

**MINUTES
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
NOVEMBER 24, 2009 - 6:00 p.m.**

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the City Council and Redevelopment Agency of the City of Highland was called to order at 6:01 p.m. by Mayor Lilburn at the Donahue Council Chambers, 27215 Base Line, Highland, California.

The invocation was given by Pastor Tracy Johnson of Immanuel Baptist Church and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman McCallon.

ROLL CALL

Present: Jones, McCallon, Scott, Mayor Lilburn
Absent: Timmer

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

Mayor Lilburn presented San Manuel Band of Mission Indians with a proclamation proclaiming November 27, 2009, and each year forward the Friday following the Thanksgiving Holiday as Native American Heritage Day.

COMMUNITY INPUT

Mr. Andy Huey stated he has a list of vandalism that has happened to his home and to his automobile. He has called the police regarding this situation. He wants only for this individual to leave him alone.

Mayor Lilburn stated the Highland Sheriff's Department will speak with him regarding this issue.

Mr. Paul Sheboe stated he is present to introduce himself as a candidate for the 63rd Assembly District. He gave a brief description of his qualifications, experience and his campaign direction.

Mr. Mike Bunch stated he is representing Pop Warner Football and he would like to thank Council for their support. Their registration has risen considerably with over 500 children in the program. They utilize Beattie Middle School for practice and parents have concerns with a restroom not being available. He would like to have more connection with the City of Highland by fundraising and supporting the program.

CITY COUNCIL/REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY CONSENT CALENDAR

A MOTION was made by Mayor Pro Tem Jones, seconded by Councilman McCallon, to approve the consent calendar as submitted. Motion carried on a roll call vote, 4-0, with Councilman Timmer being absent.

1. Waive the Reading of All Ordinances
Waived the reading of all Ordinances in their entirety and read by title only.
2. Warrant Register
Approved Warrant Register No. 494 for November 24, 2009, in the amount of \$1,453,466.54 and Payroll of \$76,695.84.
3. AB 1600 Development Impact Fee Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2008-2009 per Government Code Section 66066
Received and filed the AB 1600 Development Impact Fee Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2008-2009.
4. Developer In-Lieu Fee Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2008-2009
Received and filed the Developer in-lieu fee Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2008-2009.
5. Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009, Component Unit Financial Statements for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009, and the Single Audit Report on Federal Awards
Received and filed the Comprehensive Unit Financial Statements for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009 and the Single Audit Report on Federal Awards.
6. Easement Acceptance/Greenspot Road – CUP 07-003 (Calvary Chapel)
 1. Accepted the Grant of Easement for Road and Drainage purposes from Calvary Chapel; and
 2. Directed the City Clerk to record the Grant of Easement.
7. Application for State Bicycle Transportation Account Grant and Adoption of Bicycle Transportation Plan
Adopted Resolution No. 2009-042:
 1. Adopting the San Bernardino County Bicycle Transportation Plan, recertified in 2006, and applicable to City of Highland as the City's Non-Motorized Transportation Plan; and
 2. Certifying Availability of the required 10% local share of the total project cost.

RESOLUTION NO. 2009-042

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND,
CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE APPLICATION FOR STATE BICYCLE
TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNT GRANT AND THE ADOPTION OF
BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

8. GIS Management Support Services
 1. Approved the Professional Services Agreement with Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI), for GIS Management Support Services; and
 2. Authorized the Mayor to execute the Agreement.

CITY COUNCIL/REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING

9. Proposed City of Highland Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Applications for Fiscal Year 2010-2011 to be Submitted to the San Bernardino County Community Development and Housing Department for Determination of Eligibility

Mayor Lilburn opened the public hearing.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated this is an item that Council has heard every year for the last several years. It's the recommendation from the city for projects that would be submitted for the county for determination of eligibility for Community Development Block Grant funding of these projects. This is the first step of two steps in the process. Once we hear back from the county that projects we submit are eligible, then we hold another hearing in February, at which time we actually approve the expenditure of the funds, and at that same time Council would also distribute funds that are called Public Service Applications. Tonight is just Construction Improvement Project Proposals.

Mayor Lilburn called for speakers in favor or in opposition of. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Mayor Pro Tem Jones, seconded by Councilwoman Scott, to approve and authorize the following:

1. Approve the City's Construction Improvements Project Proposal to continue the Housing Code Enforcement Program that supports seventy-five (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; a total request of \$90,933;
2. Approve the City's Construction Improvements Project Proposal to continue the Neighborhood Revitalization Program that supports thirty percent (30%) of the salary and benefits of the Economic Development Specialist position in the amount of \$33,604;
3. Approve the City's Construction Improvements Project Proposal for a multi-year project to construct curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements on Lankershim Avenue between 5th Street and Cypress Street in the amount of \$494,000; and
4. Authorize the City Manager to sign and submit the above referenced CDBG applications to the San Bernardino County Community Development and Housing Department for consideration. Motion carried, 4-0, with Councilman Timmer being absent.

10. MCA-009-004 – The City of Highland Municipal Code is Being Amended to Add Chapter 16.80 Prohibiting the Establishment and Operation of Medical Marijuana Dispensaries in all Zoning Districts within the City of Highland

Mayor Lilburn opened the public hearing.

Community Development Director Jaquess stated in front of Council is an amended ordinance proposal that staff received today from the City Attorney's office. This is for the Medical Marijuana Dispensaries proposal and the ordinance language changes are highlighted in blue and also in red. On page 4 of the ordinance, there is a section that was added for public nuisance determination and on page 5 under section 7, some language was added to insert the word co-op and/or other entity. These words are added throughout the paragraph for consistency. At the end of the page there was a word "urgency" that was a typo, it shouldn't have been there and they took it out. This is the change in the ordinance. This ordinance is before Council to replace an ordinance that Council adopted under urgency action about a year ago and at that time that ordinance prohibited medical marijuana dispensaries in the city. He would add that we have had a number of contacts from people over the last year who would like to establish a medical marijuana dispensary in the city and at that time we said no, the city's ordinance does not permit it. We wanted to bring this ordinance back to the Council before the interim ordinance expired which we are doing as the interim ordinance does not expire until March. So before you is the ordinance and what it does is basically adopt the amendment to the zoning code to prohibit Medical Marijuana Dispensaries in the City of Highland.

Mr. Nathan Miller stated he is a member on behalf of the Inland Valley Drug Free Community Coalition and he would like to say they very much support the Planning Commission's recommendation to ban Medical Marijuana Dispensaries.

Mr. Paul Sheboe stated he is representing Coalition for a Drug Free California. He would like to briefly state they are a statewide organization which brings together 58 other anti-drug coalitions from around the state. Their partners include the California Narcotics Officers Association, California Sheriff's Association, California Police Chiefs and many other organizations. Together their primary objection is to keep kids off drugs and they also have found themselves right in the middle of a fight combating drug legalization. Their hat goes off to the City Council and Planning Commission for bringing this forward. It is the right time. Two hundred eight (208) cities as of today have banned Medical Marijuana Dispensaries throughout California including eight counties. Only 33 cities in our state allow for Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and that number continues to shrink.

Mayor Lilburn called for speakers in favor or in opposition of. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

A MOTION was made by Councilman McCallon, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Jones, to Adopt a Notice of Exemption and instruct the City Clerk to file a Notice of Exemption with the County Clerk of the Board; and to Introduce Ordinance No. 348 to amend Title 16, Land Use and Development Code, adding Chapter 16.80 "Medical Marijuana Dispensaries." Motion carried, 4-0, with Councilman Timmer being absent.

City Clerk Hughes introduced Ordinance No. 348:

ORDINANCE NO. 348
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
HIGHLAND ADDING CHAPTER 16.80 TO TITLE 16 (THE
LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT CODE) OF THE
HIGHLAND MUNICIPAL CODE PROHIBITING THE
ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF MEDICAL
MARIJUANA DISPENSARIES IN ALL ZONES, AND MAKING
FINDINGS IN SUPPORT THEREOF

which title was read.

11. Development Impact Fee Annual Adjustment

Mayor Lilburn opened the public hearing.

City Engineer Wong stated this is the annual adjustment of the city's development impact fee. This year there is a proposed reduction of the city's impact fee. There are nine infrastructure categories for the city's impact fee system and you can tell that each of these nine categories are being reduced to an amount as shown on page 1 of the staff report. He would like to draw Council's attention to the first category, Regional Circulation System. We have a 0% adjustment meaning there is no adjustment at all. This category is tied to the Caltrans Highway Construction Item Index which actually has a negative 3.2% change. However, SANBAG has adopted a policy that each year's adjustment has to be within the range of 0% to 15%. In other words each year they want to limit the increase to 15% but you cannot have a reduction for that particular year. The purpose of that is to minimize the extent of fluctuations from year to year but in this particular case the SANBAG policy also allows this negative 3.2% which is not being used this year to be used in future years if there is a positive increase in future years. For example, if next year there is a 5% increase, instead of a 5% increase it would be 5% minus the 3.2% which would become a 1.8% for next year. For categories 2 and 3, these two categories tie to the same index but the city is not subject to SANBAG's policy for the 0% to 15%. Therefore, we are going to propose that we will have the 3.2% reduction for the second and third category. Again he wants to mention that if next year we have a positive increase, what you will see though is next year is item 1 will have a lesser increase than item 2 and item 3 because we are already using the reduction this year. He just wants to make that point. The rest of the categories are tied to the California Construction Cost Index and it has a negative

2.5% adjustment. The BIA and all the active developments were notified about this public hearing through email and the only response we received is from Williams Homes. They sent a letter and it has been distributed to Council. Basically this letter proposes that the city follow some cities in Riverside County to consider a major reduction of fees. The letter attached a list of seven cities; six are in Riverside County and one in San Bernardino County. These seven cities have had a major reduction of their impact fees and this letter requests we also consider doing something similar. He just wants to let Council know after staff received this letter, staff tried to contact the cities around Highland by sending out an email survey. He received three responses. County of San Bernardino says they are not going to make any major reductions, Loma Linda said they are not going to make any reductions, however, Grand Terrace says they are considering some potential major reduction. He did not hear from Redlands, Yucaipa or San Bernardino yet. We have two resolutions staff is asking Council to approve which would make the adjustment of the DIF as proposed per the staff report.

Mayor Lilburn called for any speakers in favor or in opposition. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing.

Councilman McCallon stated last year we said we would make the fees payable at Certificate of Occupancy. Are we still continuing this policy?

City Engineer Wong stated yes the resolution still allows this exception, a one time exception. So the developer would be paying the impact fees not in the beginning of the building but at the end of the building, meaning they pay at occupancy.

Councilwoman Scott stated Council received a letter from a developer with a chart listed with the various cities with their original fee and then the reduction that the particular city gave and their revised fee. The highest original fee listed was \$19,474 and the revised fee for that particular was \$11,684. She does not know if that is for commercial or residential because it does not say. Our residential is still even the reduced one is over \$20,500 and the commercial is \$12,471. Her problem is we want development and especially commercial development here in Highland. Instead of looking at the vacant lots and if these other cities are so much lower than we are in their development impact fees, she just has to think like a developer, she is going to go where she can build it the cheapest and people will come.

City Engineer Wong stated perhaps a better comparison would be with other cities in San Bernardino County.

Councilwoman Scott stated well actually Victorville is in the County of San Bernardino, the rest of them are in Riverside County.

City Engineer Wong stated back in 2006 as you recall the city had an update of the city's development fee in 2006 and eight or nine years before that we never adjusted our fees so in 2006 we had a big jump. With that big jump and comparing the fee with 17 other cities and counties, the city's commercial fee was ranked number eight back in 2006. Now we haven't done another survey since that time so we do not know if other cities have reduced their fees.

Councilwoman Scott stated so our most current information is from 2006, we don't have anything more current than that.

City Engineer Wong stated staff did not do a survey for this adjustment but we did a survey back in 2006 of 18 agencies and of the 18 agencies, we were ranked in the top eight for commercial fees.

Councilwoman Scott stated in this age of computers she finds 2006 when the market was still fairly good versus 2009, three years later, she would like to have more updated information.

City Manager Hughes stated if he could point out in 2006 was basically a base line year. That was when we did the major adjustment to the development impact fees as they had not been adjusted in many, many years. We did the adjustment then and at that point it was the direction of the City Council to bring back the fees every year and adjust them based on CPI which is what we are doing tonight. Every city is different, every city has different infrastructure needs. To compare city to city while it might make you feel better about a base line or something, every city has different needs. You have to look within your city what are the City of Highland infrastructure needs and base it on that. That is why we do an independent study. We just don't do a survey of a bunch of cities and take the average and that is what our development impact fees are. We do a complete analysis of our needs and we adjust it every year since.

Councilwoman Scott stated she thinks the Council is aware enough of the cities around us that even with that kind of comparison we know what the cities need in infrastructure that we would be comparing ourselves to. She can go back to when Sam Racadio used to do surveys on city manager salaries and so forth. He would take cities that were a hundred years old when we were just a first and second year city.

Mayor Lilburn stated she remembers last year and we took some big hits from developers because we were increasing our DIF fees and we decided to bite the bullet as a Council and because we hadn't raised our fees in so long that we let the development go and then we had to come into compliance because of rules and regulations from SANBAG. If we went down, we would still have to adjust them and we would kind of be going backwards if we did a reduction.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones stated his concern is in normal economic times this would be a good move. These are not normal economic times and he thinks every one of us would love to be able to do something that would at least dangle the carrot for commercial or residential builders to come to Highland to build. We know it would be the best decision ever made. That being said it may be prudent for Highland to consider a greater reduction for a year's time in attempt to attract some individual developers both commercial and residential to come to our city and to resume construction and development. He has talked with a number of different developers and he's saying what's it going to take to get you guys started and none of them are making any gestures that says they are ready to do that. He thinks Council needs to take a positive proactive position and say well we want it to happen. Maybe this is a small amount and really it would be if we were to cut it 25%. It would be a small gesture that would help invite these developers to come to the city and begin development. We would rather have them start here then start in one of our neighboring cities.

Mayor Lilburn stated and we don't know what the neighboring cities are doing as far as the adjustment.

City Engineer Wong stated well because of the short time frame, he did a quick email survey and sent it out to six agencies and got three responses thus far. Out of the three, two have said they are not going to make any reduction. One says they are considering making some reductions.

Councilwoman Scott stated rather than call it a reduction, maybe use this figure and then throw in something else say like an incentive of some kind, a forgiven incentive, they build so many square feet that they pay this but then there is also an incentive.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones stated let's approach this from a different stand point; under a normal situation, City Engineer's Wong position would be correct but under this situation the development impact fees are here for the purpose of increased development which causes a need for increased services. If we have no development at all we have no need for increased services. So, if we simply attract one commercial developer, that one commercial developer is going to make an increased demand on services for the city but is it going to amount to 25% for instance, is that going to cripple our development; no it's not.

City Manager Hughes stated what will end up happening is if Council reduces it by 25% he guarantees that the development community will come back when you want to make the fee to bring it back up to the correct amount again and they will slam Council for such a huge increase. We will be right back to where we were again. From his perspective, this is a policy decision done by the Council, but from his perspective he thinks the course of action the City Council has taken and made these tied to an index is the appropriate thing to do. You have seen the increases and the decreases. This is the decrease and next year it may decrease even more again. But to say by cutting the fee by \$2,000 you are all of sudden get a bunch of new residential development in the community, he doesn't think it is necessarily the case. The developers, commercial and residential, will come to where the market is. A small reduction in fees, while he thinks it sounds good, he doesn't necessarily think Council is going to draw in development based on that.

Councilman McCallon stated that is the point he was going to make. The fees he doesn't think will drive developers as it is basically market driven. The other thing he wanted to say is that he thinks it speaks volumes that we don't have the BIA or other developers here pounding on Council to reduce the fees. He thinks they have seen what we have proposed and other than the one letter, it would appear to them to be reasonable.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones stated the argument again is that if we have no development at all we have collected no development impact fee. That is the way it is but if in fact by reducing them, we entice someone to begin this year opposed to waiting two or three years then he thinks Highland is miles ahead and our neighboring communities in getting things started here, getting the economy back on track and then he is willing to take the heat of raising these fees in a time when economics is saying it's prudent to build in Highland for many, many reasons including those additional fees. These are fixed costs they put in their feasibility studies to determine do they start today or do they start three years from now. If they know they only have a window of time of one year before this will be reconsidered again, it could be the tipping fee that brings them here.

Councilwoman Scott stated she agrees with Mayor Pro Tem Jones and Councilman McCallon. A comment was made that nobody from BIA is here and she thinks they are not here because they know that this is nothing and basically with the economy the way it is so why bother. If we say hey guys we understand that you need a boost and so we're going to give you 365 of a boost, you want to take it great, you don't want to take it that's great too because we are going to address the situation next year.

Councilman McCallon stated like he was saying fees are not what is going to drive whether they build or not, it's going to be the market.

Mayor Lilburn stated we also count ourselves as a business friendly community. If Council thinks a decrease in the DIF but we need to understand we are going to go through this heartburn the next time we go to increase this by the developers and they are going to whine, they are to cry because we are now going back when we were trying so hard to kick it up.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones stated the interesting thing when we were debating this issue some time ago and the Lowe's center was getting ready to develop, we were right on the tipping point as to whether that went ahead or didn't go ahead. Now we look back in the arrears and we say each of those including Lowe's are saying man are they glad they did it. The reason they are is because they are now finding out how hungry the people of Highland are for services. He thinks we need to do something even if it's nothing more than a gesture that will say we are willing to say we are willing to step out there and give up a percentage of our development impact fees so that we can encourage more development like that which we got going. Nobody is prouder that they came here than each of those individual businesses except the citizens who in fact are supporting them and making them the success they are. That's why he is saying for the interest and the best of Highland he thinks we ought to dangle the carrot.

City Manager Hughes stated so 25% is that what the Council is recommending because basically there is no scientific data, you are just pulling out a number.

Councilwoman Scott stated it's just the 25% carrot dangling. It's something to get people to work.

City Manager Hughes stated you do realize that the SANBAG number has to stay at 0, you cannot adjust those. You would be just talking about the city DIF.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones stated now all he is saying is 25% is a considerable amount to a developer who is sitting there trying to determine should he start now or wait another year and if that is the kicking point then let that be the penciled out number that makes his decision. It is in his best interest to do it in 2010 opposed to waiting to 2011 or whatever.

City Manager Hughes stated City Attorney Steele had a good point. If we adopt the fee as recommended with the 2.5% decrease and then do a one time credit so that the fee actually stays where it's at and it's a one time credit that if you build within 2010, you will get a one time credit of whatever the difference is. You will get a 22-1/2% credit. This way the amount stays the same and we are not adjusting.

Mayor Lilburn stated she likes that.

Councilwoman Scott stated she also likes that.

City Engineer Wong stated and basically you will have a timeline when they can take advantage of this credit.

City Manager Hughes stated it has to take place in calendar year 2010.

Mayor Pro Tem Jones stated we incur the fee when in fact they pull the permit. We allow them to pay it when the occupancy is concurred. We have incurred the fee and we have given them the carrot and they still would not pay it until occupancy.

City Engineer Wong stated our current policy is that if they want to take advantage of the lower fee that the project has to be ready to pull permit and then move on to construction. They cannot just say pull the permit and wait. The project has to be at a point where they can start construction. All the designs have to be done and plan check done, etc.

City Manager Hughes stated City Attorney's Steele's recommendation is to adopt the fee tonight and then come back with language to flush out the policy at the next meeting.

A MOTION was made by Councilman McCallon, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Jones, to approve as amended with credit policy:

- a. Resolution No. 2009-043 amending amount of development impact fees pursuant to Government Code Section 66000 (AB1600); and
- b. Resolution No. 2009-044 amending amount of park fee pursuant to Government Code 66477 (Quimby Act). Motion carried, 4-0, with Councilman Timmer being absent.

RESOLUTION NO. 2009-043

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND,
CALIFORNIA, AMENDING DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES FOR ALL
DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN CITY OF HIGHLAND

RESOLUTION NO. 2009-044

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND,
CALIFORNIA, AMENDING A FEE APPLICABLE TO RESIDENTIAL NEW
DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE CITY OF HIGHLAND ON PARK LAND ACQUISITION
AND PARK FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT, PURSUANT TO
SECTION 16.40.200 OF THE HIGHLAND MUNICIPAL CODE
AND THE QUIMBY ACT (GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 66477)

CITY COUNCIL/REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY LEGISLATIVE

12. Adopt-A-Trail Program

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

A MOTION was made by Councilman McCallon, seconded by Councilwoman Scott, to approve the "Adopt-A-Trail" Program and direct staff and the Community Trails Committee to start promoting the program. Motion carried, 4-0, with Councilman Timmer being absent.

13. Greenspot Bridge Project and Orange Street Project Funding Documentations

City Engineer Wong gave a brief review of the staff report.

A MOTION was made by Mayor Pro Tem Jones, seconded by Councilman McCallon, to authorize the Mayor to:

1. Sign a request to extend federal funding for one year for engineering of the Greenspot Bridge project;
2. Sign a Confirmation Form stating no Cooperative Work Agreement is needed for the Orange Street project; and
3. Direct staff to submit the signed documents to Caltrans by November 25, 2009. Motion carried, 4-0, with Councilman Timmer being absent.

14. Proposed Resolution No. 2009-045 Supporting the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act of 2010

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

A MOTION was made by Councilman McCallon, seconded by Councilwoman Scott, to support the League's request for Resolution No. 2009-045, in support of the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act of 2010. Motion carried, 4-0, with Councilman Timmer being absent.

RESOLUTION NO. 2009-045

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HIGHLAND,
CALIFORNIA, IN SUPPORT OF THE LOCAL TAXPAYER, PUBLIC SAFETY,
AND TRANSPORTATION PROTECTION ACT OF 2010

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

Mayor Lilburn stated at the last meeting at Omnitrans it was discussed the possibility of restructuring the JPA to a Governance Committee. Omnitrans had eight candidates for the CEO position and are now down to two finalists with an anticipated hiring date for December 2009.

Councilwoman Scott stated she is concerned about the recent activity of LAFCO. To her it appears LAFCO has made a deal with San Bernardino regarding the islands as part of the trade off for the Highland Arrowhead Springs Hotel. It appears San Bernardino is not taking the county as a whole rather they are taking pieces of the county areas. She has concerns with the portions that have Highland as a boundary. There needs to be a long range plan and goals for the island pockets of the county.

City Manager Hughes stated those islands are already in the City of San Bernardino's sphere of influence. He believes LAFCO is actually requiring San Bernardino to bring in some of those islands.

Councilman McCallon stated it is LAFCO's policy for cities that have unincorporated islands that meet the criteria of establishing State law that they annex the adjoining these properties.

City Manager Hughes stated regarding the MS4 permit which was discussed at the last Council meeting. On December 10, 2009 at 9:00 a.m. at Corona City Hall there is going to be a hearing scheduled. Staff will be present at the hearing to relay our concerns from the City of Highland. However, staff wanted to offer the invitation to Council for their attendance. We will be working with SANBAG to coordinate a conference call for a briefing.

Mayor Lilburn would like to extend her thanks for the support of staff and Council at the State of Community Luncheon.

16. San Bernardino International Airport Authority and IVDA

None

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

CLOSED SESSION

None

ADJOURN

There being no further business, Mayor Lilburn adjourned the meeting at 7:24 p.m.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Betty Hughes, CMC
City Clerk

Penny Lilburn
Mayor