



City of San Marcos

Meeting Minutes City Council

Tuesday, July 7, 2020

6:00 PM

Virtual

This meeting was held using conferencing software due to the COVID-19 rules.

I. Call To Order

With a quorum present, the regular meeting of the San Marcos City Council was called to order by Mayor Hughson at 6:03 p.m. Tuesday, July 7, 2020. This meeting was held online.

II. Roll Call

Present: 7 - Council Member Melissa Derrick, Mayor Jane Hughson, Mayor Pro Tem Ed Mihalkanin, Council Member Joca Marquez, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Mark Rockeymoore, Council Member Maxfield Baker and Council Member Saul Gonzales

III. 30 Minute Citizen Comment Period

The following comments were submitted as written comments and read aloud during the citizen comment portion of the meeting:

Taylor Hardy:

Good afternoon, I am a concerned citizen that lives on west San Antonio and I am writing to you regarding the traffic that is increasing due to the work on Hopkins street. First I appreciate the swift response made by the city a couple of months ago Regarding the Belvin street closures, but the barriers installed at the end of SA street has proven to be ineffective. I live on the corner of Wilson and San Antonio and I invite any one of you to sit on my porch and watch as cars speed past my house. Drivers use any of the side streets or use Bishop and the fly down to the Mitchell intersection. I have 2 children, in fact there are 5 houses on my block with young children and this situation is dangerous. We do not allow or enjoy the front of our house anymore. While citizens on Belvin street have a “private road” we cannot enjoy our neighborhood. This is not fair and there must be a better solution I agree the Craddock detour “sounds” like a great solution but it is long and inconvenient and most importantly ignored. Below is a list of complaints organized and discussed on San Antonio street. We look forward to a better solution. The traffic situation on San Antonio Street is growing worse. Through traffic motorists regularly speed and

run stop signs. We've had at least three accidents that I can count due to the detours. And the speed-dampening sign that was installed near on San Antonio Street near Johnson had to be removed after it caused a two-car pile-up because of--wait for it--through traffic. While San Antonio Street has taken on highway-level traffic, Belvin has essentially been turned into a private road, to the point where city police are now ticketing citizens simply for driving on it. If the San Marcos Police Department (SMPD) is ticketing motorists on Belvin simply for driving on Belvin because it's a closed street, then they should do the same for inbound traffic on San Antonio Street, since it is technically "closed" where it meets Hopkins near Jack's Roadhouse. Motorists regularly drive past the barricade and turn on Olive or Pitt, completely bypassing the detour. While Belvin is a residential street, so is San Antonio. In fact, San Antonio Street is home to many more families, many more families with children, experiences significantly more foot and bicycle traffic, and represents a larger property tax base. We realize the traffic has to go somewhere, but it's both unfair and unnecessarily dangerous for San Antonio alone to shoulder this burden (and let's face it...it's not realistic to expect any motorist to drive all the way to Bishop more than once before coming up with an alternate route). A more equitable solution would be to divert incoming traffic onto San Antonio St., and outgoing traffic onto Belvin. Use signage to route large trucks onto Bishop.

Margaret Adie:

The traffic situation on San Antonio Street is growing worse. Through-traffic motorists regularly speed and run stop signs. We've had at least three accidents that I can count due to the detours. One friend was run off the road by a delivery truck headed to CVS. And the speed-dampening sign that was installed near Johnson on San Antonio Street had to be removed after it caused a two-car pile-up because of--wait for it--through traffic. While San Antonio Street has taken on highway-level traffic, Belvin has essentially been turned into a private road, to the point where city police are now ticketing citizens simply for driving on it. If the San Marcos Police Department (SMPD) is ticketing motorists simply for driving on Belvin because it's a closed street, then they should do the same for inbound traffic on San Antonio Street, since it is technically "closed" where it meets Hopkins near Jack's Roadhouse. Motorists regularly drive past the barricade and turn on and SPEED DOWN Olive or Pitt, completely bypassing the detour. Then they fly down San Antonio Street unimpeded by police or, as noted above, even stop signs. While Belvin is a residential street, so is San Antonio. In fact, San Antonio Street is home to many more families, and many more families with children. San Antonio Street experiences significantly more foot and bicycle traffic, and

collectively represents a larger property tax base. Yet it's Belvin that remains blissfully traffic free and SMPD officers are working to ensure it stays that way. We realize the traffic has to go somewhere, but it's both unfair and unnecessarily dangerous for San Antonio alone to shoulder this burden (and let's face it...it's not realistic to expect any motorist to drive all the way to Bishop more than once before coming up with an alternate route). A more equitable solution would be to divert traffic headed into town onto San Antonio St., and outbound traffic onto Belvin. Use signage to route large trucks onto Bishop.

Michael Scheirn:

Yesterday afternoon our children, ages 10, 10 & 11, helped us in the yard and got all their chores done early so we could go swim in the San Marcos River. We drove down town to find fences and keep out signs. You sought Office believing that you could, and would, do good for your community. I am sure you truly believe you are doing the "right thing" by closing parks and making grand proclamations about behaviors that residents should do that even though you yourself don't actually follow it 24 hrs a day. In short, you are human just like us and my children. The difference is: My children are not denying you nature's gifts or steal your summer by denying you the things you want most and, even my Children recognize One Size DOES NOT Fill all whether it is shoes, homework, or policies that adults impose upon others. YOUR one-size-fits-all policy is NOT SAVING my healthy children--they are in a near zero risk cohort. You are NOT saving their grandparents, ages 88. The latter well-understand COVID19 would kill them so they are prudently isolated until a vaccine appears. What I see it doing is:

1) Bankrupting the City by crippling tax revenues and exorbitant expenditures for unwarranted fencing

2) Creating the pre-conditions for a True medical disaster this Winter when Flu Season Returns with cold, wet weather that forces everyone indoors.

I'm not advocating City Council ignore COVID19 and we all do a big kumbaya hug, or City Council promulgate 50 different policies for 50 different cohorts that confuses everyone. What I'm asking you to recognize and act on is:

1) the Majority of Tourists and Residents are young, healthy people who are at extremely low risk and should be able to draw upon City Services with little to no encumbrances. SPECIFICALLY, PUBLIC ACCESS TO CITY PARKS AND IN-FACILITY LIBRARY READING AND EVENTS.

2) The City and County need extreme diligence and pro-activity centered on retiree and elderly facilities that COVID19 could decimate.

My precautionary note is that these ham-fisted, one-size-fits-all approach

adopted by City Council is exhausting peoples' attention and patience for the policy is at odds with what people see and implicitly understand. Winter is "flu season" for a reason. Just like Summer is the anti-flu season. When City Council mindlessly bangs the drum through the Summer that the sky is falling when it is not, you are creating deaf ears for when COVID19 truly comes roaring back this Winter. Basically, don't set up San Marcos for failure 6 months from now. Have the wisdom and foresight to reverse these ridiculous Summer Restrictions for most residents and focus on ensure elderly care and retiree facilities where COVID19 is still a deadly threat. It's actually the responsible thing to do.

Sue Cohen:

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

Simply put there are two streets (Belvin and W. San Antonio) that are parallel to the much needed, very expensive, and long planned Hopkins project. Belvin: Lobbied the City to modify the original detour plans and effectively closed the street shortly after the project began. Recently drivers have been ticketed for driving down the closed street. San Antonio Street: This residential street has turned into a heavily trafficked super highway leading into the city center. Traffic includes large trucks, emergency vehicles, buses, and a greater volume of traffic than the street can handle. Drivers seemingly trying to make up time lost in cutting through are speeding and running stop signs in great numbers. Others seemingly not familiar with the street are flying through the two four-way stops in large numbers. The narrow cut through Olive, Pitt, and Scott streets are experiencing the same high traffic volumes. San Antonio Street has many walkers, bikers, and families with children. There have been several accidents and many near misses. I haven't observed drivers being ticketed on W. San Antonio for breaking the laws, but on the closed/private Belvin Street tickets are issued? Solution: The City has many highly trained planners and engineers. This project was in the planning stages for several years. Please review the original plans, evaluate the current situation, and provide a better solution than we have now. There is a safer and more equitable way to divert traffic into the town.

Robert Cotner:

My name is Robert Cotner and I have lived at 121 Scott Street for the past forty-three years. I appreciate the road improvements that are being done and understand that traffic has to go somewhere, but let's review the roads used to detour traffic. The 100 block of Scott Street is very narrow and connects San Antonio and Hopkins. On two different times, I asked the staff to put up speed limit signs on the 100 block to slow the new traffic. The amount of traffic

has increased 10-fold because of detouring traffic to this street. I have also asked in the past for additional NO PARKING signs be put on the South side of the 100 Block of Scott Street, that side of street is already no parking but the signs are not in the correct places so no one sees them. I have offered to install them for the city on my personal light poles that are on the street, there are four of them. Another problem is the dump trucks and other heavy trucks are using this 100 block of Scott to get to the site on Hopkins. The street is not wide enough for two trucks to pass so they go up into the yards that have sprinkler systems so they can pass. About 5 years ago we had water line break in the street and now that "patch" is sinking due to the weight of these new heavy trucks. There is a weight limit already on San Antonio St that they are exceeding it and then turning on to Scott that is really just an enlarged alley street. We all need to work together but not putting all the traffic on just a few streets. OPEN Belvin Street. One thought might be making San Antonio St. one way into town and Belvin St one way out. The signs are detouring traffic for Travis and Mitchell to use Scott Street but you cannot get to these streets because you have Belvin closed and these two streets stop on Belvin, so why send that traffic up Scott? The detour signs also tell you to use Scott St to get to Hopkins. I thought Hopkins was closed? What I am asking for is:

- (1) speed limit signs to 25mph for the 100 block of Scott Street and no parking signs
- (2) detour signs get corrected
- (3) the heavy trucks find a different way to get to their site. (Trucks could use Hopkins which was built for a highway so it is a thicker street than this alley street.) They could come in both way on Hopkins
- (4) open up the turn lane on San Antonio and Hopkins as there is no reason for it to be closed. People are turning right to get to San Antonio after the closed turn lane as it is approved turn lane. Thank you for all that you do for our City but give a little help to this traffic issue.

Suzanne Shield-Polk:

I would like to confirm the following concerns voiced by my neighbors on San Antonio Street regarding the Phase 1 detour onto San Antonio Street. The traffic situation on San Antonio Street is growing worse and more hazardous. Through-traffic motorists regularly speed and run stop signs. We have had at least three accidents, reportedly due to the detours. One neighbor was forced off the road by a delivery truck headed to CVS. And the speed-dampening sign that was installed near Johnson on San Antonio Street had to be removed after it caused a two-car collision because of through traffic. While San Antonio Street has taken on major thoroughfare traffic, Belvin has essentially been closed off to the point where it is reported that city police are now ticketing

citizens simply for driving on it. If the San Marcos Police Department (SMPD) is ticketing motorists simply for driving on Belvin because it's a closed street, then they should do the same for inbound traffic on San Antonio Street, since it is technically "closed" where it meets Hopkins near Jack's Roadhouse. Motorists regularly drive past the detour barricade at the South end of San Antonio St. and turn onto Olive, Bishop, or Pitt, and proceed to San Antonio St. completely bypassing the detour. Then they speed down San Antonio Street on their way across town, unimpeded by police or, as noted above, even stop signs. Belvin is a residential street, but so is San Antonio. In fact, San Antonio Street is home to many families with children and retired/older residents. San Antonio Street experiences significantly more foot and bicycle traffic, and collectively represents a broader demographic with a larger property tax base, voter base, and census base. Yet it is Belvin that remains traffic free—and SMPD officers are working to ensure it stays that way. We realize the traffic has to go somewhere, but it's both unfair and unnecessarily dangerous for San Antonio alone to shoulder this burden (and let's face it...it's not realistic to expect any motorist to drive all the way to Bishop to Craddock more than once before seeking an alternate route). A more equitable solution would be to divert traffic headed into town onto San Antonio St., and outbound traffic onto Belvin. Use signage to route commercial truck through traffic onto Bishop. I would like to add: This significant increase in traffic makes pulling out of one's driveway extremely dangerous. Most driveways on San Antonio are one directional and require residents to back out into a steady stream of traffic coming from both directions, and often approaching at an unsafe speed for a residential street. This is often complicated by the fact that as a residential street, vehicles are regularly parked along San Antonio Street, obstructing the view for both street traffic and those backing out of driveways. The traffic load on San Antonio Street frequently includes large, heavy trucks from the Hopkins construction and a wide variety of commercial trucks of all sizes, also moving hastily along W San Antonio. These are also compounding the risk of interaction with through traffic. I respectfully request that the city provide equitable enforcement of compliance with the prescribed detour routes.

Carl Furry:

We're in the early stages of a two-year construction project on Hopkins St. The stresses that the detour of highway-level traffic has placed on San Antonio Street have become untenable. We've counted at least two injury accidents, while daily witnessing cars blowing straight through stop signs as if they don't exist. A neighbor recently was run off the road by a delivery driver headed to CVS. And a speed limit warning sign had to be removed when a through traffic

motorist slammed into it and caused a two-car pile-up. (Honestly, how much more evidence is needed here?) Yet as the situation on San Antonio worsens, Belvin Street has effectively become a private drive. In fact, a San Marcos resident was recently ticketed while driving on Belvin simply because he does not live on the street and was not visiting a Belvin St. resident. Why is the city spending resources preventing the rare motorist from driving down an otherwise public street? And where are the SMPD officers ticketing those motorists who simply drive past the barricade at San Antonio and Hunter and instead enter San Antonio from Olive and Pitt Streets? For every motorist nabbed on Belvin, you could stop hundreds on San Antonio. Belvin Street residents have been quick to argue that they've had to absorb local bus traffic from Hopkins. But let's put this in perspective: According to the CARTS bus schedule, only 11 buses travel Belvin daily. That's 11 total vehicle trips in 24 hours. On Friday, we randomly walked out to our front porch to time how long it would take for 11 vehicles to pass our house on San Antonio. The result: 1 minute, 15 seconds. And it wasn't even that busy. We commend our friends on Belvin for their organized and effective lobbying efforts, but the time has come for the city to recognize that San Antonio is also a residential street. In fact, San Antonio is home to more families, more families with children, and a larger collective property tax base. And it experiences more pedestrian and bicycle traffic, which only adds to the potential danger this traffic poses. Please consider more equitable changes to your traffic rerouting plan. We know the traffic has to go somewhere, and we're willing to shoulder our share. San Antonio Street seems a natural for taking inbound detour traffic, and Belvin is the natural choice for outbound traffic. Large trucks can be detoured to Craddock via signage to avoid huge vehicles rolling down either street. Finally, in addition to (but not instead of) rerouting, please consider installing a few speed limit policing signs along any residential street having to accept detour traffic. We know these works for us, and we're sure we're not alone. Thanks for your service. This isn't fun, we know. But the families who live along San Antonio Street need some relief—and a more equitable approach to detour traffic.

Randy Polk:

Since the start of the current construction on Hopkins St our quiet street, that is a favorite route used by many bicyclists and pedestrians, has become a major vehicle thoroughfare. Despite NOT being an official detour route, San Antonio St. has become more and more busy since the start of the Hopkins construction. Few vehicles adhere to the 30 mile an hour speed limit. Stop signs are cause for 4 and 5 car backups. And since it's a residential street, parked cars cause further backups with vehicles trying to squeeze by with

oncoming traffic. I have also observed a greater number of large trucks than usual. It has come to my attention that there has been an increased amount of Police presence on Belvin St, another parallel route to Hopkins, and it has been observed that officers are handing out tickets to motorists using the street as an official detour. While I applaud the city for holding motorists accountable for not using the official detour route to Craddock St, I have not noticed any increased similar enforcement on San Antonio St. If the residents of Belvin St enjoy increased enforcement of traffic laws, those of us on San Antonio St. should receive equal relief... as well as residents on MLK St. I certainly don't advocate reassigning Police resources away from Belvin St. to our street, but only that the law be enforced equally. All traffic, save that of residents and visitors, should be routed to the official Craddock St detour route. I hope to see, by way of this suggested reallocation of resources, a lessening of traffic on San Antonio St and MLK St very soon.

James Reveley & Sonja Nagy:

As I pull out of my driveway on West San Antonio Street in the morning, I wait to see who will stop to allow me the time I need to exit my driveway. I wait for someone who is traveling a safe speed, a driver who is looking at the road, someone who will stop, so I may safely back-up my vehicle to go to work. It didn't use to be this difficult to leave my home. Even when walking, we have to be cautiously aware of what drivers are doing. I guess you can call it walking defensively. Will the driver run the stop sign today? Will the driver be paying attention to the road? We have been in the middle of crossing the street, at an intersection with a stop sign, and almost been hit on three separate occasions, when trying to cross the street. The problem is worsening. Additionally, we've seen people wreck into neighbors' yards, run stop signs, and sideswipe cars parked on the road. Our family has had three vehicles damaged by hit and run drivers on San Antonio Street. The last one was, a truck totaled by a hit-and-run driver, the first two included an SUV parked on the road for less than 15 minutes, and a car parked on the street overnight, and prior to the implemented detour. Currently, detoured traffic is diverted to one street that runs parallel to Hopkins, which is West San Antonio Street, to allow for the needed construction in our city. In contrast, the other alternative traffic path, the other parallel street to Hopkins, Belvin, has been blocked off to through traffic. With police ticketing individuals who dare travel down that road. Where are the police officers on the thoroughfare that is San Antonio Street, giving tickets to people speeding, running stop signs, and driving recklessly? The immediate solutions needed include the creation of a second detour to split the burden of the traffic between San Antonio Street and Belvin Street (both of the parallel streets to Hopkins) and more police presence

ticketing violators and offenders

Longer-term solutions for San Antonio Street includes speed limit reduction, as the speed limit on Belvin is 25 miles per hour. San Antonio Street requires equal consideration. Both previous and current traffic on San Antonio Street, demands a minimum of one more Stop Sign needed at Johnson Street to protect our community from reckless drivers. Additional speed bumps to slow down vehicles that are not observing the posted speed limits and/or stop signs. These are not only our family's problems but problems for all of the families that live on San Antonio Street and our entire community. We love our home, our neighbors, and our community and we just want to be safe when walking our dogs or when pulling out of our driveway. Please help us solve this problem, these problems deserve immediate attention.

Katie Shaw:

I'm writing to you regarding my concerns about the increased traffic on San Antonio Street. As a homeowner who has resided on San Antonio Street for more than two years (and in the neighborhood for 15+), the high volume of cars and trucks on our street is concerning from a public safety standpoint. Since the closure of Hopkins Street, our neighborhood street has been turned into a highway for motorists. This, at a time when many more residents and children are out walking, jogging and bicycling due to the COVID-19 lockdown. We've had no less than 3 wrecks on our street since the detour, and the speed-dampening sign has not been replaced since a wreck that happened near it. Why? Cars regularly drive around the barricade where Hunter Road meets San Antonio Street and speed through our neighborhood. I've also witnessed three police cars speeding down our street with lights and sirens on a few weeks ago, and the other day a fire truck going full speed with sirens. San Antonio Street needs lower speed limits and more stop signs to slow traffic. We need speed-dampening signs and occasional police presence to enforce the speed limit. San Antonio Street has more residents and more children and more foot traffic than Belvin Street does. It's unfair that the parallel thoroughfare, Belvin Street, gets preferential treatment. I've heard they have police giving out tickets for non-resident traffic. We don't have that on our street. Make the detour more equitable: split the traffic between Belvin and San Antonio Street. North bound on one, south bound on the other. Thank you for your consideration. Please help us make our streets safe. Let's not wait until residents get run over by speeding cars.

PRESENTATIONS

1. Receive a presentation from Betty Voights, Executive Director of the Capital Area Council of Governments (CAPCOG), on the "50 Years of Service" to the ten-county

region.

Mayor Hughson introduced Betty Voights, Executive Director of Capital Areas Council of Governments (CAPCOG), and noted that she been with CAPCOG for 23 years.

Ms. Voights provided the presentation on what CAPCOG does and the resources it provides to cities and counties. Ms. Voights mentioned the history of CAPCOG and noted there are 24 Councils of Government (COG) in Texas and 530 across the U.S. CAPCOG is funded by membership dues and state/federal grants. Capital Area Planning Council (CAPCO) created in 1970 to serve a 9-county region; it now serves 10, since Blanco County was added. The original executive committee consisted of 15 members: 9 city officials, 4 county officials, and 2 citizen representatives. Mayor Hughson is the current chair of the committee. CAPCO was the original name of the organization and the name was changed to CAPCOG in August 2004.

The Executive Committee periodically reviews the mission In 1998 an informal survey was conducted, in 2008 a facilitated workshop was held that discussed membership, dues, priorities, and regional issues, and in 2019 a workshop was held to look at the following issues:

- Mission Statement, is it still describing the mission of the organization?**
- Resiliency, which is important because CAPCOG is not a taxing entity. The budget is made up of many funding resources for which all employee time is allocated. Over Fifty percent of the budget is funded by 911 and the Area Agency on Aging. Resiliency means diversification of funding sources.**
- Future Regional Issues such as broad band, coordination of emergency response assets during disasters, looking at housing supply across the region based on growth analysis, flood mitigation planning, transportation planning, regional water planning, county land use authority**

COGs are Regional Planning Commission (RPCs) under state statutory directive: "...to make studies and plans to guide the unified, far reaching development of a region, eliminate duplication, and promote economic and efficiency in the coordinated development of the region."

A RPC statutory directives are:

- Efficiency: COGs operate a on reimbursements basis and are given deliverables from states federal agencies and if it is not accomplished, there is no reimbursement.**
- Effectiveness: If projects are not done right then no revenue**
- Delivery of service: programs on behalf of cities and counties**
- Local control: Members of the local governments make decisions on what**

the COG should do

Ms. Voights mentioned what COGs do and there are 24 COGs in Texas that share core programs:

- **Emergency communications/9 1 1 for cities and rural areas**
- **Area Agency on Aging is a federal program provided for seniors**
- **Solid Waste Planning/Funding is a state program and the plan drives the funding. There is an annual grant process from recycling and illegal dumping surveillance**
- **Criminal Justice Planning/Funding is contracted by the Governor's office**
- **Homeland Security Planning/Funding tasked after 9/11**
- **Economic Development District – every COG is an economic development district, and the federal Economic Development Administration (EDA) provides funding to assist cities and counties for economic development.**

Ms. Voights stated that Emergency Communications began with the state Program.

- **CAPCOG was dedicated as the nation's first COG that is also an Emergency Communications District**
- **Budget derived from 9 1 1 fees paid by phone customers**
- **Redundant dedicated network to 31 Public Safety Answering Points for 9-1-1 call delivery**
- **Call taking equipment and recording equipment, GIS mapping, language line, pre arrival care**
- **Training call takers for Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (TCOLE) licensing, continuing education & call management**
- **Public education**
- **Budget is \$18 million – 88% for equip main, networks, 911 services**

Ms. Voights mentioned that Services for Seniors and Caregivers for Area Agency on Aging (AAA) and Aging Disability Resource Center (ADRC):

- **Information, Referral & Assistance**
- **Care Coordination & Support – benefits counseling, in home support, financial support, caregiver**
- **Ombudsman – resident advocacy at assisted living facilities & nursing homes.**

Ms. Voights stated that staff goes to all the senior facilities in the region and is an advocate for residents

- **Contractual Services – senior centers, Meal on Wheels, transportation contracted with CARTS**
- **Outreach Program – Health & Wellness, Safety, Nutrition, Housing Budget \$6.8 million & 28 staff**

CAPCOG was the first COG out of 24 in Texas that formed an Homeland Security task force which Homeland Security – Budget \$350K plus project budgets & 3 staff

- **Coordinates regional approach to funding, planning, training, outreach via various active committees:**

Planning, Training & Outreach, Technology, Recovery & Resiliency, Response, and Public Health & Education

- **Manages regional notification system WarnCentralTx.com and WebEOC.**
- **Works primarily through Emergency Management Coordinators**

Ms. Voights stated there is a sub-committee of the Executive Committee working on ideas to get the public to register for Warn Central Texas to receive emergency notifications for flooding or fires. Community Economic Development division mainly assists with Planning and Funding. Ms. Voights stated there are 5 different grants, a committee scores the applications and executive committee reviews them. The Household Hazardous Waste Collection events is the most popular grants provided. Regional Planning & Project Development Division project development occurs focuses on more environmental issues and works with air quality program that ground level monitors, what the data shows for ozone. Flooding mitigation after flooding maps to show where it flooding may happen the next time. Other services include Air Quality, GIS Services & 9-1-1 Management and Mapping, County contracts for GIS 911, Broadband, and Water

Ms. Voights mentioned the Governor's office funds all COGs to do law enforcement training & retraining Regional Law Enforcement Academy (RLEA) for the last 22 years. Other training provided are:

- **Basic Peace Officer Courses (BPOCs)**
- **Jailer certification courses**
- **TCOLE Mandated Inservice courses**
- **Use of force simulator now called de escalation simulator**
- **Texas Department of Agriculture Gas pump skimmer project**

More training includes:

- **Canine encounters Crime scene investigation**
- **Environmental law Crisis intervention**
- **Cyberstalking Basic Instructors**
- **Budget \$477K and 3 Full time employees (Tuitions generate 30% of budget)**

CAPCOG does Planning:

- **Area Agency on Aging Area Plan**

- **Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown Regional Air Quality Plan 2019-2023**
- **Regional Solid Waste Management Plan**
- **Criminal Justice Plan and Priorities**
- **Homeland Security's Threat and Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (THIRA)**
- **Emergency Communications Strategic Plan**
- **Regional (CEDS) Economic Development Plan**

CAPCOG going Forward:

- **Shared services survey – 18 responses out of 222 sent Human Resources support, GIS and flooding mapping, debris management**
- **Collaboration with the Capital Area Metro Planning Organization**
 - **Regional transit coordination planning**
 - **Traffic incident management policies**
 - **Commute Solutions support**
- **Economic development funding, grant application support, and administration**
- **NextGen 9-1-1**

CAPCOG Governance

- **General Assembly: membership includes ISDs, EDCs, chambers, co-ops, special districts, local governments.**
- **Duties: budget, bylaws, policy issues, governing body which is the Executive Committee**
- **General Assembly chooses the Nominating Committee to develop the slate of elected officials for the Executive Committee – Sept Oct.**
- **General Assembly elects Executive Committee every December**
- **Executive Committee serves Jan-Dec**
 - **25 city and county elected officials**
 - **4 state legislators passed by state bill**

Council Member Rockey Moore inquired about the electronic communication NextGen environment. Ms. Voights said that 9-1-1 is voice only, capable for text 9-1-1. It is recommended to always use a voice call and send text as the last resort. Phone companies has been last to migrate into a digital environment. CAPCOG has placed fiber optic throughout region. This will allow us to digitally allow more than voice which includes video. That means you can take a picture of an accident and send into the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) right away.

Council Member Derrick asked how San Marcos can benefit from economic

development and noted the shared service survey received 18 responses out of 220 to HR support, GIS Mapping, Flood mapping similar to Wimberley. How can San Marcos take advantage? Ms. Voights stated that her staff is willing to help with EDA grants and how to write and build the application due to specific requirements. Ms. Voights stated shared services issues, board was disappointed in the response but it was paused due to Covid. Council Member Derrick asked if CAPCOG gives recommendations on where not to build as to flooding issues. Ms. Voights stated we will be working on behalf of the local government but looking at the emergency management response.

Council Member Baker asked how the passing of the cite and release ordinance fits into the larger discussion of CAPCOG related to Criminal Justice Plan and Priorities. Ms. Voights stated that the Criminal Justice Plan is updated annually and was last done in August/September 2019. Ms. Voights stated that it has not been addressed in the Criminal Justice Plan.

2. Receive status reports and updates on response to COVID-19 pandemic; hold council discussion, and provide direction to Staff.

Mayor Hughson stated the following comments:

To any and all who are watching tonight. You will hear the latest numbers shortly including the news of several recent deaths of people in San Marcos. There have been too many deaths because of this dreaded disease. Please, the studies have shown that wearing a mask **REDUCES** the chance of giving Covid to someone else. That someone else could be a stranger at the grocery store but it could also be a friend or family member. Anyone who you might infect can get sick and/or transmit it to someone in **THEIR** family. **PLEASE** keep your distance from everyone outside of your immediate household! Even if they are family members. Wear a mask. If you **AND** the people you are near **BOTH** wear masks it greatly reduces the chances of transmittal both ways. Many of us are starting to feel helpless about Covid. But we **ARE NOT** helpless! We can distance, which is free, and we can wear masks which are available at low cost. This is how each of us can fight the coronavirus today and tomorrow.

Speaking of tomorrow, I will issue my Mayor's third public health advisory related to Covid-19. It will include:

wear a face covering, physical (social) distancing, follow guidelines provided by the Centers for Disease Control and prevention, limit contact with the public and limit contact with public surfaces

Council Member Gonzales expressed his condolences to the families that have lost loved ones. He encouraged the public to avoid having family gatherings

and stay home.

Chase Stapp, Director of Public Safety provided status reports and updates on response to COVID-19 pandemic.

Known Cases – as of today

- 2,886,267 U.S. cases with at least 129,811 fatalities. (More than 44,361 new cases since yesterday)

- *source: Center for Disease Control and Prevention

- 200,557 (94,120 active) cases in 247 Texas counties with 2,655 fatalities

- *source: Texas Department of State Health Services

- 3,193 in Hays County with 10 fatalities (2,655 active and 528 recovered)

- 10,294 tests returned negative

- 1,609 active and 191 recovered in San Marcos (6 fatalities)

- 68 cases have required hospitalization, 20 current hospitalizations

- 10 deaths, 6 in San Marcos

- *source: Hays County Health Department

Mr. Stapp echoed Council Member Gonzales comments and expressed sentiments to the families.

Mr. Stapp displayed bar graphs that shows the number of new cases per day and the number of hospitalizations per day for San Marcos for 30 days.

Updates to Governor Abbott's Actions

- June 30: Extends Disaster Declaration for all counties in Texas

- July 2: Establishes Statewide Face Covering Requirement via Executive Order and Issues Proclamation to Limit Gatherings

- “Every person in Texas shall wear a face covering over the nose and mouth when inside a commercial entity or other building or space open to the public, or when in an outdoor public space, wherever it is not feasible to maintain six feet of social distancing from another person not in the same household.”

There is a fine of up to \$250 for not wearing a face covering.

- Exceptions include those under the age of 10, those with a medical condition or disability that prevents wearing a face covering, while eating or drinking in a restaurant

- First-time violators receive a verbal or written warning; second and subsequent violations shall be punishable by a fine not to exceed \$250

- Outdoor gatherings in excess of 10 people, with some exceptions, are prohibited unless approved by the Mayor of the city in which it is to be held, or County Judge if in an unincorporated area

Testing Overview

- 13,559 tests administered county wide
 - 10,294 negative (76.3%)
 - 3,193 confirmed (23.7%)
 - 72 pending as of today
- County free testing – Live Oak Clinic on Broadway
 - CDBG-CV grant application in process to enhance these services
- Past Texas Division Emergency Management (TDEM) testing sites – Ranged between 200-700 people at each
- Future TDEM sites – July 12-16 at San Marcos High School
 - Limited to 500 test kits per day

Upcoming considerations

- City re-opening plan

Mr. Stapp stated that tentative of Monday, July 27th to open facilities and we will evaluate a week prior to July 27th.

- Utility billing changes - on tonight's agenda

Council Member Gonzales inquired about the turnaround time for test results. Mr. Stapp stated the turnaround time is determined by which type of service and what lab is used. With TDEM, the results had a better turnaround time within 3-5 days. There was a backlog at the local lab from 48 hours and they are now caught up. The testing that will be done at San Marcos High School, administered by TDEM, will have a faster turnaround.

Mayor Hughson expressed her concern and sympathy to the families that have lost loved ones recently.

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Council Member Baker, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Mihalkanin, to approve the consent agenda.

Mayor Hughson abstained from item #5 because she owns property and lives near the area where part of this project is being proposed. The motion to approve carried by the following vote:

For: 7 - Council Member Derrick, Mayor Hughson, Mayor Pro Tem Mihalkanin, Council Member Marquez, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Rockeymoore, Council Member Baker and Council Member Gonzales

Against: 0

3. Consider approval, by motion, of the following meeting Minutes:
 - A. June 2, 2020 - Regular Meeting Minutes
 - B. June 11, 2020 - Special Meeting Minutes
 - C. June 16, 2020 - Work Session Meeting Minutes
 - D. June 16, 2020 - Regular Meeting Minutes
 - E. June 18, 2020 - Special Meeting Minutes
 - F. June 25, 2020 - Special Meeting Minutes
4. Consider approval of Resolution 2020-140R, authorizing funding in the amount of \$100,000 to be transferred from the Permanent Art Fund to the Art and Cultural Grants Programs for fiscal year 2021 as recommended by the San Marcos Arts Commission; and declaring an effective date.
5. Consider approval of Resolution 2020-141R, expressing support of the submission of a grant application to the Lyda Hill Lone Star Grant Program by the San Marcos River Foundation in partnership with the City of San Marcos and San Marcos Greenbelt Alliance to fund a trail connecting Purgatory Creek to the Spring Lake Natural Area; authorizing the City Manager or his designee to execute a Memorandum of Understanding regarding the rights and duties of each party and any other documents necessary to effectuate the project; and declaring an effective date.
6. Consider approval of Resolution 2020-142R, approving a fourth addendum to the Chapter 380 Economic Development Incentive Agreement with Humpty Dumpty SSM, Ltd. in connection with the redevelopment of Springtown Shopping Center which amends the agreement to establish the year 2022 as the first year in which application for a grant payment may be made; authorizing the City Manager to execute the fourth addendum; and declaring an effective date.
7. Consider approval of Resolution 2020-143R, supporting the Mayor's public statement regarding the killing of George Floyd; authorizing members of the City Council to join in such public statement; and declaring an effective date.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

8. Receive a Staff presentation and hold a Public Hearing to receive comments for or against amending the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) 2019-2020 Action Plan to add a proposed COVID-19 Testing Program as an activity, using \$105,530 of the the Community Development Block Grant - Coronavirus Response (CDBG-CV) allocation of \$425,261.

Michael Ostrowski, Assistant Director of Development Services, provided the presentation on amending the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) 2019-2020 Action Plan, to use \$105,530 of the Community Development Block Grant - Coronavirus Response (CDBG-CV) for Covid testing.

Mr. Ostrowski stated Council directed staff to look for other options for a

COVID-19 testing program to increase testing availability and the speed of the results. Mr. Ostrowski thanked Rachel Ingle, Emergency Management Coordinator, Chase Stapp, Director of Public Safety and Hays County representatives for coming up with the COVID 19 Testing Partnership which will increase testing to meet demand.

**Mr. Ostrowski provided the timeline for the next steps of the CDBG-CV grant:
Public hearing - July 7**

Public comment period & Research most effective option - July 12-17

Request City Council approval of an option - August 4

Request HUD authorization to use funds - August 5-31

Funding available - Late August

Mayor Hughson opened the Public Hearing at 7:28 p.m.

There being no speakers, the Mayor closed Public Hearing at 7:28 p.m.

Council Member Derrick asked about the mandatory workshop for best practices between the County and the City and hoping it wasn't mandatory.

Mr. Ostrowski stated that the workshop is not required. Council Member Derrick asked who is going to work on the City's behalf with the County to ensure the money is going to be used to the best ability and make a difference.

Mr. Ostrowski mentioned that CDBG funding and the need has to be there and there will be benchmarks set in agreement between the City and the County and report back to HUD.

Council Member Baker stated that expediting the money will be helpful and asked if money is being used to cover more administrative costs. Mr. Ostrowski stated there will not be any additional administrative cost for this item.

Mr. Stapp stated that the County and the City are on the same page to provide the testing to San Marcos residents only. Mr. Stapp mentioned that the reason for the flexibility and testing capacities is due to receiving test kits from the government. The program can pay for quicker testing results. Mr. Stapp stated that the timeline works with robust testing for a month through the middle of July and there will be a break and start with the program.

NON-CONSENT AGENDA

- 9. Receive a Staff presentation and hold discussion regarding the return to normal utility billing operations for non-payment, and provide direction to Staff.**

Victoria Runkle, Interim Director of Finance, provided a presentation on the

return to normal utility billing operations for non-payment.

Ms. Runkle stated there is now a different approach to helping citizens who need assistance in paying their utility bills.

(CAI) The history of procedures prior to March 2020:

- Customers have 18 days to pay their Electric, Water, Waste/Water, Drainage (Stormwater) and Garbage bills
- If no payment has been made, customers receive a late notice
- Generally, after 28 days, service is terminated
- A 10% late fee is charged to customers' accounts
- City directs low income and any other residential customers to a variety of social service agencies, if people need help
- City works with both residential and commercial customers on payment plans, if necessary

March 2020 to Current:

- City halted all termination processes, including sending accounts to collections
- Need to develop a plan to help customers and ensure our utilities do not become unstable
- Late fees are removed, upon request; system charges automatically, we have the technology to remove late fees
- In recommendations staff suggests removal of all late fees from March through December 2020; will cost approximately \$20,000 across all utilities
- More commercial than residential customers ask for the late fee removal; probably a case of not knowing they can ask.

Ms. Runkle stated residential customers tend to be running late on their bills, but only 30% of the customers have not paid their bills after three months.

- 140 of the 153 customers have deposits of \$33,000
 - We are holding money customers could use to pay their bills
- 45 customers are 91 days + longer = \$7,400
91 customers are 60-90 days = \$13,000
153 customers are 0-60 days late = \$75,000 outstanding

Ms. Runkle stated that commercial customers have only 17% of this cycle's commercial customers (3) are three months in arrears

- 12 of the 17 customers have deposits of \$2,800
 - Commercial businesses could use their deposit to pay bills
- 3 customers 91 days + longer = \$828
17 customers 0 – 60 days late = \$21,000 outstanding

12 customers 60 – 90 days = \$8,645

Ms. Runkle mentioned that they are going working on an immediate customer outreach by using all mediums, web, paper, emails: “Need help to pay your utility bills? Call us!”. Ms. Runkle stated that there will be no terminations until, at least, September 30 and prior to that, staff will bring back to council to evaluate. Staff will monitor assistance requests as this will inform us as to the level of support our citizens need – help determine duration and level. Ms. Runkle mentioned determining next steps in mid September, based upon: economy, student ability to pay, other possible programs.

Ms. Runkle stated that the assistance options are deposits can be applied to outstanding bills, if the customer wants, offer a payment plan and City has a partnership with Community Action that has almost \$100K that can help with utility payments. Community Actions handles the qualifications and how many times a customer can apply for assistance. The City does not get involved in determining who is eligible.

Ms. Runkle mentioned the "Click to help your Neighbors" Program:

- Paper Bills already include a way for people to offer assistance by including extra money over their bill amount and the money goes to the assistance fund.**
- Our new software, beginning this week, will include an electronic way to contribute.**
- Customers are helping more in 2020 than in prior years: \$1,500 as of this period last year – this year \$1,700 in same period**
- We will not offer “incentives for giving” this lowers the available assistance Funds.**

Ms. Runkle stated staff is working on changing the Community Action, Inc who can only help individuals, not businesses. (CAI) Agreement for available assistance with more accessibility because the current contract only permit us to help low income residents, using federal guidelines. Any changes will require Council approval and staff will bring back with contract changes in August.

Ms. Runkle mentioned that staff is working with our Economic Development staff and the Chamber of Commerce to determine if there are other agencies who can help in administering a commercial assistance program. They are exploring the use of CARES money to dedicate to the program.

SUMMARY and RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL: To have a clear customer process and timeline

ACTIONS:

- Continue the “no-termination” process until, at least, September 30
- Market a “We are here to help” customer outreach program
- Eliminate all late fees effective March – End of Calendar year
- Assistance program includes, but is not limited to use of deposits, pay plan set up, assistance to help with bills through a third-party(s) and no one will be sent to Collections for the remainder of calendar year
- Working on Agreements to make the use of available assistance more accessible
- Bring Agreements to Council for consideration in August for both residential and commercial accounts

Council Member Derrick asked if use of deposits are for residential and commercial customers and if they have to replenish the deposit. Ms. Runkle stated they may use the deposit but are suggesting a payment plan to not use their deposit.

Council Member Derrick expressed concerns about administrative fee charges for Community Action of 8% compared to other partners. Chamber of Commerce is handling economic development program for small business with \$240K and using 40% for administrative fee. Community Action has a flow and the Chamber needs to work with a new system, why is that? Ms. Runkle stated Community Action has more support resources did not reject the idea about commercial programs but will need more on the administrative fee as that would be new to them. Chamber needs to start a new program if Community Action has a new basis. Concern for Community Action parameter is that CARES money has on them with the \$1.2M. Council Member Derrick suggests we work with Community Action for solutions to consider and is appreciative.

Mayor Hughson stated that Community Action has a system in place and Chamber of Commerce had to set up software and that is part of the difference in the administrative fee. Mayor Hughson asked if Community Action gives the money to the individual or can they pay the City directly. Ms. Runkle stated the money is not given to Community Action, customers get qualified and will be notified by the City of approval but likely not give money to the individual. Ms. Reyes stated that with small business the goal is to have a simple and combined application.

10. Receive a Staff presentation and hold discussion regarding Recommendation Resolution Number 2020-0201 of the Main Street Advisory Board regarding the Emergency

Installation of Curbside Pickup Parking Spaces for COVID-19 Small Business Operations, and provide direction to Staff.

A motion was made by Council Member Gonzales, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Mihalkanin, that this item be postponed until August, per request from the Main Street Board. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 7 - Council Member Derrick, Mayor Hughson, Mayor Pro Tem Mihalkanin, Council Member Marquez, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Rockeymoore, Council Member Baker and Council Member Gonzales

Against: 0

11. Hold discussion regarding Recommendation Resolution 2020-01RR, of the Parks and Recreation Board of the City of San Marcos, Texas Supporting the creation of a River Benefit Parking District with the implementation of paid parking with this district; hold discussion to determine how such funds may be used for City parks; and provide direction to Staff.

Drew Wells, Director of Parks and Recreation, provided the presentation of a creation of a River Benefit Parking District with the implementation of paid parking.

Mr. Wells stated that this recommendation is from the Parks and Recreation Advisory board to council to consider the concept of paid parking within the river parks. Parks and Recreation held a joint meeting with Parking Advisory Board, to accomplish potential revenue to help offset some of the associated with maintenance, park ranger program and other expenses in the parks system. Mr. Wells stated we would have public input to structure it to make it successful. We wanted to introduce this and ask the Council if this a concept that Council wants to explore and then the staff can do the research to answer some questions.

Mayor Hughson read part of the resolution recommendation of the Parks and Recreation board:

Part 1: It is recommended that the City Council provide direction to staff to move forward with the creation of a River Benefit Parking District with consideration for free or low cost parking for residents.

Part 2: It is recommended that City Council consider the potential negative impact of adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Diane Phalen, Chair of Parks and Recreation Advisory Board stated the board discussed cost recovery last year and Parks department is at 14% of cost recovery, the funds are needed. Ms. Phalen stated one option is to charge out of towners to

enjoy the parks. The current board that has been newly appointed hasn't discussed about this and seeking direction on how to go forward.

Council Member Derrick stated we need revenue to increase the number of park rangers and maintenance and a number of other items. None of the locals are at Rio Vista, because it is crowded. Out of towners do not pay anything for our parks. We need more park rangers for families to feel safe. Council Member Derrick stated the Council approved the Parking advisory board 3 phase approach and wants to ensure each item happens inside the plan. The Parking Advisory Board received \$500K for eCab/electric cabs allocated from the Downtown TIRZ to alleviate traffic congestion downtown. Would like to hear from chair of the Parking advisory board, Kelly Stone to address any concerns.

Mayor Hughson stated she would like the two boards to work together to start with and get things identified. Parks advisory look into actual parking at the parks and come up with plan. Then get back with Parking advisory and get all things addressed.

Kelly Stone, Chair of the Parking Advisory Board, stated Mr. Wells said that community input will be important and that is what it is taking place from the Parking advisory board. We were selected in March and met until May of last year but there was no purpose in meeting until paid parking was implemented. We began to meet because Council Member Mihalkanin stated during a workshop for paid parking that the Parking Advisory Board hasn't met. She stated in December \$500K was approved for an eCab program assist with mobility issues/parking downtown. Ms. Stone mentioned the board is trying to have solutions on a variety of problems. Downtown residents have difficulty parking and all of the parking are a 2 hour limit and enforcement has been an issue.

Ms. Stone mentioned there was a joint meeting with Parks and Recreation Advisory Board after they became aware of the Parking Advisory Board. Task for the Parking Advisory Board is to develop all benefit districts and not just the river and downtown districts that Kimley Horn presented. Ms. Stone stated that only 30% of parking tickets get paid so tickets are not a big revenue source.

Mayor Hughson asked if the Parking Advisory Board has been discussion River Parks parking prior to January. Ms. Stone stated yes as part of the full

rollout, that eCab is not just for downtown but for last mile solutions. The Parks and Downtown are so close that they are interconnected with respect to parking. We were told by our staff liaison they we are not to meet because we do not have legislative items and not met in 4 months. The RFP for the eCab company has been on hold.

Mayor Pro Tem Mihalkanin supports the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board working with Parking Advisory Board. Mr. Mihalkanin suggests the burden can be shared by having the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board researching parking in the parks and then any recommendations go before the Parking Advisory Board before Council. The PAB was working and committed and would like to have the Parking Advisory Board meet soon.

Mayor Hughson asked Ms. Stone if the eCab is to serve the parks. Ms. Stone stated the board has been looking at different surface lots by the dog park and the armory. The Council had provided \$50K to assist the local business to lease parking spots for employees for \$3 a day and the eCab can take the individual from that parking to downtown Mayor Hughson stated the money that was allocated with the Downtown TIRZ dollars is to serve downtown and we might need to look at other funding source to add serve the parks.

Council Member Derrick asked if we can use funding from the CARES act from transit to help with funding.

Council Member Baker is concerned that paid parking will not stated about paid parking that we need to make revenue and parking will detour bad behavior which is one of the biggest issues with river tubing. It is a class issue and changes the demographic we can serve, whether they are local residents or not. Mr. Baker stated we are not issuing littering tickets which could bring revenue and finds issues with paid parking. He looks forward to the proposal that will come to us. Council Member Baker suggested we do more prioritizing with the funding we receive through sales tax and hotel occupancy tax (HOT). without having paid parking. Mayor Hughson stated that we have tried to be able to use HOT funds to help with expenses on the river, such as cleaning up littering. It is not allowed. Mayor Hughson stated residents that live or rent in San Marcos pay taxes so they are helping to pay the parks and out of towners are not paying for parks.

Council Member Derrick stated we cannot enforce anything due to limited funding, needing money for the park rangers and maintenance and trash pickup is a via a revenue stream and paid parking is an option. We cannot

have the enforcement needed because we do not collect enough money because we do not have enough rangers to do the enforcement. In other cities, parking fees help to pay for services related to the parks and it is time to do that here.

Council consensus is to move forward with a river parks parking district through the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board and the Parking Advisory Board working together to present options.

Mr. Lumbreras stated that the parking manager position is on hold due to the hiring freeze and the RFP for the eCab service we have to work through the project plan for the TIRZ board but that is a different funding source. Staff will get this initiative moving.

Ms. Stone stated that the Parking advisory was charged with the benefit district areas and if Parks and Recreation is working separately there needs to be distinctions between what is park and city parking and how to work separately on the parking issue from the 3 phase approach.

Mayor Pro Tem Milkanin suggested to make sure that the two boards meet together and bring each other up to speed on what they have been doing up to now to come to an understanding to divide the labor and have communication. Mayor Hughson confirmed that was her suggestion from the beginning.

Ms. Phalen stated that the Parks and Recreation board hasn't discussed this in detail but the parking resolution was to begin a conversation; there is no plan proposed yet. Parking is a city wide problem and river parking has special considerations because of the out of towners who come to the river. Mayor Hughson stated the two boards need to meet on what each board has been doing and proceed from there.

Direction to staff is to proceed with the creation of a river benefit parking district. The Parking Advisory Board is to begin meeting for regular business. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Board and Parking Advisory Board should work together on the park benefit district and eventually bring back recommendations to Council.

12. Hold discussion on council policy related to placing a discussion item on an agenda; provide direction on any additional information needed, and provide direction to the City Manager.

Council Member Derrick and Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Rockeymoore asked that this item be brought forward. Council Member Derrick stated two Council Members can place items on the agenda without going through the Mayor or

City Manager.

In the future when items are placed on the agenda, she would like to know why an item is being placed on the agenda. This will help Council better understand the purpose. Council members should provide the reason they want the item on the agenda

Sam Aguirre, Assistant City Attorney, recommended that the council members requesting the item include in the email request the reason for the item to be on the agenda.

Council provided consensus to include background information when requesting an item to be placed on the agenda and the City Clerk will forward it to the Mayor for notification purposes. If a PowerPoint will be presented it the council member requesting it should provide it within two weeks from the date of the council meeting.

Mr. Lumbreras recommended an update the code of conduct policy. Mayor Hughson stated that the Pro Tems are working on updating it and will be sending an update on the procedures to the City Manager.

IV. Adjournment.

A motion was made by Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Rockeymoore, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Mihalkanin, to adjourn the regular meeting of the City Council on Tuesday, July 7, 2020 at 9:24 p.m. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 7 - Council Member Derrick, Mayor Hughson, Mayor Pro Tem Mihalkanin, Council Member Marquez, Deputy Mayor Pro Tem Rockeymoore, Council Member Baker and Council Member Gonzales

Against: 0

Elizabeth Trevino, Deputy Interim City Clerk

Jane Hughson, Mayor