



MINUTES

Tuesday, October 2, 2018

5:30 P.M. Closed Session

6:30 P.M. Open Session

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

Council Chambers
211 Hillcrest Avenue
Marina, California

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Nancy Amadeo, Gail Morton, Frank O'Connell, Mayor/Chair Bruce C. Delgado

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mayor Pro-Tem/Vice Chair, David W. Brown (Excused)
3. CLOSED SESSION: *As permitted by Government Code Section 54956 et seq., the (City Council, Airport Commissioners, Marina Abrams B Non-Profit Corporation, and Redevelopment Agency Members) 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, 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: Marina Municipal Airport Business Park
Negotiating Party: Joby Areo Inc.
Property Negotiator: City Manager
Terms: All terms and conditions
 - c. Performance Evaluation, Unrepresented Employee – City Manager

6:50 PM - RECONVENE OPEN SESSION AND REPORT ON ANY ACTIONS TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

Deborah Mall, Assistant City Attorney reported out closed session: Council met on the three matters listed. For the two matters under litigation, council gave direction. With regard to the Real Property Negotiations, council received information, gave direction.

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

5. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS:

a. Proclamations

i. Restorative Justice Week

b. Recreation Announcements

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.*

- Wendy Askew – Announced that tomorrow, October 3rd is the MPUSD Fall Festival Resources Fair at the Seaside Oldemyer Center from 6:00-8:00pm; also requested is the city could agendizing a declaration of Shelter Crisis so that organizations operating homeless services in Marina can be eligible to receive some of the \$12.5 million in HEAP funds that are coming to our region through the Continuum of Care Collaborative. About \$10 million of that roughly would come to Monterey County. Each city needs to adopt this declaration of Shelter Crisis.
- Michael Fector, Director of One Starfish Safe Parking and Supportive Services – Provide an update on the Safe Parking Program in Marina. We have had no incidences at the Marina Safe Parking program. In Marina's program nearly 80% of our guests are working full-time. A number of them are two people living in the vehicle where both of them are working full-time. We are concluding that people are being priced out of housing market, especially when most of our guests have previous medical or educational debt. Good news, even though we were capped at 15 vehicles at the Marina lot we have already seen 14 people back into housing and 23 have gone into greater employment and we've been able to send out 100 into better mental health, better health care and providing services if not directly through our agency but through other agencies. Program is running low on funding and seeking city to donate or agendize some funding for our organization so that we can continue to see that people are getting housed.
- Ann Malocus – Marina Youth Arts Fundraiser on Evening of Duets Wine Tasting on October 20th from 5:00-7:00pm at Vince DiMaggio Park. Advanced tickets \$25, \$30 at the door. Tremendous opportunity to support Marina wineries and Marina children.
- Elizabeth Stetler – Comments about the safety of pedestrian that walk along Del Monte Blvd. at Beach Rd. No sidewalks and commented about the Takahashi Bike Path and that cyclists are demanding that people walking on the path need to move as it's designated for cyclists. Where are people supposed to walk if there are no sidewalks? Is the City really ADA compliant with regard to making sure we have sidewalks for all and making sure they are accessible for persons with disabilities?
- Bob Nolan – Mayoral candidate. Recently participated in a candidate forum at CSUMB which consisted of candidates from both cities of Seaside and Marina. When the subject of affordable housing was addressed we realized both cities faced the same dilemma, a shortage of affordable housing units. Our city and others around the county have either neglected or been able to keep up with the pace to provide adequate housing for our residents. The time for addressing our housing needs is now and must develop creative means to deal with the shortage. Encouraged our city to

support the use of Accessory Dwelling Units often called “granny quarters” and the development of modular housing units within the infill possibilities found within our city structure. Our elderly population would benefit by having the opportunity option to downsize from larger structures where they raised their families to smaller living units. It would also provide to our nearby student population at the university who also seek smaller adequate housing units in a very competitive rental market.

- Brian McMinn – Informed the Council and public that the City Street Resurfacing Project is kicking off and getting underway. We are doing spot repairs, structural repairs prior to maintenance surface coating. This will be starting this week and moving on into next week. The following week will be crack sealing to help preserve those streets, and then the resurfacing will start the week of October 15th and hoping to have the finished up by the end of October or early November. There will be no parking signs posted as needed on the streets that are going to be resurfaced 72 hours in advance of the working taking place and contractor is distributing flyers to all the adjacent properties. The schedule is weather dependent. This work is made possible by the budget that council approved, Measure X funds and in future years SB1 funding.
- Bruce Delgado – Educated the public on Prop 6. Statewide ballot measure that will be voted on. If you vote yes on Prop 6 it will repeal Senate Bill 1 (SB1). SB1 is bringing Marina \$300,000 this year and will go up to \$500,000 next year. All of that money is to be spent on street projects. A YES vote on Prop 6 will make that money will go away. A vote NO on Prop 6 means money will continue to come our city, our county and every other city in California. In 2013 Marina needed \$1.4 million each year for 10-years to stabilize our streets. We didn’t have the money, we didn’t spend the money and now that number has grown to \$2.4 million per year for the next 10-years. If we don’t find the money this year, it’ll become more in subsequent years. So, with Prop 6 we’re going to have \$1.1 million of the \$2.4 million that we need. So, there’s still a huge funding gap but if we lose Prop 6 that funding gap becomes even larger. So please vote NO on Prop 6.
- Council Member Amadeo – Gas Tax money is protected by a Constitutional Amendment and can only be used on transportation related expenses. Spoke about the multiple debates and all the debates can be viewed online or by watching Comcast Channel 25. The three debates will be played back to back the 1st and 3rd Monday and Wednesday and Saturday at 6:00pm; every day at Noon and Saturdays at 8:00am. Multiple opportunities to hear what the public asked and how the various candidates responded. This is not the only way to learn about the candidates, you can learn more about them through their flyers and through talking to them is they knock on your door. Please watch these debates, pay attention, be an informed voter. Thank you to all the candidates for participating.
- Council Member Morton – Next Friday, October 12th is the next Fort Ord Reuse Authority’s board meeting. Right now, FORA is dealing with many issues regarding the transition to FORA going away in June of 2020 and there is a tremendous momentum of other jurisdictions asking for FORA to be continued. Board of Supervisors are requesting their legislators take forward FORA continuing to 2030. Understanding these issues at FORA is really critical and want to thank our city council for taking a position on September 25th. Our City’s position paper was served on the FORA Board in total, there’s 13 voting and it was also served on the ex-officio and wanted to thank our representatives Frank O’Connell who sits on that board and fights for the interest of the City of Marina and last Friday at this special board meeting staff, Brian McMinn, Layne Long, Eric Frost all appeared and I wanted to say thank you for being at the microphone with also Bob Rathie, our City Attorney all trying to put forward additional explanations of why the City of Marina is taken a position that it’s in our best interest for FORA to sunset.

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 90616-90710, totaling \$209,676.64
Accounts Payable Successor Agency Check Numbers: 18-19 and EFT's totaling \$3,567.80

 - b. MINUTES:
 - (1) September 11, 2018, Special City Council Meeting
 - (2) September 18, 2018, Regular City Council Meeting

 - c. CLAIMS AGAINST THE CITY: None

 - d. AWARD OF BID: None

 - e. CALL FOR BIDS: None

 - f. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS:
 - (1) City Council consider adopting **Resolution No. 2018-117**, accepting donations totaling \$6,250 to support Police, Fire and Labor Day Parade activities and to increase operating budgets appropriately.

 - g. APPROVAL OF AGREEMENTS:

 - h. ACCEPTANCE OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS: None

 - i. MAPS: None

 - j. REPORTS: (RECEIVE AND FILE): None

 - k. FUNDING & BUDGET MATTERS: None

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

 - m. APPROVE APPOINTMENTS: None

Council Member Motion had questions for 8f(1), the resolution states: “City Council consider adopting a resolution accepting donations totaling \$6,250 to support police, fire Labor Day parade activities” initially when I read this I was thinking this was all paying for costs incurred for Labor Day but you just lumped these together, correct? The \$3500 in non-departmental Division, being offset against the expenses of non-fire, not police on the Labor Day Parade what is the actual cost the we incur for supporting the parade? Does the \$3500 cover it? Requested a report of the supporting costs in the future.

Council Member Amadeo had questions for 8f(1), confused about the nonprofit side of this. Knows there had been a nonprofit that was acting as the fiduciary responsible party and they stopped but we still had a parade after that, not sure what the change is. Is the parade committee looking for a new nonprofit? In the future if there isn't a nonprofit associated with this will organizations be able to donate directly to the city for the cost of the donations for the parade?

DELGADO/AMADEO: TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. 4-0-1(Brown)-0 Motion Passes

9. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- a. City Council to open a Public Hearing to consider adopting Resolutions for: 1) adoption of a Negative Declaration; 2) adoption of a General Plan Amendment (GP 2016-03) to reclassify the property land use designation from “multiple use” to “multi-family residential”; 3) adoption of an Ordinance amending the City of Marina Zoning Map (ZM 2016-04) rezoning the property from “C-1/Retail Business District” to “SP-Shores at Marina”; 4) adoption of a General Plan code text amendment to delete policy 2.63.5 to eliminate the requirement for the provision of childcare; 5) adoption of a Specific Plan; 6) amendment to the Official Plan Line (OPL) to eliminate the cul-de-sac at the end of the De Forest Road extension; and 7) approval of a combined development permit to allow the development of a new five-story, fifty-eight (58) unit apartment complex at 3125 De Forest Road (APN: 032-171-018). CEQA Determination: Negative Declaration.” *Continued to October 16, 2018.*

Combined Development Permit = Specific Plan (SP 2016-04); General Plan Amendments (GP 2016-03); “Multiple Use” “Multi-Family Residential” Deletion of Policy 2.63.5; Zoning Map Amendment (ZM 2016-04); “C-1/Retail Business District” “SP-Shores at Marina”; Official Plan Line Amendment; Conditional Use Permit; Site and Architectural Design Review (DR 2016-11) *Considered by DRB on Dec 20, 2017 (DRB Res No. 2017-07*

August 8, 2018 – Council Consideration = Motion (Continue to 10/2; Address Fire Concerns (4th/5th Floor); New Conditions 12, 13, 14 of CDP Draft Resolution

Additional Comments - Vehicle Movements – End of De Forest Extension; “Jobs-Housing” Balance; Impact to City housing stock.

Environmental Review (CEQA) = An Initial Study/Negative Declaration prepared. *Circulated March 20 – April 20, 2018 (30 days); Comment Letters: State Clearinghouse and MBARD*

Staff Recommendation = 1) Adopt a Resolution to adopt the Negative Declaration; 2) Adopt a Resolution to approve a General Plan Amendment (GP 2016-03) to reclassify the land use designation; 3) Adopt an Resolution to approve an Ordinance to Amend the Zoning Map (ZM 2016-04) to reclassify the site zoning; 4) Adopt a Resolution to approve a General Plan Code Text Amendment to delete Policy 2.63.5; 5) Adopt a Resolution to approve a Specific Plan (SP 2016-04); 6) Adopt a Resolution to amend the Official Plan Line (OPL) to eliminate the cul-de-sac at the end of the De Forest Road Extension; and 7) Adopt a Resolution to approve a Combined Development Permit consisting of a Conditional Use Permit for multi-family residential development exceeding 25 units/acre and Site and Architectural Design Review (DR 2016-11) for a new 5-story, 58-unit apartment complex.

Applicable State Housing Laws = AB 1515 - Housing Accountability Act (Govt. Code Section 65589.5) Effective January 1, 2018

(d) A local agency shall not disapprove a housing development project ... or condition approval in a manner that renders the housing development project infeasible for development ... including through the use of design review standards, unless it makes written findings, based upon a preponderance of the evidence in the record, as to one of the following:

(1) The jurisdiction has adopted a housing element ...and the jurisdiction has met or exceeded its share of the regional housing need allocation

(2) The housing development project ... as proposed would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety, and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact without rendering the development unaffordable to low- and moderate-income households ...

“**specific, adverse impact**” means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete.

“**Housing development project**” means a use consisting of any of the following:

(A) Residential units only.

(B) Mixed-use developments consisting of residential and nonresidential uses with at least two-thirds of the square footage designated for residential use.

(C) Transitional housing or supportive housing.

(3) The denial of the housing development project or imposition of conditions is required in order to comply with ... state or federal law, and there is no feasible method to comply without rendering the development unaffordable to low- and moderate-income households ...

(4) The housing development project is proposed on land zoned for agriculture or resource preservation ... or which does not have adequate water or wastewater facilities to serve the project.

(5) The housing development project ... is inconsistent with both the jurisdiction’s zoning ordinance and general plan land use designation ... and the jurisdiction has adopted a revised housing element ...that is in substantial compliance with this article.

1) When a proposed housing development project complies with applicable, objective general plan, zoning, and subdivision standards and criteria, including design review standards, in effect at the time that the housing development project’s application is determined to be complete, but the local agency proposes to disapprove the project or to impose a condition that the project be developed at a lower density, the local agency shall base its decision regarding the proposed housing development project upon written findings supported by a preponderance of the evidence on the record that both of the following conditions exist:

(A) The housing development project would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety unless the project is disapproved or approved upon the condition that the project be developed at a lower density. As used in this paragraph, a “specific, adverse impact” means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete.

(B) There is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the adverse impact identified pursuant to paragraph (1), other than the disapproval of the housing development project or the approval of the project upon the condition that it be developed at a lower density.

Council Questions: Is this the staff recommendation? Staff is proposing that agree with what council is being asked to do tonight? What is the difference between the NFPA 13R and NFPA 13 and is 13 better than the 13R for this project? Why was this matter brought to us in August without the 13

systems? Is this a new condition? Can emergency vehicles and fire trucks/engines drive completely around the buildings during a fire or earthquake? What would happen if there was a fire on the 5th floor and someone was trying to get out on the right side of the building? “spot zoning” since we are in the process currently of developing that plan what plan was shared when we haven’t approved the Downtown Revitalization, the new Downtown Specific Plan? Did we give them something to rely on? Would it still be considered spot zoning because we’re still in the process of developing a general plan where this property would be within the parameters of that area we’re working on? How many apartments does the Junsay Oaks project have compared to this project? Has anyone contacted CHISPA and asked them if they are willing to give the city easement for a right-of-way that continuous and protected in perpetuity for that to be an open right-of-way for people to turn around if going down Deforest? Would it be prudent if in fact we wanted to rely on that as a means for egress out of that street? Would CHISPA be willing to eliminate the parking spaces to eliminate potential impacts when directing cars through their parking lot? GP amendment of elimination of childcare, is this only for this project or throughout city? RHNA requirements for Marina? Are apartments considered affordable housing as opposed to single-family dwellings? Mutual Aide, how do we reach the upper floors during an emergency? Can we ask the developer to help pitch-in with the purchase of a ladder truck? Is it wise to continue adding more developments over four stories? Was there a discussion since August 25th of having some kind of mitigation fee that would contribute towards getting a ladder truck soon? Does this development help or hurt out Job/Housing Balance Ratio? Have building standards changed since the Loma Prieto earthquake? Do incoming businesses look at a city’s job housing balance prior to coming in to build? Connectivity measurements, how is it done? Condition #12, was this a condition on August 8th? Condition #13, what are the current locations of generators? Where is the closest fire hydrant to this project? Where are the current locations of the bicycle locker locations? What can we do to solidify the number of lockers wither inside or outside this project? Are the trash enclosures setup so that it’s ready for 2022 and not stuck in 2010?

Anthony Lombardo – this is the end of our four (4) year journey since considering buying this property. We’ve done what we thought was everything that everyone at the city asked us to do. We presented six (6) alternative designs, received direction from staff on how to proceed and finally your counsel considered whether to exempt this project from the development moratorium in this area for this project which was already on file, which you did. We prepared the environmental document which concluded there was no unmitigable impacts including on traffic and public safety. Your Planning and Design Review Board and Planning Commission recommended approval of this project. I think the applicants have gone above and beyond to design a project which complies with every requirement of state law and local code.

The term “spot zoning” is probably not appropriate in the case of portion of the city of Marina because you require, it’s your regulations, not our request that every development in this area produce its own specific plan. So, every development has to come in for a rezoning, a general plan amendment to comply with the requirements of your ordinance that mandates the adoption of a specific plan. What we’re doing is complying with your ordinance. Spot zoning is where you propose a gas station in the middle of a residential zone and say we’re going to zone this piece commercial in the middle of residential zoning is a classic example.

This property is bounded at least on two sides by residential development and if you look at its location in relation to the commercial thoroughfare of Reservation Road the theory that this might be appropriate for a mixed-use or commercial and residential development is not born out by the reality of its location. Back in the corner at the end of a dead-end street is not a location for a successful commercial venture adjacent to other residential development. The dead-end street is something that we also need to look at because this is not a dead-end street, it’s a driveway at the end of a cul-de-sac at the end of the MST property. I assume this city like all cities, when the street extension is built will

put a sign up that says dead-end or not a through street or no access/no exit. I doubt that the residents of Marina will be going like lemmings to the ocean trying to drive through to Carmel Avenue through the dead-end street unless they want to ignore the sign at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Chief has done an excellent job in explaining fire/life safety items. There is no question that this project creates any greater danger than any other project you've approved that are detailed in my letter in the city of Marina of this height or elevation.

The Jobs/Housing Balance that was raised, typically when I see these types of analysis's they talk about construction jobs and how many jobs are created by virtue of the construction of the project or the purchase of the concrete or the purchase of the lumber, they're not permanent but they do provide jobs for some period of time. I don't know how many jobs are related to the fact that there will be residents living here now who will buy more product, eat more food, buy more gas but I do know one thing, the city is as Layne said 1300 units behind in meeting its regional housing requirements. Don't know where you are in terms of your regional jobs analysis, but I don't know you're not meeting your regional housing requirements.

This project as I think we've discussed before is entitled to state mandated incentives under GC 65915 and we are consistent with that requirement for those incentives which the city of mandated to provide.

There are very limited, the state legislator recently enacted some new legislation in the GC 65589.5 which is meant to address project which for one reason or another may not find favor with local government jurisdictions and it places some very stringent limitations on the ability to deny those kind of projects and I would caution and ask the city council to be cognoscente of the fact that coming up with reasons which are not specified in that statute which in a nutshell requires that a finding be made that on specific written life safety standards there are specific public safety or standards which this project does not meet and they can be feelings or concerns. It has to be based on you violate the requirement for fire sprinklers or unsafe traffic intersection. That is not the situation which exists in this development.

Regarding a contribution to fire safety costs or improvement of public safety in the city of Marina, and I also have the job of working with the new owner of the Marina Station property and in looking through the dozens of conditions associated with that development there is a specific condition imposed on that project by this city which states that "*the city intended to develop a Fire Safety Impact Fee and that the developer of that project was mandated to agree to pay that fee on the issuance, if adopted on the issuance of building permits*" for that project, residential and commercial building permits in order to fund the city's improvement of fire safety/public safety services. As far as I know that hasn't occurred yet. That is of course the fair way to impose fees is that everybody pays their fair share equally. The Owhadi's are willing to participate on that basis as well.

Paul Owhadi – We bought the property and when it was in escrow we came and met with city staff to get their support and direction and we were encouraged to indeed design a very contemporary multi-story building and we have done that. We have gone back and forth for years. Due to the lack of staff in the planning department we couldn't do anything then in increments of 6-8months and then we've gone through about 4 planning directors. So, we're here tonight but regardless of the outcome of the vote tonight I would just like to express our appreciation to the Fire Department, the Fire Chief, Development Director and all of the staff. They have worked very, very hard and we have gone back and forth for a long time and ultimately, we developed what you see collectively with them.

Mayor opened public comments:

- Paula Pelot – Will the fire sprinkler connections be located out in front of the building, near the road or will it be buried in the back as what was done at the CSUMB apartments? Has concerns with CHISPA property parking mainly due to the fact that people will have to back out of the

parking spots and might hit someone coming through to turn around. Also concerned about the post office parking lot always being filled with overflow parking.

- Sherry Brady – Excited that Marina is growing but has concerns with the building relating to the safety of not having a proper fire truck to reach the 4th and 5th floors of this development as well as the development of the recently constructed hotel. Concerned about possible overcrowding of the units. Most families have 2 vehicles and if its college students then there could be more. Not enough room. Asked council to consider the parking issues and safety concerns when making a final decision on this project.

9:58 PM

Delgado/Amadeo: to continue the meeting until completion of agenda item 9a. 3-1(O’Connell)-1(Brown)-0 Motion Passes.

MORTON/O’CONNELL: TO SEND IT BACK TO STAFF TO MAKE FINDINGS AS UNDER GC 65589.5 WITH CONSULTATION WITH OUR LEGAL COUNSEL. 3(Morton, O’Connell, Delgado)-1(Amadeo)-1(Brown) Motion Passes by Roll Call Vote

If there is, no findings to find in the project then it’s going to come back without findings at which time I would feel much more comfortable if we are told after that thorough review that approval is appropriate.

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).

- ~~City Council and Successor Agency Board consider adopting Resolution No. 2018, and Resolution No. 2018 (SA/MRA), approving the revised Investment Policy for the City of Marina. Continued to October 16, 2018~~

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 10:18 PM

Anita Sharp, Deputy City Clerk

ATTEST:

Bruce C. Delgado, Mayor