



MINUTES

Tuesday, April 14, 2020

6:30 P.M. Open Session

**ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING
CITY COUNCIL, AIRPORT COMMISSION,
MARINA ABRAMS B NON-PROFIT CORPORATION, PRESTON PARK SUSTAINABLE
COMMUNITY NON-PROFIT CORPORATION, SUCCESSOR AGENCY OF THE FORMER
MARINA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND MARINA GROUNDWATER
SUSTAINABILITY AGENCY**

Council Hall
211 Hillcrest Avenue
Marina, California
Telephone (831) 884-1278 - Fax (831) 384-9148
E-Mail: marina@cityofmarina.org Website: www.cityofmarina.org

**Zoom Meeting URL: <https://zoom.us/j/730251556>
Zoom Meeting Telephone Only Participation: 1-669-900-9128 - Webinar ID: 730 251 556**

In response to Governor Newsom's Executive Order N.29-20 and City Council Resolution 2020-29 ratifying the Proclamation of a Local Emergency by the City Manager/Director of Emergency Services related to the COVID-19 (coronavirus) pandemic, public participation in the City of Marina City Council and other public meetings shall be electronic only and without a physical location for public participation, until further notice in compliance with California state guidelines on social distancing. This meeting is being broadcast "live" on Access Media Productions (AMP) Community Television Cable 25 and on the City of Marina Channel and on the internet at <https://accessmediaproductions.org/>

1. CALL TO ORDER:
2. ROLL CALL & ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM: (City Council, Airport Commissioners, Marina Abrams B Non-Profit Corporation, Preston Park Sustainable Communities Nonprofit Corporation, Successor Agency of the Former Redevelopment Agency Members and Marina Groundwater Sustainability Agency)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lisa Berkley, Adam Urrutia, Frank O'Connell, Mayor Pro-Tem/Vice Chair, Gail Morton, Mayor/Chair Bruce C. Delgado
3. ~~CLOSED SESSION: As permitted by Government Code Section 54956 et seq., the (Preston Park Sustainable Communities Nonprofit Corporation, Successor Agency of the Former Redevelopment Agency Members and Marina Groundwater Sustainability Agency) may adjourn to a Closed or Executive Session to consider specific matters dealing with litigation, certain personnel matters, property negotiations or to confer with the City's Meyers Milias-Brown Act representative.~~

- a. ~~Conference with Legal Counsel, anticipated litigation — initiation of litigation pursuant to paragraph (4) of subdivision (d) of CA Govt. Code Section 54956.9 — two potential cases.~~
- b. ~~Real Property Negotiations~~
 - i. ~~Property: Water City Roller Hockey, 2801 2nd Ave, Marina, CA 93933~~
~~— Negotiating Party: Mark Tanous~~
~~— Property Negotiator: City Manager~~
~~— Terms: Price and Terms~~
 - ii. ~~Property: Imjin Parkway/Landfill Site, APNs 031-101-039, 031-101-040, 031-101-041 and 031-101-042~~
~~Negotiating Party: County of Monterey and Successor to the Redevelopment Agency of the County of Monterey~~
~~Property Negotiator: City Manager~~
~~Terms: Price and Terms~~

7:05 PM - RECONVENE OPEN SESSION AND REPORT ON ANY ACTIONS TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

4. MOMENT OF SILENCE & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (Please stand)

5. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS:

a. Review of updated Website — COVID-19

6. ~~SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE FLOOR: Any member of the Public or the City Council may make an announcement of special events or meetings of interest as information to Council and Public. Any member of the public may comment on any matter within the City Council's jurisdiction which is not on the agenda. Please state your name for the record. Action will not be taken on an item that is not on the agenda. If it requires action, it will be referred to staff and/or placed on a future agenda. City Council members or City staff may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed as permitted by Government Code Section 54954.2. In order that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, please limit comments to a maximum of four (4) minutes. Any member of the public may comment on any matter listed on this agenda at the time the matter is being considered by the City Council.~~

7. ~~CONSENT AGENDA FOR THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE FORMER MARINA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY: Background information has been provided to the Successor Agency of the former Redevelopment Agency on all matters listed under the Consent Agenda, and these items are considered to be routine. All items under the Consent Agenda are normally approved by one motion. Prior to such a motion being made, any member of the public or the City Council may ask a question or make a comment about an agenda item and staff will provide a response. If discussion or a lengthy explanation is required, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda for Successor Agency to the former Marina Redevelopment Agency and placed at the end of Other Action Items Successor Agency to the former Marina Redevelopment Agency.~~

8. ~~CONSENT AGENDA: Background information has been provided to the City Council, Airport Commission, Marina Abrams B Non-Profit Corporation, and Redevelopment Agency on all matters listed under the Consent Agenda, and these items are considered to be routine. All items under the Consent Agenda are normally approved by one motion. Prior to such a motion being made, any member of the public or the City Council may ask a question or make a comment about an agenda item and staff will provide a response. If discussion or a lengthy explanation is required, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and placed at the end of Other Action Items.~~

a. ~~ACCOUNTS PAYABLE:~~

- (1) ~~Accounts Payable Check Numbers 94656-94809, totaling \$347,724.02
Accounts Payable Successor Agency Checks Numbers 44-45 and EFT totaling \$5,093.78~~

b. ~~MINUTES:~~

- (1) ~~March 17, 2020, Regular City Council Meeting~~

c. ~~CLAIMS AGAINST THE CITY:~~ None

d. ~~AWARD OF BID:~~ None

e. ~~CALL FOR BIDS:~~ None

f. ~~ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS:~~

g. ~~APPROVAL OF AGREEMENTS~~

- (1) City Council consider adopting Resolution No. 2020-, authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract with HdL Companies not to exceed \$50,000 to provide cannabis program application review, tax audits, compliance inspections, background checks, and subject matter expertise and technical support, subject to final review and approval by the City Attorney; and authorizing Finance Director to make appropriate accounting and budgetary entries. ***Pulled from consent and placed in Other Action***
- (2) ~~City Council consider adopting Resolution No. 2020-, approving professional services agreements between the City of Marina and Wallace Group, Inc. for program management, on-call design, and on-call construction management, and construction inspection services for projects in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Airport Capital Improvement Programs (ACIP), and; authorizing the City Manager to execute the agreement on behalf of the City subject to final review and approval by the City Attorney.~~
- (3) ~~City Council consider adopting Resolution No. 2020-, approving a consultant services agreement in the amount of \$93,407 with Coffman Associates to update operating documents and establish standard lease rates for the Marina Municipal Airport (OAR); and approving appropriation of \$93,407 for these professional services; and authorizing City Manager to accept the proposal and execute the project authorization on behalf of City, subject to final review and approval by City Attorney.~~

h. ~~ACCEPTANCE OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS:~~ None

i. ~~MAPS:~~ None

j. ~~REPORTS: (RECEIVE AND FILE):~~

k. ~~FUNDING & BUDGET MATTERS:~~ None

l. ~~APPROVE ORDINANCES (WAIVE SECOND READING):~~ None

m. ~~APPROVE APPOINTMENTS:~~ None

9. ~~PUBLIC HEARINGS:~~ None

10. ~~OTHER ACTIONS ITEMS OF THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE FORMER MARINA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY: Action listed for each Agenda item is that which is requested by staff. The Successor Agency may, at its discretion, take action on any items. The public is invited to approach the podium to provide up to four (4) minutes of public comment.~~
11. ~~OTHER ACTION ITEMS: Action listed for each Agenda item is that which is requested by staff. The City Council may, at its discretion, take action on any items. The public is invited to approach the podium to provide up to four (4) minutes of public comment.~~

Note: No additional major projects or programs should be undertaken without review of the impacts on existing priorities (Resolution No. 2006 79—April 4, 2006).

- a. ~~City Council consider adopting Resolution No. 2020, confirming the City Manager/Director of Emergency Services' issuance of a First Supplement to the Proclamation of a Local Emergency temporarily suspending until May 31, 2020, the authority of any landlord to commence evictions on any residential (including mobile homes and mobile home lots) or commercial property within the City due to the tenant's nonpayment of rent or a foreclosure arising out of a documented substantial decrease in household or business income caused by the COVID-19 pandemic or the governmental response thereto. Discussed on April 7, 2020~~
- b. ~~Update and discussion regarding impacts of COVID-19 and provide staff with further directions. Discussed on April 7, 2020~~
- c. ~~City Council consider adopting Resolution No. 2020, adopting the mitigation monitoring & reporting plan in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15097 for the Fort Ord Regional Trail and Greenway (FORTAG), and; approving the Master Agreement between and among the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), the county of Monterey, the cities of Seaside, Marina, Monterey, Del Rey Oaks, California State University Monterey Bay, University Of California Santa Cruz, and Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District, and; authorize the City Manager to execute the Master Agreement on behalf of the City of Marina subject to final review and approval by the City Attorney. Discussed on April 7, 2020~~
- d. City Council consider adopting Resolution No. 2020-, approving the 2020 Engineering and Traffic Survey with proposed speed limit revisions, and; authorize a budget appropriation of \$45,000 of Gas Tax/Street Fund for signs and supplies, and; authorize the Finance Director to make necessary accounting and budgetary entries, and; consider introducing Ordinance No. 2020-, for first reading by title only and waive further reading, amending Section 10.60.010 "Speed Limits Established" of Chapter 10.60 "Speed Limits" of Title 10 "Vehicles and Traffic" to adopt *prima facie* speed limits pursuant to an engineering and traffic survey and the California Vehicle Code (CVC).

Council Questions: If you certify the survey and you did not use the 85 percentile is it enforceable? What is the showing required for us to indicate that the speeds are unsafe? What do we have to have as a level of proof to not adopt an increase in a speed limit in areas where it's the conditions that would make that unsafe? How do you work into a traffic study to make sure that we're not increasing a speed limit to a dangerous level? Between Reservation Road and Quebra Del Mar we put traffic calming circles and because of the traffic calming circles traffic is driven into the bicycle lanes as you progress

down that street, and so an increase and a high density in sense of driveways, have those factors been taken into consideration in the recommendation for Crescent? As to the roads in the southern part of Marina the traffic studies were done in 2018, correct? So, we're now in 2020, how do we address that the changes in the traffic in the number of residents that did not exist in 2018 but exist in these areas such as 2nd Ave, 3rd Ave how would those be addressed in this traffic survey? Would the next speed survey be done in 2023 or 5-years after we adopt this one? Do you have any ideas about how some of the proposed traffic changes such as the roundabouts on Imjin would affect the speeds and or traffic patterns? Do you have any guestimation about how that would impact over by the Dunes development? Enforcement of D2, G3 and U1 when children present, how will that be enforced? Is there a grace period during or notification so that people are aware of the forthcoming or current change in speeds? Is there a typical protocol for how it's handled? When you do a survey and the survey is done is there any done as to the residents if it's a residential street as to what their thought process is? Are the residents surveyed to get their input on the change? The speed survey from 2018, was it updated as to any of the street on that survey? Why are you increasing the speed limit on 3rd Ave by 5mph if the 85th percentile is exactly the same as it was in 2018? Why would we consider raising speed limit to 30mph on 3rd Avenue when there are two additional stop signs on 3rd of mile street? Is there a lot of weight given to a petition that would be put together by residents in a neighborhood as to what they want in a speed on a particular road if the survey said the speed should be higher than what the residents want? If you increase the speed along California Ave to Imjin Pkwy was a crosswalk talked about for students going to and coming from Marina High School? Is there any way to round the speed along California Ave. to 35mph? The Traffic Engineers is only one that can apply special condition to a speed survey, correct? At Imjin Pkwy where we're seeing a recommendation to increase the speed limit and most people are aware of the death at 3rd Ave. and Imjin and some of are aware that the city is still planning on doing a 3-6 month study on that park of Imjin Pkwy, but what is the wisdom of increasing that right when we are about to do a study to see what can be done about that whole area? Why did it take us two years between 2018 and 2020 to come back to us for approval? What it a typical timeframe to do a speed survey? If there is a change of circumstances in a particular area are you able to do a survey and certify a traffic study as to a limited scope of roads? Del Monte/Reservation Road area, the increase in speeds that are recommended there, if in fact, if and when our Downtown Specific Plan is adopted would the adopting of that specific plan, which calls for slowing speeds down in that corridor would we be able to justify that or would we have to wait until full buildout? Would the five years be measure from 2018 or is it from the date of certification? So, if it's going to expire five years after certification would you do the collection two years before that or further in advance so that it has time to be reviewed and brought before Council? In paragraph U what is the speed if children are not present? Can we adopt a partial survey tonight? Since it's been five years since our last study was adopted does that mean we could do another study at any point going forward? What is the cost of doing another survey and how long does it take? What are the pro's and con's of doing another survey? So, we could adopt this tonight and give direction to start a new survey starting physically tomorrow? The process of a survey requires a notices public comment public hearing, which we're doing tonight, how is that due process and having the public heard if the surveyor doesn't take into consideration the fact that are collected at this public hearing and then determine whether or not they need to modify the conclusions in the survey? The point of having a public hearing is to get that input into the survey, correct? Is it true that the 85th percentile speed is our starting point and once we know that fact is, we can only reduce it from there using special conditions by rounding down couple and then applying a 5mph reduction for the special conditions?

Berkley/Delgado: to adopt the survey as is and within the next month we do the necessary steps to start a new survey.

Public Comments:

- Steve Zmak – Lives at the top of Crescent Ave and submitted comments to you on why he doesn't think Crescent should be increased to 30mph but should stay at 25mph. How much money was spent on all the traffic calming measures for Crescent Ave? Does Crescent Ave. qualify with the rounding down and the special circumstances, can Crescent qualify for being 25mph? Was anything looked at along the lines of Google Map? If you increase the speed limit on Crescent and DeForest you're creating an incentive for traffic going towards Walmart or just cutting through the city to get to the freeway. If we do increase the speed to 30mph on Crescent, well we've obviously failed on our efforts for traffic calming on Crescent so if we raise it to 30mph what additional traffic calming measures will be considered for Crescent Ave to get it back to down to 25mph?
- Paula Pelot – Page 9, #W – Preston Drive speed limit will increase 5mph and has issues because a lot of traffic crosses from Landrum to the sports park and bus stop and opposed the speed limit increase from 25mph to 30mph. The TAMC project that's going to be widening Imjin from Reservation up to Abrams and the Roundabout Projects and fails to see how that does not impacts this study or would not have an impact on speeds in this study. Would like to get a robust answer as to "has TAMC been a part of this or been consulted on this? What have we taken into consideration or not in this study with regard to that project? Thanked Steve Zmak for pointing out that we might be sabotaging the most recent traffic calming measures on Crescent Ave.
- Hans Ongchua – 3rd Avenue, Segment 40 – Survey was completed May 18, 2018 and recommended a speed increase for 3rd Avenue from 25mph to 30mph. Now a discretionary 5pmh reduction allowed by CVC 627, which was applied to other streets in Marina was not applied to 3rd Ave. Pointed out that the speed survey has two major deficiencies: 1) Road and neighborhood conditions have substantially changed as of 2020; 2) the low recorded accident rate is highly questionable and misleading". The traffic engineer should therefore have applied and allowed 5mph reduction in the recommended speed limit. The traffic survey results compiled in 2018 do not accurately reflect street and neighborhood conditions as they are in 2020. The low accident rate is highly questionable given the short time the full length of the road has actually been opened. You can't apply a five-year record to a road that was in existence for only 9-months. Our recommendation is to go ahead and apply the 5mph reduction to the 85th percentile as allowed by law.
- Liezbeth Visscher – Asked that Council not approve the proposed speed limit increases on 3rd Avenue, 9th Street, Imjin Pkwy and California Avenue. The main reasons for my requests for each of these streets is pedestrian and bicycle safety. Questioned using the 85th percentile of the speeds that have been measured during the traffic survey in 2018. The expiration of the previous survey the city has not been allowed to enforce the speed limits with electronic devices since June 2018. If the city had been able to actively enforce the speed limits the behavior of drivers would have been different and the speed of free-flowing traffic would have been lower. This makes it questionable and dangerous to use the measured speeds as the base for speed limit increases. During a city council meeting in February 2019 I requested lowering the speed limit on Imjin Pkwy because of the near accidents. Was surprised to see the increase to 50mph. I do think that this could be a safe speed in the future but not at this moment with unprotected intersections at 3rd Avenue where people cross to go to the Veterans Transition Center, MPC and at Abrams Drive. Please do not approve higher speed limits until a safe bicycle path has been installed and traffic lights at Abrams Drive and 3rd Avenue. Is there a way for interested residents to get involved in the design stages? It is easy to criticize projects after they have been completed. Close to my home I have seen several situations where safety for pedestrians and bicyclists can be improved. Why are the Traffic Advisory Committee meetings are not announced on the city's website? Please start your next survey in 2023 not 2025. Thank you for all you do for our city.

- Denise Turley – Imjin Road/Imjin Pkwy wondering about unsafe conditions being included in the traffic survey such as Imjin Road having nonexistent spotting lighting at night whereas Imjin Pkwy has consistent lighting at night. Do they take into effect the change from Imjin Road to Imjin Pkwy? Are such deficiencies when they come up on a traffic survey reported to the tax measure wish list for fixing existing conditions, such as missing bike paths, missing streetlights?
- Brian McCarthy – Shocked to see this staff report before you because it seems to be the opposite of what council spoke about in October 2018. Motion made in 2018 by Council Member Morton was that the matter be deferred to address the concerns made by council and concerns raised by David Brown a known traffic attorney. So, staff came back with this modified recommendation that not only does it not reduce speed limits or justify the limits in the initial report as requested but it increases speeds on 12 street segments. In the end no one knows a particular street better than the residents who drive it every day. Would the city make a better effort to fully engage the public by agendizing and posting Traffic Committee meetings and adding it to the city's notify me webpage? Concerns about Segment 7 long Reservation Road and Locke Paddon Park. The data in the engineer's report supports the 30mph or lower speed limit as the 85th percentile is 31mph, which should get rounded down to 30mph in accordance with the law. In fact, in Edrie's presentation it says it must be rounded down. There are separate measurements for each section. I don't belief this was done on Segment 7. The DOT manual for setting limits speaks trial runs which is defined as driving through the speed zone section of a roadway at the chosen speed confirming that this speed is appropriate for that area. Encourage any one of the councilmembers to try to ride through those segments on a trail run and guarantee you will question the safety of the speed limit. The city has spent a tremendous amount of money on traffic calming circles to slow speeds and now seems ready to ignore some of that and instead asking drivers to speed up with a possibility of costing the city more money. I'm asking you to reject this staff report in its entirety and urge public participation to the greatest extent when it come back to you; also asked that segment 7 speed limit be set at 25mph after properly rounding down the 85th percentile and taking a 5mph reduction due to multiple conditions.
- Mike Kennedy – When determining speed limits, I believe that careful thought should be given to the safety to our residential streets in Marina. I am referring to residential, that just that. Streets where people reside and live. Street exclusively with homes and apartments where people should have a reasonable expectation of protection and not being exposed to the risk of harm or injury. Traffic surveys seem to focus on how expeditiously and expediently a volume of cars and trucks can get from Point A to Point B. this adventitious favoring of the volume of cars and trucks is at the detriment to the safety within residential areas. Increasing the speed limit to 30mph on 3rd Avenue from Imjin Pkwy to Eight Street only diminishes the safety of the many pedestrians, bicyclists and children on this road in a high-density residential area. A driver entering 3rd Avenue from Imjin seeing a 30mph sign will feel an implied consent to continue at 30mph throughout the entire residential area even when turning off 3rd Avenue to connect to other streets within the residential area. The 85th percentile provides discretion to local governing bodies for the application of good judgement and sensitivity to reduce speed limits for beneficial to safety. I am asking that our town of Marina establish and enforce a uniform consistent 25mph speed limit on all residential streets within the Dunes residential community.
- Christine Laquan – Lives on 3rd Street and can see the whole length of 3rd street from Imjin to Eight Street. Upset to hear that there is a proposed increase to 30mph because my family has had two near misses on 3rd Avenue. Drivers don't seem to care that we walk and bike across the street. They just ram down 3rd Avenue and it's very upsetting. We should have the freedom to get out of our house and walk across the street, to be on the sidewalk. We become very fearful when we have to cross the street at 3rd. Earlier, Mr. McMinn had elude or respond to Council Member O'Connell's .. about houses on 3rd Avenue driveways actually face the back alley. Not all the

houses are backloaded in the alley. Almost have of the houses are front street parking and even so from all the side streets Boardwalk, 8th Street, 9th Street, 10th Street we still have to get onto 3rd Avenue to get somewhere and car parking on 3rd Avenue are tightly packed. We have to stick our heads out to at least 1/3rd of the street see if a car is coming. For the proposal to be proposing an additional 5mph on top of it is incomprehensible. Respectfully ask that you consider rejecting this proposal or not to increase the speed limit on 3rd Avenue for the safety of the Dunes residents.

Substitute Motion #1

DELGADO/MORTON: THAT WE GIVE COUNCIL AND PUBLIC 2-WEEKS TO SEND IN OUR CONCERNS IN WRITING AND THEN WE GET THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER TO ADDRESS EACH SEGMENT'S LIST OF CONCERNS SO WE CAN ALL BE SURE THAT WE'RE ALL DOING ALL THAT WE CAN TO REDUCE THESE SPEEDS. 5-0-0-0 Substitute Motion Passes by Roll Call Vote

Substitute Motion #2

Berkley/Delgado: that we give council and public 2-weeks to send in our concerns in writing and then we get the traffic engineer to address each Segment's list of concerns; and that we accept the speed survey as it is now so that we can start collecting further data and enforcing the radar and lidar.

Substitute Motion # 3

O'Connell/ : that we to approve the engineering and traffic survey based on the recommended speed limit survey in Table 6 that was presented to Council back in 2018; and add to that 8a and 8b and 14a and 14b from Table 6 of the 2020 survey; proceed with the placing of the signs for \$45,000 from the Gas Tax Fund. Motion dies for a lack of Second. Withdrawn by maker of the motion

Council discusses wrap up this portion of the agenda to continue with the Special City Council meeting on COVID-19

Mayor asked for public comments on not hearing agenda item 11g tonight:

- Mike Owen – Asked if the City Attorney had a chance to look at his appeal? Also asked if mayor received his email with the attachments as it too a week to put those together.
- Steve Zmak – Would like to see when this comes back to Council an option on the staff report for consolidating the DRB and Tree Committee but not dissolving them and pushing their duties onto the Planning Commission. Right now the only two options are both the dissolution of both of those bodies and pushing them into the Planning Commission. Would like to see another option where those two bodies are joined together but kept separate from the Planning Commission.

Delgado/Urrutia: that we drop 11e, 11f and 11g for further discussion and have them come back at the earliest time or next April meeting.

Substitute Motion

O'CONNELL/MORTON: TO CONTINUE ALL ITEM TO THE APRIL 17, 2020 COUNCIL MEETING AND GO BACK INTO THE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING ON COVID-19. 3-2(Urrutia, Delgado)-0-0 Substitute Motion Passes by Roll Call Vote

- e. ~~City Council consider adopting Resolution No. 2020 , approving Job Description and Salary Range for Public Works Maintenance Superintendent; authorizing the City Manager to make necessary adjustments to the City's classification and~~

~~compensation plans, and; authorizing the Finance Director to make necessary budgetary and accounting entries. **Continued to April 21, 2020**~~

- f. ~~City Council consider adopting Resolution No. 2020, approving Job Description and Salary Range for Senior Management Analyst /Communications Coordinator.~~
- g. ~~City Council consider consolidation of the duties of the Site and Architectural Design Review Board and Tree Committee to the Planning Commission to streamline the planning review process and provide direction to staff. **Continued to April 21, 2020**~~
- h. ~~City Council consider placing on a future agenda a ballot measure setting forth the modifications necessary to remove the existing flaws to the Marina Municipal Code Title 19 entitled Commercial Cannabis Activities. [O'Connell] *Step One of Two Step Process Continued to April 21, 2020*~~
- i. ~~City Council consider adopting Resolution No. 2020, authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract with HdL Companies not to exceed \$50,000 to provide cannabis program application review, tax audits, compliance inspections, background checks, and subject matter expertise and technical support, subject to final review and approval by the City Attorney; and authorizing Finance Director to make appropriate accounting and budgetary entries. **Pulled from consent and placed in Other Action, was 8g(1) Continued to April 21, 2020**~~

12. COUNCIL & STAFF INFORMATIONAL REPORTS:

- a. Monterey County Mayor's Association [Mayor Bruce Delgado]
- b. Council and staff opportunity to ask a question for clarification or make a brief report on his or her own activities as permitted by Government Code Section 54954.2.

13. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 9:35 to reconvene to the Special City Council meeting on COVID-19

Anita Sharp, Deputy City Clerk

ATTEST:

Bruce C. Delgado, Mayor