

NEWPORT BEACH HARBOR COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
City Council Chambers - 100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach, CA
Wednesday, April 13, 2022
5 p.m.

1) CALL MEETING TO ORDER

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

2) ROLL CALL

Commissioners: William Kenney, Jr., Chair
Ira Beer, Vice Chair
Steve Scully, Secretary
Scott Cunningham, Commissioner
Marie Marston, Commissioner
Gary Williams, Commissioner
Don Yahn, Commissioner

Staff Members: Paul Blank, Harbormaster
Jennifer Biddle, Administrative Support Specialist

3) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Vice Chair Beer

4) PUBLIC COMMENTS

Michael Spano stated that at the last meeting the high cost of permits was discussed for offshore moorings and there was mention of decreasing the costs of permits by increasing the monthly rent. He agreed the mooring prices were too high. He encouraged the City to create new moorings by rearranging or expanding the existing fields. The City should own the new moorings and they should not be transferable. The City should buy back the moorings for the register transfer price.

Chair Kenney encouraged Mr. Spano to stay for the mooring configuration discussion happening later in the meeting.

Pete Swift suggested the Harbor Commission create a subcommittee to evaluate the Council H-1 Policy and requested to be involved in the process.

5) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Draft Minutes of the March 9, 2022 Harbor Commission Regular Meeting

Chair Kenney announced written comments were received from Secretary Scully. He recommended on Page 2, Item 6, paragraph 1, in the fourth line down the word “are” should be “area”.

Vice-Chair Beer moved to approve the draft Minutes of the March 9, 2022 meeting as amended. Secretary Scully seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Chair Kenney, Vice Chair Beer, Secretary Scully, Commissioner Cunningham,
Commissioner Williams, Commissioner Yahn

Nays: None

Abstaining: Commissioner Marston

Absent: None

2. Draft Minutes of the March 21, 2022 Harbor Commission Special Meeting

Chair Kenney stated written comments were submitted to staff by Vice Chair Beer and Secretary Scully.

Jim Mosher noticed in the March 9, 2022 draft minutes, on Page 1 in the title line the word "Snewport" should be "Newport".

Secretary Scully moved to approve the draft Minutes of the March 21, 2022 meeting as amended. Commissioner Yahn seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Chair Kenney, Vice Chair Beer, Secretary Scully, Commissioner Cunningham, Commissioner Marston, Commissioner Yahn
Nays: None
Abstaining: Commissioner Williams,
Absent: None

6) CURRENT BUSINESS

1. **Update on Mooring Row Alignments and the Mooring Extension Application Process**

At the Harbor Commission meeting of June 12, 2019, the Harbor Commission reviewed proposed amendments regarding offshore mooring extensions in conjunction with their 2018 Goals and Objectives to "Establish policies for modifications to mooring sizes". At that meeting, Commissioner Beer took responsibility for analyzing the mooring field layouts and drafting policies for review and consideration by the Harbor Commission. Commissioner Beer has conducted significant research with the aid of City staff and documented his findings. He continues to put significant effort into a proposal which will include optimizing the mooring field layouts and providing a pathway and policies for those offshore mooring permittees who wish to adjust the length of the mooring for which they are currently permitted. This report and presentation will update the Harbor Commission on Commissioner Beer's efforts, process and research. Commissioner Beer seeks input from the full Commission and public to further refine his recommendations.

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) Provide direction to Commissioner Beer on further development of recommendations.

Vice Chair Beer reported the purpose of the item was to review existing policies and provide modifications to mooring sizes and open water initiatives to improve navigation safety as well as better utilize the space within the current mooring fields. While mooring extensions were allowed in the past by Orange County Sheriff's Department (OCS), no formal guidelines were ever established. Previous years practice was if requested, the OCS would inspect a mooring and determine if a mooring could house a larger vessel safely. This practice has caused significant disarray within the mooring fields. Many vessels and mooring balls are protruding into the navigational path of the adjacent fairways and do not provide adequate spacing. In 2019, the Harbor Commission was asked to explore a way to extend the moorings for existing mooring permittees and if possible, develop a process and policy to facilitate an extension. An ad hoc committee began investigating options and met with the Newport Beach Mooring Association (NMA) to discuss concepts for a new Harbor Policy that would address the issue. The ad hoc committee presented a draft policy to the Commission as a temporary solution. The policy allowed the rows within a mooring field to have a maximum boat length overall (LOA) and allowed boats who exceeded the LOA to remain but would revert back to the intended LOA if the boat was sold or the mooring was transferred. The policy intended to bring the row widths back to the designed lengths for safety and improved navigation. The NMA expressed concerns about the loss of equality ownership under the temporary solution. In a public hearing, the Harbor Commission approved the policy but was later rejected by City Council. The Council expressed concerns that the temporary solution did not solve the long-term problem and may be taken advantage of by increasing the value of the mooring permittee's transfer right. The ad hoc committee worked with staff to draft new language that could temporarily accommodate certain mooring permittees who are seeking a 5-foot mooring extension request while also addressing Council's concerns. The new solution is that mooring permittees seeking an extension must follow specific conditions. Those conditions are they must

be in full compliance with all permit requirements, they must sign a new mooring permit, the new mooring length with the 5-foot extension will not exceed the length of any other mooring or boat in the same row, the new mooring could not create unsafe navigation for other uses and the mooring permittee will install new tackle, weight and chain at their own expense. Also, the vessel must be registered to the existing mooring permittee and located on the mooring within 12-months of granting the mooring extension. The mooring permittee may not sell, transfer or otherwise dispose of the mooring permit before 12-months from the date the vessel permanently occupies the mooring. If the mooring permittee fails to comply with the requirements, the Harbormaster may revoke the mooring extension. After further review by the ad hoc committee and staff, it was rediscovered that the problem is very complex and warrants further review. A temporary solution that allows extensions may adversely affect the ability to discover, implement and maintain a new permanent design. The ad hoc committee and staff continue to work on a new plan that improves safety and navigation, improve aesthetics for all users, opens up the waterways, allows for new City-owned moorings, considers extension requests previously submitted to the Harbor Commission, relocates current mooring permittees within their field to accommodate overall mooring lengths that may exceed or fall short of intended mooring row widths and eliminates opportunities for mooring permittees to increase the mooring length beyond the intended length of the row. For the new design, accurate maps of all the moorings fields and their dimensions as well as an accurate account of all mooring permits and their respective vessel LOAs is required. Due to incomplete records, all mooring permittees were asked to complete a new permit but the Harbor Department has yet to receive all the new forms. Not having accurate records will likely result in improper spacing and adverse impacts on mooring permits. Upon completion of the third audit, the process of designing a solution and mapping it will begin with the help of the Geographic Information System (GIS). The Harbor Commission will be updated monthly about progress and when ready, the final plan will be reviewed and discussed separately in a public meeting as an agenda item.

In answer to Commissioner Yahn's inquiry regarding the start of the process, Vice Chair Beer answered the process began in the year 2019.

Chair Kenney thanked Vice Chair Beer for his time and work on the matter.

Vice Chair Beer thanked staff for their hard work.

Paul Bailey shared he has been on the list for several years now for a mooring extension. He agreed with the process and understands how complex it is. In answer to his query regarding the timeline, Vice Chair Beer acknowledged there have been setbacks. The next step is to begin and complete the third audit. Then design and mapping can begin. He emphasized this is a high priority and every effort will be made to accommodate previous requests.

George Hylkema, a Board Member of the NMA, recommended instead of using LOA use deck length. He commented if the moorings are tethered, there will be a clear fairway of irregular width but it would be more navigable. He asked if there are public records of incidents that prove the current configuration is unsafe.

Hein Austin stated different boats require different approaches and this is not a one-size-fits-all solution. OCSD has highly skilled and trained professionals who know the Harbor very well. They have the skill to determine if a mooring can accommodate a specific size vessel. Along with accurate mapping and boundaries, the exact location of the weight for every boat must be plotted. To improve safety in the fairways he suggested requiring every mooring to have a splitter line.

Tom O'Keefe concurred that with the combination of wind and current, coming into a mooring can be very difficult. He mentioned there is an open space at the west end of North Balboa Island Channel that should be explored as a future mooring field.

Vice Chair Beer mentioned that mooring fields have very specific defined lines that have been approved by the U.S Coast Guard but agreed to investigate the area.

Jim Mosher understood from the presentation that the Harbormaster can revoke a mooring permit and that action is unappealable. He did not understand the rationale behind not allowing folks to appeal a revoked permit. Vice Chair Beer answered the provision of not allowing appeals was not part of the current plan.

Michael Spano supported the proposed plan. In answer to his inquiry regarding what the biggest hurdle is, Vice Chair Beer restated having accurate data is the biggest hurdle.

Mr. Bailey suggested working with the Harbormaster to compile the data. He found it shocking the Harbor Department did not have accurate data after having to update his information many times over the years. Chair Kenney restated a significant portion of the data is out of date and inaccurate.

Bob Thurmund commented he has filled out information for his vessel three times and has never received a notice that the information was received, verified and confirmed. Harbormaster Paul Blank stated the information should have been confirmed the first time it was submitted. Mr. Thurmund expressed frustration that the process is being held up by data confirmation. In reply to his question regarding how the GIS tracking for navigable waters takes place, Harbormaster Blank answered this is an active survey to collect field data and update both systems used by the Harbor Department.

In answer to Chair Kenney's query regarding if Mr. Thurmund received a Mooring Permit, Mr. Thurmund answered yes.

Chuck Smith stated one constant variable is the size of the mooring. He found it irrelevant to know what size of vessel is on mooring because the Harbor Department monitors the water and issues violations to mooring permittees that house larger than allowed boats.

Bill DeWitt requested more information on how many City-owned moorings exist and Harbormaster Blank answered approximately 21. Vice Chair Beer understood from the discussions that there is a desire to have more City-owned moorings.

Wade Womack, speaking on behalf of himself, requested the Harbor Commission allow the public to review the final plan a month in advance of the Harbor Commission making a decision. He supported having more stakeholder meetings about the matter. He suggested reconfiguring the mooring fields one at a time instead of all at once. He commented the functionality of the existing mooring fields is good and he has not heard of folks complaining about safety. He did not think it is fair to put mooring permittees who are seeking an extension on hold while the City rectifies its system issues. He noted he did not receive the email he had to update his information until 2-months into the process.

Bud Cullens predicted there will be more requests for mooring extensions if the plan uses LOA. He requested the Commission to clarify the definition of LOA and transfers with extensions. Vice Chair Beer clarified having a mooring revert back to the allowable length was part of the original proposal. The new plan did not include that provision but the permittee must replace the boat with a similar size, pay for the tackle and the vessel cannot be transferred within the first year. LOA is defined in Title 17 as the manufactured specified LOA which typically represents the hull of the vessel.

Mr. Austin mentioned a 5-foot extension could mean a massive vessel on a mooring. He suggested allowing mooring permittees a year to update their information and then revoke any permits that do not comply after that time.

Vice Chair Beer restated that the process is not stopping because of the inability to receive updated information. Many of the data is missing or inaccurate and that slows down the audit process but the project continues to move forward.

In response to Mr. Hykema's query regarding his 40-foot mooring and his 36-foot boat with a 55-foot overall, Vice Chair Beer could not answer if Mr. Hykema should apply for a mooring extension and would have to review the details.

Chair Kenney recommended having a definition for the term "length" in the definition section of Title 17. Harbormaster Blank mentioned the definition was under "vessel length". Chair Kenney read the definition into the record. In answer to his query regarding if LOA is defined in the Municipal Code is used to determine the size of a boat for moorings, Harbormaster Blank answered yes. Chair Kenney answered Mr. Hykema's

question that a bowsprit and davit device are pertinent to a boat but when the boat is tied to the mooring by the forward and stern cleat. If the distance between those is 36 feet, then that is the length of the boat.

Vice Chair Beer commented the intent is to not allow any vessels to extend beyond the mooring ball.

Chair Kenney acknowledged that Title 17 is a working document and appreciated the comments from the public to make Title 17 a more readable and understandable document.

Jennifer Kresly wanted more information on how many accidents have been reported annually in the mooring fields. Harbormaster Blank did not have a specific breakdown of what the Calls for Services pertained to.

In reply to Chair Kenney's query regarding who answers Calls for Service, Harbormaster Blank explained if OCSD receives the call, they forward the call to the Harbor Department.

Mr. Austin recommended the City have requirements that boats not using the mooring fields not be allowed to drive through the mooring fields.

Chair Kenney predicted educating renters not to go through mooring fields would be a huge task.

Vice Chair Beer was not sure why folks object to making the mooring fields a safer place to navigate. The Harbor is incredibly busy and getting busier. To wait for an accident to occur and then make changes is negligent. He could not recall using the word compact when talking about mooring fields and that was not the intent of the plan but rather to make the mooring fields more functional. The fairways between the mooring field rows are public waterways and the public is entitled to have access to the water.

Chair Kenney invited the Commission and the Harbormaster to provide comments on allowing the Harbor Department to issue temporary extension permits. Vice Chair Beer noted there are 10 requests for 10 feet extensions and three requests for above 10 feet. Chair Kenney did not support a temporary permit for mooring permittees requesting an extension over 5 feet. Vice Chair Beer did not support a process that grants a temporary extension, then discontinues the extension and leaves the mooring permittee no time to adapt to the change. Chair Kenney noted the temporary extension would be personal to the vessel and mooring permittee. Secretary Scully supported issuing a temporary permit. Commissioner Marston remarked the Harbor Department will have to know where the extension is being proposed to know if the extension will fit. It would be unfair to revoke the extension if realignment happens and the extension is not appropriate for the row. Commissioner Williams supported a temporary permit as long as there was a time limit attached to it. Chair Kenney mentioned the temporary permit would be in place while Vice Chair Beer completes his analysis. Commissioner Yahn also supported a temporary extension as long as it did not interfere with the process and did not allow boats to extend into navigable areas. Commissioner Cunningham stated it is a bad precedent and could not support it. Vice Chair Beer agreed with Commissioner Cunningham but is willing to explore it once the data comes in and the maps are finished.

2. Ad Hoc Committee Update

Several ad hoc committees have been established to address short term projects outside of the Harbor Commission objectives. This is the time the ad hoc committees will provide an update on their projects.

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.

Chair Kenney invited the ad hoc committee investigating floats and lifts in the Harbor to provide an update.

Commissioner Yahn reported currently under the Municipal Code axillary floats and lifts are required to have a Harbor Development Permit. The City records indicate that none of the axillary floats and lifts in the Harbor have applied or have been issued a Harbor Development Permit. The ad hoc committee is exploring amending Section 17.25.030 by adding subsections B, C and D that relate to floats, lifts and the grace periods. The ad hoc committee presented its findings to the Harbor Commission in February 2022 and received feedback. The next step is to hold a stakeholder meeting on May 17, 2022, before final recommendations are made.

Jim Mosher understood from the Coastal Commission letter that any addition of a float or lift to a permitted pier would require a review of the permit. He suggested that be discussed at the stakeholder meeting.

3. Harbor Commission 2022 Objectives

Each ad hoc committee studying their respective Functional Area within the Commission's 2022 Objectives, will provide a progress update.

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.

Functional Area 1: Commissioner Yahn confirmed work continues on Title 17. City Council recently discussed several of the revisions but the item was continued to a future meeting for further consideration. With respect to the other objective areas, there was no update at this time.

Functional Area 2: Vice Chair Beer reported with respect to Objective 2.1, Commissioner Williams has expressed interest in working on the objective and he invited him to work with Commissioner Cunningham and himself. Commissioner Cunningham added Objective 2.1 will have to explore how to add more moorings into the Harbor.

Chair Kenney appointed Commissioner Williams to work on Objective 2.1.

Commissioner Cunningham announced there is no report with respect to Objective 2.2 and Objective 2.4.

Functional Area 3: Commissioner Cunningham stated there is no update for Functional Area 3.

Functional Area 4: Secretary Scully reported there is no update for Objective 4.1. With respect to Objective 4.2, Commissioner Marston and himself continue to discuss next steps and engagement with Council Members regarding Lower Castaways ~~continues~~. With respect to Objective 4.3, Commissioner Williams and himself continue to discuss ~~establishing and establish~~ a Newport Harbor Safety Committee. One function of the Safety Committee ~~could will~~ be to educate rental companies and their renters about where they can ~~transverse travel~~ safely ~~within~~ the Harbor. The framework has been established for the Safety Committee and ~~the process to identify~~ key members have been ~~identified started~~ to form the ~~first Newport Harbor~~ Safety Committee. ~~He Commissioner Scully~~ predicted the first meeting will be held in the third quarter of 2022. Also, work continues on the ~~list outlining of all commercial and non-profit of the~~ operators in the Harbor and a report will be provided in the near future to the Harbor Commission for consideration.

Jim Mosher concurred that Title 17 is a living document but confessed he was confused about the role of the ad hoc committee. An ad hoc committee is supposed to investigate a topic and then disband at the conclusion. If the ad hoc committee is intended to be a lasting committee then it should be a standing

committee and its meetings should be conducted in a public setting. Regarding Objective 2.2, many of the items have to do with moorings and when Harbormaster Blank was a Harbor Commissioner. He had to recuse himself from items that had to do with moorings because he is a mooring holder. He inquired if Harbormaster Blank is still a mooring holder and are there any limitations on his participation in those matters.

4. Harbormaster Update - March 2022 Activities

The Harbormaster oversees the City Harbor Department and is responsible for the management of the City's mooring fields, enforcement of the municipal code, events permitting, safety and rescue operations, the Marina Park Guest Marina, marine sanitation pump out equipment and public pier maintenance, impound and disposition of abandoned and unclaimed vessels and public relations and information dissemination on and about Newport Harbor. This report will update the Harbor Commission on the Harbor Department's recent 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 Blank reported there was a steady stream of wayward vessels in March which were collected by harbor staff and returned to the owners or placed in a holding area for auction. The Harbor Commission and Water Quality Coastal Tidelands Committee met and Secretary Scully will be leading the effort in strengthening that relationship. Regarding the NMA's remark that on-shore mooring permittees receive no services from the City, he commented that Notice of Violations were issued to many on-shore mooring permittees on Balboa Island. The Harbor Department received a 90 percent compliance rate within 2-days of the violations being issued. In addition, the department provides pump-outs for sunken vessels and removed many vessels that were being stored on the beach at Balboa Island. Regarding safety, a vessel was reported stolen which was found and returned to the owner. Code Enforcement Supervisor Cosylyon is collaborating with the California Association of Code Enforcement Officers on new training that is unique to marinas and marine environments. The human lift has been successfully installed at Marina Park and he thanked Mr. Swift and his team for building the mount for the lift. Staff will be mailing out notice of the May 17, 2022 floats and lifts stakeholder meeting. The Harbor Department continues a pace of increased revenue compared to the year 2021 and that was due to increased occupancy at Marina Park and the new sub permitting program for on-shore moorings. Also, the Harbor Department is keeping pace with the number of vessels they have helped over 20 feet but was ahead of pace for vessels under 20 feet. Regarding Mooring Permits, the total issued permits was 929, permits converted from the old permit to the new permit was 195 and the total number of permits entered into the Harbor Department System is 769. Several dozen on-shore mooring permittees have indicated they will not sign their permit until the rate matter has been settled. The Harbor Department continues to reach all mooring permittees by placing notes on vessels, phone calls, mailers and other methods. The Council will be considering proposed Municipal Code changes not associated with raft-ups at their April 26, 2022 meeting. Staff will be bringing forward recommendations regarding raft-ups to the Harbor Commission in the near future. He encouraged the Harbor Commission to consider not requiring permits for raft-ups that break up before sunset.

In reply to Secretary Scully's query regarding what is considered an incident, Harbormaster Blank stated there is a variety of them. Secretary Scully mentioned that with the formation of the Newport Harbor Safety Committee this information could be used to work on bringing the frequency of incidents down, may be able to help with incidences.

In response to Commissioner Marston's inquiry regarding the allocation of revenues, Harbormaster Blank explained the revenue from Marina Park slip rentals and on-shore mooring rentals as well as off-shore sub-permits and on-shore mooring sub-permits are deposited into the Tidelands Fund.

Commissioner Yahn pointed out revenue has doubled over the years 2020 and 2021 and that reflects the Harbor Departments' fantastic work.

In answer to Commissioner Cunningham's request for more information about mooring permittees not signing their permits, Harbormaster Blank understood folks are refusing to sign the permit until rates have been established. He shared recently City Council discussed Consumer Price Index (CPI) increases for rates and determined that a 2 percent CPI increase is sufficient. Commissioner Cunningham commented the ad hoc committee had no idea it would take years to update the permits. He recommended the Harbor Commission discuss the item at a future Harbor Commission meeting. Harbormaster Blank restated that a lot of staff time and resources are being used to update the permits.

In response to Chair Kenney's question regarding what total permits issued means, Harbormaster Blank restated the City currently maintains and manages a total of 929 Mooring Permits. Chair Kenney summarized 769 have been finalized, 36 are in progress and the remaining was permits that permittee have not responded to.

Hein Austin stated there are 6,500 vessels in the Harbor and staff was only focusing on a specific group of users. He requested more information about the other permits that influence the Harbor Department's statistics.

In answer to an interested party's query regarding what Harbor Ops means, Harbormaster Blank explained Harbor Ops is the system that tracks all the documentation for the various uses and activities in the Harbor.

7) MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

None

8) COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS (NON-DISCUSSION ITEM)

Secretary Scully ~~concurred~~ discussed that he met with a Water Quality Coastal Tidelands Committee member and discussed various topics with ~~them~~ him. He shared he will attend the next Water Quality Coastal Tidelands Committee meeting on May 5, ~~2022~~ 2022, to understand what initiatives overlap between the two bodies.

Chair Kenney reiterated there will be a stakeholder meeting on May 17, 2022 regarding floats and lifts. Also, the Council recently reviewed the revisions to Title 17 and decided to bifurcate the item into two sections. The Harbor Commission will be discussing raft-up provisions at the May 2022 Commission meeting and the remaining revisions to be reviewed by City Council at their April 26, 2022 meeting.

9) QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WITH STAFF ON HARBOR-RELATED ISSUES

In answer to Vice Chair Beer's request regarding Caulerpa in the Harbor, Harbormaster Blank confirmed there has been another outbreak. The City of Newport Beach has submitted its response plan and was awaiting a response from the State. Commissioner Cunningham added a DNA study of the Caulerpa found at Collins Island is underway to determine if the outbreak is related to the outbreak in China Cove. Vice Chair Beer observed it may be best to do more surveying ahead of the major degrading project about to begin in the Harbor. Commissioner Cunningham confirmed extensive surveys of the areas will happen before the dredging project begins.

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

Secretary Scully suggested the Commission revisit Policy H-1.

Commissioner Cunningham supported Secretary Scully's recommendation.

Chair Kenney recommended the issue of raft-ups be placed on a future agenda.

11) DATE AND TIME FOR NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, May 11, 2022 at 5 p.m.

12) **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Harbor Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

DRAFT