

Attendees:

Eddie Hard - DBW

Cara Roderick – DBW

Jeffrey Caudill – DBW

Peter Zaleski (CYBA)

Katie Hawkins – DBW Commissioner

Mark Smith – Mark Smith policy group

Mike Sinacori – Newport beach assistant city engineer

Morris Lum (RBOC)

Jerry Desmond (RBOC)

Notes:

Katie – Welcomes everyone to the subcommittee meeting to kick off the meeting. Thanks staff for the preparation. Introduces herself. Provided update on last month's in person committee meeting in Santa Barbara.

Introductions.

Eddie – Starts by showing the agenda, talks to the public attendees for introductions and provides background on the subcommittee and provides an update on the beach erosion and nourishment and how that's better discussed in the program subcommittee. All comments and recommendations will be taken and sent to the correct subcommittee and commission.

Mike – The harbor needs the shoreline as well so funding should also be used to support shoreline otherwise the harbor will be in the ocean.

Eddie – We are starting to discuss recommendations as we have had a lot of great discussions previously. All comments/recommendations will be memorialized. Full disclosure, as this is a public meeting, DBW staff cannot make the recommendations.

Mike – If additional funding is found and approved, the shoreline still needs funding. Could separate funding be found for shoreline or is a percentage could be accessible for shoreline protection? It would take millions of dollars to protect the shoreline.

Eddie – Asked for clarification on Mike's recommendation.

Mike – I do not have any ideas for additional funding sources, especially for shoreline.

Mark – Shoreline is a multi-billion dollar problem and we've spent so much time discussing this. Boaters cannot solely be responsible for discussing and funding this. Local entities should be taking point and looking for funding. Boaters don't even cause 5% of the problems for shoreline. Paddle sports, non-

motorized boating registration should be on the discussion. Perhaps a boat registration cost increase. Other funding sources, could we open up to the other programs, such as AIS and looking for alternative funding for AIS, sch as county ag commissioners. Is this all in scope?

Eddie – Scope does include non motorized vessel registration and increased vessel registration costs should be in scope. AIS alternative funding sources are in scope.

Mark – Motor Vehicle gas taxes needs to be reallocated. Boaters do not see enough of the gas taxes supporting boating. Should we be giving specific recommendations, such as a \$5 fee for paddle sports or something similar?

Eddie – Yes, specific recommendations are great.

Mark – We haven't had a chance to talk internally with others, but we believe an annual assessment, not a point of sale assessment, should be utilized for paddle sports. Jerry and Beau might also have recommendations. Motor vehicle fuel money also should be given to DBW at a higher amount.

Jerry – RBOC supports a non motorized vessel fee. Motorized registration fee increases should be discussed at the point they review the recommendations for program efficiencies etc. RBOC believes that capturing additional motor vehicle fuel tax dollars into the HWRF is another revenue enhancement.

Mark – I'd like to discuss with others outside of the meeting before giving specific recommendations.

Jerry – Restated the above statement, which he put into the chat. Having other funding sources for AIS that benefit should also be considered. Vessel registration increases need to show how the funding will be spent and what benefits boaters might see, efficiencies, etc.

Eddie – Thank you Jerry, we're looking for specific recommendations, so thank you! What kind of efficiencies are you looking to see?

Jerry – Don't other subcommittee have to present what program adjustments should be, don't we have to talk to the other subcommittees as well? We're taking what comes out of this month's subcommittee meetings, we want to put together or see a comprehensive package for DBW. Each subcommittee should be providing to this comprehensive package.

Katie – I agree, it's about timing. The more focus we can get on these recommendations, the better we can drill into these as a subcommittee and leadership and potentially share these within the department. If we can get a little more focused on the recommendations, the better it'll be.

Eddie – Jerry and Mark and others may discuss offline, but recommendations coming out of this subcommittee are great and can be shared with other subcommittee. The recommendations we find might not be the same as other subcommittees, but DBW will share knowledge between the others.

Jerry - Another alternative revenue piece RBOC supports a transfer of boat registration from DMV to DBW (chat). I've typed my recommendations into the chat and believe these are all great recommendations to make. I believe the goal of the subcommittees is to prepare recommendations to go to Parks. We want to meet the timeframes of the subcommittees and support this effort.

Eddie – Part of this work is a heavy ask of the subcommittee members. We could use your recommendations to move this forward and thank you for your support!

Cara – In chat asked Jerry if he also meant mussel sticker with the DMV to DBW comment.

Eddie/Jerry/Mark – putting together recommendations within a month or so should be good for timelines.

Peter – I wasn't able to make the first couple of meetings. I'd like to confirm with Beau before commenting.

Jerry - Another topic for RBOC under "revenues" is a "savings" by having the beach erosion funded by the GF or other sources, with the DBW function remaining as grant administration (Typed in chat)

Eddie – Moved to item 2B on the agenda. Discuss and determine whether more information is needed or subject matter expert needs for future subcommittee meetings.

Eddie/Mark – Beach erosion and nourishment, Jonathan Clay wasn't able to make it and might be a representative with this type of program so can wait for him.

Eddie/Jerry – Fuel taxes? In the past, all boating fuel tax dollars went to HWRF. That has been changing where the money goes, which might be going to SPRF or Parks. A small percentage goes into HWRF (14% or less). Capturing more of these fuel dollars into the HWRF should be a priority.

Eddie – Broad brush commentary like this is very useful. It would be good to know how this money goes into supporting boaters. We not only want to address the current funding challenges but also not to repeat the past. OHV had an issue in the past where funding didn't exactly go towards the goal of the funding. We also want to state why we are seeking alternative funding. If funding has been reallocated away, perhaps that can help with the funding challenge.

Mark – Good point. We are unsure how the government would act if we ask for all \$107M fuel taxes back into HWRF when only maybe \$14M goes into HWRF now. We want to make sure recommendations are reasonable.

Eddie – Some programs aren't line itemed in the budget for DBW. AIS is discretionary.

Jerry – Constituents should be aware of any increases or funding changes. They want to know what the review of programs and services are happening with additional fees/taxes.

Eddie – There should be accountability. We still want to avoid past mistakes.

Mark – Thank you Eddie and commissioner for facilitating a great conversation!

Katie – Thank you all and staff and I will continue putting together recommendations from today's conversation.

Eddie – We will put together a date around second week of July for the next meeting.