**

#### **Recommendation:**

- 1) Determine this action is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15060(c)(2) and 15060(c)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines because this action will not result in a physical change to the environment, directly or indirectly; and
- 2) Receive and file.

Harbormaster Paul Blank presented his monthly report, noting that July was an especially busy month for the Harbor Department. He highlighted activities supporting the mission to keep the harbor clean, safe, and well-enjoyed. He reported that significant trash accumulated on public docks over the holiday weekend, particularly at Balboa Marina, and was not collected until after the weekend. He advised that this issue is being addressed in coordination with service providers and City staff in water quality and refuse collection. He described a vessel in the A field that had begun taking on water and was at risk of sinking. He reported that the vessel was stabilized through the use of department dewatering pumps and assistance from a professional service provider. He noted that additional early morning patrols focused on unpermitted liveaboards. In one incident, he reported that an entangled sea lion was reported by a mariner. Harbor Safety Officer Timmerman boarded a vessel to free the animal, which swam away unharmed.

Harbormaster Blank continued his monthly report by addressing harbor safety. He stated that excessive speed and wake remain the department's most significant challenges, particularly on busy weekends. To improve enforcement, he advised that staff will be strategically stationed at key locations, including the harbor entrance, the ferry crossing, West Lido Reach, and Marina Park. He reported that the department regularly assists tired paddle boarders, often on a near-daily basis, and cited a recent incident in which a group was safely returned to its point of embarkation. He also noted that branded life rings had been added to patrol boats to improve visibility and safety. He further reported on a suspected unpermitted charter vessel carrying excessive passengers over the July 4th weekend. He reported that the case, initiated by an anonymous tip on July 6, required more than 12 hours of enforcement activity in coordination with the U.S. Coast Guard. He stated that the joint operation strengthened collaboration with the Coast Guard's Long Beach enforcement division, which expressed appreciation for the Harbor Department's support.

Harbormaster Blank concluded his monthly report by highlighting operational and community activities. He emphasized the value of the department's fourth patrol boat, which was instrumental during the July 4th weekend in maintaining order within public anchorages. He also reported that Harbor Safety Officer Timmerman observed an unpermitted bonfire on the beach at Marina Park at the end of a patrol shift. Officer Timmerman contacted the responsible party and ensured the fire was extinguished.

Harbormaster Blank reported that a drifting tender had been recovered and returned to its permit holder. He also described a special harbor tour provided to "Mayor for the Day" Amelia Jenkins and her family. In a lighter note, he noted that Santa Claus made two summer appearances at Marina Park while filming a promotional video for the Christmas Boat Parade, in which Harbormaster Blank participated. He further reported that Newport's Marine Activities Permit Program was recognized by a U.S. Coast Guard compliance officer as the best he had seen nationwide in his 17-year career, calling it a "gold standard" for other jurisdictions. He expressed pride in the acknowledgement and welcomed the opportunity for other municipalities to adopt similar practices.

Harbormaster Blank reported heavy use of the large vessel anchorage in July and confirmed that the 89th Flight of Newport was successfully held with strong participation and no major incidents despite challenging conditions. He further noted that the Harbor Department had devoted significant effort to responding to three recent claims against the City, which required compiling surveillance footage and coordinating with the City's claims administrator. While the process was time-consuming, he emphasized that it protects the City financially and stated his belief that the City would prevail in all three cases with no funds disbursed.

Harbormaster Blank provided updates on budget matters, enforcement actions, and a free speech issue. He reported that the Harbor Department has secured \$175,000 in state "SAVE" grant funds over the last two cycles to remove abandoned or surrendered vessels. Based on that success, he advised that the department apply for \$250,000 in the upcoming cycle. He noted, however, that the state has reduced the overall program budget to \$1 million and capped individual awards at 10 percent of available funds. He expressed disappointment at the cut but stated that the department would maximize the use of any funds awarded.

Harbormaster Blank reported that another mooring license agreement had been terminated due to nonpayment. He also described an unusual situation involving a political banner displayed on a vessel moored in public waters. He explained that while the banner was on private property, the location of the vessel itself raised legal questions because the vessel was situated on public tidelands. He reported that the Harbor Department has taken no enforcement action, considering the display protected free speech, while the City Attorney reviews case law to determine whether restrictions may apply.

Harbormaster Blank further clarified the criteria used to evaluate his performance, which include leadership and staff supervision, fiscal responsibility, maritime and technical skills, public administration, productivity, attitude, and communication with staff and City leadership. He emphasized that public relations, marketing, and direct support for the Harbor Commission are not part of his formal evaluation. He encouraged commissioners or members of the public with concerns about his performance to contact him directly first and, if unresolved, to elevate concerns to the City Manager.

Harbormaster Blank reported that July generated nearly 2,700 calls for service, a record high, with responses distributed widely throughout the harbor as shown on a heat map. He noted that usage of the harbor amenity map declined during the month due to the temporary removal of QR code signage during dock refurbishments. To improve access, he advised that QR codes have been added to all patrol vessels, allowing the public to quickly locate amenities such as restrooms, docks, and fuel stations. He expressed hope that amenity map usage would increase in the coming months. He also reported a significant year-over-year increase in harbor events and marine activity permits in 2025. By contrast, he advised that permits for Rhine Wharf declined, as the boat show shifted launching operations to the dunes rather than using the wharf. He further highlighted strong public use of anchorages in July, noting that facilities were occupied every day of the month, with more individual entries than could be shown on a single calendar graphic.

Commissioner Yahn commended the Harbor Department for managing the increased activity and offered praise to Harbormaster Blank and his staff.

Commissioner Williams also expressed appreciation for Harbormaster Blank and his staff.

Secretary Scully praised the Harbor Department's work over the July 4th period, commending Harbormaster Blank and his team for keeping operations smooth during the busy holiday and ensuring a safe and enjoyable experience for the community. He also noted the year-over-year increase in harbor activity and highlighted improvements in code enforcement. Additionally, he suggested that emerging artificial intelligence (AI) tools could potentially assist in reviewing video surveillance more efficiently, reducing the time required for investigations.

Harbormaster Blank agreed, explaining that recent video review tasks had presented a steep learning curve, as such work is not frequently performed by his staff. He described the challenges of navigating the software to locate specific footage, as well as the technical difficulties of storing and transferring large video files under IT restrictions.

Chair Beer asked Harbormaster Blank to clarify details regarding the recently terminated mooring license. Harbormaster Blank emphasized that it was a license, not a permit, that was terminated for nonpayment. He explained that it was located in the J field and was for a 40-foot mooring.

Chair Beer noted that the 40-foot mooring field has one of the longest waiting lists. He thanked Harbormaster Blank for the clarification and for his ongoing work.

Chair Beer opened public comments.

Adam Leverenz requested clarification on the SAVE grant. He asked how long each grant cycle lasts, whether the \$175,000 awarded in the past two cycles represented a total of \$350,000, and when the Harbor Department expects to learn the allocation for the next cycle.

Harbormaster Blank explained that SAVE grant cycles run for two years. He reported that over the past four years, the City has received \$175,000 per cycle, totaling \$350,000, with a required 10 percent City match of \$35,000. He stated that the application for the current cycle has been submitted, with awards expected to be announced in October or November. He explained that the new cycle will begin shortly after the start of the year, while the current cycle ends September 30. He noted that \$4,000 remains from the current grant and will be used before the deadline.

Chair Beer asked whether those funds are typically spent on abandoned vessels or on "Good Samaritan" cases where owners voluntarily surrender their boats.

Harbormaster Blank responded that usage is split roughly 50/50 between abandoned and surrendered vessels. He explained that larger surrendered vessels often require more costly removals, so while expenditures have leaned toward surrendered boats, this is due to their size and complexity rather than departmental preference.

Chair Beer observed that with reduced funding, abandoned vessels might continue to be addressed, but fewer voluntary surrenders could be accommodated.

Harbormaster Blank agreed, noting that in such cases, the Harbor Department would likely direct vessel owners to private contractors for removal at their own expense.

Mike Fleming praised the new docks, noting their alignment and cleat placement, and described them as highly effective. He suggested adding two more docks to meet the high level of public demand. He observed that most dinghy users comply with posted time limits, as shown by yellow notices, but noted a growing trend of private boat operators shuttling people like ride services. He questioned whether that was the best long-term solution.

Chair Beer responded that expanding public dock space in the harbor remains a challenge. He recalled serving on a subcommittee with Commissioner Miller that reviewed all public docks and developed proposals for reconfiguration and expansion. While some ideas were partially approved, he explained that many were limited by Coastal Commission restrictions. He noted that public docks and harbor amenities remain under ongoing review.

Mr. Fleming noted that he had previously suggested installing docks just outside the buoy lines near swimming beaches.

Chair Beer explained that ~~expanding dock square footage~~ constructing new floating docks would likely face significant challenges, including environmental concerns, ~~extensive~~ permitting, regulatory requirements, and high costs, with no guarantee of approval. He referenced ~~the~~ an earlier dock reconfiguration in which 100 square feet was reduced to address eelgrass impacts for Coastal Commission approval. He emphasized that while ~~expansion~~ expanding public dock space is difficult, the Commission continues to recognize ~~and evaluate~~ the need and evaluate future possibilities.

Peter Chas asked whether volunteer rides for a nonprofit serving disabled children could use the marina, or if any provisions existed for such volunteer services.

Harbormaster Blank explained that while the City cannot offer free slips, extended tie-ups, or variances from conditions of use at public docks, it does provide facilities that assist with transferring individuals with mobility challenges into vessels. He advised that these human lifts are available at Marina Park and the Balboa Marina Public Dock at no cost, with 24 hours' notice required.

Chair Beer closed public comments.

There was no further action taken on this item, and it was received and filed unanimously.

**8. MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

None.

**9. MATTERS WHICH COMMISSIONERS WOULD LIKE PLACED ON A FUTURE AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION, ACTION, OR REPORT (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM)**

Secretary Scully announced that Anne Stenton of the Newport Mooring Association would provide a presentation at the September meeting, subject to confirmation. He also proposed adding a discussion item on safety training requirements for harbor rentals, including electric boats, motorized vessels, paddle boards, kayaks, and jet skis. He noted that while all motorized operators are legally required to hold a California Boater Card, the Commission should consider whether rental operators should meet similar standards, identify safety gaps, and evaluate options to ensure renters receive adequate instruction.

Chair Beer agreed and stated that the item could be scheduled for a September or October agenda, depending on availability.

**10. DATE AND TIME FOR NEXT MEETING – Wednesday, September 10, 2025 at 5 p.m.**

The next regular meeting is scheduled for September 10, 2025 at 5:00 p.m.

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Harbor Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.