CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 5, 2005

The Regular Meeting of the City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 5th day of July, 2005, at the hour of 6:33 p.m., in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, at 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

PLEDGE TO FLAG

Fire Chief Dennis Groat led the pledge of allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Present:	Tell, Aldinger, Montgomery, Ward and Mayor Fahey.
Absent:	None.
Clerk:	Tamura.

CEREMONIAL ITEMS

05/0705.1 Consideration of a Resolution to Rename the City of Manhattan Beach 6-Man Beach Volleyball Tournament the "Charlie Saikley 6-Man Beach Volleyball Tournament"

Mayor Fahey, on behalf of the City Council, presented Rosa Lee Saikley with a copy of the Resolution and thanked the Saikley family for allowing the City to participate in remembering Charlie Saikley.

Mrs. Saikley thanked the City of Manhattan Beach for honoring her husband and keeping his memory alive.

MOTION: Councilmember Aldinger moved to <u>adopt</u> Resolution No. 5991 renaming the Manhattan Beach 6-man Volleyball Tournament the "Charlie Saikley 6-Man Beach Volleyball Tournament." The motion was seconded by Councilmember Montgomery and passed by the following unanimous vote:

Ayes:Tell, Aldinger, Montgomery, Ward and Mayor Fahey.Noes:None.Absent:None.Abstain:None.

RESOLUTION NO. 5991

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA, RENAMING THE MANHATTAN BEACH 6-MAN BEACH VOLLEYBALL TOURNAMENT THE "CHARLIE SAIKLEY 6-MAN BEACH VOLLEYBALL TOURNAMENT"

CONSENT CALENDAR

The Consent Calendar (Item Nos. 2 through 15), consisting of items under *General Consent* and *Boards and Commissions*, was <u>approved</u> by motion of Councilmember Montgomery, seconded by Councilmember Tell and passed by unanimous roll call vote with the exception of Item No. 14, which was considered later in the meeting under *Items Removed from the Consent Calendar*.

Ayes:	Tell, Aldinger, Montgomery, Ward and Mayor Fahey.
Noes:	None.
Absent:	None.
Abstain:	None.

GENERAL CONSENT

05/0705.2 Approve Minutes of the City Council Adjourned Regular and Regular Meeting of June 21, 2005

The Council approved the subject minutes.

05/0705.3 Approve Minutes of the City Council Special Work Plan Meeting of June 24, 2005

The Council <u>approved</u> the subject minutes.

05/0705.4 Consideration of the State Budget and Legislative Update from Shaw / Yoder, Inc., the City's Legislative Advocate

The Council received and filed the July Budget and Legislative Update from Shaw / Yoder, Inc.

05/0705.5 Authorize the City Manager to Enter into an Agreement with Communications Support Group, Inc. for Consulting Services Associated with the Adelphia Cable Franchise Transfer and the Development of a Verizon Cable Franchise Agreement and Appropriate \$16,000 from the City Council Contingency Fund

The Council <u>approved</u> authorizing the City Manager to enter into an agreement with Communications Support Group, Inc. for consulting services associated with the transfer of the Adelphia franchise to Time Warner and development of a new cable franchise agreement with Verizon; and <u>appropriated</u> \$16,000 from the City Council Contingency Fund to cover costs of this agreement.

05/0705.6 Consideration of Financial Report: Ratification of Demands: June 30, 2005

The Council <u>approved</u> with no exception Warrant Register Nos. 27B and 1B in the amount of \$5,573,975.51 in payment of ratification of demands and claims as prepared by the Director of Finance, together with the original demands and claims as prepared by said Warrant Register.

05/0705.7 Consideration of Advanced Payment of Employer Pension Costs for Fiscal Year 2005-2006 Which Results in Net Savings of Approximately \$53,000

The Council <u>approved</u> the advanced payment of the City's Fiscal Year 2005-2006 employer pension costs to CALPERS as recommended by the Finance Subcommittee and Staff.

05/0705.8 Consideration of a Request from the Manhattan Beach Little League for the Limited Use of a Public Address System at the Marine Sports Park Complex: July 7-11, 2005 for One Little League Tournament

The Council <u>approved</u> the request from the Manhattan Beach Little League for limited use of a pubic address (PA) system at the Marine Avenue Sports Park for the League's All-Star Tournament.

05/0705.9 Approve Sewer Connection Agreement with the City of Hermosa Beach

The Council <u>approved</u> a sewer connection agreement with the City of Hermosa Beach and authorized the City Manager to execute the agreement on behalf of the City.

05/0705.10 Award an Engineering Services Contract to Boyle Engineering Corporation for the Water/Sewer/Storm Drain Control Conversion Project in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$535,179 and Approve Supplemental Appropriation (\$36,000)

The Council <u>approved</u> awarding an engineering services contract to Boyle Engineering Corporation for the Water/Sewer/Storm Drain Control Conversion Project in an amount not-to-exceed \$535,179; <u>approved</u> authorizing the Director of Public Works to approve additional work in an amount not-to-exceed \$50,000, if required; and <u>approved</u> a supplemental appropriation of \$36,000 from the Water Fund Reserves.

05/0705.11 Disbursement of Progress Payments:

- a) Progress Payment No. 3 in the Net Amount of \$28,949.63 to S.P. Pazargad Engineering Construction, Inc. for the Strand Improvement Project
 b) Progress Payment No. 2 in the Net Amount of \$101,790 to John T. Malloy,
 - b) Progress Payment No. 2 in the Net Amount of \$101,790 to John T. Malloy, Inc. for the 2003-2004 Water Main Replacement Project
- c) Progress Payment No. 4 in the Net Amount of \$114,219.35 to S.P. Pazargad Engineering Construction, Inc. for the El Porto Retaining Wall Project

The Council <u>approved</u> the issuance of the subject progress payments.

05/0705.12 Award an Engineering Design Services Contract to NBCE for the 2002-2004 Street Resurfacing Project; and 2004-2005 Street Resurfacing Project in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$179,400

The Council <u>approved</u> awarding an engineering design services contract to NBCE for the 2002-2004 Street Resurfacing Project and the 2004-2005 Street Resurfacing Project in an amount not-to-exceed \$179,400.

05/0705.13 Accept Flournoy Road Street Right-of-Way Dedication

The Council <u>adopted</u> Resolution No. 5990 accepting a real property dedication at 1807 Flournoy Road.

RESOLUTION NO. 5990

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIFORNIA, ACCEPTING A REAL PROPERTY DEDICATION AT 1807 FLOURNOY ROAD

05/0705.14 Authorize Staff to Submit Implementation Plan to Reduce Bacteria in Storm Water City Council Meeting Minutes of July 5, 2005 <u>Run-Off in Compliance with the Santa Monica Bay Beaches Bacteria Total</u> <u>Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Regulations</u>

Item No. 14 was pulled from the "CONSENT CALENDAR". Please refer to "ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR."

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Cultural Arts Commission

05/0705.15 Consideration of Draft Minutes, Cultural Arts Commission Meeting of June 14, 2005

The Council received and filed the subject draft minutes.

COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS

05/0705.19 Mayor Fahey Re Concerts in the Park

Mayor Fahey announced that *Concerts in the Park* take place on Sundays throughout the summer at Polliwog Park and encouraged everyone to attend.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

GENERAL BUSINESS

05/0705.16 Status Report and Review of the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance

City Manager Geoff Dolan explained that this report would include a review of the provisions of the current Tree Preservation Ordinance and how it is administered, focusing primarily on private property trees. He noted that staff is looking for direction from Council regarding possible modifications to the Ordinance or changes on how it could be administered differently. He introduced Senior Planner Laurie Jester, who gave a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed Tree Preservation Ordinance.

Senior Planner Jester reviewed that Council gave direction to staff to come back with a report on the status of the Tree Ordinance after its first appeal in May of 2005. She explained that the original Ordinance, adopted in 1993, applied only to the Tree Section and then, in 2003, was expanded to the entire City except the Beach Area, and included the adoption of goals and policies related to the preservation of trees during the General Plan review process. She explained that a few months later, at a Joint City Council/Planning Commission Meeting, staff asked Council for guidance on how to implement the Ordinance, noting that with the expansion, it was perceived as more of a preservation Ordinance than a removal and replacement Ordinance. She noted that the regulations are incorporated in the Zoning Code and explained that the purposes include conserving scenic beauty, prevention of erosion, protection against flooding, counteracting pollutants, maintaining climatic and ecological balance, as well as preserving trees necessary for the health and welfare of the citizens of Manhattan Beach. Senior Planner Jester emphasized that the intent of the Ordinance is the retention and preservation of trees while permitting reasonable enjoyment of private property and stated that it is important to staff to maintain that balance. She clarified that the regulations only protect and preserve trees in a front yard that have a 12-inch or greater trunk diameter, measured 4-1/2 feet above the ground and stressed that tree replacement is required if a tree is removed. She reviewed the various exemptions to the preservation Ordinance including City Council Meeting Minutes of July 5, 2005

trees less than 12 inches in diameter.

In response to Mayor Fahey's inquiry regarding the reasons specific trees are exempt and whether it would be worthwhile to review the exemptions, Senior Planner Jester stated that following review of several years of reports and minutes, staff did not find a decisive reason for the exemptions, however, they would be willing to look at the exemptions if directed by Council.

Senior Planner Jester reported that staff provides education regarding the preservation Ordinance to architects and contractors via a newsletter and quarterly meetings. She explained how staff inspects and photographs trees when plans come in for plan check; noted that, if necessary, the City arborist is consulted regarding removal of trees; that if the trees are determined to be unhealthy or hazardous or limits development, City staff may approve the application; and that if it is an unsure situation, the City's consulting arborist is contacted. She provided several examples of designs to accommodate trees while allowing access to a project and reviewed the replacement criteria. She explained what details staff looks for during the tree permit process; that walk streets have a different set of criteria; that decisions are made by the Director of Community Development; and that they can be appealed to the Planning Commission and received and filed by the City Council.

In response to Councilmember Ward's inquiry as to whether there is a requirement that trees must be replaced by the same type of tree that was removed, Senior Planner Jester stated that there is no specific requirement and that the City provides a list of trees from which residents can use as a guideline to choose their replacement tree.

Senior Planner Jester explained that the City occasionally uses the Code Enforcement Process, in concert with the City Attorney, when a tree is removed without a permit; that citations and fines have been issued for these types of violations; and that funds from these fines are put in a "Tree Canopy Restoration Fund" to replace trees in public areas. Senior Planner Jester and Council reviewed possible Code revisions and discussed whether they should be referred to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Councilmember Tell expressed concern regarding the City "taking on" the responsibility of preserving trees; stated that he prefers having a Tree Preservation Ordinance as opposed to a View Preservation Ordinance; and asked about the thought process the previous Council went through in deciding what the criteria would be.

Mayor Fahey stated that, at the time the Ordinance was adopted, Council did not go into detail regarding neighboring properties and roots affecting neighbor's lots; and that these things are a result of the implementation of the Ordinance.

Senior Planner Jester explained that, in 1993 when the Ordinance was originally adopted, Council looked at 8, 10 and 12 inch trees. When the Ordinance was expanded in 2003, the language stayed the same and it was a philosophical decision to implement it as a Preservation Ordinance.

Council discussed the reasoning behind requiring a certain size of tree and that because the approach has changed philosophically, more staff time is being required for this issue, even though the substantive part of the Ordinance has not changed.

In response to Mayor Fahey's inquiry regarding the procedure to be followed if administrative fines were imposed, City Attorney Robert Wadden stated that they could be imposed by the Community Development Director and subject to appeal to either the City Manager or an outside City Council Meeting Minutes of July 5, 2005

hearing officer and that the amount could be specified or set by Resolution.

Councilmember Tell noted that it is important for Council to decide what it wishes to accomplish with the Ordinance; the purpose of exemptions from the Ordinance; the reason for the 12-inch diameter as a guideline; and whether Council wishes to try to preserve trees that contribute to the community and neighborhood and ensure that replacement trees are mature trees.

The following individuals spoke on this item:

- Karol Wahlberg, No Address Provided
- Mark Radville, No Address Provided

Councilmember Aldinger stated that his purpose in voting for the expansion of the original preservation Ordinance was because the aesthetics were being changed citywide and it was important to ensure that mature trees are kept in town.

Mayor Fahey agreed that the Ordinance was expanded beyond the tree section in an effort to maintain character in the communities without losing mature trees. She pointed out that the purpose as currently stated includes "the retention and preservation of trees while permitting the reasonable enjoyment of private property" and agreed that the balance is difficult to maintain. She stated that while staff is doing an excellent job of implementing the Ordinance, perhaps asking developers to build homes around a tree or to build their house around the roots of a neighbor's tree is going too far and that a fair balance needs to be "struck".

Councilmember Ward agreed with Mayor Fahey's concerns of going "too far", especially with regard to dictating pruning guidelines. He pointed out that Planning Commission and City Council discussions have always included the 24-inch box replacement tree and said this is a great opportunity to review the situation, either by doubling the size of the box or increasing the size of the diameter of the replacement tree. He stated that he is not willing to extend the rules to corner lots, noting that the current Ordinance works well but change could affect the ability to develop corner lots. He also questioned the logic behind the specific tree exemptions and suggested that they be reviewed.

Maintenance Superintendent Juan Price explained that the original intent of the exemption of fruit trees was to reduce rodent population, litter, stains on cars and sidewalks, and "trip hazards". He noted that some palm trees cause rodent problems and further indicated that fruit trees and/or some palm trees are not on the approved list of trees for replacement.

In response to Councilmember Montgomery's comment regarding box size and tree size, Maintenance Superintendent Price noted that there is no direct correlation between the box size and the trunk size, therefore suggested that the box size be changed to caliber size.

In response to Councilmember Tell's inquiry regarding how the age of a tree is determined, Maintenance Superintendent Price stated that the only "fool-proof" way of determining age is by boring into the trunk of the tree. He added that just because a tree is old and large, does not necessarily mean it is a good tree and that regulations in other cities vary from very restrictive to non-existent.

Councilmember Montgomery stated that he is in favor of fruit tree exemptions as well as protecting trees on the street side.

City Manager Dolan pointed out that if street side yard trees are protected, it makes it City Council Meeting Minutes of July 5, 2005 exceedingly difficult to develop these lots and suggested that the Planning Commission review the impact of this type of protection.

Councilmember Aldinger stated that the reason this matter is before Council is because of the two recent appeals. He said he is not in favor of relaxing the Tree Preservation Ordinance and complimented staff for doing a great job considering the number of applications they have processed.

Mayor Fahey approved the following individuals to speak a second time on this item:

- Mark Radville, No Address Provided
- Karol Wahlberg, No Address Provided

In response to Councilmember Tell's inquiry regarding disclosure requirements regarding tree protection for the sale of property, City Attorney Wadden stated that most of the requirements are in the Ordinance itself and are common to every property.

City Manager Dolan pointed out that the City already requires sellers to obtain a current building report and that this disclosure could be added as a component of the report, which would put the new owner on notice of any specific requirements for that property.

Council reviewed each component and provided the following direction to staff to have the Planning Commission review the following possible Amendments to the Ordinance:

Emergency Removal: There should be a separate emergency application to be decided administratively prior to the tree being removed, not after removal as currently allowed.

<u>Protected Trees and Replacement Tree Size</u>: Reconsider the definition of the trees to be preserved (consider caliper, canopy and height) and the replacement size in relationship to the size of the tree removed, as well as whether replacement is to be based on the size of a box, the diameter of the tree and/or tree canopy.

<u>Street Side Yards</u>: Review and consider replacement trees in side yards, but not preservation. It was noted that this proposal is a result of a meeting with residents, who proposed balancing this with the homeowners' rights and the rights to preserve the value of the property.

<u>Administrative Fines</u>: Review and consider setting up a schedule, determining who would have discretion to impose, etc.

<u>*Pruning*</u>: Leave as is, no standards or permits required for pruning.

Purpose: Add further language.

<u>Trees on Adjacent Properties</u>: Council noted that there are conflicting provisions in the Code - an issue of protecting neighbors trees versus allowing pruning of branches and roots across property lines. It was agreed that there are some trees that should be preserved and further discussion is needed regarding whether the root system of the neighbor's trees must be preserved. A reasonable balance should be the goal.

In response to Councilmember Aldinger's concern that Council set a precedent when it acted on the appeal last month, City Manager Dolan explained that the action of Council was to direct staff to do whatever could reasonably be done to preserve the tree, but, if it was not possible, the tree could be removed and replaced. Mayor Fahey pointed out that this is a "reasonableness" test, which is an appropriate action.

Councilmember Tell emphasized that the current Code has two conflicting provisions that have been addressed on an individual basis, but need to be reconciled.

<u>*Right of Way Improvement*</u>: This is a staff request to codify what is currently being done, which the council supported.

City Manager Dolan thanked Council for their direction, noting that the Community Development staff devotes significant time to this issue and it is helpful to understand the intention of Council.

05/0705.17 Presentation of Proposed Downtown Hanging Plants Improvements

City Manager Dolan introduced Maintenance Superintendent Juan Price and reviewed Council's request for staff to design ways of hanging plants from light standards as part of the downtown improvement. He suggested that Council take a break to view the three different designs, which had been hung outside of City Hall and to provide direction to staff regarding which, if any, of the designs they would like to use in the downtown improvement project.

RECESS AND RECONVENE

At 8:02 p.m. the Council recessed and reconvened at 8:10 p.m. with all Councilmembers present.

Councilmember Ward described the three different designs: an emblem of the sun, a surfboard and waves along the sand; a triangular hanging with a mermaid chasing three dolphins; and a platform-like element with the Pier Roundhouse at the end and a wave crashing over the top of the Roundhouse.

City Manager Dolan reiterated Council's desire to place planters at a few intersections in the downtown area for the remainder of the summer, determine maintenance requirements and public reception, and perhaps consider expansion of the program if it is successful. He noted that this is a budget item and funds are available.

Council discussed the various designs and provided comments and input regarding their preferences of the three designs, agreeing that the mermaid design was not appropriate; that the sun/surf/surfboard could also be designed without the surfboard as well as with a solid surfboard; and that the wave at the end of the Pier Roundhouse should be smaller and "break" under the pier.

The following individual spoke on this item:

• Carol Rowe, Downtown Business and Professional Association

Mayor Fahey suggested, and Council concurred, that staff be allowed discretion in using all of the designs, with the exception of the mermaid, and provided direction that the planters be installed only at the main intersections at this time.

05/0705.18 Consideration of the City Council's 2005-2007 Work Plan

City Manager Dolan explained that Council holds an annual Work Plan Meeting to develop a set of goals and objectives for staff and the Council to work on in the coming year. He noted that this year's plan spans two years and reviewed 32 different high priority items, as listed in the staff report, that have not yet been prioritized. Referring to the significant list of ^{City Council Meeting Minutes of July 5, 2005}

accomplishments in 2004-2005, he asked Council to adopt the Work Plan, as amended.

The following individual spoke on this item:

• Karol Walhberg, No Address Provided

Councilmember Aldinger emphasized the importance of the City providing funding to the Manhattan Beach Unified School District (MBUSD), pointing out that other local cities provide substantial funding from their coffers to support local schools.

Councilmember Ward agreed that there is a need to support the School District but emphasized his unwillingness to give them money without anything in return.

Councilmember Aldinger agreed, noting that he would be in favor of giving the School District funds for restricted, concrete use, perhaps in conjunction with matching funds from the private sector and suggested that donations to the School District be included in the subcommittee's discussion.

Mayor Fahey commented that she would be more supportive of helping maintain specific programs such as physical education or art, but not for administrative purposes.

Councilmember Tell pointed out that this might be a good way to get corporate matching funds, as part of a marketing plan.

City Manager Dolan suggested staff write an issue paper of how other cities support their school districts around the state and add it as part of the Work Plan Item. There was no objection.

Councilmember Aldinger suggested the Ad Hoc Committee ask the School District for a list of items that are genuinely at risk.

The following individual spoke on this item:

• Viet Ngo, No Address Provided

The Council discussed the wording of several items in the Work Plan and agreed with the following changes:

<u>#23 Entryway Improvements</u>: Change title to "City" Entryway. Review existing City monuments and signs and look at ways to more appropriately designate the entryway to the community.

<u>#29 Downtown Parking Issues</u>: Include "work with the Manhattan Beach Chamber of Commerce and Downtown Manhattan Beach Business and Professional Association to implement a marketing campaign for the "Cash Key" program."

<u>#10 City Support for the Schools</u>: Staff to develop an issue paper on state-wide practices of municipalities contributing to school districts (including a comprehensive survey of how much they give; are there strings attached; and where they get the money).

<u>MOTION</u>: Councilmember Montgomery moved to <u>adopt</u> the 2005-2007 Work Plan as amended. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Ward and passed by the following unanimous roll call vote:

Tell, Aldinger, Montgomery, Ward and Mayor Fahey.
None.
None.
None.

ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT CALENDAR

05/0705.14 Authorize Staff to Submit Implementation Plan to Reduce Bacteria in Storm Water Run-Off in Compliance with the Santa Monica Bay Beaches Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Regulations

Councilmember Tell stated that he removed this item because, while the staff report indicates that there is no fiscal impact this year, there is potential for a significant fiscal impact in the near future.

Public Works Director Neil Miller reviewed the background of the Federal Clean Water Act, noting that it has two main regulations for cities: the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) Program and the TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) Program. He explained that the NPDES Program allows cities to operate storm drain systems and the TMDL Program requires cities to measure the impact of storm water on receiving waters. He reported that during the past 18 months, Manhattan Beach has been working with the cities of Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, El Segundo and Torrance to put together a plan to meet the requirements. He pointed out that there is plenty of time to meet the requirements (up to 18 years if it is determined necessary); that the plan has been submitted to the Regional Water Quality Control Board; and that their comments are included in the packet. Public Works Director Miller explained that the plan will be submitted for approval in the next 6-8 months; that the first phase includes trying different programs and implementing outreach programs; and that the second phase includes putting treatment underground. He further noted that, until the projects are approved, it is not possible to determine the cost, but Manhattan Beach's obligation is a small percentage of the total cost of the project.

In response to Councilmember Tell's inquiry whether the \$400,000 plus in the Storm Drain Fund is sufficient for the next five years, Public Works Director Miller stated that, based on what he knows today, Manhattan Beach is in good shape for the next five years. He added that the Work Plan addresses quality as well as quantity and that he doesn't foresee anything in the next 3-4 years in the hundreds of thousands of dollars category. He emphasized that there are no known Public Works projects to incorporate into the budget at this time and, while regulations and quantitative numbers could change, he does not believe there will be any high-level expenses for at least three years. He concluded by commenting that the debate continues regarding whether the "fixes" are ahead of the science and cities are pushing to study whether projects are effective prior to implementing them area-wide.

Councilmember Aldinger said it is extremely important for Manhattan Beach to lead the way in this area, noting that while it may be minimal, this is not a short-term process and he has met with other cities to work on the long-term project solution.

There was no public comment on this item.

<u>MOTION</u>: Councilmember Aldinger moved to <u>approve</u> authorizing staff to submit the Implementation Plan to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board in compliance with the Santa Monica Bay Beaches Bacteria TMDL Regulations. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Tell and passed by the following unanimous roll call vote:

Ayes:Tell, Aldinger, Montgomery, Ward and Mayor Fahey.Noes:None.Absent:None.Abstain:None.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

05/07057.20 Viet Ngo Re Payments to Jonathan Tolkin and Metlox LLC

Viet Ngo, No Address Provided, alleged that payments made to Metlox LLC and Jonathan Tolkin were paid without authority of the law, which he believes is racketeering; that he is still waiting for intervention from the United States Department of Justice, the U. S. Attorney and the FBI to stop the alleged ongoing racketeering; and requested that Council place an explanation for the approval of these payments on the agenda.

CITY MANAGER REPORT(S)

None.

OTHER COUNCIL BUSINESS & COMMITTEE REPORTS

05/0705.21 Councilmember Aldinger Re Memorial Services for Assemblyman Gordon

Councilmember Aldinger announced that memorial services will be held for State Assemblyman Mike Gordon at 5:30 p.m. on July 6, 2005 in the El Segundo High School Stadium; at 5:30 p.m. on July 8, 2005 at Chevron Park; and the funeral will be at 1:00 p.m. on Friday, July 8, 2005 at Forest Lawn Memorial Park

05/0705.22 Councilmember Montgomery Re Congratulations to City Manager Dolan

Councilmember Montgomery congratulated City Manager Dolan on once again serving as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the South Bay Regional Communications Center.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:15 p.m. the meeting was duly adjourned, in memory of Mike Gordon and Connie White, to the 5:30 p.m. Adjourned Regular Meeting, to be followed by the 6:30 p.m. Regular City Council Meeting, on Tuesday, July 19, 2005, in said City.

MERNA MARSHALL Recording Secretary

JOYCE FAHEY Mayor

ATTEST:

LIZA TAMURA City Clerk

CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING JULY 5, 2005

The Adjourned Regular Meeting of the City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach, California, was held on the 5th day of July, 2005, at the hour of 6:03 p.m., in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, at 1400 Highland Avenue, in said City.

ROLL CALL

Present:	Aldinger, Montgomery, Ward and Mayor Fahey.
	(Tell arrived at 6:07 p.m.).
Absent	None.
Clerk:	Wadden (Acting).

CLOSED SESSION

The Council recessed into Closed Session at 6:03 p.m. and moved to open session at 6:31 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was duly adjourned at 6:31 p.m.

ROBERT V. WADDEN, JR. Recording Secretary

JOYCE FAHEY Mayor

ATTEST:

LIZA TAMURA City Clerk