

**MINUTES  
CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING  
NOVEMBER 13, 2012 - 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 Reverend Paul Reed, Immanuel Baptist Church and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman Timmer.

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Lilburn, McCallon, Racadio, Scott, Timmer  
Absent: None

**REPORT FROM CLOSED SESSION**

No Reportable Action.

**SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS**

Mr. Chas Kelley stated he would like to take this opportunity to publicly share his delight in being able to serve the County of San Bernardino Third District as well as being able to serve the City of Highland as Highland is a great community.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Mark Edwards stated he is a resident and a partner with a law firm. He is present today representing his client, Citizens for the Preservation of Rural Living, which is a non-profit corporation dedicated to maintaining open space and recreational activities. In a broader sense, he is present to speak to the citizens of Yucaipa and all the citizens of the County who respect and treasure local control. For years Lazer broadcasting has proposed to build a radio tower adjacent to the Wildwood Canyon State Park in the County of San Bernardino. The City of Yucaipa opposes the tower as well as many others. If a similar threat existed to the City of Highland, this Council would expect its voice to be heard and heeded. If not, this Council would likely ask its fellow cities to stand up and remind the Board of Supervisors that Highland's voice should count in local matters. He is asking the Council to support local control, to support the voice of its fellow City and adopt a Resolution to support the City of Yucaipa in rejecting this proposed eye sore.

Mayor McCallon stated this item will have to come back to a future Council meeting but the City of Yucaipa has not asked us to weigh in on this matter. He would expect the City of Yucaipa to ask for support before our Council took any particular action.

## **CITY COUNCIL CONSENT CALENDAR**

**A MOTION** was made by Councilman Racadio, seconded by Councilwoman Scott, to approve the consent calendar as submitted. 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 – October 23, 2012 City Council Regular Meeting  
Approved the Minutes as submitted.
3. Minutes – October 23, 2012 City Council Special Meeting  
Approved the Minutes as submitted.
4. Claim Consideration – Navarro Family Living Trust  
Rejected claim.
5. Warrant Register  
Approved Warrant Register No. 551 for November 13, 2012, in the amount of \$1,177,504.53 and Payroll of \$143,104.08.
6. Developer In-Lieu Fee Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2011-2012  
Received and filed the Developer In-lieu Fee Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2011-2012.
7. AB1600 Development Impact Fee Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2011-2012 per Government Code Section 66006  
Received and filed the AB 1600 Development Impact Fee Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2011-2012.
8. Easement Acceptance/5th Street Storm Drain Project
  - 1) Accepted the Grant of Easement for Road and Drainage Purposes from Lloyce C. Dillard; and
  - 2) Directed the City Clerk to record the Grant of Easement.
9. Application of Rubberized Asphalt Concrete Grant
  - 1) Adopted Resolution No. 2012-041 approving the application for state grant funds through the CalRecycle Rubberized Asphalt Concrete Grant Program FY 2012/2013 for various street rehabilitation projects throughout the City; and
  - 2) Authorized the Public Works Director/City Engineer to represent the City in this grant program.

10. Speed Zones for Various Streets

Adopted Resolution No. 2012-042 establishing speed zones on Base Line, Church Street, Cunningham Street, Cypress Street, Del Rosa Avenue, Del Rosa Drive, Greenspot Road, Orange Street, Pacific Street, Palm Avenue, Tippecanoe Avenue, Victoria Avenue, Weaver Street, Third Street, Fifth Street and Sixth Street.

RESOLUTION NO. 2012-042

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND, CALIFORNIA, ESTABLISHING PRIMA FACIE SPEED LIMITS FOR BASE LINE, CHURCH STREET, CUNNINGHAM STREET, CYPRESS STREET, DEL ROSA AVENUE, DEL ROSA DRIVE, GREENSPOT ROAD, ORANGE STREET, PACIFIC STREET, PALM AVENUE, TIPPECANOE AVENUE, VICTORIA AVENUE, WEAVER STREET, THIRD STREET, FIFTH STREET, SIXTH STREET AND/OR PORTIONS THEREOF AND RESCINDING RESOLUTION NOS. 2005-043, and 2006-005

11. Proposed City of Highland Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Applications for Fiscal Year 2013-2014 to be Submitted to San Bernardino County for Determination of Eligibility

- 1) Approved the City's Proposal for Neighborhood Revitalization that supports thirty percent (30%) of the salary and benefits of the Economic Development Specialist position in the amount of \$33,064 and supports seventy-five percent (75%) of the salary and benefits for a full-time Code Compliance Officer and forty percent (40%) of the salary and benefits of a full-time Clerk in the amount of \$90,933; a total request of \$123,997;
- 2) Approved the City's Proposal for pavement rehabilitation on portions of Newcomb Street, 11th Street, Grape Street and Cypress Street in the amount of \$228,370; and
- 3) Authorized the City Manager to sign and submit the Applications to the San Bernardino County Economic Development Agency for consideration.

**CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING**

12. 2014-2021 General Plan Fifth (5th) Cycle Housing Element Update (GPA-012-001) (Planning Period of June 30, 2014 – January 1, 2021)

Mayor McCallon opened the public hearing. It is from his understanding from his discussions at SCAG that FCD has said if we have an approved fourth cycle Housing Element that for the fifth cycle we can just take the fifth cycle and red line and submit it. Is this your understanding?

City Planner Mainez stated that is his understanding, which is correct. They are still working on the process to streamline the City's review and they have not completed that. In fact, he went to a workshop today and they have criteria there and we meet most of them, but there is some issue with some of the programs that we still have not implemented because it's part of our fourth housing element

cycle and that doesn't end till next year. So we may not qualify for the extremely fast process, but he's not worried about it. We have a pretty good element. The Planning Commission does recognize the element as satisfying the Housing law requirements. It was a little bit of a challenge. The economy is pretty slow in terms of housing development and we lost RDA which has been a huge impact to overcome. SB 375 changes the schedule on us in terms of timing to submit to the State. He says that because you are probably aware we already have a Housing Element certified last January 2012 but it's time to do it again. He would like to start by summarizing some of the issues. One of them is our land inventory. It is part of the Housing law and every City must do it and it's to identify parcels that could be developed with housing, and that housing could be multi-family up to very low density, or could be mixed use. In your Housing Element there is a table on which we included every parcel that is not only vacant but also under utilized and could be zoned for residential. As a result there are 3,375 potential dwelling units just on the vacant and under-utilized land. He is saying this to have a perspective of capacity within this next Housing Element planning period. Keeping in mind under the Housing Element law there is what is called an RHNA and each City in the County is allocated a number that they must accommodate to accommodate future growth within that planning period. Our new allocation is 1,500 units and the last round was 2,700. When the Council certified the last Housing Element back in January, they directed staff to look at re-evaluating the distribution of the multi-family R4 zoning which is the highest designation, 20-30 dwellings per acre. There was a thought that the Council would probably have put some of those housing designations too much on the western side of the City and not on the eastern side. With that in mind, we presented that issue to the Planning Commission and they narrowed it down to five sites. The first site is very small and it's right across the street from Wong Elementary on Ninth Street. The second site is the Coffee Family Trust. The Planning Commission agreed they wanted Council to consider this site. The third site is Blossom Trails, and that's in East Highlands Ranch. The problem with that particular site is that it is part of the East Highlands Ranch PUD. So it's a little bit complicated to go through that process and there's a development agreement associated with that and that could take time. Plus the property owner, Camille Bahri who is in the audience, has asked that this not be considered. He would like to stick with the medium density as he thinks this is appropriate, and Staff agrees as does the Planning Commission. The fourth site is Stan Stringfellow's. This particular site is 60 acres, and the developer and property owner have believed setting aside 12 units of that 60 acre site might be a good opportunity for multi family housing and that would help redistribute the R4 on that portion of Highland. The last site is Harmony specific plan. He noted because he wanted Council to know we considered this site and presented it to the Planning Commission. However, looking at it from the perspective of the State's housing element or HCD reviewer, that particular plan is not yet adopted and because it's not adopted and we don't think it will be adopted by the time we submit this draft to the State. We will be considered as speculative and we don't want to complicate the planning review process for that specific plan given that it hasn't gone through the public hearing process. It could be changed, it could be

modified but we did put in the staff report that we will look at that in the sixth round of the housing element so it's not off the table. The option for the Council tonight is to either consider those other sites increasing the surplus amount of lower income units or do nothing, and staff is recommending that we do nothing. We accept the certified housing element and go forward. That will at least give us the opportunity to go through the expedited review process as the Mayor indicated. If we do change the sites, it's like starting over. We would have to review it and the reviewers would have to look at it like it's a new element instead of an update. The second item of issues is the loss of RDA. What we have basically done is eliminated all mention of RDA in the housing element. As you recall we had budgets, we had programs for rehabbing, we had assistance programs, we had grants and all of this has been removed from the housing element so if you read it's going to look like it never existed. Of course with this change comes in to play an evaluation of what replaces it, what do we have. Really the only options we have are to look at grants, look at State and Federal grants. The problem there is we will be competing now more than ever with other State agencies. We have in place now an inclusionary housing ordinance and that's the third item. That only comes up here because there have been some written comments from the Building Industry Association and some of our local developers. We've only included the housing element as a program to study it further. We are not hoping to resolve it tonight because there are still a lot of unknowns with RDA and the City starting up the Housing Authority. We want to hold off on whether to eliminate it or keep it or raise the fee or whatever until we study it further. We still have a lot of questions from staff that we need to work on with our City Attorney in terms of how we can use the existing fee.

Mayor McCallon called for any speakers in favor of the housing element. He would also like to state in addition to the letters that are included in the staff report, we also have before Council a letter from Systems Change Advocate to the City Council on the housing element and we also have a letter from Sunland Communities LLC.

Mr. Camille Bahri, Sunland Communities, LLC, stated he would like to speak about the affordable housing ordinances. You may know it or refer to it as the inclusionary housing ordinance. In his opinion and in some instances, maybe most instances, they are not needed and they simply add up to a form of socialism. The problem with socialism is that you eventually run out of other people's money. This is a quote from Margaret Thatcher, a great friend of the United States. At the risk of sounding and continue to sound like he is preaching to the choir, there is a lot of philosophical aspect to this type of social program and if it's needed to the degree it's needed and want to help lower income families by all means. The question is, it needed or not? So for that he wants to address the housing element and share a couple of numbers, and then eventually ask Council to direct staff to eliminate the existing affordable housing ordinance before you submit your housing element update to the State. They believe the time frame that staff is looking for to study that ordinance given until the end of 2014 would be a huge burden on the industry. There is no way he

would get the call back from a lender if they think or know that this sword is hanging over our heads that amounts to millions of dollars that may get in the way of investing in different projects in Highland. Speaking to the first thing, which is the housing element in the affordable housing component of that, is there are two categories from what he understands: obviously the existing housing stock and then the new housing to be developed. One thing, in terms of principal that he cannot wrap his arms around is, it would align to some degree on the in-lieu fee in the affordable housing ordinance to pay for rehab of existing houses. Now if you follow the logic, this is a new fee instead of building a new affordable housing unit in a new development. So again, take that fee and instead of building a new housing unit, somebody else may build that unit; we're going to spend it on existing housing. That principal doesn't add up for him and he's not aware of any industry that has that kind of burden. Imagine for instance, like Ford or General Motors, it would have the burden of maintaining or fixing thirty or forty or fifty year old cars for the privilege of producing and selling cars in California. It just doesn't add up. Now he knows from a legal perspective from how the laws are written and all of that, he knows you can take the in-lieu fee that was supposed to be for building new houses and spend it on existing houses. He knows there maybe is a way, but it's just the principal of it that is not adding up. What makes it even more problematic for him is, if you can imagine for a second you are projecting by 2021 that 1,500 units would have to be built to satisfy your RHNA requirements. Let's assume for a second, although it's possible that maybe not probable, that every single development include affordable housing in their project and you meet all of your new affordable housing requirements to the State. Not a single dollar is paid into the in-lieu fee. Where would the City go to meet its requirements? That is the essence of this question is where you would go then if there is lack of funding coming from new development because they have met that affordable housing requirement. Why burden the new development with that additional fee when the new housing is trying to solve a problem with you, especially the affordable housing problem as we will see in the new housing element? So it makes no sense; and as a matter of principal and when you do the numbers it doesn't make sense either. He's not sure the City would want to collect fees in order to be in the business of building affordable housing. In any case that relates to the existing housing. He knows there are a lot of Cities, maybe 8-5, 90%, in the Inland Empire that have never adopted inclusionary housing ordinances and you should learn from them how they are doing it; but when it comes to new housing, we will all agree including the State that 20-30 units per acre meet affordable housing requirements. He does not know why we need more. We all agree with the numbers, and we have more than meets the requirements. There are a host of incentives that you have from density bonus to design standards to what have you to incentivize and encourage the development of affordable housing. He just can't see why the imposition of that in lieu fee would help. It will only get in the way of investing in the community and that investment is not only to provide housing as you know; your goal is a long ways to paying for physical infrastructure and this contribution also for the social infrastructure. For that, if you could, please pass this exhibit. There has been a lot of talk about RDA laws. He just wanted to play around with

the numbers and see what they mean, because like City Planner Mainez just suggested there has been a loss and it looks on the surface that it is a huge loss of revenue. Now the RDA, as he understands it, had it still existed would be a stream of revenue that is incremental tax revenue that stays locally rather than going to the State and was just robbed away from us. A good portion goes towards infrastructure and maybe a small percentage would go towards affordable housing. If you keep that in mind, let's see the loss of that. How does that compare to the affordability that would have been provided through the market collapse recently. Currently there are 55,000 residents in Highland. If you divide by 3.4 persons per household which is your average, you have roughly 60,000 units of housing in Highland of all kinds. On Zillow, which is a reputable website, your overall median price of houses in Highland in April 2006, at the peak of the market, was \$383,000. That collapsed down in September 2012, six and half years later, to \$165,000. \$206,000 on average, over 16,000 units, is the drop in value in the City of Highland. If you multiply these numbers together it's a mind boggling 3.3 billion dollars. He can't wrap his arms around a number that big. He just never thought the City of Highland, relatively small on the housing level alone, in equity alone for housing, forget commercial, there would be a loss of 3.3 billion dollars. Then he thought looking at all the numbers it includes the higher end, the million dollar homes and that shouldn't be equated for affordable housing. So he looked into Zillow further and they break it down into three categories, the top, the middle and what they call the bottom price tier and these are the most affordable houses in Highland. A third of the houses and the numbers are there as well. In April 2006, the median house was \$299,000 and today as of September 2012 it is \$104,000. It's about \$195,000 drop for every single house. You multiply that by a third of the number of houses that's a mind boggling 1.1 billion dollars. Why is that significant to the RDA? Because all we have been arguing in terms of existing housing the affordability is there. We don't need affordability. If you read through his letter in the affordability index it's one of the top in comparable areas.

Mayor McCallon stated he is having a real hard time understanding the nexus between the inclusionary housing ordinance, which our staff and our Council have agreed we need to take a look at and see if we would like to keep it or not, and the adoption of the Housing Element. All of this information is good when we start talking about whether we want to keep the inclusionary housing but how does that relate to what we are really talking about tonight which is do we adopt the Housing Element or not?

Mr. Camille Bahri, Sunland Communities, LLC, stated it goes just to the heart of it because in order to take care or remove the affordable housing ordinance you have to do a housing element update which requires a GPA. If that is not taken care of now, you will have to do a GPA again later on and revise your housing element.

Mayor McCallon stated why?

Mr. Camille Bahri, Sunland Communities, LLC, stated because it's by law, your housing element requires you to take into consideration and to do all your efforts to provide housing for all kinds of incomes. For all kinds of incomes, all levels of incomes include affordable or low income.

Mayor McCallon stated he still does not understand. Maybe staff can explain further. How does the Housing Element, the inclusionary ordinance all fit into the Housing Element whether we want it or not?

City Planner Mainez stated the inclusionary housing ordinance on its face is not a requirement under the Housing Element law. He thinks what the developers are putting forward is it impacts, it's a fee, it impacts the bottom line. It is not part of the Housing Element law and we kept it in there because redevelopment is gone and this is all we have left and we will build on it over time. We will present it that way to the State reviewer. He doesn't think they are going to focus and narrow in on that. If we don't need, Mr. Bahri is right, we just amend the Housing Element to take it out but that's going to come out of our letter that we are going to get from the State in about 60 days. We will see if they are actually putting weight to it but he doesn't think they will.

Mayor McCallon stated one thing we have agreed to do is the inclusionary housing element is going to be something he thinks they will try to put on the Work Program to see if we want to continue it or do away with it. All this is good information for that discussion but he really doesn't know whether it really relates to what we are doing tonight.

Mr. Camille Bahri, Sunland Communities, LLC, stated it does relate and he would call on his friend, Mr. Matt Livingston, who happens to be an attorney and he brought to his attention, which is part of your packet, a law suit between the City of Folsom and the State, where the City eliminated its inclusionary housing ordinance without amending their Housing Element and doing a revision to the General Plan. The reason this needs to be addressed is because you have the obligation of providing affordable housing and you are adopting a policy in your Housing Element which is a part of your General Plan. That's a part of the law of the land. The State requires you have a General Plan and you have policies to follow and from these policies you branch down on how you can implement them. You're adopting the inclusionary housing ordinance as a part of your policy and it cannot be undone without revising the Housing Element of the General Plan which requires a General Plan amendment. If you do that and decide tomorrow that after all we had a good argument and you agree with us and the inclusionary housing ordinance was adopted he doesn't think you will like it anymore than we will. It was done in 2006 when the housing market was way up there, so the point being it has to be done now, otherwise you're coming back and revisiting with it. It will remain a hindrance to investing in the community in new housing until it's resolved. The test has been done. Had Folsom changed their housing

element, eliminated through that process, the inclusionary housing ordinance and did the General Plan amendment there would have been no law suit. The State said you can't have in place an inclusionary housing ordinance, a part of your policy under your General Plan and not implement it, not adopt it and go a different route.

Councilman Racadio stated the concern he has is to go at this late time and eliminate that. We wanted to have plenty of time to discuss the ramifications of possibly eliminating that. We don't know what the State's going to do. Are we going to keep low mod housing, are we still going to have those requirements, and he thinks to just act on it now, and he sees the point, but he means it kind of delays it. Part of our action after we've had a full review of the inclusionary housing fee would include taking the appropriate actions to make it legal if we should change it. He is uncomfortable tonight to just address something that he thinks is really a complex issue that we need to discuss and talk about what are the impacts on the citizens as far as the State law as we go through redevelopment, the different ROPS, and everything else it's like a moving target.

Mr. Camille Bahri, Sunland Communities, LLC, stated he would have to agree 100%. He's not sure who needs to apologize for this coming to you this late and honestly he doesn't know what that means. Is it because we are coming towards the end of the year? But when we became aware of it and we became aware of the law suit up North we realized this is the avenue to get rid of it. In 2006, we couldn't get rid of it and he remembers some faces in that same room argued back and forth on how much that fee should be and how the ordinance should be structured and they supported you. He thinks we have a simple enough argument that you could act on it tonight, that's what he believes because if you break it down in a couple of elements regarding the existing housing and how the RDA loss is inconsequential to the affordable housing. If you look at the number down there that he gave you on the first page, you have an affordability that's brought to you on existing houses equal to 1.1 billion dollars. If you want to rely on income from RDA, assuming the RDA stayed in place, and you're collecting \$5,625,000 every year that you can spend on affordable housing. He could never imagine that you would have reached that number but if you assume that and all of it spent on affordable housing, it would take 196 years to collect 1.1 billion dollars. So what we're saying to open flea market has taken care of affordability on the existing houses. The other element, and we all agree and nobody can argue that, the 20-30 units per acre, the State agrees that meets the new housing affordability without the incentives, without anything else and you have more numbers to meet that than you need. It's really that simple. We struggled with it for a couple of months, we talked to staff and when you bring it down it's as simple as that. He begs of Council, if you cannot do it tonight, that Council direct staff instead of agonizing over this till the end of 2014. It's going to be a huge burden to the investments to the community.

Councilman Timmer stated in the staff report it talks about inclusionary housing and it also talks about it in the draft but it's only a short paragraph, a couple of paragraphs. Right now we have a fee that kind of stands on its own. If we took this wording out of the draft, where it talks about the inclusionary housing, doesn't the ordinance or the fee still stand in place without this draft?

City Planner Mainez stated that is correct.

Councilman Timmer stated so if it's not included in there, it doesn't mean that the inclusionary housing fee goes away, it just means that if we choose to reduce it or change it later we don't have to go back and change the General Plan, is that correct?

Ms. Michelle Halligan, The Planning Center, stated she wanted to let Council know they are required by law to list your fees and so if you have the fee it will be listed but you have a program to study it and so these studies happen all the time. The results of the study could affect the Housing Element and you would amend it. Every City goes through this process.

Councilman Timmer stated in the report he did see the developer impact fees all listed.

Ms. Michelle Halligan, The Planning Center, stated correct and that is required.

Councilman Timmer stated so we can eliminate the housing inclusionary fee from this narrative, well it has to be included in there, if we choose to eliminate it or reduce it later we have to go back and change the Housing Element.

Ms. Michelle Halligan, The Planning Center, stated you would amend your Housing Element. Housing Elements often require studies and so you amend it based on the findings of the study. What you have here is a Housing Element and a tech report; you would not be amending your tech report so if you had the program to study, you could update your Housing Element to discuss the findings of the study and that is typical.

City Attorney Steele stated and we do have a responsibility, even though this is sort of a forward looking process right now because it's the start of process that is going to take several months. We have a responsibility to state accurately what the situation is now. The fact is there is an inclusionary housing ordinance in the City, there is a fee and we have to be accurate about the fact that there is and we can't really sort of pull it out of this document and pretend it doesn't exist, because it already exists. There is a study process that you have go through to determine whether it's still justified, whether another number is justified or there are other mechanisms that may be better suited to Highland than this ordinance, but it's not an easy solution.

Councilman Racadio stated what he is hearing here is this can be done; it's not a major issue to change if we want to change in the future but then he's hearing from the developer that it is.

City Attorney Steele stated it requires a process. Part of the program that is laid out in the plan that is before you is to go through that study process and as our consultant has said, its something that Cities do all the time.

Mr. Carlos Rodriguez, Building Industry Association, stated he thinks we have a simple solution to an otherwise complex issue before us. What we have is a desire as an industry to work with you and your staff to have a Housing Element that passes with flying colors by HCD. We are committed and want to make sure there is housing for the affluent, housing for folks who are struggling economically, we want to make sure you have a Housing Element that stands on its own. What we ask is that today rather than submit the draft as currently constituted, there is up till October 2013, so we do have some time. What we would ask is to let us take a step back, have the draft, direct staff to explore open market alternatives solutions to inclusionary zoning and let's get something submitted to HCD the first time so we don't have to come back later on in 2014. We stand ready to work with you and your staff to look at market solutions. We submitted a letter to begin the dialogue and have a very productive discussion with staff, which was appreciated. We believe as highlighted by the Councilman earlier that you have very talented staff that are committed, pro-business Council and we can work together. We don't need to submit the draft and approve it tonight and then have HCD look at it and comment and then later on in the process, to study inclusionary zoning and then have to tell them never mind, we want to pull it out. Let's get it right the first time. If we can't find an open market solution to inclusionary zoning then so be it but at least give them an opportunity to work with Council and staff. Let's roll up our sleeves and come back in early 2013 with something to consider which would be an alternative to inclusionary zoning.

Mayor McCallon stated what is the problem with submitting the approved fourth Housing Element, redlined, as is, and getting it approved? Then we have the fifth Housing Element that is approved and amended as we do something with inclusionary housing ordinance, what is wrong with that approach?

Mr. Carlos Rodriguez, Building Industry Association, stated well he would just highlight the issue with inclusionary zoning for a moment which is highlighted by HCD themselves. In the letter from HCD it states some inclusionary zoning programs may have the potential to negatively impact the overall development of housing.

Mayor McCallon stated he understands that and we are committed, Staff and Council, we want to look at the inclusionary housing ordinance and do something with it but do we want to do it tonight or over the next couple of weeks, its going to be a process we have to go through. Rather than delaying submittal of Housing Element which has a 2-3 months process, it has to go to Planning Commission and Council, October comes rather quickly. He is trying to understand why it's not okay to submit the redlined version of our approved Housing Element which HCD said we can do and then amend it if we decide to get rid of inclusionary housing ordinance.

Mr. Carlos Rodriguez, Building Industry Association, stated it's really the opportunity to have the best draft submitted to HCD and they believe if they were permitted to have some additional time to work with staff and to direct staff to look at other alternatives. We can get this draft updated now, not wait, not submit it to HCD and go through the grinding bureaucracy and the process, Let's get the product done correctly the first time. We have the opportunity now to work on it together. The Industry is here, let's roll up our sleeves, and give us some time to work with you.

Mayor McCallon stated we do want to work with you but whether it has to be done before or after is the question.

Mr. Carlos Rodriguez, Building Industry Association, stated we are eleven months from the time it's due.

Mayor McCallon stated how long did it take us to get the fourth approved?

Mr. Carlos Rodriguez, Building Industry Association, stated we are just looking at one section of the Housing Element and they are going to look at the draft and say okay, here's how they are handling affordable housing. So why give them something which is already agreed upon, it's not the best approach.

City Attorney Steele stated we have not agreed on anything, let's make that clear.

City Manager Hughes stated a statement has been made that we have already agreed that the affordable housing ordinance is not the way to go, it has not been agreed to.

Mayor McCallon stated that has not been agreed upon, that is correct. We have not agreed that that is not the way to go.

Mr. Carlos Rodriguez, Building Industry Association, stated he was just reading between the lines with respect to the lack of pureness to pass it back in 2006 and the willingness to study it. It implies there are some questions about it, so, okay. The likelihood of HCD seeing the draft in front of them saying inclusionary zoning and then coming back at a subsequent time and pulling that is going to raise concerns that really aren't necessary.

Mayor McCallon stated they may go ahead and approve our Housing Element as is and then we can amend it later.

Mr. Carlos Rodriguez, Building Industry Association, stated and we can continue to be status quo and see the market hit with an ordinance that is hurting the opportunity for development.

Mayor McCallon stated and he understands this but we are speaking about the inclusionary housing ordinance and we are going to take a look at it. We have made a commitment to do that but it's not going to be over the next month is the problem.

Mr. Carlos Rodriguez, Building Industry Association, stated again, he doesn't think it would necessarily be a problem with respect to some of the solutions they have proposed and that they believe, in short order, and could turn this issue right around. It's really a crossroad and they believe not having to subsequently go back and make amendments, why go through that if you can avoid it by just allowing them some additional time to work with staff to submit to Council a more updated and stronger Housing Element to propose to HCD.

Mr. Matt Livingston, Glenrose Ranch, stated he also would like to echo the passionate comments from Mr. Bahri and Mr. Rodriguez. He won't address the point that they are against inclusionary housing ordinance, as it seems this will be addressed another day. He would add a couple of clarifications points. Mr. Bahri mentioned the case of the Sacramento Housing Alliance vs. Folsom and he thinks what this case found was pretty specific. What the City of Folsom tried to do was to eliminate the inclusionary housing ordinance without amending their General Plan, and the reason this was an issue was because their inclusionary housing ordinance was an implementation to their Housing Element. So their Housing Element said they were going to do this and this and fund it with fees from their inclusionary housing ordinance. So once they eliminated that funding mechanism the whole thing fell apart. Community Development Director Jaquess and he had an opportunity to talk about this several months ago and to him this seems like the opportune time to address it because why go through this process twice. He has never negotiated a Housing Element with the State but from what he has heard is they are difficult to deal with and they are demanding. He thinks if you were to show them a draft or if you got your Housing Element approved and then you came back a few months later and said we're just going to do the same thing but eliminate the inclusionary housing ordinance, if that's what you decide, is the right course of action. He thinks so little time has passed and

without showing several other funding mechanisms, he can't imagine that they will look at that too favorably because they will say how are you going to make up for all these lost funds. He thinks today, you've had great arguments, all the points that Mr. Bahri made are that affordability is not an issue and we've changed the zoning to offer higher zoning to address the issues and staff has done a great job addressing it in other ways. If you try and renegotiate that in a few months, he thinks its going to be really challenging. He really appreciates staff recommending the study be done and he firmly believes this is the time to do it. Taking a month or two months will still leave you plenty of time. Barring the housing market jumping up by a large amount, what most developers will do if that issue won't be decided for two years, is people will just stop. People will just wait and say that's a meaningful issue, let's see how this gets resolved before I go forward with my project. He thinks it would have the exact opposite effect of what everyone is trying to accomplish which is to jump-start the economy in Highland.

Mr. Stan Stringfellow, Greenspot Partners Inc., stated we have been working with staff and have requested that a portion of that site be included in higher density housing. The owners of this property are very supportive.

Mayor McCallon stated which property are you speaking of?

Mr. Stan Stringfellow, Greenspot Partners Inc., stated the 60 acre site just south of Greenspot, northeast of Church. They are very agreeable to have a portion of that property included. They actually have a map prepared to submit on that property and they have left a portion of it out of the map and are currently doing a land plan that will be coming into the City shortly to allow them to take a look at it and see how that may be included in a higher density. He has been listening to this argument and the gentlemen who spoke and have been sending him emails, keeping him updated but he has been involved in another project that's taking most of his time and he's not as familiar with all the details of this conversation. He will say this, he has been dealing with several cities and he can tell you that this dissolution of these redevelopment agencies has caused great difficulty for all the Cities and how to deal with it has been a real difficult problem. The State Treasurer thought there was like 3 billion dollars available in these redevelopment agencies and they are going to the Legislature now and saying for every \$2 we thought you were going to get, you're only going to get .40 cents. He knows they went through the first audit of redevelopment agencies and swept a lot of the monies and now they are coming back a second time because they didn't get as much money as they want. They are even at this time interfering with contracts for projects that had funds previously committed. So, it's a real problem for staff, for cities, and how to deal with this has brought all this to forefront. In a practical sense, why Council should probably take just enough time to look at this, as a developer, if he brought a project in to the City and brought a development plan but 60 days from now I think I will have a better one but I would like you to approve this right now. He wouldn't get an approval vote from Council; you would say you want to see the better plan first. He thinks from

their side, they are asking Council to do the same thing that you would ask us to do. There may be a better plan here and rather than go through some amendment process, take the time to take the extra 60 or 90 days to actually study this and maybe articulate a time schedule. It is apparent from these gentlemen who have already spoken that they think there is plenty of time to look at this issue and still comply with the submission requirement to the State. To look at this maybe the same way, you might look at one of their requests for a project.

Mr. Glenn Elssmann, Mission Development Company, stated he is impressed with the thoughtful dialogue on this very important issue. He can assure Council that if the Housing Element gets submitted to the State, that train has left. To try and stop it, try to pull it back is only going to add delays and you are going to hear in four to five months we don't have time to fix it. He is hearing over and over again is that it doesn't have to be submitted this week, there is time to get this fixed towards the beginning of the year and its impact will be thoughtful and ultimately he thinks in everyone's best interest. So he would like to echo maybe just continue it to next week until we can get maybe some tighter answers and some tighter schedules and then have the opportunity to make a more completely informed decision. He thinks waiting will hurt this process.

Mayor McCallon called for any other speakers in favor or in opposition of this item; hearing none, the public hearing is now closed.

Councilwoman Scott stated on page 7, where it talks about the steps, step one says it's going to be submitted, if approved, November 2012 and then step two says receiving the response in January, well that's not 90 days. Each one is 60 days actually. Over on page 8, under A, third paragraph down, it talks about the City's land inventory indicating the potential for accommodating 3,375 new housing units. Is that including the Harmony project?

City Planner Mainez stated no, it does not include the Harmony project.

Councilwoman Scott stated so this is basically, even though they are in Highland, this is not including that project and yet on the following page, page 11, it talks about inclusionary housing fee ordinance you are counting 1,500 as being RHNA housing and that's almost half of the 3,000, not including Harmony and she's not understanding that. Harmony is what 2,500?

City Planner Mainez stated Harmony is 3,600 units.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated the 1,500 is just the RHNA number, it has nothing to do with capacity in the City. It's the RHNA number that we have been assigned by SCAG. It's really not a comparable number back to the 3,000.

Councilwoman Scott stated that number we already have, right, she means that's in what we have now that is good till 2014.

City Planner Mainez stated the RHNA number is good from January 2014 to sometime 2021.

Councilwoman Scott stated what is our number now?

City Planner Mainez stated 2,784 and we got certified because we were able to re-zone parcels to our four to accommodate that 27/80.

Councilwoman Scott stated so we are already above.

City Planner Mainez stated we're already above, that is correct.

Councilwoman Scott stated what we have now is valid till 2014, right?

City Planner Mainez stated that is correct.

Councilwoman Scott stated we have absolutely no idea what the State is going to be doing in the next year and she really doesn't see a need to open a can of worms. Right now we have empty, extremely affordable homes in Highland, all over, without having any built. She keeps thinking when you have a glut of affordable homes; you have major increases in your services, your fire, your police, your paramedics and your schools. She doesn't see any sense in doing it right now.

City Planner Mainez stated one of Councilwoman Scott's comments was she was looking at the schedule on page 7 and she is correct it should be 60 days, instead of 90 days. You have heard some comments about a deadline in October of 2013, which is a deadline to have a Housing Element adopted by City Council.

Councilman Timmer stated based on a point Councilwoman Scott made, if we are going to submit this in November 2012 to HCD that's still a ways off. If we adopt the plan today but don't submit it and then as we do our inclusionary housing study and find out we want to change it, we could still make changes to the draft, right?

City Planner Mainez stated that is correct.

Councilman Timmer stated and still be submitted by November 2012.

City Planner Mainez stated November 2012 is this month. Actually when we submit this month we are actually doing an initial submittal, they are aware this is draft. We will actually call our reviewer and talk about this. They know it's a first attempt.

Councilman Timmer stated one thing is we have an opportunity to take care of this and get it through the system rather quickly if we don't make a bunch of changes. That would be his position that Council take our current R4 zoning as it's in the current plan and roll it over to the 2014/2021 and just put it through the system and if we need to change it we contact the consultant we hired to put us through this process. It isn't a difficult process and it's done all the time. He doesn't see the urgency. His concern is he would hate to react and change something now and things are still changing with redevelopment as we go, everyday, and then find out we have to go back and revisit this. He would rather give it some time to really explore the data and look at what we are doing. He remembers when Council first talked about inclusionary housing in 2006 we were throwing numbers around like \$66,000 per unit and we compromised down to \$37,000. Whether it's still practical now to have that, which is what the analysis will do. He wouldn't feel comfortable just doing this without some data to support what we are doing and why we are doing it. Staff has indicated they will make it one of our Work Program items and the process starts in January. Depending on this Council, we would say we want it done in 90 days or whatever the time frame is to do that. His recommendation is to go with what the current fourth year plan is, approved, go forward with that and just implement it as it is today.

Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn stated she doesn't recall seeing these, 1-5, on the additional sites. Is that something the Planning Commission did? Did they go through and edit it?

City Planner Mainez stated these are something new. We did not include this in the Housing Element, this is a separate discussion. If the motion stands, these additional sites will not be included in the Housing Element.

Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn stated she understands where we are and how we come up with the inclusionary. She too is going to support going forward.

Councilman Racadio stated the worst situation we could be in, is if things continue to move slowly in government and we get there and we are stuck and have to make a decision. It just makes for bad decisions. Whereas if we act now, and he knows there are concerns and he appreciates it, but it might raise eyebrows up in Sacramento with us submitting it, but we just let them know we are looking at this and we possibly may change our inclusionary fees. Rather than this is a project that you come to the Council for approval, he looks at it as decisions to move forward. He agrees with going forward.

Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn stated have we used in-lieu fees for housing projects?

City Planner Mainez stated no.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated we actually have suggested that some thought be given to our Work Program to evaluate how to actually allocate the money that already has been collected. That has to be spent at some point and time.

Councilman Timmer stated on page 90 and page 91, it's talking about parking requirements. One of the things City Council did very early on as a City was to develop some very good apartment standards and if you look at table 8:20 and look at all the different land uses as far as R2 and R4 and so on, no where does it talk about including garages in many of those parking. Some do, single family does but in apartments, the City Council adopted washer and dryer in apartments and those kinds of things. He would think we would want to clarify on this particular parking requirement section of this draft that the City has higher density standards that require garages and some other things. So it's very clear so if someone reads it and they were going to build a multi-family R4 they may have to put in some garages.

City Planner Mainez stated so noted by staff.

Councilwoman Scott stated she is not against this special meeting or workshop meeting on this.

Mayor McCallon stated the motion, as he understands it, is to go ahead and submit the approved fourth element cycle.

Councilwoman Scott stated the motion is to approve it. She thought it was to delay it till we could vote again. She withdraws her second. Why would we want to submit something before we clean it up?

Mayor McCallon stated we are going to clean it up.

Councilwoman Scott stated the motion was to submit it, she thought we were going to clean it before we submitted it.

Mayor McCallon stated what does clean up mean to you?

Councilwoman Scott stated such as Councilman Timmer stated. So how are they going to know page by page what things?

Councilman Timmer stated that was the only page he specified clean up on, if that's your term. That was the only thing he found that doesn't reflect of what we have done in the past.

Councilwoman Scott stated the minute this is sent in; even though some of those properties are not zoned they will automatically be zoned?

Mayor McCallon stated those properties are not included. There are no changes to the current zoning. What we are going to submit is the current approved Housing Element, redlined to make some changes but not changing any of the zoning or any of that, just to clarify and submit as a draft.

Councilwoman Scott stated and if it's accepted then we have to change the zoning.

Mayor McCallon stated no, there is no zoning change at all because we've already changed the zoning.

Councilman Timmer stated if you look at the colored map, Attachment C, basically the orange ones are the ones included in today's plan that is approved. The green ones were being asked to consider but we are saying we are going to go forward with the old plan, which is the orange parts of the map.

Councilwoman Scott stated the green ones are already R4 and so forth?

Mayor McCallon stated we are not including those.

Councilwoman Scott stated when do we have to update the General Plan?

City Planner Mainez stated you just adopted 2006 and generally every ten, fifteen, twenty years. We look at it every year in your annual report.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated if you are talking the whole General Plan there is no statutory requirement for review. It's more of a local policy decision. If you are talking Housing Element, if this Housing Element that you are dealing with tonight is adopted by October 2013, formally, then it's good for eight years. If we don't get it adopted by October then we have to redo it in four years but 2021 would be the statutory round of the next Housing Element review.

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

- 1) Review and provide comments, as appropriate, on the 2014-2021 Fifth (5th) Cycle Housing Element Update; and
- 2) Direct staff to submit the 2014-2021 Fifth (5th) Cycle Housing Element Update to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for their initial review and approval and with clarification of table 8.2 and include as part of the Work Program. Motion carried, 4-1, with Councilwoman Scott dissenting.

## CITY COUNCIL LEGISLATIVE

### 13. Loan Agreement with Greenspot Village and Marketplace

Community Development Director Jaquess stated before you tonight is a request from the property owner of Greenspot Village and Marketplace for a deferral of fees so that the specific plan and its related environmental impact report can be completed without additional out of pocket expense immediately by the applicant for those fees. Staff has worked with the applicant and done an internal review and determined that we believe approximately \$100,000 would be the amount of money that would be appropriate for a fee deferral to cover the costs that either are already incurred or will be incurred in the next few months. We have also indentified though that the fee deferral would be supported by a note and a trust deed and in effort to make sure that the loan is secured and in first place on the title that it would be appropriate for us to resolve any existing liens against the property. The only lien we have indentified is a tax lien for taxes that go back to 2009 and it involves about roughly \$16,000. We are also recommending that the loan amount include funding for the subsequent year taxes for the life of the loan so that we don't have to put ourselves behind again in the future during the life of our loan and also to pay for a title policy. Working with the City Attorney's office who drafted the loan, it is estimated we project that the loan amount would be appropriate in the amount of \$130,000 to cover those costs and obligations.

Councilwoman Scott stated does this include interest?

Community Development Director Jaquess stated no. The recommendation from the Subcommittee who reviewed this request is that the interest rate should be the local LAIF rate. The material that was attached to the staff report was a draft of the loan agreement that was available to staff on Tuesday of last week. Staff and the applicant and his attorney and our attorney continued to work on that language and review it up until Friday. On Friday he got an email stating here is the updated draft which includes information from the title report as well. In front of you, an updated version of the loan agreement, and basically the changes are underlined and they point out that the property tax amount was adjusted from \$15,887 to \$16,051.91 and made some other adjustments, more in terms of terminology. We also have funding in there to pay the taxes which are due in December for this year and there was a lien for weed abatement for \$508.00 which was included in the agreement to cover that. Title Company is prepared to issue a title policy to the City.

Mayor McCallon stated how is that particular parcel chosen?

Community Development Director Jaquess stated actually there was a choice of several parcels. We got a title policy from the applicant and worked to find parcels that did not have trust deeds on them already. This particular parcel was selected by staff and the City Attorney's office because it is a parcel that is fairly minimal tax obligations to be paid off and it has structures on it so it casts some value. Its one of the only parcels with structures on it over on Boulder and if we ever had to foreclose, we would at least have something with potential value.

Councilwoman Scott stated the property you're talking about is the 1.5 acres.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated yes.

Councilwoman Scott stated all five of these people own these 1.5 acres. She realizes it's an LLC.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated those all deal with different parcels.

Councilwoman Scott stated so it's not this parcel.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated it's a title report for the entire Greenspot Village and Marketplace property ownership. We had to go through this to determine what had trust deeds against them and what the amounts of the deeds were.

City Attorney Steele stated one of the other reasons we selected this property is because it's only owned by Greenspot Village and Marketplace, LLC and not other interest.

Councilwoman Scott stated who is Greenspot Village and Marketplace? Who is going to sign for them?

Community Development Director Jaquess stated Mr. Elssmann is the managing partner and he would sign the document.

Councilwoman Scott stated is this LLC bonded?

City Attorney Steele stated in what sense, what kind of bond are you referring to?

Councilwoman Scott stated and its \$130,000 we are going to put up front?

Community Development Director Jaquess stated the note is till November 2015 or the issuance of grading permits on this specific plan whichever comes first, so roughly a three year agreement.

Councilwoman Scott stated and in three years if it isn't paid, then we have the acre and half. Has the acre and half been appraised?

Community Development Director Jaquess stated no, we don't have an appraisal on it. We have an appraisal on other properties in the area and we think the value that is estimated is a reasonable value for the property.

Councilwoman Scott stated she would feel more secure if there are more partners, having each one of the partners sign.

City Attorney Steele stated there is only one property owner.

Mayor McCallon stated the LLC is the property owner.

Councilwoman Scott stated the LLC is the property owner. Let's say the five of us bought a piece of property and we are the LLC and you go out and make some kind of arrangement and sign something.

Mayor McCallon stated no, you would have to have authorization from the LLC to designate him as the person to sign for the LLC.

Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn stated to Mr. Glenn Elssmann, do your partners know that you are here on behalf on the LLC?

Mr. Glenn Elssmann stated yes, absolutely.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated in the review of the document that he received on Friday, he got it this morning and forwarded it to Mr. Elssmann and he forwarded it to his attorney. They reviewed it and they came back with some requests for modifications. He passed around this piece of paper as well. He has discussed it with the City Attorney and they are in agreement with those changes so it's not a problem. The one thing that is in there, our Attorney said it was really more the applicant's call than ours. We are comfortable without the reference to market rate interest because the concern is anything we do might impact prevailing wage requirements, and the goal is to not impact prevailing wage. The applicant's attorney was concerned that LAIF rate interest would be a potential issue and the recommended we charge a market rate. We do not know what that market rate will have to be but we will work with applicant.

City Attorney Steele stated the Council direction was an LAIF rate which would pretty minimal, if the borrower wants to define a market raise which presumably will be higher than the LAIF rate.

Councilman Racadio stated and this protects us.

City Attorney Steele stated it does protect us.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated staff is recommending that Council approve the agreement and that the changes being made as reflected in the material received at tonight's meeting and responding to those changes recommended by the applicant's attorney that document be prepared by our City Attorney tomorrow or the next day, have Mr. Elssmann sign it and then the Mayor would sign the document.

Councilman Timmer stated it was stated we would be first lien holder, doesn't usually delinquent taxes have a higher position?

Community Development Director Jaquess stated yes, that is why we are paying those off.

Councilman Timmer stated we are paying the delinquent taxes.

City Attorney Steele stated to protect us and it will be rolled over into the loan.

Councilwoman Scott stated and during the three years that the note is being paid off, who is paying the taxes.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated the agreement provides that we would to protect our own interest but we would get reimbursed.

Councilman Timmer stated this is General fund money we are doing this with. He has concerns about Government being involved in land deals, especially using General fund money. He has mixed feelings when this was discussed at the finance Subcommittee level and some factors have changed since then.

**A MOTION** was made by Councilman Racadio, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn, to approve the Loan Agreement with Greenspot Village and Marketplace subject to the changes reflected in the information received tonight in accordance with the City Attorney's corrections and to have the document be prepared for signatures. Motion carried, 3-2, with Councilman Timmer and Councilwoman Scott dissenting.

14. Repayment of the Payment of Three Loans (Advances) from the City of Highland to the Successor Agency to the Highland Redevelopment Agency

Director of Administrative Services Dantuono gave a brief review of the staff report. We have four loans going to the RDA, four loans being repaid and now three loans have to be repaid back to the Successor Agency. Of those three loans, two of them were made within the first two years of the RDA's existence. If we can put those on a future ROPS, we can get 100% back and we did, we placed them on ROPS III and have been approved by the Oversight Board and the Department of Finance. He would like to point to the staff report, last paragraph, page 2, he put 11% interest and it should state 9%. The third loan because there was no exchange of property, we will lose 20% of the principal to the State.

**A MOTION** was made by Councilwoman Scott, seconded by Councilman Racadio, to:

- 1) Authorize the repayment of the payment of three loans (advances) from the City to the RDA totaling \$950,000 in principle and \$2,705,904 in interest for a grand total of \$3,655,904. This will replay the Successor Agency for three of the four loans that were originally repaid in January, 2011; and
- 2) Authorize the following budget adjustments:  
Transfer \$1,953,036 from 001-2100 (General Fund-unreserved, undesignated) to be expended from 001-1450-4189 (General Fund-Operating Transfer Out) and sent to 089-8090-9901 (RDA ORF Debt Service-Operating Transfer In) & Transfer \$1,702,868 from 023-2100 (General Capital Financing-unreserved, undesignated) to be expended from 023-3890-4189 (General Capital Financing Fund-Operating Transfer Out) and sent to 089-8090-9901 (RDA ORF Debt Service-Operating Transfer In). Motion carried, 4-1, with Councilman Timmer dissenting.

15. Appointments of the Three Vacancies on the Historic and Cultural Preservation Board (HCPB)

**A MOTION** was made by Mayor Pro Tem Lilburn, seconded by Councilman Timmer, to appoint Nancy Alexander, Patrick Sandford and John Starbuck to the Historic and Cultural Preservation Board with terms ending November, 2016. Motion carried, 5-0.

16. AB 1234 – Ethics Training

City Clerk Hughes gave a brief review of the staff report.

Mayor McCallon stated any person serving on a Board or Commission should complete the Ethics Training.

Councilman Timmer stated the City should have a formal policy stating if you are appointed to a Board or Commission and if you fail to adhere to the Ethics Training within 60 days of the required completion date then you will be terminated from the Board.

**A MOTION** was made by Councilman Timmer, seconded by Mayor McCallon, to draft a formal policy and bring back to Council regarding individuals who do not comply with AB1234 within 60 days of the required completion date. Motion carried, 5-0.

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

City Manager Hughes stated staff is working on compiling a Work Program list and will be bringing them forward shortly.

Councilman Racadio stated he attended the League of California Cities Thalman Dinner Award dinner on November 8, 2012 in Fontana.

18. San Bernardino International Airport Authority and IVDA

None

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

November 17	Silver Jubilee – 25th Anniversary Celebration
November 21	Operation Thanksgiving Dinner at the YMCA
December 8	Breakfast with Santa at the YMCA

**CLOSED SESSION**

None

**ADJOURN**

There being no further business, Mayor McCallon adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m. in memory of Bob Moore.

Submitted By:

Approved By:

---

Betty Hughes, MMC  
City Clerk

---

Larry McCallon  
Mayor