



MINUTES
REGULAR CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2006, 7:00 P. M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 245 E. BONITA AVE.

PRESENT:

Mayor Curtis W. Morris
Mayor Pro Tem Jeff Templeman
Councilmember Denis Bertone
Councilmember John Ebiner
Councilmember Sandy McHenry

City Manager Michaelis
City Attorney Brown
City Clerk Rios
Assistant City Manager/Community Development Stevens
Public Works Director Patel
Parks and Recreation Director Bruns
Planning Manager Hensley
Senior Engineer Garwick

1. CALL TO ORDER AND FLAG SALUTE

Mayor Morris called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

2. RECOGNITION

- Presentation by Cindy Torres, Executive Director, Habitat for Humanity

Cindy Torres, Executive Director, Habitat for Humanity and Janetta Harris, Advisory Board, presented a special plaque to City Manager Michaelis to thank him for participating in building a home for a family in need, at the Los Angeles County Fair Habitat for Humanity.

- Proclaim November 29, 2006 Fire Fighter Appreciation Day.

Mayor Morris presented to **Captain Wade Seymour** a proclamation declaring November 29, 2006 Fire Fighter Appreciation Day in appreciation of their support of the Muscular Dystrophy Associations many causes.

Wade Seymour, Captain, Los Angeles County Fire Station #64, thanked the Council for all their support and said it's a strong tradition and firefighters enjoy collecting money to be donated to the MDA.

- Proclaim the week of November 12-18, 2006 "Children's Book Week" for Los Angeles County Library, San Dimas Branch.

Mayor Morris presented to **Galen Gillote**, Children's Librarian, a proclamation declaring the week of November 12-18, 2006 "Children's Book Week - More Books, Please! Mas Libros, Por Favor!" and encouraged citizens to join in the celebration of books for young people and learning through reading.

Galen Gillote, Children's Librarian, San Dimas Branch Library, thanked the Council and stated that as part of Children's Book Week, she is pleased to honor annual Book Mark contest winners: Grades K-2 – First Place Lanna Chomchai; Second Place Caleb Weimer; Third Place Katelyn Ray; Grade 3-5: First Place Sonya Fregoso; Second Place Jessie Henry; Third Place Zoe Magno; Grade 6-8: First Place Mckenna Ledesma; Second Place Jillian Nobles; and Third Place Matthew Cui. Ms. Gillote invited everyone to the Library to see the representation of their Book Mark and said all winners would be honored at a special program on Saturday. She mentioned they also have Family Story Time on Thursday, 7:00 p.m. and Preschool Story Time on Friday, 10:30 a.m.

3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

(For anyone wishing to address the City Council on an item not on the agenda. Under the provisions of the Brown Act, the legislative body is prohibited from taking or engaging in discussion on any item not appearing on the posted agenda.)

a. Members of the Audience

1) **Dennis James**, San Dimas resident, expressed concern regarding an article in the San Gabriel Valley Tribune.

Mayor Morris stated this item is on the agenda and would be considered at the time the item comes up.

2) **Dennis Phillips**, 525 No Amelia Avenue, expressed concern with getting information on a small property on Fourth Street.

3) **Gary Enderle**, 2044 Via Esperanza, asked the Council for the opportunity to address political signs.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

(All items on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion unless a member of the City Council requests separate discussion.)

Councilmember McHenry requested item 4a(1) be considered separately.

It was moved by Councilmember McHenry, seconded by Councilmember Bertone, and unanimously carried to accept, approve and act upon the consent calendar, as follows:

a. Resolutions read by title, further reading waived, passage and adoption recommended as follows:

(2) **No. 06-60**, A Resolution of the City Council of the City of San Dimas Adopting and Extending the Pay Plan and Reimbursement Schedule for City Employees.

b. Approval of minutes for the study session of October 24, 2006 and regular City Council meeting of October 24, 2006.

c. Cataract Avenue and Gladstone Street Drainage Swale Improvement Project:

- 1) Appropriation of funds in the amount of \$13,231.00 from the infrastructure fund;
- 2) Award of Cash Contract No. 2006-05 to NPG Inc. Asphalt Services, in the amount of \$74,984, for Cataract Avenue and Gladstone Street Drainage Swale Improvement Project.

d. Cash Contract No. 2006-10, Zone F Priority 2, Phase 2, Streets Overlay and Reconstruction Project in Via Verde.

- 1) Appropriation of \$71,500 from Fund 012 for CC 2006-10 Zone F Priority 2, Phase 2, Streets Overlay and Reconstruction.

- 2) Award of Cash Contract No. 2006-10 to Sully Miller Contracting Co. in the amount of \$669,500.00.

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR

- 4 a. Resolutions read by title, further reading waived, passage and adoption recommended as follows:
(1) No. 06-59, A Resolution of the City Council of the City of San Dimas, California, approving certain demands for the months of October and November, 2006.

It was moved by Councilmember Bertone, seconded by Councilmember Ebner, and carried 4.1, with Councilmember McHenry abstaining.

5. PUBLIC HEARING

- a. Consideration for adoption of Resolution No. 06-61 vacating a portion of the alley west of Dallas Road, north of Fifth Street behind 221 and 225 West Fifth Street.

RESOLUTION NO. 06-61, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, VACATING A PORTION OF PUBLIC ALLEY NORTH OF FIFTH STREET, WEST OF DALLAS ROAD AND TO THE REAR OF 221 AND 225 WEST FIFTH STREET.

Senior Engineer Garwick reported that the public hearing is in response to a request by the owner of 221 and 225 West Fifth Street for the City to vacate the portion of 20 foot wide alley adjacent to and north of these properties. She stated that this section of alley is unimproved and is currently not being used for street purposes and to date, staff has received three responses from utility companies indicating no facilities within the proposed area. Staff recommends that the Council adopt Resolution No. 06-61.

Mayor Morris opened the public hearing and asked if anyone was opposed to, or in favor of, this item. There being no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

After the title was read, it was moved by Councilmember McHenry, seconded by Councilmember Ebner, to waive further reading and adopt **RESOLUTION NO. 06-61**, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, VACATING A PORTION OF PUBLIC ALLEY NORTH OF FIFTH STREET, WEST OF DALLAS ROAD AND TO THE REAR OF 221 AND 225 WEST FIFTH STREET. The motion carried unanimously.

- b. Municipal Code Text Amendment 06-04, amending Section 18.152 (Signs) to clarify language in regards to political signs in the landscaped medians and residential parkways.

ORDINANCE NO. 1164, AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS APPROVING OF MUNICIPAL CODE TEXT AMENDMENT 06-04, AN AMENDMENT TO SECTION 18.152 (SIGNS) REGARDING POLITICAL SIGNS IN THE LANDSCAPED MEDIANS AND RESIDENTIAL PARKWAYS. **INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING**

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens summarized minor amendments to the Sign Code to eliminate confusion related to political signs in the parkway portions of residential properties as previously directed by the City Council. Staff and the Planning Commission recommend introduction of Ordinance No. 1164 approving Municipal Code Text Amendment 06-04.

In response to Councilmember Ebner, Mr. Stevens replied that it was declared unconstitutional to restrict the posting of political signs 60 days prior to an election and the restriction was eliminated from the Code. He added that the Code was amended to clarify approved 1999 changes relative to permitting signs on public right-of-way.

Mayor Pro Tem Templeman inquired where in the code does it reflect that signs could be located in the public right-of-way in front of a private residence. He also felt that homeowners should have approval rights.

Councilmember Bertone also felt the ordinance should be clarified to state that political signs are permitted in the public right-of-way in front of a private property, with the owner's permission.

In response to Council, Mr. Stevens stated that all signs are prohibited in the public right-of-way except as listed in 18.152.170 subsection (b). He mentioned that pre-1999, the code required obtaining an owner's permission to post signs in front of their residence; however, it was difficult to enforce since the owner had the right to remove unauthorized signs at any time.

Mayor Morris opened the public hearing and asked if members of the public wished to provide input on the Sign Ordinance.

Gary Enderle, 2044 Via Esperanza, cited safety issues as reasons to prohibit political signs on the parkway. He shared pictures from the 2005 election of political signs on the public right-of-way that he felt littered the parkways, and suggested also addressing in the code instructions to candidates concerning putting up signs on horse trail fences.

In response to Councilmember Bertone, Mr. Enderle stated that posting signs on fences is not prohibited in the code and if it is illegal, signs should be removed. He stated that neighboring cities restrict the use of signs in the public right-of-way.

There being no one else wishing to speak on this matter, the public hearing was closed.

Councilmember Bertone recommended that staff be given direction to clarify language and bring back the ordinance for consideration.

Councilmember McHenry pointed out that the definition of parkway should be clear in the ordinance to state that signs are permitted from the curblin in, in front of residential property.

Mayor Pro Tem Templeman recommended requiring owner's permission to post signs on private property.

Mayor Morris re-opened the public hearing to continue this item to the November 28, 2006 meeting and staff was directed to bring back the ordinance for consideration to include specific language consistent with the direction of the City Council.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

- a. Cast vote for Councilmember Margaret Clark as representative to the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority Board.

RESOLUTION NO. 06-62, CASTING ITS VOTE(S) FOR ROSEMEAD COUNCILMEMBER MARGARET CLARK TO REPRESENT CITIES WITHOUT PRESCRIPTIVE PUMPING RIGHTS ON THE BOARD OF THE SAN GABRIEL BASIN WATER QUALITY AUTHORITY.

After the title was read, it was moved by Councilmember Bertone, seconded by Councilmember McHenry, to waive further reading and adopt **RESOLUTION NO. 06-62, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS, CALIFORNIA, CASTING ITS VOTE(S) FOR ROSEMEAD MAYOR PRO TEM MARGARET CLARK TO REPRESENT CITIES WITHOUT PRESCRIPTIVE PUMPING RIGHTS ON THE BOARD OF THE SAN GABRIEL BASIN WATER QUALITY AUTHORITY.** The motion carried unanimously.

b. Approval of Right of Way Agreement for NextG Telecommunications.

Public Works Director Patel reported that NextG Telecommunications has submitted a request to access the City's Right-of-Way to construct telecommunications facilities. A ten-year agreement has been developed to address their construction and operating rights and the City's regulatory rights. Staff recommends approval of the Right-of-Way Use Agreement.

In response to Councilmember Ebner, Director Patel stated that NextG would have approximately 20 above-ground boxes at some locations, most mounted on signal poles.

Joseph Milone, Director of Government Relations, Southwest Region, NextG Telecommunications, replied that at twenty locations small boxes would be visible with cover valves.

Mayor Morris asked if anyone in the audience wished to ask any questions or comment on the proposal. No one came forward to speak.

In response to Councilmember McHenry, Director Patel replied that other companies have the right to install on city facilities; however, under the provisions of the Federal Communications Act, the city has the right to restrict the use. He added that NextG poles are not as invasive as Verizon.

It was moved by Mayor Pro Tem Templeman, seconded by Councilmember Bertone, to approve the Right-of-Way Agreement between the City of San Dimas and NextG Telecommunications. The motion carried unanimously.

7. SAN DIMAS REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Mayor Morris recessed the regular meeting at 8:08 p.m. to convene a meeting of the San Dimas Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors. The meeting reconvened at 8:09 p.m.

8. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

a. Members of the Audience

Gil Gonzales, 2193 Terrebonne, called for the Council to make a motion to establish ethics for Councilmembers and requested that a third party conduct investigations.

b. City Manager

- 1) Correspondence – request from Patrick Jones to have an update regarding DPRB conditions Case 04-64 December 20, 2004, placed on a city council agenda.

City Manager Michaelis reported receiving two requests to place items on the agenda. He stated that there is no Council action pending on DPRB Case No. 04-64; however, staff is prepared to provide an update.

Assistant City Manager of Community Development Stevens reported that in mid-2004, staff received a complaint that a residential use was established on the subject property. A review determined that permits had not been secured for improvements and upon notification to the property owner, an application was filed for use determination and Development Plan Review Board approval. The DPRB determined that subject to conditions a caretaker's facility was permitted in SP-25. Mr. Stevens reported on the lengthy application process and building permits issued consistent with the approval, and a scheduled final inspection determined compliance with permits and DPRB approval.

City Manager Michaelis recommended that this matter be added to the next agenda for discussion and requested that questions be submitted in writing by Friday, November 17, to allow sufficient time to respond at the next meeting.

In response to **Mr. James**, Mr. Stevens stated that permits were issued consistent with approval granted by the DPRB and as with any permit issued, at such time work has been completed, the City schedules an inspection to verify the work is consistent with DPRB conditions of approval and approved building plans.

In response to Mr. James, Mayor Morris clarified that any building permit is subject to final inspection and if everything passes, the project is signed off. He stated that the City is typically looking for compliance.

Mr. Stevens added that in many cases, multiple departments are involved. In this case, approval is required from Building and Safety, Planning, and Public Works.

Mayor Morris stated that a listener raised the issue on "Ask the Mayor" and a report was made as to what the findings had been; and the process began. The DRPB made the determination that an ancillary use was permitted. He mentioned that the caretaker facility is ancillary to grazing; is temporary; and is reviewed every three years to determine if it is still appropriate.

In response to Mayor Pro Tem Templeman, Mr. Stevens replied that if the ancillary use does not exist, there is no need for caretaking and the caretaking operation would need to be eliminated. He added that there has been a grazing operation of varying scale since early 1990's, prior to construction of the barns. He stated that another issue that arose is that this is the only piece of property that has the caretaker facility; however, he anticipates another application to be filed for a caretaker's unit. He added that with the large lots in the northern foothills, it was an oversight to not provide in the original plan a provision for caretaker's facilities.

Patrick Jones outlined a chronological record of meetings, discussions regarding ancillary use, permits issued on the property; fees and taxes; and Los Angeles County Assessor's records. He questioned why Mr. Stevens' and the city attorney's recommendations were not considered on the barn conversion and inquired about the ongoing business relationship with Mr. Williams.

Mayor Morris stated that the City Attorney would bring back a report at the next meeting.

Ginny Phillips addressed the City Council on their rights and stated she and her husband, Dennis, defended and supported the Secretos and Randy Argo, and reported to the Assessor's Office the converted barn.

Diana Palumbo stated this situation is similar to the situation she brought to Council's attention concerning her daughter.

Randy Argo stated that Mr. McHenry recommended Mr. Williams to him for his Gladstone project.

Mayor Pro Tem Templeman stated that the city code has in place a list of people who have to file conflict of interest documentation. He believes in homeowners' rights; however, he believes the City Council owes it to the community to have a policy in place that when complaints are levied against that group of people, a third party should investigate issues.

In response to Councilmember Ebner, City Manager Michaelis stated that so as not to interpret the questions, it would be helpful to receive questions in written form by Friday, November 17, 2006 and he would do his best to respond by the next meeting.

In response to Mr. James, Mayor Morris stated that Mr. Stevens and Mr. Michaelis would ask the city attorney for advice concerning the extensions. Mayor Morris indicated that scheduled within the next three days is a final inspection by city employees to see whether or not the applicant complied with the building code on issues of the building permit. He stated the caretaker facility has not been approved for a long term. The caretaker facility has two limitations: 1) grazing use has to continue; and 2) DPRB review is required after three years from January 12, 2005, to determine justification to continue the use. He added that there was lengthy discussion on questions raised concerning the maximum size of the unit, and ultimately there was DPRB approval. He further replied that at the suggestion of the City Council, an attorney's services were employed to prepare a third party review, which was found to be fairly critical and which began the current process.

It was the consensus of the City Council to request that the City Attorney bring back a report on November 28, 2006 to consider the issue of whether or not the DPRB approval is void by time running out.

RECESS

Mayor Morris recessed at 9:56 p.m. and reconvened at 10:04 p.m.

Dennis Phillips, 525 No. Amelia Avenue, stated the decision should be made to determine whether it is a residence or if it should be reduced to a caretaker's quarters.

Diana Palumbo would like the following two questions answered: 1) How does a Vice President of a Construction Company not know if permits are required; 2) Was a certificate of occupancy issued for the property.

It was moved by Councilmember Bertone, seconded by Councilmember Ebner, to request written inquiries be submitted to the City Manager by Friday, November 17, 2006, and that the building inspection continue, but that the results be held.

Due to the Thanksgiving holiday, Councilmember Ebner inquired if responses to the questions could be prepared by next Tuesday for Council review.

The motion carried unanimously.

- 2) Correspondence – request from Gary Enderle to have the Walker House on all regular City Council agendas through December 2006.

City Manager Michaelis reported that approximately six contractors completed the walk-thru process on the Walker House. The tentative bid opening date is December 5, 2006 for the Walker House project and the intent is to award the bid at the December 12, 2006 Council meeting.

Mayor Morris stated that an update on the Walker House is on the agenda for the City Council/Staff Retreat on November 20 and November 28, 2006, at 3:00 p.m. in the City Council Conference Room; for award of bid on December 12, 2006.

Mayor Pro Tem Templeman felt due amount of time should be devoted to all items. He suggested continuing the discussion on the Walker House to December 12, 2006. He thought the two dates would provide two opportunities to gather more information from the community.

Gary Enderle addressed the Council on the 600 signatures. He stated he is not opposed to the restoration; but expressed concern at spending \$6.5 million and suggested returning the grant monies and looking at all options, including the private sector.

Mayor Morris replied that the Council expressed concern over the cost and requested the architect to consider estimates not following historical guidelines. The architect reported that not restoring the fireplaces would reduce the cost by only \$1.5 million; the grant funds would have to be returned; and the opportunity would be forever lost. Mayor Morris stated that the restoration is dictated by state requirements, without regard to use, and it was the consensus of the Council to go forward with a full historic restoration.

Councilmembers expressed disappointment at the rising cost of materials; however, they felt that this is one of the most significant historic buildings in Southern California and worthy of being fully restored for current and future generations.

Councilmember Ebner stated that in redevelopment areas, the Redevelopment Agency could take out a loan from the general fund; however, the loan would be repaid from property tax increments, not sales tax.

In response to Mr. Enderle, Councilmember Ebner stated that a 23 year investment for the amount of money is short term in comparison to how long the building would stand as a monument to the history of San Dimas and Southern California.

In response to Mr. Enderle, Mayor Morris stated that no one thought the project could be completed for \$2.3 million. He stated that Mr. Ellinger never provided a cost estimate because there were no finalized plans. He indicated that once the bids are received and analyzed, the cost of each element would be revealed.

In response to Mayor Morris, Planner Hensley replied that prior to the plans being completed, Mr. Ellinger submitted a rough estimate of approximately \$2.1 million that did not include minimum wage, bond costs, and other miscellaneous costs.

Councilmember Ebner invited Mr. Enderle to the bid opening on December 12, 2006.

In response to Mr. Enderle, Mayor Morris replied that it is not the aim of the Council to make a decision on December 12, but intends to consider all costs before award of the bid.

3) Review Draft City Council/Staff Retreat agenda sessions November 20, 28, 2006.

City Manager Michaelis provided a draft agenda on the City Council/Staff Retreat for Council's review and comment.

c. City Attorney

The City Attorney had nothing to report.

d. Members of the City Council

1) Appointment of Youth Commissioner to Parks and Recreation Commission.

It was moved by Councilmember Ebner, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Templeman, to appoint Chelsea Shore as Youth Commissioner to the Parks and Recreation Commission for a one-year term to expire September 13, 2007. The motion carried unanimously.

2) Councilmember McHenry: DPRB matter October 26, 2006 – addition to 316 West Third Street, building materials.

City Manager Michaelis stated that the applicant made a submittal for different material that may have resolved this matter.

Mr. Stevens stated that this was a small addition constructed contrary to approved plans using masonite siding which has not been permitted on any downtown building for approximately six years. The applicant made a request to the Board to consider approving what was already constructed. The Board discussed the request and unanimously determined to not approve masonite and suggested the applicant work with staff to come up with alternate siding. Staff approved appropriately historic alternate wood siding materials. Prior to their ownership, windows had been altered and the Board did not require them to make adjustments. He stated it appears that issues have been satisfactorily worked out.

Councilmember McHenry explained that this was a difficult case that received over the counter approval and met inspection; however, the masonite siding did not match and windows were nailed on vinyl. Consistent with City Council policy, Mr. McHenry abstained on the vote because he thought it might be appealed to the City Council.

In response to Council, Mr. Stevens stated that even if the addition might be approved over the counter, the matter is elevated to the Development Plan Review Board for full discussion if it is determined a historic house. He mentioned that this house was simply on the list and it seemed that since plans clearly showed wood siding, the masonite became a more critical issue than the windows. He stated he was satisfied with the end result.

Maria Madrigal, 125 W. Commercial Street, stated that her parent's historic home was accidentally demolished and the family was required to adhere to the policy. She felt there should be no exceptions.

Mayor Morris replied that each case is unique and some flexibility is necessary to administer the program.

3) Consider Councilmember volunteer to serve on a San Gabriel Valley Council of Government Committee regarding the 605/10 freeway interchange.

It was determined that this position would not be filled at this time.

4) Provide direction to the City's Los Angeles County LOC Delegate regarding \$15,000 to provide technical support to the municipal representative on the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board.

City Manager Michaelis reported that the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments is forming an elected official subcommittee to review the 605/10 freeway interchange and is requesting Council participation. 2) The Los Angeles County Division of the League requested that the City's voting delegate vote on whether or not to provide financial assistance, up to \$15,000 per city, to hire a consultant to advise the municipal representative that serves on the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board for the purpose of enabling a more informed and effective review of the many complicated issues and regulations being considered by the Regional Board. Staff recommended the Council direct the Council's representative to support a pilot program to provide assistance to the municipal representatives serving on the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board.

It was moved by Councilmember Bertone, seconded by Councilmember Ebner, to authorize funding in the amount of \$15,000 to support a pilot program to hire a consultant to provide assistance to the municipal representatives serving on the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. The motion carried unanimously.

5) Report on Meetings.

Councilmembers did not attend any meetings and had nothing to report.

6) Mayor Pro Tem Templeman mentioned that he had difficulty locating the Lucky Elephant restaurant on Arrow Highway, and believed some type of signage on the street should be permitted.

7) Mayor Pro Tem Templeman felt that staff should be able to provide general information to anyone inquiring at the counter about a property in San Dimas.

8) Councilmember Bertone invited public comments at the City's public forum to be held Thursday, November 16, 2006, 7:00 p.m., regarding the Vista Verde project, a 70 home development in Walnut Creek, an unincorporated area of Los Angeles County. He stated that a recording of the forum will be presented to the Board of Supervisors to aid in their decision.

Mayor Morris and Mayor Pro Tem Templeman expressed their apologies at being unable to attend. They will both be attending the Risk Management Conference.

9. CLOSED SESSION

Mayor Morris recessed at 11:08 p.m. to a City/Redevelopment Agency closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8:

- a. Property: Southeast corner of Lone Hill Avenue and Gladstone Avenue
Negotiating Parties:
For Agency: Blaine Michaelis, City Manager/Executive Director, and J. Kenneth Brown, City/Agency Attorney.
For Property: Steve McArthur, Northwest Atlantic - Costco
Under Negotiation: Possible sale of property and terms and conditions of City/Agency possible participation.
- b. Property: Fox Project Grove Station L.L.C., San Dimas Avenue
Negotiating Parties:
For Agency: Blaine Michaelis, City Manager/Executive Director, and J. Kenneth Brown, City/Agency Attorney.
For Property: William Fox; Jide Alade
Under Negotiation: Terms and conditions of property disposition and/or Agency participation.

c. Report on Closed Session Items.

1) Costco Project: The Agency received a report from the Executive Director and the Agency Counsel regarding the status of the property acquisitions and the project. Direction was given to staff. No reportable action was taken.

2) Grove Station, LLC: The Agency received a report from the Executive Director and Counsel regarding the project and authorized the staff to proceed to transfer the Agency owned property to the Developer and prepare plans to provide the full improvements on San Dimas Avenue, including the undergrounding of utilities and to report back to the Agency on that plan and its costs. That motion was unanimously approved.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m. The next meeting is Monday, November 20, 2006, 3:00-7:00 p.m. for a Council/Staff Retreat.

Mayor of the City of San Dimas

ATTEST:

City Clerk