



MINUTES
REGULAR CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2005, 7:00 P. M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 245 E. BONITA AVE.

CITY COUNCIL:

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

City Manager Michaelis
City Clerk Rios
City Attorney Brown
Assistant City Manager Duran
Community Development Director Stevens
Public Works Director Patel
Parks and Recreation Director Bruns
Planning Manager Hensley
Associate Planner Vacca

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Morris called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

RECOGNITION

➤ **RECOGNIZE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO YOUTH AWARD RECIPIENTS**

Mayor Morris recognized Parks and Recreation Commission Chair Jon Brainard and Commissioners Laura Alvarado, Maurice Kane, Melissa Njoo and Maureen Smith. He welcomed everyone and the honorees selected to receive the 2005 Distinguished Service to Youth Awards for rendering outstanding service to the youth of San Dimas. He congratulated and presented resolutions to recipients in the Volunteer Category (J. Michael Dutton Memorial) Lance Beckford, Amanda Ramsey, and Bill Walls; in the Professional Category to Jerome Walczak, Beverly Walczak, Anita Avila, Jilla Baillargeon, Lita DeGuzman, Chris Neal, Roseann Pearson, Janene Peterson, Cyndy Starkey, Mary Delgado, Marlene Morgan, Jim Jones, Lonnie Carr and Phil Suttner; and in the Group Category to San Dimas Optimist Club and Shull 5th Grade Team for Colonial Days Project.

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

Randy Argo sympathized with applicant of approved DPRB Case No. 04-64 and offered his assistance.

Paul Rippens, President, Historical Society, thanked the City for their continued support and for putting up banners across Bonita Avenue for their membership drive. In the last month, they have 14 new members, for a total of 249 members.

Dennis Phillips, 525 No. Amelia Avenue, stated he was angry with Councilmembers and the City Attorney for what they put him and his family through when the City filed and dismissed criminal charges against him and the civil suit he filed against the City in response to the violation of probation case.

CONSENT CALENDAR

(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.)

It was moved by Councilmember McHenry, seconded by Councilmember Bertone, to accept, approve, or act on the consent calendar as presented, as follows:

- a. Resolutions read by title, further reading waived, passage and adoption recommended as follows:
 - (1) RESOLUTION NO. 05-44, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS APPROVING CERTAIN DEMANDS FOR THE MONTHS OF MAY AND JUNE, 2005.
- b. Approval of minutes for regular City Council meeting of March 22, 2005; regular City Council meeting of April 12, 2005.
- c. Award of Cash Contract 2005-05 to CAM Services, in the amount of \$147,055.00, for Arrow Highway Landscaping, from Lone Hill to Valley Center.
- d. Request for time extension for Tentative Tract No. 52717 (San Dimas 18 LLC – Homeland Developers)
- e. Letter of Support from the Mayor – “Safe Routes to School” Grant.
- f. Rejection of claim for damages from Linda Dee Server.
- g. Proclamation recognizing Pastor Shelter T. White’s 46 years of Pastoralship.

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR

5. PLANNING

- a. Appeal of DPRB approval of Reasonable Accommodations Request Case No. 05-01 - Bradley and Rebecca Secreto, 1110 North Cataract Avenue.

Mayor Morris stated this appeal has two aspects: the appeal by Councilmember Ebner of the DPRB decision and the appeal by the applicants of a condition of approval which required acknowledgement and acceptance of conditions.

City Attorney Brown indicated that before the meeting he had an opportunity to speak with Mr. Secreto and his attorney, Mr. Sutton, and it may be unnecessary to have further discussion. Mr. Sutton had filed an appeal expressing concern with a requirement to submit an “Acceptance of Conditions” form and with ambiguity concerning an HVAC and pool heater/filter setback requirement. A letter explaining Building Code requirements was sent to applicants, and the appeal has been withdrawn.

Christopher Sutton, Attorney for Mr. and Mrs. Secreto, stated that Mr. Brown has outlined the discussion and accurately set forth the two concerns expressed in his letter. The two issues have been resolved and there is no need for further discussion. He mentioned that the DPRB minutes reflect Dr. Osinski as being an expert on Fragile X syndrome. Dr. Osinski is an expert in the design and use of swimming pools. Dr. Hagerman is the expert on Fragile X syndrome.

Councilmember Ebner briefly explained the reasons for the appeal: 1) This is the first reasonable accommodation application under Ordinance 1146, and he felt the City Council should make sure the procedure is working the way it is intended; 2) He would like Council affirmation because this is a long running issue and it would be helpful for the public to hear the explanation on how the Development Plan Review Board arrived at their decision; 3) A split vote. Staff evaluated the materials submitted and made a recommendation; whereas, the DPRB arrived at the decision to approve an eight-foot encroachment into the front setback.

Director Stevens reported that the request for accommodations is essentially in three parts: 1) allows a two-foot encroachment into the required five-foot side yard, changing the five-foot setback into a three foot setback; 2) The request is to permit a 15' x 40' pool to encroach up to eight-feet into the front yard, changing the setback from 20-feet to 12-feet; 3) The current code limiting the fence in the front yard to 42" was increased to accommodate minimum safety requirements for pool fencing to be a minimum of five-feet in height. He stated that the Board evaluated the Ordinance, the extensive proposal, information submitted by the applicant, and concluded on a 4.2 vote, that it was reasonable and necessary to grant the accommodation to provide the best possible access to the pool for the disabled children and to reduce potential costs associated with a pool and affected utilities. It was determined that it was also reasonable to grant the accommodation request in the side yard to facilitate as wide a deck space around the pool as possible to increase access safety options for the disabled children. Director Stevens stated that even though staff made a different recommendation than the Board, staff believes the decision of the DPRB should be upheld without changes.

In response to Mayor Pro Tem Templeman, Director Stevens stated the applicants could sign the conditions on the same day they take out building permits. Staff could also include an appended statement if they have a concern of waiver of litigation.

In response to Councilmember Ebner's concern, Director Stevens stated that staff expressed concern that moving the pool forward in the front setback may have some detrimental impact on vision and Jacob's obsessive response to be able to see it. He said the Board accepted the applicant's response that it would be a relatively minimal view particularly from the equestrian area and related activities. They believe they would be able to sufficiently screen the area in a way that is not a concern and were comfortable with Dr. Osinski's review of the general location. Director Stevens added that one reason raised to support moving the pool forward was to keep the pool and spa as far away as possible from the supporting equipment to be placed along the east property line. A second reason specifically related to accommodate a shorter distance of travel, particularly for the children. He added that while access is from inside the residence, principle access is likely to be from the front. The last point related to some additional costs associated with having to relocate utilities.

In response to City Attorney Brown, Christopher Sutton said he agreed with Mr. Stevens, however, he wished to emphasize some points that were left out. He said Lee Cromer, the closest neighbor directly affected to the east, has appeared to City Council and Planning Commission meetings to support the applicant; the Uniform Building, Mechanical and Swimming Pool Code issues raised by Mr. Stevens suggest the pool should be moved forward. To have the patio area located farther away from the entrance would be a burden on disabled people; believes the DPRB acknowledged that the pool may be located south of the house due to Jacob's conditions and forced as a matter of economics. He hopes the City Council votes to affirm.

Mayor Morris asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak for or against the issue.

Rebecca Secretto felt this process was unnecessary because what is being considered tonight was requested three years ago. She understood the concern with Jacob and indicated that when he is not in their view, it becomes a concern. She is grateful the law was changed to reasonably accommodate the disabled.

Randy Argo stated he was at the Planning Commission meeting with an issue of his own when the Secretos presented their request, and remembers their plight. He said staff has a legal method to be able to grant variances, but they will not grant variances. He completely understands the Secretos' pain and the pre-determined mindset before walking into one of these meetings.

Dennis Phillips inquired why it took three years to accommodate the Secretos, and what they were put through when they provided good reasons to have a pool for their children. He said it is about the kids, their lives, the place they live, and people make up the town.

Howard Leveau, Planning Commissioner, 950 Deerflats, specifically pointed out that he does not believe from any of the staff reports seen, or any inter-meetings with the DPRB or Planning Commission that anyone of those groups has ever expressed the opinion that they don't care about the kids, in the sense now projected. He said everybody cares about the kids, the Secretos, and their particular situation. It was his opinion that they be allowed to have a pool. However, at one time the location was prohibited by code; the Planning Commission attempted to enforce the code; then the code was changed to allow a pool on the south side of the house. According to code, they could still have had a pool on the south side of the house. The question is could they encroach on the front yard setback. He indicated that all citizens should be represented, and it is the City's responsibility to address safety issues for all people, not to encroach on the rights of other citizens and endanger their kids by blocking the view with a block wall that extends into the 20-foot front setback.

There being no one else wishing to speak, Mayor Morris closed the comment period.

It was moved by Councilmember Bertone, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Templeman, to deny the appeal and uphold the DPRB decision.

City Attorney Brown stated for the record that it is important to realize that the application now being considered before the City Council, approved by the DPRB, is different than the application originally filed. He stated it is an unfair characterization that there is insensitivity to the Secretos and their need. He is happy that the pool presented that could be approved.

Councilmember Ebiner commented that he may disagree with aspects of the application; however, on balance, he could support the DPRB decision. He appreciates Director Strevens' explanation, specifically the encroachment into the front yard which met the test of reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. He added he is anxious to see the pool built.

The motion carried unanimously.

- b. Appeal of Community Development Director's decision denying nonconforming use - Randy Argo, 213 West First Street.

Community Development Director Stevens reported that a review of records and other available information regarding the existing second kitchen at 213 W. First Street does not provide staff with conclusive proof that the second kitchen was constructed in compliance with regulations in effect at the

time of construction. As a result, staff felt that the rehabilitation of the property should include removal of the illegal second kitchen.

In response to Council, Director Stevens stated that based on information received, it has not been demonstrated that the kitchen is a nonconforming use, therefore the use is illegal. He indicated that Code Section 18.204.170 grants an automatic variance to continue a nonconforming use. However, the automatic variance ceases if the use is abandoned or has been suspended for a consecutive period of one year or more. He felt that if Council concluded that permits, records or other information are sufficient to establish that this particular kitchen should be treated as a nonconforming use, there is a provision relative to expansion or remodeling that becomes a guide against which the application is measured. Director Stevens indicated that it not completely fair to call this a duplex; however, the intent when the work is completed, is that it would be a duplex. Under the zoning code, only one kitchen is permitted in a single family residence and the definition of a kitchen would require some judgment.

Councilmember Ebner left the dais at 8:43 p.m. and returned at 8:45 p.m.

Director Stevens stated he made arrangements to have an inspection of the dwelling; however, Mr. Argo decided it was not to his benefit to have an inspection. Mr. Stevens said staff has not been inside the building and made judgments based on records and photographs.

In response to Mayor Pro Tem Templeman's inquiry concerning the notation "½ area" on the kitchen line of the Assessor Information Form, Director Stevens stated that he believes the notation applies to the calculation of the permit values on an unfinished screen porch addition/shed room and has nothing to do with the kitchens. He further replied that there was no plan reflecting where the fifth fixture was located.

In response to Councilmember Ebner, Director Stevens said the Assessor would change the value of a dwelling for assessment purposes on the Assessor Information Form if they were notified of an improvement on a property. He stated that if the kitchen was constructed before 1934, it would not require permits and the only thing to do was notify the assessor to make the adjustment.

Councilmember Ebner thought an onsite inspection would be beneficial to determine when the second kitchen was built.

Councilmember McHenry left the dais at 9:13 p.m. and returned at 9:14 p.m.

In response to Mayor Morris, Director Stevens stated that the plans submitted by the applicant are part of the original plan check, but the wall dividing the sections was not completed. He indicated it was possible that this particular plan is a partial intention of the remodel intended, as opposed to representation of what existed.

In response to Councilmember Bertone, Director Stevens stated that there was no indication there two units; however, a couple of records reflect a different street number indicating that the address could have changed over the course of time. A search conducted for permits under a different address yielded no results.

Mayor Morris asked the appellant to make his presentation.

Randy Argo, Az, said the house was never abandoned and up until he purchased the property, there were two sets of furniture. The house has been vacant since April only because his proposal was denied. As for the interior inspection, he recognized that he was not providing information because he felt he did not receive responses to his inquiries. During a meeting on May 4 with Mr. Stevens, Mr. Argo indicated that a lot of information was brought up and he provided evidence that city records were incomplete. At the meeting Mr. Stevens said he would take two weeks to review the additional information, however, the

time frame was postponed. Mr. Argo stated that the screen porches were actually built at different times and do not have the same floor as the kitchen. He stated that the Building Description Blank actually said "open screened sides for sleeping" and he disputed staff's interpretation that they are screened porches. He mentioned that on the same form it states "1/2 area" next to kitchen, and he interpreted it to mean that there is an extra kitchen since only one-half of the kitchen was assessed.

Mayor Morris stated that since Mr. Argo is concerned that not all materials were presented to the City Council for consideration, he had the opportunity to submit anything for this hearing that he wanted Council to consider, and until that information is submitted, the City Council cannot make a decision without reviewing the additional material.

Mr. Argo mentioned two other projects that were grandfathered in by the system because there are no permits on file for the additions and improvements, and Planning based their decision on whether or not it was a nonconforming use.

Mayor Morris stated that he lived in one of the houses mentioned and the improvements were built before permits were required.

In response to Mr. Argo, City Attorney Brown stated that the roof is nonconforming if it pre-dated 1933 and was constructed without permits. However, that is not something to rely upon to say there is entitlement.

In response to Mr. Argo, Councilmember McHenry stated that in 1988 there were no approved design standards and the City Council by adoption in 1992 of Ordinance No. 965, rezoned multiple family zoned properties.

Mr. Argo pointed out that the City is missing the application for Permit No. 116759 showing a diagram of a "Y" die for 213 West First Street, which he said goes to the kitchen. He indicated he found a similar diagram on Permit No. 118140 for 303 West Cataract.

In response to Council, Director Stevens stated what appears to be a sketch of sewer work on the Sewage Disposal Permit Application is related to Permit 118140; however, the application is not available for Permit 116759.

Mr. Argo contends that this is a legal kitchen. He said the city is missing permits and the letter submitted by Mr. Trimm states the kitchen was built in the 1930's. He mentioned that he has concrete evidence that sometime in 1950 the sewer connected to the kitchen. He does not believe the city has demonstrated enough evidence to deny the use of the kitchens.

City Attorney Brown stated that Director Stevens thought it might be helpful to visit the property. He asked Mr. Argo if he would allow a site visit.

Mr. Argo replied that on advice of Counsel, the City does not have access unless he consents; however, if access is not granted, he cannot get a permit. He expressed fear that the inspector might try to find other uses that would not conform to current building codes. He would be willing to allow access if Counsel could move forward with an expeditious writ if he is denied.

Director Stevens indicated that there is no question there was a renter for a significant period of time. He would be happy to delegate the inspection to Superintendent Eric Beilstein, or to bring in a third party if it gets this issue closer to conclusion.

Council continued discussion that one bathroom is not indicative of a duplex; and it might be helpful to inspect the building to determine when the kitchen was built.

Mayor Morris felt that if a use cannot be proven, the Council could not determine a nonconforming duplex use, and the burden of proof should be placed on the applicant. He said it appears that staff has done a lot of work to try to establish one way or the other what the situation is. The Council could only consider the evidence before them. He stated if Mr. Argo has additional evidence, he could present it for Council's consideration.

Council further discussed that there is insufficient information to make a decision and Mr. Argo has an opportunity to have a third party inspect the premises if he agrees to permit access.

It was moved by Councilmember Bertone, seconded by Mayor Morris, to deny the appeal without prejudice.

Councilmembers discussed the willingness to hire a third party to inspect the building.

Councilmember Bertone withdrew his motion if staff could hire an expert to inspect the bungalow if Mr. Argo gave consent.

Director Stevens indicated he could hire a contractor or architectural historian to look at the areas of construction to determine a more precise timeframe.

- c. Request for City Council to authorize staff to send a letter opposing SB 435, proposed by State Senator Hollingsworth regarding density bonuses.

Community Development Director Stevens reported that staff and the League of California Cities recommended the City oppose SB 435 (Hollingsworth). The bill proposes further bonuses beyond those established by SB 1818 which only took effect in January 2005. The Planning and Zoning Law requires that the city provide the developers with a density bonus and other incentives or concessions for the production of lower income housing units or the donation of land within the development if the developer meets certain requirements, including a requirement that the developer agrees to construct a specified percentage of the total units for specified income households or qualifying resident. The bill would require an applicant for a density bonus to receive an additional incentive or concession as specified, for projects in which the applicant is entitled to a density bonus, but uses less than 50% of the density bonus. This bill would delete the requirement that the developer show that the waiver or modification is necessary to make the housing units economically feasible. Director Stevens stated there was an additional document from the League of California Cities and he may need to add a paragraph based upon the revision that occurred in the legislation.

It was moved by Councilmember Bertone, seconded by Councilmember McHenry, to authorize staff to send a letter opposing SB 435. The motion carried unanimously.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

- a. Receive report and recommendations regarding a new contract with Inland Valley Humane Society for Animal Control Services.

Assistant City Manager Duran reported that the existing agreement with the Inland Valley Humane Society (IVHS) for providing animal control services to the city expires June 30, 2005. The proposed new agreement is for a three-year term. The direct cost to the City for the first year is \$92,996; the cost in the second and third year would increase by CPI but would not exceed 5%. Staff has worked with IVHS this year to address service issues that were raised last year. Staff also evaluated other animal control

service options. Staff recommends approval of the three-year contract maintaining a long standing partnership with the Inland Valley Humane Society.

Bill Harford, Executive Director, Inland Valley Humane Society and SPCA, indicated that he tried to address any issue that came up over the last four years, including spiraling workers' compensation, health care and other insurance costs, which are passed on to contract cities. He stated that within the first eighteen months, major changes would become visible.

It was moved by Councilmember Bertone, seconded by Councilmember Ebiner, to approve the three-year contract with the Inland Valley Humane Society per staff's recommendations.

Councilmember McHenry opposed the significant 25% increase in the first year. He stated that the Humane Society did not provide the service the public expects and felt that the County should be considered as an alternative.

Mayor Pro Tem Templeman was not convinced the County should be considered, however, he expressed concerns with unresolved problems and the lack of service provided by IVHS.

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers Bertone, Ebiner, Morris
NOES: Councilmembers McHenry, Templeman
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

Councilmember Bertone commented that he would support the appropriation of additional funds for better service.

b. 2005-2006 Annual City Budget

1) Adoption of 2005-2006 Annual Capital and Operating Budget.

City Manager Michaelis presented and reviewed highlights of the 2005-06 City Budget, stating that the proposed budget reflects the favorable position of the city's finances. He stated that staff is moving forward with significant street, facility, and maintenance projects, as well as adding resources to assist with processing and inspection time for development projects, meeting tree maintenance needs and recreation counter assistance. He stated the only change is the removal of 1 of 2 proposed Assistant Planner and the Street Maintenance Worker positions. The proposed expenditures are less than proposed revenues, while all services are being maintained and some will be expanded.

In response to Councilmember Bertone, City Manager Michaelis said he would be happy to take time out to go over the budget with any citizen.

It was moved by Councilmember Bertone, seconded by Councilmember McHenry, to adopt the proposed 2005-2006 Annual Capital and Operating Budget. The motion carried 5.0.

2) **RESOLUTION NO. 05-46**, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING AND EXTENDING THE PAY PLAN AND REIMBURSEMENT SCHEDULE FOR CITY EMPLOYEES.

After the title was read, it was moved by Councilmember Ebiner, seconded by Councilmember McHenry, to waive further reading and adopt:

RESOLUTION NO. 05-46, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING AND EXTENDING THE PAY PLAN AND REIMBURSEMENT SCHEDULE FOR CITY EMPLOYEES.

The motion carried unanimously.

- 3) **RESOLUTION NO. 05-47**, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING AN APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT FOR FY 2005-2006 AND APPROPRIATE EXCESS REVENUES.

After the title was read, it was moved by Councilmember Ebiner, seconded by Councilmember McHenry, to waive further reading and adopt:

RESOLUTION NO. 05-47, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING AN APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT FOR FY 2005-2006 AND APPROPRIATE EXCESS REVENUES. . .

The motion carried unanimously.

Mayor Morris stated that this Resolution sets our appropriations limit based on propositions that limit our ability to spend and our appropriations limit next year will be \$49,284,815.

7. SAN DIMAS REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Mayor Morris recessed at 11:49 p.m. the regular City Council meeting and convened a meeting of the San Dimas Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors. The meeting reconvened at 11:50 p.m.

8. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

- a. Members of the Audience

None

- b. City Manager

No report.

- c. City Attorney

No report.

- d. Members of the City Council

- 1) Appointment to the Parks and Recreation Commission

Councilmember Ebner said he and Councilmember Bertone had interviewed candidates in 2004 and from that pool of applicants, selected Mr. Adam Phipps, an attorney involved in several activities.

Councilmember Ebner said Adam Phipps would make a good addition to the Parks and Recreation Commission and moved to appoint him for a two year term to expire on June 30, 2007.

Councilmember Bertone stated it was difficult to choose from many outstanding individuals and seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

2) Mayor Pro Tem Templeman said while the crews are working on the downtown landscaping, merchants would like input that the right trees are being planted to not create barriers that block their businesses from consumer view.

3) Mayor Pro Tem Templeman stated that the San Dimas Sheriff Station Booster Volunteer Recognition dinner is on June 24, 2005, and anyone wishing to attend could RSVP to the City Clerk.

4) Councilmember Ebner said he will be out of town and not attend the June 28, 2005 meeting.

5) Mayor Morris received consensus to postpone the closed session matter on employee evaluation, and he stated that there is not a need to have the closed session on the Secreto matter.

9. CLOSED SESSION

Adjourn to a City/Redevelopment Agency closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(a):

a. **CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – PENDING LITIGATION
(SUBDIVISION (a) OF GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9)**

Name of Case: Bradley and Rebecca Secreto v. City of San Dimas, LASC Case No. BC298567

b. **CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – PENDING LITIGATION
(SUBDIVISION (a) OF GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54956.9)**

Name of Case: Bradley and Rebecca Secreto v. City of San Dimas, LASC Case No. BS094531

Items (a) and (b) were not heard in closed session.

Recessed at 11:54 p.m. to a City/Redevelopment Agency closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8:

c. **CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATION**

Property: Agency-owned Property at the southeast corner of Lone Hill and Gladstone.

Negotiating Parties:

For Agency: Blaine Michaelis, City Manager/Executive Director, and J. Kenneth Brown,
City/Agency Attorney.

For Developer: Steve McArthur, Costco-Northwest Atlantic

Under Negotiation: Terms and conditions of City/Agency possible participation.

No reportable action.

- d. Also adjourn to closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 54957:
PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
Title: City Manager

This item was not heard in closed session.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 a.m. The next meeting is on June 28, 2005, 5:30 p.m. for a study session concerning street name signs.

ATTEST:

Mayor of the City of San Dimas

City Clerk