

CITY OF SOLANA BEACH

SOLANA BEACH CITY COUNCIL, SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY,
PUBLIC FINANCING AUTHORITY, & HOUSING AUTHORITY



MINUTES

Joint REGULAR Meeting
Wednesday, May 10, 2017 * 6:00 P. M.

City Hall / Council Chambers, 635 S. Highway 101, Solana Beach, California AND
Teleconference Location: Holiday Inn Express and Suites, 226 Aurora Avenue Seattle, WA. 98109 (Zito)

- City Council meetings are video recorded and archived as a permanent record. The video recording captures the complete proceedings of the meeting and is available for viewing on the City's website.
- Posted Reports & Supplemental Docs contain records up to the cut off time prior to meetings for processing new submittals. Complete records containing meeting handouts, PowerPoints, etc. can be obtained through a [Records Request](#).

CITY COUNCILMEMBERS

Mike Nichols, Mayor

Ginger Marshall, Deputy Mayor

David A. Zito, Councilmember

Jewel Edson, Councilmember

Judy Hegenauer, Councilmember

Gregory Wade
City Manager

Johanna Canlas
City Attorney

Angela Ivey
City Clerk

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

Mayor Nichols called the meeting to order at 6:09 p.m.

Present: Mike Nichols, Ginger Marshall, David A. Zito, Jewel Edson, Judy Hegenauer

Absent: None

Also Present: Greg Wade, City Manager
Johanna Canlas, City Attorney
Vaida Pavolas, Deputy City Clerk
Mo Sammak, City Engineer/Public Works Dir.
Marie Berkuti, Finance Manager
Bill Chopyk, Community Development Dir.
Danny King, Assistant City Manager

FLAG SALUTE:

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Motion: Moved by Deputy Mayor Marshall and second by Councilmember Edson to approve. Approved 5/0 **Motion carried unanimously.**

PROCLAMATIONS/CERTIFICATES: *Ceremonial*

Bike to Work Month / Day

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the City Council on items relating to City business and not appearing on today's agenda by submitting a speaker slip (located on the back table) to the City Clerk. Comments relating to items on this evening's agenda are taken at the time the items are heard. Pursuant to the Brown Act, no action shall be taken by the City Council on public comment items. Council may refer items to the City Manager for placement on a future agenda. The maximum time allotted for each presentation is THREE MINUTES (SBMC 2.04.190). Please be aware of the timer light on the Council Dais.

Judi Strang, from San Diego Alliance for Drug Free Youth, stated that they were concerned about the Cannabis Festival at the Del Mar Fairgrounds, that the Proposition 64 did not allow marijuana smoking in public places and that Del Mar Fairgrounds was a public place, and submitted a draft regulations for cannabis manufacturing handout (on file). She further stated that the Fairgrounds should wait until these cannabis regulations were in place before having this Festival.

COUNCIL COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS / COMMENTARY:

An opportunity for City Council to make brief announcements or report on their activities. These items are not agendized for official City business with no action or substantive discussion.

A. CONSENT CALENDAR: (Action Items) (A.1. - A.6.)

Items listed on the Consent Calendar are to be acted in a single action of the City Council unless pulled for discussion. Any member of the public may address the City Council on an item of concern by submitting to the City Clerk a speaker slip (located on the back table) before the Consent Calendar is addressed. Those items removed from the Consent Calendar by a member of the Council will be trailed to the end of the agenda, while Consent Calendar items removed by the public will be discussed immediately after approval of the Consent Calendar.

A.1. Minutes of the City Council.

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Approve the Minutes of the City Council Meetings held April 12, 2017.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Edson and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0 **Motion carried unanimously.**

A.2. Register Of Demands. (File 0300-30)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Ratify the list of demands for April 8, 2017 through April 21, 2017.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Edson and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0 **Motion carried unanimously.**

A.3. General Fund Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Changes. (File 0330-30)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Receive the report listing changes made to the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 General Fund Adopted Budget.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Edson and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0 **Motion carried unanimously.**

A.4. Commercial Solid Waste Rate Review – Proposition 218 Public Noticing and Majority Protest Voting Procedures. (File 1030-15)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Approve **Resolution 2017-070** authorizing the City to proceed with the proper Proposition 218 noticing and majority protest voting procedures and setting the commercial Solid Waste Rate Review Public Hearing protest vote for June 28, 2017.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Edson and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0 **Motion carried unanimously.**

A.5. Building Department Services with EsGil/SAFEbuilt Corporation. (File 0800-20)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt **Resolution 2017-066** authorizing the City Manager to execute a professional services agreement with EsGil/SAFEbuilt Corporation for City Building Services for the period July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019, and authorize the City Manager to extend the agreement annually up to two years, based on previous performance.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Edson and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0 **Motion carried unanimously.**

A.6. National Urban Search & Rescue MOA. (File 0260-30)

Recommendation: That the City Council

1. Adopt **Resolution 2017-068** authorizing the City Manager to execute a Memorandum of Agreement and any amendments with the City of San Diego, as the sponsoring agency, regarding participation in the National Urban Search and Rescue Response System with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security acting through the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the State of California.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Edson and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to approve. Approved 5/0 **Motion carried unanimously.**

B. PUBLIC HEARINGS: (B.1. – B.3.)

This portion of the agenda provides citizens an opportunity to express their views on a specific issue as required by law after proper noticing by submitting a speaker slip (located on the back table) to the City Clerk. After considering all of the evidence, including written materials and oral testimony, the City Council must make a decision supported by findings and the findings must be supported by substantial evidence in the record. An applicant or designees for a private development/business project, for which the public hearing is being held, is allotted a total of fifteen minutes to speak, as per SBMC 2.04.210. A portion of the fifteen minutes may be saved to respond to those who speak in opposition. All other speakers have three minutes each. Please be aware of the timer light on the Council Dais.

B.1. Public Hearing: 216 Ocean St., Applicants: Jackel, Case: 17-16-10. (File 0600-40)
posted 4-20-17

Recommendation: The proposed project meets the minimum zoning requirements under the SBMC, may be found to be consistent with the General Plan and may be found, as conditioned, to meet the discretionary findings required as discussed in this report to approve a SDP (Structure Development Permit) and a DRP (Development Review Permit).

1. Conduct the Public Hearing: Open the Public Hearing, Report Council Disclosures, Receive Public Testimony, and Close the Public Hearing.
2. Find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and
3. If the City Council makes the requisite findings and approves the project, adopt **Resolution 2017-062** conditionally approving a SDP and a DRP to demolish an existing single family residence, construct a new two-story, single-family residence with a subterranean basement and an attached two-car garage, and perform associated site improvements at 216 Ocean Street, Solana Beach.

Greg Wade, City Manager, introduced the item.

Mayor Nichols noted allowed times for speakers.

Corey Andrews, Principal Planner, presented a PowerPoint (on file).

Councilmember Hegenauer and Corey reviewed an aerial photo of the neighboring properties' setbacks and the property lines for the proposed home.

Johanna Canlas, City Attorney, clarified that this was not an appeal, that the project required a DRP in addition to a SDP, that the View Assessment Commission's (VAC) decision was not final, that the Council was to consider the VAC's recommendation and they could overrule it, and that the findings from the Municipal Code Section and VAC toolkit were included in the agenda packet.

Council and Staff discussed that the second floor was approximately 17 ft. from the set-back line in relation to the first floor set back, that the lowest point of the existing grade was at 83.15 ft. above the mean sea level, that the proposed grade adjacent to the residence was at 84.11 ft. which was approximately one foot higher than the lowest point of existing grade, that the highest point was measured to the existing grade so the maximum height limit was 22.90 ft. above the existing grade, and that the proposed grade would be 22.42 ft. as clarified in the blue folder item. Councilmember Edson and Corey further reviewed a site plan slide to review where the proposed structure was outside of the existing footprint, stated that the proposed structure would occupy 100% of the widest point of the first floor, 31% at the most narrow point, and 70% of the second story buildable area. Councilmember Edson and Corey reviewed the roof eaves along the southern, northern and eastern sides of the first and the second floors, discussed that the VAC received a small version of the preliminary landscape plan, identified as L-1 sheet, in the February VAC meeting and a large version at the March meeting, and that the proposed stairway in the public right-of-way would require a hand rail on at least one side but it was not yet identified by the applicant.

Council and Staff discussed that there was no railing at this time, that it pre-dated the current building code requirements, and that light wells were allowed to encroach into the required setback and they were required to be covered with a grate.

Council and Staff discussed Staff's interpretation of the recommendation for the roof portion that extended beyond the deck to the south, that the applicant requested to bring the ceiling height up to the original location, and that a walkable grate would need to be reviewed by the fire department.

Mayor Nichols opened the public hearing.

Council disclosures.

Applicants (Steve Dalton, Marco Gonzalez)

Audrey & Larry Jackel stated that they wanted to build the home prior to their children leaving for college, that it was their first time building a home, they understood the charm of Solana Beach and wanted to maintain it. They stated that a developer previously planned an obtrusive structure that would have blocked the neighbors' view, the Striblings, that they listened to VAC (View Assessment Commission) meetings from August 2014 and hoped to be heroes to the neighbors by designing a house that would respond to the VAC members and didn't think they were going to have fights because they were not going to block anyone. He said that view claimants believed that no one had a right to build something that would block any part of their views and they would fight to make sure of this, that it appeared that their view claims had changed based on the building location, that some neighbors did not care about the long term relationships with their new neighbors, and that they had no incentive to compromise. He said that the neighbors had an unbreakable reliance that pushed back on their plans to remodel this home, that all angles were used to make impossible to build a house with any meaningful views, that it was clear that the claimants goal was to make them move out of the neighborhood, which they had already done to two other people who owned their house before him. He stated that he tried to have conversations with the neighbors to find solutions but that they wanted

the VAC to decide, that two of the neighbors didn't allow them to enter their homes to confirm their claims, that now the VAC had downsized their house, lowered the heights, removed the roof deck, decreased the second floor bedroom deck for the project to be approved by the VAC, and that it was hard to hear that VAC's decision was not the last. He asked Council to approve the project with conditions recommended by VAC, and to consider how VAC's process could be improved so nobody else had to go through what he had gone through.

Steve Dalton, the architect, reviewed modifications made (PowerPoint on file).

Council questioned and Applicant clarified where the master bathroom corner was located, that there was no view obstruction to the neighbors because it was in line with the house to the west, that the 80 cubic yards of fill would be used to create a patio, they would be exporting more dirt than importing, the finished floor of the proposed house was about the same finish floor of the existing house, that they were aware of the VAC's comments regarding the previous proposal, and that the proposed railing would not cause a view obstruction. Discussion continued confirming that the applicant removed a roof top deck, lowered the ceiling height by 1 foot, shrank back the deck by 13 ft., and removed an overhead trellis.

Corey Andrews, Principal Planner, noted that Jorge Valdes, a VAC claimant, submitted a PowerPoint (submitted via Supplemental materials, on file) but was not able to attend the meeting.

Lorraine Pillus, VAC claimant, presented a PowerPoint (on file).

Council and Ms. Pillus discussed that her primary view was the 180 degree view to the west and that she had previously filed two claims against the neighbors to the west.

Michelle Stribling and Frank Stribling presented a PowerPoint (on file) and submitted a handout (on file), and stated that they had high hopes that Mr. Jackel would build a home and preserve their views, that Steve Dalton and his team went on their roof deck to evaluate their views, took pictures and estimates and promised not to block their ocean views, and that they worked ever since to make sure that their views would not be blocked. They stated that following the first VAC meeting February 2017, the applicant partially reduced the roof height but that the second floor deck still blocked their ocean view, the applicant already had a beautiful view from their existing first floor and didn't need to better the applicant's view to impose on the their view, that some of the best views were where the closet and the bathroom were located, and that the proposed project was not compatible with the neighborhood. They said that the proposed landscape plan violated the required DRP findings and requested to reduce the size of the proposed second floor deck by 7 ft., to eliminate the southerly second floor roof overhang, to allow the second floor building envelope to be moved to the north by up to 10 ft., to not change the height of the roof above one story part of house, to add conditional approval to prohibit conversion of the roof to be used as a deck, and to eliminate view-killing vegetation. She confirmed that they installed their second floor deck prior to the Jackels purchasing their property.

Public Speakers

Chrisse Sahadi stated she bought her house in 2006 and decided to remodel in 2011 and were able to work with the neighbors to maintain their views to keep the relationship with the neighbors, that she supported the Jackels project, that what they were going through was sad for them and everyone else, that she had a hard time understanding why this process was so outrageous for them. She said that she felt grateful to move to Solana beach, felt a sense of community and believed there should be common courtesy where everyone should be able to build the house they want as long as they do it with respect of others, and that she thought the Jackels had presented a fair proposal and hoped that the Council would vote to approve their plan.

Greg Zimmer said he was a 25 year resident and supported the Jackels plan, that he was embarrassed about the process that they were put through, they had compromised, and that it seemed that the only way to satisfy the claimants was if nothing was done.

Pia Jensen said she supported the Jackel's proposal, that she purchased her home 25 years ago and loved the great relationship with their neighbors, that it was sad to witness the neighbors pitted against one another, the Jackel's changed their plans, that she had heard about neighbors that had done everything to thwart the plans of neighbors, this is a terrible precedent that needs to be changed.

Walt Edwards said he was a property owner for 21 years, that he believed the right to maintain views should not outweigh the right to gain a view, the VAC process should be impartial, deliberate with balance, and delivered with justice. He asked why there was no consideration for the view that the Jackels would gain, why were their property rights less valued in this case, and requested that Council approve the plans as submitted and restore principals of justice to the process.

Jeff Knutzen said he lived 2 homes west of the Jackel family, that this was setting a new trend on whether or not the City Council would support the VAC decision, that he had gone through the VAC process three times when building his home in the past and that he was familiar with the process. He said that it was pointless to have VAC if you disregard their decision and take it to a higher level, that the Jackels had made many compromises to shift their structure for their neighbor's benefit, the views needed to be shared, that we don't want to discourage any future home remodeling, that this process was time consuming, and that he hoped that the City Council would back the VAC and stop the fighting among neighbors.

Bill Kempner said he lived on West Circle Dr. and presented a PowerPoint (on file). He said that he was considerate of the process of VAC, particularly to the point of primary view, and that VAC guideline for a single viewing area represented the best and most important view that should be established, that the guidelines stated a single view not views, plural.

Cher Watson said that she was the previous owner of the Jackels home, that the house did not work for one reason, we allowed those houses to go up, she stepped back and said Joe and his wife can build that, and she lost that view they have today. Due to her bad

experiences with trying to work with the neighbors in trying to build her second story, she decided to tell the Jackel's to leave and build elsewhere.

Bruce Gresham said he lived on Pacific Ave. and that he supported the process, this it was an emotionally charged neighbor against neighbor and had seen this happen over the 30 plus years he had lived in town, and that he knew that the City Council could get through this by sticking to the facts and the process in place.

Janice DeGraw said he had lived on Solana Vista Drive since 1958, that it was upsetting to see a big house right next door sabotaging the view that they have had, it is hard to see what her daughter went through over this.

Fabian Vonposern said that he lived on Circle Dr. and moved there 20 years ago, that his was one of the first homes to have a second floor and had a wonderful 360 degree view around their house, that one by one other houses built second stories and they never said anything about it, that he thought it was their right to build a second story, the most obtrusive home turned out to be the tallest in the neighborhood, that this was not something to argue about, that everybody would have an opinion about their view, the Jackels seem to be reasonable people, and asked Council to let them build their home.

Marco Gonzalez said he was the attorney for the Jackels and presented a PowerPoint (on file). He stated that there was an element of law involved that the job of the City, VAC, and City Council was to find the best balance between the owners desire to develop the property in accordance with regulations and the neighbors desire to protect their views. He stated that this did not create a right to an unobstructed view, that this meant compromise, and that not everyone got what they wanted. He stated that the job of the commission was to determine the area of the structure that had the best and most important view, that the VAC members believed that the view could be dependent on where the development was proposed, that this violated what the tool kit stood for because the VAC did not clarify from the beginning that the compromises that should be pursued should be focused on the Stribling's house, that they spent a lot of time focusing on other things like the roof top, that the Striblings took the pictures of their lost views from the most northern part of their roof deck patio that would tell you the worst possible story, he said that it had to be considered whether the Jackels had done enough, they reached out to their neighbors, worked with their architect, and they had a project that should be approved. He said that Council needs to send a message to the VAC that a 180 degree view to the west should prevent further requests for an eave over hanging a view that is not the primary view of the home.

Mayor Nichols recessed the meeting at 8:32 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 8:38pm

Council reached consensus that all the SDP findings could be made on Circle Drive and Ocean Street.

Council and Mr. Dalton discussed changing the closet/bathroom location so it would not block the Stribling's view, and that the story poles would have to be posted to show the change.

Council discussed various aspects of the project view impacts: that the Jackel's first floor views would be improved if the Knutzens trimmed their trees and reduced the height of their shrubbery, that feasible solutions for the development were not considered, that the property values and views were important, that the outline of the proposed project matched with the outline of the property to the west of the applicant, that the VAC's recommendations should be followed, that the applicant made compromises and changes, that the other applicants did not have a claim, to consider modifying the landscaping plan to replace the high plants with alternatives, to consider maintaining the lower dining level as proposed at the last meeting, that the right to maintain a view should not outweigh a right to obtain a view, that the applicant already had a view, the applicant would take someone's view to obtain a view.

That applicants stated that everyone had the same view on the first story, that most of the surrounding properties had a second story, and that they did not request anything that anyone else had. Mr. Dalton submitted a handout (on file) with the proposed modifications.

Council discussed the submittal handout (on file) of the proposed modifications, requested to include the elevations in the new drawings and to put new story poles up at the time of the Staff Report distribution, and to include a condition regarding the roof deck.

Deputy Mayor Marshall stated that she could approve VAC's recommendations as the project was currently proposed.

Johanna Canlas, City Attorney, asked to formalize the polling regarding the other two claimants to recognize that there was only one claimant that was being addressed.

Motion: Moved by Mayor Nichols and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to close the public hearing. Approved 5/0. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Motion: Moved by Mayor Nichols and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to continue the meeting to the date certain of May 24th. Approved 5/0. **Motion carried unanimously.**

B.2. Public Hearing: 187 S. Nardo, Applicant: Meredith, Case 17-16-22. (File 0600-40)

Recommendation: The proposed project meets the minimum objective requirements under the SBMC, is consistent with the General Plan and may be found, as conditioned, to meet the discretionary findings required as discussed in this report to approve a Development Review Permit (DRP) and administratively issue a Structure Development Permit (SDP). Therefore, Staff recommends that the City Council:

1. Conduct the Public Hearing: Open the Public Hearing, Report Council Disclosures, Receive Public Testimony, Close the Public Hearing;
2. Find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and

3. If the City Council makes the requisite findings and approves the project, adopt **Resolution 2017-064** conditionally approving a DRP and SDP to construct a new second-floor addition and a first-floor addition to an existing single-story, single-family residence at 187 S. Nardo Avenue.

Greg Wade, City Manager, introduced the item.

Regina Ochoa, Assistant Planner, presented a PowerPoint (on file).

Mayor Nichols opened the public hearing.

Council disclosures.

Applicant

Joel Meredith presented a PowerPoint (on file) reviewing the project.

Public Speaker

Michael Baker stated that he lived in Solana beach over 30 years, that he did not object to the second floor addition but that the second floor addition was too large compared to the most single story houses in the neighborhood, and asked to move the deck in a couple feet to preserve his view corridor.

Mr. Meredith, applicant, stated that his home was not surrounded by the single story houses and showed pictures of the surrounding houses (on file), that he was not building a mansion, that he was willing to take the second level in one or two feet , and that he did not agree that they were taking away from Mr. Baker's view corridor.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Hegenauer and second by Councilmember Edson to close the public hearing. Approved 5/0. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Motion: Moved by Deputy Mayor Marshall and second by Councilmember Edson to approve. Approved 5/0. **Motion carried unanimously.**

B.3. Public Hearing: 1448 Santa Marta Court, Applicants: Hyzer, Coelho, Case: 17-16-09. (File 0600-40)

Recommendation: That the City Council

The proposed project meets the minimum objective requirements under the SBMC, is consistent with the General Plan and may be found, as conditioned, to meet the discretionary findings required as discussed in this report to approve a Development Review Permit (DRP) and administratively issue a Structure Development Permit (SDP). Therefore, Staff recommends that the City Council:

1. Conduct the Public Hearing: Open the Public Hearing, Report Council Disclosures, Receive Public Testimony, and Close the Public Hearing.

2. Find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15303 of the State CEQA Guidelines; and
3. If the City Council makes the requisite findings and approves the project, adopt **Resolution 2017-065** conditionally approving a DRP and SDP to construct an 369 square-foot first-floor addition and new 599 second-floor addition to an existing, single-story, single-family residence with an attached two-car garage located at 1448 Santa Marta Court.

Greg Wade, City Manager, introduced the item.

Corey Andrews, Principal Planner, presented a PowerPoint (on file).

Mayor Nichols opened the public hearing.

Council disclosures.

Betton Court, applicant's representative from RITZ Design Built, stated that he did not have a presentation and was available for questions.

Motion: Moved by Councilmember Zito and second by Deputy Mayor Marshall to close the public hearing. Approved 5/0. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Motion: Moved by Deputy Mayor Marshall and second by Councilmember Edson to approve. Approved 5/0. **Motion carried unanimously.**

C. STAFF REPORTS: (C.1. - C.2.)
Submit speaker slips to the City Clerk.

C.1. Marine Safety Center Feasibility Needs Assessment Study Final Report Consideration. (File 0730-30)

This Item was pulled from the Agenda.

C.2. Refinancing of Successor Agency Tax Allocation Bonds and Solana Beach Public Financing Authority Subordinate Sewer Revenue Bonds. (File 0340-00)

1. Provide input and necessary and authorize Staff to continue pursuing refinancing of the existing TA Bonds and Wastewater Bonds.

Greg Wade, City Manager, presented a PowerPoint (on file).

Council and Staff discussed support in continuing to pursue the refinancing of the existing bonds, that the City had reserve funds with certain types of bond issuances in case of a default, typically there were not defaults on these types of bonds issuances because the revenue stream was consistent, that if the City did a direct placement with the Tax Allocation Bonds there would not be a reserve, that the Wastewater Bonds would likely

have a reserve due to the size of the issuance and because it was going out to the market, that it would be rolled into the issuance of the refunding, the savings already took into account the assumptions whether there was a reserve or not, and that the information was still being evaluated so staff may come back with slightly different information.

Discussion continued regarding fees being paid out of the new bond issuance, that the bond issuance with the San Elijo Joint Powers Authority should not have any effect on the ability to refinance the Wastewater Bonds, and that the City was not looking at significantly extending the term on any of the current debt but to refinance the same term.

COMPENSATION & REIMBURSEMENT DISCLOSURE: None

GC: Article 2.3. Compensation: 53232.3. (a) Reimbursable expenses shall include, but not be limited to, meals, lodging, and travel. 53232.3 (d) Members of a legislative body shall provide brief reports on meetings attended at the expense of the local agency at the next regular meeting of the legislative body.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Regional Committees: (outside agencies, appointed by this Council)

- a. City Selection Committee (meets twice a year) – Nichols (Edson, alternate).
- b. County Service Area 17 – Marshall (Nichols, alternate).
- c. Escondido Creek Watershed Authority – Marshall/Staff (no alternate).
- d. League of Ca. Cities' San Diego County Executive Committee – Nichols (Edson, alternate) and any subcommittees.
- e. League of Ca. Cities' Local Legislative Committee – Nichols (Edson, alternate)
- f. League of Ca. Cities' Coastal Cities Issues Group (CCIG) – Nichols (Edson, alternate)
- g. North County Dispatch JPA – Marshall (Edson, alternate).
- h. North County Transit District – Edson (Nichols, alternate)
- i. Regional Solid Waste Association (RSWA) – Nichols (Hegenauer, alternate).
- j. SANDAG – Zito (Primary), Edson (1st alternate), Nichols (2nd alternate) and any subcommittees.
- k. SANDAG Shoreline Preservation Committee – Zito (Hegenauer, alternate).
- l. San Dieguito River Valley JPA – Hegenauer (Nichols, alternate).
- m. San Elijo JPA – Marshall, Zito (City Manager, alternate).
- n. 22nd Agricultural District Association Community Relations Committee – Marshall, Edson.

Standing Committees: (All Primary Members) (Permanent Committees)

- a. Business Liaison Committee – Zito, Edson.
- b. Highway 101 / Cedros Ave. Development Committee – Edson, Nichols.
- c. Fire Dept. Management Governance & Organizational Evaluation – Edson, Hegenauer
- d. I-5 Construction Committee – Zito, Edson.
- e. Parks and Recreation Committee – Nichols, Zito
- f. Public Arts Committee – Marshall, Hegenauer.
- g. School Relations Committee – Nichols, Hegenauer.

ADJOURN:

Mayor Nichols adjourned the meeting at 10:14 p.m.

Vaida Pavolas, Deputy City Clerk

Approved: August 23, 2017