

**MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
SEPTEMBER 10, 2013 - 6:00 p.m.**

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Mayor McCallon at the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

The invocation was given by Tracy Johnson, Immanuel Baptist Church and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn.

ROLL CALL

Present: Lilburn, McCallon, Racadio, Scott, Timmer
Councilman Timmer joined the meeting at 6:03 p.m.
Absent: None

REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION

No Reportable Action

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

None

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

CITY COUNCIL CONSENT CALENDAR

A MOTION was made by Councilman Racadio, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn, to approve the consent calendar as submitted and also with Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn abstaining from Item #6. Motion carried on a roll call vote, 5-0.

1. Waive the Reading of All Ordinances
Waived the reading of all Ordinances in their entirety and read by title only.
2. Minutes – August 27, 2013 City Council Regular Meeting
Approved the Minutes as submitted.
3. Warrant Register
Approved Warrant Register No. 568 for September 10, 2013, in the amount of \$2,035,154.44 and Payroll of \$74,230.80.

4. Treasurer's Report for July 2013
Received and filed the Treasurer's Report for July 2013.
5. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Subrecipient Contract Between the City of Highland and Highlanders Boxing Club
Approved the Contract and authorized execution by the Community Development Director.
6. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Subrecipient Contract Between the City of Highland and Highland District Council on Aging, Inc., to Provide for Senior Services, Transportation Services and Senior Visitation to Low-and Moderate-Income Seniors
Approved the Contract and authorized execution by the Community Development Director.

CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING

7. Municipal Code Amendment 013-004 – Land Use and Development Code Amendment Related to Modifying Provisions for Non-Conforming Single Family Residential Uses

Mayor McCallon opened the public hearing.

Community Development Director Mainez stated as indicated, this is a Code Amendment to our Land Use and Development Code and this is also a City Work Program item. He brings forward an ordinance which we believe meets the intent of Council's directive. The ordinance now affects the existing legal non-conforming single family homes anywhere in the City, and if they become vacant for more than 180 days they will now be able to resume that use. They will also be able to modify the structure up to 25% of the floor area and if they are destroyed by fire more than 50% they will now be able to rebuild. He does want to point out that there are a couple of items on the agenda tonight for clarity. This particular ordinance only addresses single family detached homes; the other item for a multifamily directive, staff is asking for direction on that. As he indicated, this ordinance only affects single family dwelling units that are considered non-conforming. It does not permit the construction of new housing in the City. This has been presented to Planning Commission who has debated the item, and the summarized comments are in the staff report. We want to point out, as presented tonight, these exceptions are basically exceptions to exceptions. These non-conforming ordinances are designed to really help transition the existing uses that are in zoning districts that may not allow those types of uses. It is a tool that we use for the General Plan as we move forward into the future. This ordinance does preserve the City's ability to promote development in the future, and he thinks more importantly it helps mitigate some of the urban decay that we have been seeing around the airport.

Mayor McCallon stated he wants to let it be known, Councilman Timmer has joined the meeting at 6:03 p.m.

Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn asked so these are what is was and this is what is being proposed?

Community Development Director Mainez stated yes, in the ordinance we did strike out and underline so you can see what the changes are. We summarized in the staff report about five or six of the highlights that we thought would be important to know.

Councilwoman Scott stated please clarify a non-conforming single family residence may be moved or altered. What does that mean? Moved from where to where?

Community Development Director Mainez stated when he asked the City Attorney to help, that provision is existing in the Code and it had restrictions on what you can do with the structure. You are not allowed to move it, alter it, expand it, and what this does it says is if there's a single family detached housing element on the site you can now move it, alter it, up to a point, on that site.

Councilman Timmer stated on that site, you can't move it to a vacant lot.

Community Development Director Mainez stated correct.

Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn asked was that the percentage that went from 25 to 50%.

Community Development Director Mainez stated that was the third point, which is up to 25%. That came from a previous appeal, if you remember the Thach appeal, where they modified the structure and tore down some walls and tore down the roof and we calculated up to 25%. Since you made this determination we felt there was somewhat of a precedence there, so we just carried that forward. But just for clarification, in no means does that restrict the Council, they can eliminate the percentage, they can increase it, we are just throwing it in here for general discussion.

Councilwoman Scott stated that was something else that was kind of confusing because back here in the ordinance itself when it first started it talks on page two but it's actually page 10, it talks about 20%, of course that's a slope.

Mayor McCallon stated before we go any further, let's have the speakers speak.

Councilman Timmer stated in the ordinance it starts out saying this is talking about business parks and industrial, but then the title of the ordinance it says this is allowed anywhere in the City, so that applies to all zoning or all land use.

Community Development Director Mainez stated it does, it applies where there is a single family detached home in any zoning district in the City.

Councilman Timmer asked so why does the ordinance just talk about business park?

City Attorney Shiri Klimi stated this ordinance as it was written before had an exception. It was under Section B1, and it said the section shall not apply to non-conforming single family detached dwelling units that are located outside of Business Park or industrial districts and are utilized for residential purposes with associated accessory structures used for storage purposes. So everything outside of those particular zones already had this exception, and now the change applies, now we've taken this out and created the exception for across the City. So the change that is happening here is affecting your Business Park and Industrial Districts, but it does allow non-conforming houses to be rehabbed, altered or slightly enlarged or expanded anywhere in the city because that was allowed already everywhere but those particular zones.

Councilman Timmer stated there was something in the Staff Report that talked about this being allowed to happen to commercial, and why weren't they told they could already do that?

City Planner Stater stated that was a duplex, it wasn't a single family detached home.

Ms. Ondre Harris stated she is for the new ordinance. However, at the last meeting it was supposed to be addressed with the multifamily because the property she owns is within the residence.

Mayor McCallon stated that is the next item on the agenda. The ordinance that we are currently talking about does not include that. Staff is asking the Council in the next item on the agenda to give them direction on what the Council wants Staff to do relative to multi-family.

Mr. Frank Faichoun stated regarding AD41 and AD37, Tippecanoe, that's a good a duplex. He has been trying to do something and he doesn't want to leave it the way it is.

Mayor McCallon stated a duplex is not included in this ordinance; it is the next item on the agenda. You are welcome to speak then.

Mr. Dan McCaig stated he would like for it to be okayed for them to be able to expand up to 25% because for him, he has people who come to visit, like 22 at a time. It makes it kind of tough to not be able to house these people and of course they are only here for Christmas.

Mr. Kevin Bush stated this is a good thing that is forthcoming. It's going to cut down on the City spending a lot of money sending Code Enforcement out on these properties that can be put back in and make viable houses out of the ones that are sitting out there.

Mr. Oscar Parrott stated he doesn't know if he's for it or against it. The reason it is hard to make the decision about that is because 25% is not quite a lot if you have different items at one particular place. So he doesn't know if 25%, for

instance you have three different write-ups so is 25% the total or is that each item?

City Planner Stater stated the intent is the total.

Mr. Oscar Parrott stated let's say you have a place that is in a redevelopment zone over this way that's not a big deal...

Mayor McCallon stated we don't have any more redevelopment zones. Redevelopment was taken away from us.

Mr. Oscar Parrott stated okay, good, now that we know that and we are holding it down to 25%, he doesn't see the reason of 25% if a property owner wanted to bring up their residence. Especially in this area over this way near Tippecanoe and Del Rosa, people don't even want to buy in that area anymore and that's why it's so run down. During the redevelopment state they didn't have investors or even families that would want to buy in that area so what he's trying to say is over the years circumstances have brought the area down so much that 25% in that zone would be nothing, just a drop in the bucket. So that's why he's torn between this, he means it's a good thing the Council is deciding about this but if you seriously are going to help the people in that particular area, you will need to really give some thought to this area.

Councilman Timmer asked what does Mr. Parrott feel the appropriate percentage is.

Mr. Oscar Parrott stated it depends. If you have property and the property owner can't afford to bring up the 25% then it would be nice to bring some investors to tear down the place or buy it, because it's just going to continue to snowball affect that area. It's not a good appearance for the City of Highland; you've got this nice area and then you go over there and say this is Highland, what is this the back room of Highland? This is the biggest potential for Highland and it is ignored to some extent. What he means is, if it was zoned for more entrepreneurs, businesses and it would bring more businesses.

Councilman Timmer stated the current zoning is Business Park and Industrial so it already has that zoning.

Mr. Oscar Parrott stated okay, it already has that zoning, but nothing has been taken out. The properties are abandoned or that is ran down, you can't, if he was from out of state and wanted to buy and open a business in this area it's so spotty that you can't develop.

Councilman Timmer stated this ordinance is addressing existing housing that is there now, not new development. It's how we can maintain and upgrade the existing housing stock, single family that is there is now. People are asking us because they would like to improve it or increase the size or put new roofs on.

Mr. Oscar Parrott stated he understands that, but what he's saying is you are holding it down to 25% and a lot of the items that are over there, 25% isn't going to be enough for some of the homeowners there.

Mr. Angel Cachua stated, through an interpreter, his home was burned down to the ground and he wants to rebuild it again. There were no more permits to rebuild his house and he wants to know why this is and how he can rebuild his house again.

Mayor McCallon stated he believes the ordinance does address that.

Mr. Angel Cachua stated, through an interpreter, it has been eight years since his house burned down.

Community Development Director Mainez stated he is familiar with the property and it's going to depend on the outcome of tonight.

Mayor McCallon stated the ordinance we are considering tonight does address that.

City Attorney Shiri Klimi stated there is a Section F of the ordinance which addresses the restoration of damaged structures.

Community Development Director Mainez asked the City Attorney if this is retroactive that far back or just from the time of the ordinance?

City Attorney Shiri Klimi stated no, it's from the time of the ordinance.

Councilman Timmer stated under the old building code generally if more than 50% of the house was damaged or burned that they would have to then build it up to current code. Does that change by this ordinance? For example, this house which is basically on the ground and they want to rebuild it, they would have to rebuild it to all the new codes, not from the codes way back?

Community Development Director Mainez stated yes, if this property was in Business Park and Industrial Zone and it burned more than 50% as determined by the Building Official they would not be able to rebuild it. That's where he's at under the existing ordinance.

Mayor McCallon stated and if he understands under the ordinance we are considering tonight, because it already happened it would not allow him to rebuild.

Community Development Director Mainez stated that was his question to the City Attorney.

City Attorney Shiri Klimi stated now he can rebuild because he now has the exception and build to the current standards. If we are talking about eight years ago the answer is no, he would not be able to do it. If we are talking about the house burns down today or tomorrow then the ordinance is within 120 days. If you are talking about the fire from eight years ago, there's nothing there and now building it up that exceeds the time period of the ordinance.

Mayor McCallon stated because it's not a vacant lot and it's way outside the time limit that is in the ordinance of 180 days.

Mr. Angel Cachua asked, through an interpreter, what about if he builds a shed, can he do that?

Mayor McCallon stated he can't without a building permit and no building permit would be issued unless it was being built as a building, a Business Park and Industrial application.

Mr. Angel Cachua stated, through an interpreter, if he can't do it, he understands.

Ms. Ondre Harris stated she would like to address the question about the 25% allowance for adding on or making additions. A lot of the property in the area, some are only 500 square feet, 516, she thinks Mr. McCaig's property is 600 square feet, and in today's market, to be marketable, 25% of this only gives you an additional 129 square feet that you can add to the property. So if it's a one bedroom, one bath, it's still not functional for today's market. If something was to be actually added to make it marketable for the area, you need to at least have a three bedroom and two bathrooms. There's no way a 129 more square feet would even bring it up to par to be marketable for the area. Let alone if you have two kids and two adults in the home, so maybe it is a good idea to take a look at that 25%.

Mr. Oscar Parrott stated when the gentleman came up and was talking about his house being burned down and it became a vacant lot, in this particular area that we were talking about earlier, there's a lot of lots that are just empty lots. Now without the redevelopment and with the Business Park zone, the Business Park says you have to have over an acre or something like that in order to build something. So if you have vacant lots or have a property that is so bad that it needs to be redone in order to make it attractive for the area, it's hard to do that and you're going to continue to have vacant lots with trash and different things. A lot of people think because they have done some things at the Base there and there are people that come from far away and want to live in this area but it's not marketable. It's a dilemma since we don't have the redevelopment, but we still are keeping this Business Park and we are keeping people from spending money that would. He personally owns a lot, and he wouldn't mind building a place there if he was going to stay there, but he can't so he has to maintain the vacant lot until whatever goes on.

Mayor McCallon called for any other speakers in favor or in opposition. Seeing none, he will close the public hearing.

Councilwoman Scott stated after reading the synopsis of the ordinance she thinks the Planning Commission and Staff did a fantastic job on a real sticky issue that kind of got thrown on us because of the loss of redevelopment.

Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn stated she does appreciate all this. We as a Council went and rezoned this area as Business Park and Industrial because of the changing of our City and the dynamics of what is going on around us. So we had a couple of things that happened that caused us to come back to the Council to make some tough decisions, and being sensitive to it and showing some compassion we decided to give direction and let's go ahead and look at the ordinance. When they ask us if we drive around the area, she can speak for herself, she does drive around and 25% build on isn't going to. There are some places that people just don't care about and its very criminal that people own a home and allow their home to become what it is. She doesn't care what side of the tracks you live on, whether it be the west side or east side. She happens to live on the western side and she doesn't allow her house to look like some of the houses she's seen. So when they say it's going to be make a big difference, she's very conflicted, she understands there is a need and she believes we should allow the quality of living to be approved on some of the improvement, but to rezone and allow certain things she just can't support that.

Councilman Timmer stated this is a tough issue because in the past year or so we've dealt with two appeals with this specific thing, and during the process it was hard and we asked Staff to come back with this so we can look at how we can resolve this issue. As Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn has mentioned, there are some things that have changed since we did the General Plan Update several years ago with the growth that was going around the airport and the noise factor from the airport, so having residential and Business Park Industrial next to each other or comingled, there would have been noise issue and some use issue problems. We identified way back then that there was a lot of very small lots and how would we consolidate those lots to get bigger parcels, so Industrial and/or Business Park project could be developed there, and we were relying on the redevelopment agency to be a mechanism for that process. Well, redevelopment has now gone away and the single family homes continue to need help if that's a polite way of saying it, and this may be the only way we can do that. We are opening a door that we've opened and now how do we put boundaries on that door that's open and he thinks this ordinance is a good start to do that. We have to encourage the current folks who are living there to maintain their homes and upgrade their homes and if they are damaged now under this ordinance they can repair them and they can also expand them up to 25%. Maybe for some homes that is not sufficient, but he thinks it's a good point to start from so he would support this ordinance.

Councilman Racadio stated he agrees with most everything said here tonight. The purpose of the nonconforming use is when you zone something business or commercial or whatever, it's not a perfect world where it's a vacant piece of land everywhere and you just start putting things in. There's existing uses and so you have to make it, but you have nonconforming uses and allow the houses to stay there with the intent that the use will eventually go away and become commercial or Business Park. We have a planning code, a document, that talks about the nonconforming uses and that has worked well, except now the process has slowed down because of the economy and other things, and so there's been no action there. This action tonight, if we take it, would at least allow those who are there to continue to stay there as long as they want and to rehab it. The way it is now it's not allowing any rehab it, no additions. We had families that had added on and were in violation of the building codes. At least he wants to see the ability while people are still there to fix up their homes and to add on, and 25% helps. In most homes you could add a bedroom so he thinks this is a good alternative.

Mayor McCallon stated he agrees with Councilman Racadio. It is the intention by the General Plan, the intention of the City Council that this area is zoned Business Park and eventually that's the intent it will be Business Park and that's why the vacant land, we are not allowing you to put nonconforming buildings on vacant land. The intent is to build Business Park. As Councilman Racadio stated, we want to accommodate the housing that is there now to make sure you can maintain it and add slightly on to it if you want to, because we don't want the neighborhood to run down, we want to see it kept up.

A MOTION was made by Councilman Timmer, seconded by Councilman Racadio, to:

1. Adopt a Notice of Exemption and instruct staff to file a Notice of Exemption with the County Clerk of the Board; and
2. Introduce Ordinance No. 384 to amend Title 16, Land Use and Development Code Section 16.08.150 (Non-Conforming Use Provisions).
Motion carried, 4-1, with Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn dissenting.

City Clerk Hughes introduced Ordinance No. 384:

ORDINANCE NO. 384
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, ALLOWING
NONCONFORMING HOUSES TO BE REHABILITATED, ALTERED, MOVED
OR SLIGHTLY ENLARGED OR EXPANDED ANYWHERE IN THE CITY,
APPROVING AN ENVIRONMENTAL EXEMPTION, AND AMENDING THE
HIGHLAND MUNICIPAL CODE

which title was read.

CITY COUNCIL LEGISLATIVE

8. Land Use and Development Code Amendment Proposed by the Planning Commission Related to Modifying Provisions for Non-Conforming Multi-Family Residential Uses

Community Development Director Mainez gave a brief review of the staff report.

Councilman Timmer stated the intent of the Work Program when we talked about this was to address the single family detached housing issue, not multi-family, but he can't support it.

Mr. Frank Faichoun stated they have this building and they are not asking to change the zoning, you have already made up your mind for the zoning. They have no objection to this, but to leave the building the way it is without use, it causes them a headache and the City looks dumb. He has shown pictures that this building needs to be demolished or they can use it. He offered someone who is in need to live in it and he would cover the utilities free of charge.

Councilman Timmer stated if it's an existing building and you maintain it, there's no reason you can't use.

Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn asked is it red tagged or just uninhabitable?

Mr. Frank Faichoun stated no, it's because it was unoccupied for over 180 days.

City Planner Stater stated under the existing code after 180 days it can't be reoccupied under its nonconforming status and this particular property is in the planned commercial zone.

Mr. Frank Faichoun stated if it was a dump he would demolish it but it has new paint, new carpet and the windows are in good shape. It costs him money to clean it and cut the grass. When he bought it, it was the intention of having his son live in one duplex and rent the other one. Then they found out from the City you cannot use it.

Ms. Ondre Harris stated she has a long history with the City, and her family moved here in 1984 so she's seen Highland grow from country setting and areas where there was no such thing as East Highland Ranch. She purchased a piece of property under the assumption she knew what she was getting herself into, and currently now she has a permit to have her unit occupied as single offices. She has three years to redevelop under the current conditions. She has already invested over \$68,000 into this project, and when she started this project she wanted to rehab the property as single family residences, but she was told she could not. She is stuck in the middle because her property is within the residence of a single family residence that has just been approved to upgrade. It would not be appropriate at this time to have offices as they upgrade their residence. The way the property is set up, it's over a 9,000 square foot lot and each individual home is two bedrooms with one bathroom and there are three units. She is

having issues with graffiti and if the housing in the area is upgraded then it still would present an issue with this. The units are just boarded up, inside they are not torn up to the point where they can't be rehabbed, and the structures are solid. If the City could consider the property at its existing original zoning of residential as the three units, then that would be something additive to the residents and to the City. If she was to develop them as offices, she would be paying an additional \$100,000. She would like to have it upgraded the way that it stands but the only difference would be it would have a kitchen installed. She is pleading with the Council to consider her request because as the residences start to upgrade what would it do for her to have offices right in the middle of residences?

Mr. Kevin Bush stated he owns six units on Tippecanoe and he understands it is now zoned office professional. He has owned these buildings for 20 years and sometimes during this time they became unoccupied. He came down to the City and was given a special inspection permit. He was told by the Building Official he was issued the inspection without looking into the fact that there was over 180 days. The buildings are in perfect condition and they sit there. They were originally permitted by the County as six units and they should be able to be used as six units.

Ms. Cynthia Mendoza stated her concern is for two properties within a residential area that are going to be converted over to commercial or business. The properties have been vacant for more than 180 days and they are kind of at a standstill. They would like to purchase it but they have been told they can't because it's going to be converted over to business. One property is burned and the other one is a multifamily that has been vacant for much longer than 180 days. They would like to rehab it and have tenants who are interested in renting the units but are waiting for the decision tonight.

Mr. Dan McCaig stated Ms. Harris' property is next door to his property. His home has been broken into with theft in the amount of \$7,000 and it's all accessible through Ms. Harris' property. He would appreciate something being done with her property and get some residents in there. It would help keep his property safe.

Mayor McCallon stated Staff is looking for direction to see if Council would like to include non-conforming multi family.

Councilman Racadio stated his support of the previous item was to discourage dilapidation, discourage houses sitting there and becoming a nuisance, so to him this is an extension of that; therefore he would be supportive of this.

Mayor McCallon stated his first reaction is the fact that we want to encourage home ownership and not rental properties. Multi-family tends to be rental properties and rental properties historically are not as well kept as single family homes. That would be his opposition to doing it because it doesn't foster home ownership.

Councilman Racadio stated he agrees, but his concern is those owners who are near these are going to be impacted and brings the neighborhood down.

Councilman Timmer stated most of the examples he has heard tonight, even though we adopt a similar ordinance for multifamily they wouldn't qualify and be able to rehab.

City Attorney Shiri Klimi stated correct, but Staff is asking for direction so that we can notify and bring this to Planning Commission and then bring back to Council. In any case, we would not be adopting an ordinance tonight.

Councilwoman Scott stated hearing the owners we listened to tonight, and she understands the concerns about rentals, but they are Highland residents.

Mayor McCallon stated no they are not, they own property in Highland.

Councilwoman Scott stated Ms. Harris is a resident and she cannot live on the property because she cannot. To her this goes hand in hand with the other one, and Council should give direction to Staff to make it 25% each unit on the property.

Mayor McCallon asked are you saying you are supporting apartments or just duplexes?

Councilwoman Scott stated some of these are larger than the apartments you guys want on Greenspot.

Mayor McCallon stated he is asking would you like to include apartments? What kind of multi-family are you speaking of?

Councilwoman Scott stated we can say excluding apartments, the most we have are three-plexes.

Mayor McCallon stated well those are the people who have come before us, but he does not know in the City what we have in terms of multi-family.

Councilman Racadio stated this is citywide, not just in one area.

Councilwoman Scott stated so we are going to get the single family clean up their property and do something to their property to enhance the community and then the ones that have more than one unit on their land, we are going to say no, you are just going to have to let it go.

Councilman Timmer stated if they are currently occupied, and as a prudent property owner they should be maintaining their property.

Councilwoman Scott stated some of them are not occupied because they cannot be occupied due to us when we designated the zoning down there.

Councilman Racadio stated this is not to encourage development from outsiders or even insiders who want to develop a property. It is just for those who live there to enhance their property.

A MOTION was made by Councilman Timmer, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn, to discontinue any further review process for multi-family and not to take any action regarding amending Title 16, Land Use and Development Code Section 16.08.150 to exempt certain multi-family uses from the City's Non-Conforming Use Provisions. Motion carried, 5-0.

9. Allocation of Unused CDBG Funds

Public Works Director/City Engineer Wong gave a brief review of the staff report.

Councilwoman Scott asked this \$179,000 is the CDBG fund that has to be a city work project and it is not a \$179,000 that could have been used for public services?

Public Works Director/City Engineer Wong stated \$158,000 is left over from a previous street project and the remainder is not construction project related.

Councilwoman Scott asked so we could put the remainder amount to the Little League?

Councilman Timmer stated we are already up to the maximum amount we can allocate to public projects under CDBG guidelines.

A MOTION was made by Councilman Racadio, seconded by Mayor McCallon, to allocate all unused CDBG funds in the amount of \$179,075.14 to the Olive Street Improvements Project. Motion carried, 5-0.

10. Year-End Budget Adjustments for Fiscal Year 2012/2013

Director of Administrative Services Dantuono gave a brief review of the staff report.

A MOTION was made by Councilwoman Scott, seconded by Mayor McCallon, to approve budget adjustments for fiscal year 2012/2013. Motion carried, 5-0.

11. Update on SANBAG, SCAG, Omnitrans, Work Program and Regional/Legislative Issues/Development Issues/Subcommittees/AB 1234 Updates

Mayor McCallon stated SANBAG's Chair Janice Rutherford brought forward the fact they are going to be looking at changing the charter at the County. It was written originally in 1903 and has had 40 amendments and would like to modernize it.

City Manager Hughes stated the Sterling Avenue storm drain project has had a possibility, and we are hopeful it will not happen, but we may have to come back to Council for a change order as we found some unforeseen soil conditions. We have money set aside to cover this in the contract, but it may end up being more than we had in the contract amount. We also found an old part of the system underneath there on Sterling that is starting to fail and crumble so we will have to do some repair work.

12. San Bernardino International Airport Authority and IVDA

None

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Thursday, September 26, 2013

20th Annual Volunteer Dinner

CLOSED SESSION

None

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Mayor McCallon adjourned the meeting at 7:25 p.m. in memory of Robert Frey and Paul Kanka.

Submitted By:

Approved By:

Betty Hughes, MMC
City Clerk

Penny Lilburn
Mayor Pro Tem