The City Council of the City of Inglewood, California held a regular meeting on Tuesday, July 18, 2006 in the Council Chambers in City Hall of said City.

Mayor Dorn called the meeting to order at the hour of 6:05 p.m. The City Clerk announced the presence of a quorum as follows:

Present: Mayor Dorn, Council Members Morales and Franklin;

Absent: Council Members Price and Dunlap.

City officials and personnel present for closed session were:

Yvonne Horton City Clerk

Joseph T. Rouzan, Jr. City Administrator Anita C. Willis City Attorney

Yakema Decatur Administrative Assistant Katie Howe Administrative Analyst

Mayor Dorn called the Redevelopment Agency into joint session at the hour of 6:06 p.m.

134 <u>PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING CLOSED SESSION ITEMS ONLY.</u>
Mayor/Chairman Dorn inquired if there were any persons present who wished to address the City Council/Redevelopment Agency on any closed session items.

There was no response.

Mayor/Chairman Dorn recessed the City Council/Redevelopment Agency at the hour of 6:06 p.m. for closed session item nos. CS-1 through CS-5, CSR-1 and CSR-2.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country and invocation by Mayor Dorn, the meeting was called to order at the hour of 7:03 p.m. The City Clerk announced the presence of a quorum as follows:

Present: Mayor Dorn, Council Members Morales and Franklin;

Absent: Council Member Price (arrived at 7:03 p.m.); Absent: Council Member Dunlap (arrived at 7:03 p.m.).

City officials and personnel present were:

Yvonne Horton City Clerk

Joseph T. Rouzan, Jr. City Administrator Anita C. Willis City Attorney

Yakema Decatur Administrative Assistant Katie Howe Administrative Analyst

134 **PUBLIC COMMENTS - AGENDA ITEMS.** Mayor Dorn inquired if there were any persons present who wished to address the City Council on any item on the agenda.

Paul Russell, 2<sup>nd</sup> District, spoke concerning agenda item no. O-2, Ordinance No. 06-11 amending Chapter 4, Article 2, Section 4-13 of the Inglewood Municipal Code to adopt by reference a revised Title 10 of the Los Angeles County Code.

Council Members Price and Dunlap arrived in the Council Chambers at 7:03 p.m.

142.9 **PAYMENTS OF WARRANTS AND BILLS.** It was moved by Council Member Morales and seconded by Council Member Franklin that the demands presented to the City Council dated July 12, 2006 in the amount of \$1,935,203.27 are hereby approved and the City Clerk is hereby authorized to certify upon said registers that said demands are so approved. The motion was carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Council Members Price, Morales, Franklin and Mayor Dorn;

Noes: Council Member Dunlap.

- 132 <u>CLAIMS DENIED.</u> Letters from the City Attorney's Office were presented, recommending denial of the following claims:
  - a) Rosa Lopez for personal injury on November 29, 2005.
  - b) James Pace & Herbert Greene for reimbursement on March 2, 2006.
  - c) Carol Winston for property damage on December 26, 2005.
  - d) Nathaniel Worthen III for personal injury on June 30, 2006.

It was moved by Council Member Price, seconded by Council Member Morales, and carried that the above listed claims be denied.

165.26 APPOINTMENTS TO THE SOUTH BAY WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD (SBWIB) APPROVED; RESOLUTION NO. 06-81 ADOPTED – APPOINTING PAMELA SHORT POWELL AND KEITH SKOTNES TO THE SBWIB. Staff report dated July 18, 2006 was presented recommending the appointment to the two nominated persons to fill the vacant seats on the South Bay Workforce Investment Board (SBWIB) and adoption of a resolution corresponding to this selection as appointments to the SBWIB.

It was moved by Council Member Price and seconded by Council Member Morales that the City Council does 1) Approve the appointments and 2) that Resolution No. 06-81 entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CALIFORNIA APPOINTING PAMELA SHORT-POWELL AND KEITH SKOTNES TO THE SOUTH BAY WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD FOR THE TERM OF JULY 1, 2006 TO JUNE 30, 2010

be approved. The motion was carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Council Members Price, Dunlap, Morales, Franklin and Mayor Dorn;

Noes: None.

Mayor Dorn called the Redevelopment Agency into joint session with the City Council at the hour of 7:05 p.m.

131 <u>FUNDING OPTIONS FOR THE INGLEWOOD SENIOR CENTER & RESIDENTIAL FACILITY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT – TO BE CONTINUED.</u>

Staff report dated July 18, 2006 was presented recommending consideration of the funding options for the Inglewood Senior Center & Residential Facility Redevelopment Project, and approval of staff's funding recommendation.

Redevelopment Manager, Barron McCoy, commented that the item before the City Council/Redevelopment Agency is the funding recommendations to construct a 52 unit senior facility as well as the 33,000 square feet senior center that is to be located on the corner of Queen and Locust Streets. He commented that the funding strategy detailed in the staff report took into account the various funds that were available for the particular project that was brought before the body on the April 18<sup>th</sup>. He stated that during that session, there were concerns about the use of CDBG Funds that were currently allocated to programs as well as Section 108 funds that have been allocated to the Economic Development program. He further commented that staff went back and identified HOME funds that could be used and researched how the funding gap could be addressed without using the CDBG funding or the \$5 million dollars that was to be allocated for the Economic Development program. He commented that the funding strategy that staff is currently presenting will enable the City

Council/Redevelopment Agency to construct the project at the estimated \$32,350,000 cost.

Council Member/Member Franklin commented that the body has stated they want nothing to do with an intergenerational facility. He inquired if the suggested funding, particularly Housing Set Aside, was strictly for senior housing.

Mr. McCoy stated that it was not. He commented that the body would have to allocate an additional 4.7 million dollars. He commented that as it relates to the residential component of the project, 4.7 million dollars would be allocated from the Housing Set Aside funds and that amount represents 12 units that would not be age restricted. He further stated that if the body would identify funds to substitute the Housing Set Aside funds, those 12 units could be age restricted.

Council Member/Member Franklin commented that the Redevelopment Agency/City Council agreed that the facility would not be intergenerational. He further stated that the presentation of funds provided for consideration, commingles that term. He commented that the body was looking for a presentation to support as it relates to providing funding for a senior housing facility.

Mr. McCoy stated that he was unclear as to what the Council was requesting. He commented that if the body were to approve the allocation, excluding the 4.7 million dollars, the majority of the funding would be in place and staff would have to identify an alternative type of funding for the other 12 units.

Council Member/Member Franklin commented that he can not support the item based on the way it is presented. He commented that Mr. McCoy made reference to an attachment in the agenda packet, which he does not have and he stated with reference to the 32.3 million there is nothing to lead him to believe that the presentation is not intergenerational.

Mayor/Chairman Dorn inquired if the presentation could currently be approved, excluding the 4.7 million dollars for intergenerational. He also inquired once the source is identified by staff to fund the 4.7 million dollars, if the body could come back and approve it.

Mr. McCoy commented that was correct. He commented as the funding strategy currently stands, the intergenerational only represents the 4.7 million for the housing component. He commented that the rest of the funding does not have the same restrictions and the balance would be applied to the senior center. He further commented if the body was to approve the funding minus the 4.7 million dollars, the majority of the funding would be in place and staff would have to go back and identify a source from which to cover the 4.7 million dollar gap to allocate towards the housing component.

Mayor/Chairman Dorn inquired if that would eliminate the facility becoming intergenerational.

Mr. McCoy stated that was correct.

Mayor/Chairman Dorn commented that the City Council/Redevelopment Agency has voted not to include intergenerational housing. He inquired if it would be simple to bring the item back next week with the resolution to identifying a funding source.

Mr. McCoy stated that staff would need time to identify the source to fund the 4.7 million dollars.

Council Member/Member Morales concurred with his colleagues and stated that it would be easier to have the information in front of them next week than to just vote without the 4.7 million dollars. He further inquired if the information regarding the 6320 Bond could be included in the report.

Mr. McCoy stated the 6320 bonds is simply a revenue bond that could be issued and revenues from the project would be applied towards the debt service. He commented that

the typical term of the debt service would be a 30 year period. He further commented that it is his understanding that for the 30 year period, the building would not be owned by the public agency but rather a non profit agency that is set up for that particular purpose. He stated after the debt is repaid, the property would confer back to the public entity.

Mayor/Chairman Dorn inquired why this body would agree to that when the monies can be borrowed against the project and the City still maintain total control of the property and use the rent collected to pay off the debt that way. He further commented that it would be crazy to invest approximately 28 million dollars and then turn over the property for 30 years to a non profit agency for 4.7 million dollars. He commented that he doesn't believe any of the members on the dais would support that idea.

Council Member/Member Morales inquired if the 4.7 million dollars would be included in the report along with suggestive ways of repayment.

Mr. McCoy stated that was correct. He commented that staff is going to revisit ways to substitute the 4.7 million dollars. He commented if the substitution is a bank loan, the body will be provided with what staff anticipates the terms to be as well as if the rent is sufficient enough to repay the debt service.

It was the consensus of the City Council/Redevelopment Agency that the item be brought back next week.

Joseph Rouzan, Executive Director, inquired if staff could have 2 weeks instead. He commented that research is going to have to be performed and the task is a little different than what they understood it to be initially.

Mayor/Chairman Dorn stated that it was made clear that the body did not want intergenerational housing.

Mr. Rouzan commented that intergenerational housing was not the issue, but rather allocating funds for a project. He further stated that the term intergenerational was thrown out a while ago.

Mayor/Chairman Dorn stated that because 12 of the units in question does not have age restrictions, makes it intergenerational. He commented that a deadline was approaching.

Mayor/Chairman Dorn announced that the matter will be continued to August 1, 2006 at the request of the City Council/Redevelopment Agency.

Council Member/Member Dunlap commented that the reason Housing Set Aside funds can not be used is because the City has overbuilt with regards to the statute for senior housing. She inquired how many of the 19 units in question are set aside for seniors. She inquired how the housing component can be built if there is no money for senior housing. She asked how the gap can be filled, which is the reason why the project was initially termed intergenerational.

Mr. McCoy stated that at the direction of the City/Agency, staff is going to see if a commercial loan or other funding can be facilitated to substitute the 4.7 million dollars.

Council Member/Member Dunlap inquired from where the 4.7 million dollar figure derives.

Mr. McCoy commented that the calculation of 3.9 million from the 8.6 million dollars in Set Aside Funds can be used for restricted senior housing. He commented that the 4.7 million dollars is the balance.

Council Member/Member Dunlap inquired if staff was going to look at other sources of funding to make sure it is all senior housing.

Mr. McCoy commented that was correct.

Council Member/Member Dunlap commented that she was under the impression that the 5 million dollars from the Section 108 loan was for Economic Development.

Mr. McCoy commented that the funds staff is asking to consider for the project is money that has been used and repaid. He stated that it is money that is on an account with no allocation.

Council Member/Member Dunlap inquired to whom the money belongs.

Mr. McCoy commented the City of Inglewood.

Council Member/Member Dunlap inquired why the funds are called Section 108.

Mr. McCoy stated it is referred as that because that is the name of the original funding.

Council Member/Member Dunlap inquired if the HUD Section 108 Loan that the City obtained for 10 million dollars has been repaid in its entirety.

Mr. McCoy commented that it had not. He commented that he stated the initial 5 million dollars that was used was repaid.

Council Member/Member Dunlap inquired if the remaining 5 million dollars is in the bank.

Mr. McCoy commented that it was not. He commented that the remaining 5 million dollars was reallocated to the Economic Development Loan program.

Council Member/Member Dunlap inquired what the source of funding is for the 5 million dollars in the bank.

Mr. McCoy commented that it is program income.

Council Member/Member Dunlap inquired from what program the income originated.

Mr. McCoy commented that he does not have the exact breakdown from which the income derived.

Council Member/Member Dunlap inquired if he could give a general description of the program.

Mr. McCoy stated that he unfortunately did not have that information available.

Council Member/Member Dunlap inquired if the 10 million dollar loan was repaid with Community Development Block Grant funds at approximately \$800,000 a year until it was paid off.

Mr. McCoy stated that he believes that was the repayment for the first 5 million dollars.

Council Member/Member Dunlap commented it was stated that the 5 million dollars was identified as program income, and she would like to know from which program. She inquired if it is City money that is just sitting in the bank, why is it being referred to as Section 108 Loan funds.

Mr. McCoy stated that he will have an answer when he returns with an updated report after consulting with the CDBG administrator. He commented that the funds whether or not they are special grant funds, are either allocated as a grantee to the Redevelopment Agency of

the City of Inglewood.

Council Member/Member Dunlap commented that it was stated that the funds were the City's money generated from the City.

Mr. McCoy commented that he did not say the funds were generated from the City. He commented that he stated the funds were on account in the City's name. He commented that he believes that the money is program income derived from the original 5 million dollars from Section 108 funds.

Council Member/Member Dunlap inquired if Mr. McCoy would have a full explanation when the item is brought back in two weeks.

Mr. McCoy stated he would.

Mayor/Chairman Dorn recessed the Redevelopment Agency at the hour of 7:20 p.m.

214.1 ORDINANCE NO. 06-10 ADOPTED – ESTABLISHING FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS. It was moved by Council Member Morales and seconded by Council Member Franklin that Ordinance No. 06-10 entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD CALIFORNIA ADDING ARTICLE 15 TO CHAPTER 10 OF THE INGLEWOOD MUNICIPAL CODE FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS FOR THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD

be adopted. The motion was carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Council Members Price, Dunlap, Morales, Franklin and Mayor Dorn;

Noes: None.

214.1

ORDINANCE NO. 06-11 ADOPTED – ADOPTING A REVISED TITLE 10 OF THE

LA COUNTY CODE FOR MANDATORY SPAY AND NEUTER PROGRAM FOR

DOGS, MICROCHIPS FOR DOGS AND INCREASING LICENSE FEES FOR

ALTERED AND UNALTERED DOGS. It was moved by Council Member Morales and seconded by Council Member Price that Ordinance No. 06-11 entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CALIFORNIA AMENDING CHAPTER 4, ARTICLE 2, SECTION 4-13 OF THE INGLEWOOD MUNICIPAL CODE TO ADOPT BY REFERENCE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CODE, TITLE 10 AS THE ANIMAL CONTROL CODE FOR THE CITY

be adopted. The motion was carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Council Members Price, Dunlap, Morales, Franklin and Mayor Dorn;

Noes: None.

214.1 ORDINANCE NO. 06-12 ADOPTED – ESTABLISHING REGULATION FOR
 140. SUPERSTORES IN THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD. It was moved by Council Member Franklin and seconded by Council Member Morales that Ordinance No. 06-12 entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING ARTICLE 25 OF CHAPTER 12 OF THE INGLEWOOD MUNICIPAL CODE ESTABLISHING REGULATIONS FOR "SUPERSTORES" IN THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD

be adopted. The motion was carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Council Members Price, Dunlap, Morales, Franklin and Mayor Dorn;

Noes: None.

# 214.1 ORDINANCE NO. 06-13 INTRODUCED – AMENDING FRANCHISE ORDINANCE NO. 04-09 FOR THE LIMITED PURPOSE OF ACCEPTING CONOCOPHILLIPS PIPE LINE COMPANY AS THE SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST TO UNION PIPLINE.

The City Clerk read the title of the Ordinance whereupon it was moved by Council Member Franklin and seconded by Mayor Dorn that further reading be waived. The motion was carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Council Members Price, Dunlap, Morales, Franklin and Mayor Dorn;

Noes: None.

Thereupon Ordinance No. 06-13 entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CALIFORNIA AMENDING FRANCHISE ORDINANCE AGREEMENT NO. 04-09 FOR THE LIMITED PURPOSE OF ACCEPTING CONOCOPHILLIPS PIPE LINE COMPNAY AS THE SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST TO UNION PIPELINE COMPANY (CALIFORNIA) TO MAINTAIN A CRUDE OIL TRANSMISSION PIPELINE AND APPURTENANCES FRO THE TRANSPORTATION OF HYDROCARBON AND OTHER SUBSTANCES IN THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD

was introduced by Council Member Morales.

Council Member Dunlap left the Council Chambers at 7:24 p.m.

Mayor Dorn recessed the City Council at the hour of 7:24 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

Mayor Dorn reconvened the City Council at the hour of 7:29 p.m. with all Council Members present except Council Member Dunlap.

132.6 <u>CLOSED SESSION – ONE CASE.</u> Closed session - Confidential - Attorney/Client Privileged; Anticipated Litigation, Government Code Section 54956.9(c); one case.

Discussion to staff; No Action Taken.

132.6 <u>CLOSED SESSION – CITY OF INGLEWOOD VS. ROBERT ARMIJO, ET AL.</u> Closed session - Confidential - Real Property Negotiators' Meeting; Pending Litigation, Government Code Section 54956.9(a); City of Inglewood vs. Robert Armijo, et al, LASC Case No. BC328624.

It was moved by Council Member Franklin and seconded by Council Member Morales that the City Council does hereby approve, confirm and ratify the recommended settlement with regards to the acquisition price in the amount of \$735,000, interest in the amount of \$25,085.95 and court costs. The motion was carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Council Members Price, Morales, Franklin and Mayor Dorn;

Noes: None;

Absent: Council Member Dunlap.

132.6 CLOSED SESSION – 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY INSURANCE COMPANY VS. CITY OF INGLEWOOD, ET AL. Closed session - Confidential - Attorney/Client Privileged, Pending Litigation; Government Code Section 54956.9(a): 21st Century Insurance Company vs. City of Inglewood et al, Case No. 06C01244.

It was moved by Council Member Morales and seconded by Council Member Franklin that the City Council does hereby approve, confirm and ratify the settlement in the amount of \$6,030.71. The motion was carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Council Members Price, Morales, Franklin and Mayor Dorn;

Noes: None;

Absent: Council Member Dunlap.

132.6 <u>CLOSED SESSION – ANNIE DEXTER VS. CITY OF INGLEWOOD, ET AL.</u> Closed session - Confidential -Attorney/Client Privileged; Pending Litigation, Government Code Section 54956.9(a); Annie Dexter vs. City of Inglewood et al. USDC Case No. CV-06-1171 RSWL (CTx).

Discussion to staff; No action taken.

132.6 <u>CLOSED SESSION – MARIA LUPERCIO, ET AL VS. CITY OF INGLEWOOD ET AL.</u> Closed session - Confidential - Attorney/Client Privileged, Pending Litigation; Government Code Section 54956.9(a); Maria Lupercio, et al vs. City of Inglewood et al. LASC Case No. YC 051983.

Discussion; Direction to staff.

Mayor Dorn recessed the City Council at the hour of 7:27 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

Mayor Dorn reconvened the City Council at the hour of 7:30 p.m. with a quorum present.

214.1 PUBLIC HEARING HELD – AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 12 OF THE IMC TO REVISE GROUP COUNSELING/TUTORING REQUIREMENTS. The City Clerk announced that the next scheduled matter was a public hearing to consider the adoption of amendments to Chapter 12 of the Inglewood Municipal Code to revise group counseling / tutoring requirements to allow small group/tutoring uses for a maximum of 15 people and to require Special Use Permit approval for more than 15 people, that notice of this hearing has been given in the time, form and manner as required by law, the affidavit is on file, the complete file of the Planning Commission is present and no communications have been received.

City Administrator, Joseph Rouzan, Jr. presented the staff report dated July 18, 2006.

Mayor Dorn ordered the staff report received and filed.

Wanda Williams, Senior Planner, gave a brief oral report commenting this item for consideration is a direct result of an action taken by the City Council in July, 2005 which basically directed staff to perform additional research and evaluate what the potential impact would be if the number of clients would be increased from 10 to 15 people. She stated that staff subsequently prepared a report that was given to the Planning Commission in March, 2006. She further commented that based on staff's analysis, the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation to the City Council requesting that the small group counseling or tutoring size be increased from 10 clients to 15. She commented that the Planning Commission's rationale was if the number of parking spaces was proportionally increased as the number of clients is increased, the parking demand would be similar to that of a small office. She pointed out an issue that was discussed back in March, 2006 and stated that the definitions adopted in 2005 by the City Council regarding what constitutes small group counseling or tutoring use, would allow for a divergent, such as Weight Watchers, at-risk pregnant teenagers or lifestyle counseling. She suggested that

based upon that fact, the City Council may want to consider directing staff to do additional research in order to narrowly define the types of small group/tutoring uses that they want to allow. Lastly, she stated that the negative declaration was prepared for the proposed amendment to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act.

Mayor Dorn inquired if there were any persons present who wished to address the City Council on the matter.

There was no response.

Mayor Dorn closed the public comment portion at the hour of 7:40 p.m.

Council Member Price commented that he appreciates staff's effort in bringing the matter back before the City Council. He stated that this matter originated because a group wanted to provide after school tutoring services and they were not in compliance. He further stated that the City Council amended the ordinance to allow groups of 10. He commented that after subsequent discussions, it was determined that there might be a need to increase the number of clients from 10 to 15. He commented that he believes it is the right action to take and the intent was to encourage tutorial programs. He also stated that staff brought up a point regarding opening up the door for a variety of other programs and services that may require a little more scrutiny. He stated that the general objective was to make available tutorial services amongst families that are encouraging educational development amongst their youth. He commented that he supports the expansion of the number of clientele but he also supports staff coming back to Council with a more narrow definition of suggested uses.

Council Member Morales commented that he supports the change.

Council Member Franklin commented that he supports his colleague's recommendation and that the City Council must be mindful to not only look at the good of the proposed amendment but to look at the bad as well. He commented that a negative element could be juvenile detention group sessions, sex offender group sessions or half way houses. He commented that those uses might want to be exempt. He stated that he would like staff to bring back to the City Council an assessment with regards to those issues.

Mayor Dorn inquired if there was a suggested date to bring the item back before the City Council.

Council Member Franklin inquired if August 1<sup>st</sup> would give staff enough time.

Wanda Williams commented yes.

Mayor Dorn announced that the matter will be continued for further discussion until August 1, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

134 <u>PUBLIC REMARKS.</u> Mayor Dorn inquired if there were any persons present who wished to address the City Council on any matter connected with City business not elsewhere considered on the agenda.

Willie Agee spoke concerning a casual conversation regarding a fund raiser and requested that the matter be investigated.

Roosevelt Douglas commented the City Council and staff with regards to agenda item no. 4 & R-4.

Michael Benbow spoke concerning the lighting on the businesses on Century and requested that the meeting be adjourned in honor of Dr. Mildred McNair.

Lynette Lewis spoke concerning being unaware of having to get permission to hold an event honoring citizens of the City. She also stated that she will be having other functions.

Diane Sambrano spoke concerning falsehoods for the dais and residents utilizing the community buildings.

James Burt spoke concerning National Night Out.

Milton Brown spoke concerning the event at the Proud Bird and invited the public to be aware and participate in the interesting events that are to take place this summer.

Council Member Morales left the City Council Chambers at the hour of 7:50 p.m.

Elliot Petty commented on the adoption of the superstore ordinance.

Johnny Inghram spoke concerning breast cancer prevention and giving donations.

Council Member Morales returned to the Council Chambers at the hour of 7:51 p.m.

Frank Knowle spoke concerning his high regard for Dr. Mildred McNair and the redevelopment on Crenshaw and Imperial.

Fred Davis spoke concerning street sweeping on City streets and the Blackhawks victory and upcoming schedule.

214.1 VERBAL REPORTS REGARDING AGENDA ITEM NO. PH-1 – CITY ATTORNEY. The City Attorney, Anita Willis, commented that the City Council's direction to staff regarding PH-1 has to be sent back to the Planning Commission first for consideration and they will not be able to bring the matter back on August 1. She commented that after it is sent for consideration to the Planning Commission, the item would have to be re-noticed prior to coming back to the City Council.

There being no further business to be presented, Mayor Dorn declared the meeting adjourned in honor of Dr. Mildred McNair and Officer Andre "Rosey" Brown at the hour of 8:20 p.m.

			City Clerk
Approved this	day of	, 2006	
Mayor			