FILED
STEPHEN THUNBERG
Clerk of the Superior Court
NOV 23 1999
By: C. NEPOMUCENO, Deputy

CITY OF CORONADO

1825 STRAND WAY
CORONADO, CA 92118-3099

OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER
TEL. (619) 522-7335
FAX. (619) 522-7846

November 19, 1999

Honorable Wayne L. Peterson
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
220 W. Broadway
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: City of Coronado response to May 26, 1999Grand Jury Report entitled "Implementation of the Multiple Species Conservation Program"

Dear Judge Peterson:

The City of Coronado has reviewed the above mentioned document and submits the following responses in accordance with Section 933.05 (a), (b), and (c) of the Penal Code.

First, the City apologizes for the delayed response to your office. A miscommunication occurred with respect to the document that the City was being requested to respond. As soon as it was clarified what document the City was supposed to respond to, as well as after receiving the document, (November 18, 1999 via facsimile), the City prepared a response to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court.

Second, pursuant to Section 933.05(a) of the Penal Code, the City generally agrees with the Findings of the Grand Jury. However, several of the Findings pertain to other Cities operations and procedures and Coronado's knowledge of their policies is limited. Therefore, we cannot agree or disagree with all of the findings of the Grand Jury.

Third, pursuant to Section 933.05(b) of the Penal Code, pertaining to Recommendation 99-102, the City does not agree or disagree with the finding. It is necessary for the City to review and analyze the recommendation before a City position to agree or disagree with the finding can occur. The recommendation will require review and analysis by City staff, coordination with other municipalities, examination of potential organizations for management, and ultimately public hearings to discuss suggested recommendations by both the Coronado Planning Commission and Coronado City Council. It is estimated that the City would complete this review within five months. While the City

acknowledges the report indicates the time period for such study should not exceed six months from the date of publication of the grand jury report, given the miscommunication on the document requested to be responded to, the City requests this time period be permitted to provide for proper and thorough analysis.

Lastly, the City is providing the response to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court in accordance with Section 933.05 of the Penal Code.

Please contact my office should you have any questions regarding this correspondence.

Sincerely,

Mark Ochenduszko
City Manager

cc: Grand Jury