

CITY OF HIDDEN HILLS  
REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

City Hall

Monday, July 28, 2008

***MINUTES***

**CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

A regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Hidden Hills was duly held in the Council Chambers at the City Hall, 6165 Spring Valley Road, Hidden Hills, California 91302 on Monday, July 28, 2008 at the hour of 7:30 p.m. Mayor Steve Freedland called the meeting to order and presided thereover after leading the Council and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL**

Council:

Mayor Steve Freedland  
Mayor Pro Tem Larry G. Weber  
Council Member Jim Cohen  
Council Member Monty Fisher  
Council Member Stuart E. Siegel

Staff:

Special Counsel Larry Wiener  
City Engineer Dirk Lovett  
Environmental Coordinator Kevin Powers  
City Manager Cherie L. Paglia

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Upon MOTION of Council Member Siegel, seconded by Council Member Fisher and unanimously carried, it was resolved that the agenda for the July 28, 2008 regular meeting be approved as submitted.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mayor Freedland made the following announcements:

The Community Association/Parks and Recreation Committee will again be offering a BBQ this Thursday evening at the Community Center at 5:00 p.m.

The August 11, 2008 City Council meeting has been cancelled; the next regularly scheduled meeting will be on Monday, August 25, 2008.

## **AUDIENCE**

There were no questions or comments at this time.

## **PUBLIC SAFETY**

### **A. Los Angeles County Fire Department Report - June**

Community Services Representative Maria Grycan presented the following report:

During the month of June there were 19 responses, which included 8 medical calls, 6 false alarm/good intent calls, 2 snake removals, 1 outside rubbish fire on Jim Bridger, and 2 hazardous conditions with no fire (one being an overheated motor and the other a downed power line); there were 63 station inspections which were probably in Calabasas; 12 Fire Prevention Bureau inspections occurred in Hidden Hills, with no plans being checked; the CERT training was completed; in relation to brush inspections, all of those in Hidden Hills are conducted by Fire Station 68; of the total 1506 conducted by Station 68 (all of which have been completed), 572 are in Hidden Hills, and they have all been completed; of the total 1506, 91 received 410s, which are the notices of compliance; 40 of those 91 are now in compliance, 51 are outstanding, and none have been turned over to Brush Clearance for enforcement; anyone receiving a notice of compliance has 30 days; if the Station then inspects and determines that an effort is being made to comply, the Station can give a 7 day extension; if there is no effort being made, no extension is given and the property is turned over to the Brush Clearance Unit; this Unit can give another 7-14 days; after that, the property is turned over to Weed Abatement/County Agriculture which clears the property and bills the owner on his tax bill.

In response to Council Member Siegel, the City Manager explained that there was one house that did have four false alarms in one day, and then false alarms three other days. The house is under construction, so the owner was going to look into the problem, but will be billed for four days of false alarms.

In relation to the accident at the swimming pool last week, Mayor Freedland had several questions and asked Ms. Grycan and the other representatives from the Fire Department who were in attendance to provide information to help educate the residents on the best procedures to follow during an emergency and when calling 911. Ms. Grycan stated the following:

It is very common during a 911 call for people to panic, as they are responding to some type of emergency; she would urge everyone to try to stay focused and calm so they can adequately give the necessary information to the dispatcher; knowing where you are when making the call is of the utmost importance, as the address may not be displayed properly, especially if calling from a cell phone; it is always better if possible to call from a land line or pay phone, which normally will capture the address, than from a cell phone; the number of rings that might occur before a 911 call is answered would be better addressed with the Sheriff's Department, as they get the call and then dispatch it to the Fire Department; 911 calls from cell phones used to go to the California Highway Patrol (CHP), but should now be routed to local law enforcement.

The City Manager reported the following:

All 911 calls used to be routed to the CHP, but several months ago changes were made in an attempt to have 911 calls answered by the local law enforcement agency; however, where the calls are routed depends on the carrier and the nearest towers; at the request of the Mayor, staff conducted a test calling 911 from the City Hall area and from the Community Center pool area using different cell phone carriers; from City Hall, AT&T and Nextel/Sprint connected to CHP, while Verizon connected to LAPD; from the pool area, Verizon and Nextel/Sprint connected to CHP, T-Mobile connected to the Lost Hills Station, and AT&T had no signal.

Mayor Freedland wished to make it very clear that if at all possible, a land line should be used in an emergency as opposed to a cell phone. Ms. Grycan agreed, and added the following:

This incident had a very positive outcome, but did present a few challenges in the beginning; there was a physician at the site who did not want to immediately transfer care to the paramedics; this is fine, if certain protocols are followed; the paramedics were not aware right away that the person was indeed a doctor as he did not identify himself as such.

Ms. Grycan then introduced Dr. Frank Pratt, the Medical Director for the L.A. County Fire Department for almost twenty-one years, who provided the following information:

In relation to this incident, all of the actions taken at the pool prior to the arrival of the paramedics were superlative, and all involved deserve accolades; there was some

confusion regarding roles in the beginning which happens consistently, especially when emotions are running high and often when there is some type of family or community relationship between the patient and person assisting; this is all predictable and laudable, as they want people to help in these situations; when there is a physician on scene, there are protocols per state law; for a physician to be involved, he first has to identify himself and allow the paramedics to initially be responsible for the call and then coordinate the role of the physician with their base hospital; California statute precludes a physician on scene without an official relationship with that provider agency from assuming command of advanced life support given by the paramedics; if that person assists with the patient's care or has a relationship with that patient and wants to guide where the patient goes or how treatment is given, that is done in concert with the base hospital; that is how the system works, mostly driven by California statute and in this case by an EMS agency policy which delineates the roles at that time and how they can be adjusted and modified by the base hospital.

Dr. Pratt then answered a question regarding the possible application of an AED in this case:

Almost always with a drowning or submersion situation, the heart's rhythm is not a rhythm; the heart beat slows down but does not go into the shockable rhythms; in this case and particularly with a youngster, the chance that an AED would have been used and delivered a shock is incredibly small; almost all loss of pulse in a patient like this is in relation to no oxygen getting in, not a primary heart problem, which is mostly when the AED would be used; the patient had pulses upon the paramedics arrival; one could make an intelligent argument that the use of an AED might have slowed down the application of the right care; it seems the way it was handled before the paramedics arrived was right on target.

Mayor Freedland then asked if CPR/first aid training could be provided to those taking CERT training classes, as he is aware that the CERT training does not teach people what to do in an emergency situation. Ms. Grycan explained why that is not done:

CERT training is designed in response to disasters when first responders may not be available; it is not first aid or CPR, but disaster medical operations; in CERT classes, they teach the absolute essentials to keep someone alive – how to open an airway, how to control bleeding, and how to treat for shock, which are considered the three killers; in a disaster, you need to move quickly; once you start giving CPR, you have to stay with that person and cannot help anyone else, which means you may help one person at the expense of ten others; when you triage, you cannot do CPR; CERT training involves trying to do the most good for the greatest number of people; she would suggest that after CERT training is provided, classes then be offered in first aid/CPR.

Mayor Freedland pointed out that the Association offered first aid/CPR classes last August, with more classes being scheduled this August. He suggested that the City also offer such classes for the CERT members. Emergency Services Director Jim Doran stated that the schedule for classes was being finalized now for the City Council, Public Safety, City staff, those who purchased AEDs, and CERT members.

Division 7 Assistant Fire Chief Joseph Graham then addressed the Council:

As said earlier, the best way to initiate a 911 call is with a hard line; initially the call goes to our local public safety answering point, which is usually law enforcement; they determine whether the call requires law enforcement, fire, or both; once the call is transferred to the Fire Department, dispatch has two devices which automatically indicate the number and the location; the system is about 90% accurate; dispatch is required to ask certain questions to make sure the information on the screen coincides with where the incident is actually occurring; there is a perception when a 911 or seven digit call is made, that the equipment is not rolling fast enough, and it feels like the dispatcher is asking unnecessary questions; that is not the case, as even when the questions are being asked, the emergency equipment is already enroute; once the information is confirmed, it opens a response matrix preprogrammed into Cad, which determines the amount and type of equipment to be sent; for a drowning like this, normally one engine (three individuals), one squad (two individuals), and an ambulance would be sent; in this particular instance, there were four individuals assigned to the engine due to increased fire danger, so there were four paramedics at the scene.

Resident Mathy Wasserman reported that there was a 911 call this past Thursday for the private portion of Rolling View, and the fire engine, paramedics, and ambulance were all holding maps, and all went the wrong way. She wondered why personnel from Station 68 did not know our City better. Chief Graham responded as follows:

As he said earlier, the information on the system is about 90% accurate; and there are times when they are not given information from the caller that is 100% accurate; when the dispatch goes out, as much information as possible is given to the emergency personnel; on the MDT (mobile data terminal) screen, it usually shows the address and the nearest cross street, a Thomas Guide grid, a County grid, and latitude and longitude; in the future, probably within one to two years, all the vehicles will be provided with GIS.

Council Member Siegel asked Chief Graham to get the specific private street information from Ms. Wasserman and relay that to the Station, as they might be able to manually change any inaccurate information (which both GPS and the Thomas Guide sometimes have). Chief Graham agreed to look into the problem.

Mayor Pro Tem Weber wished to point out, since his business revolves around Cad systems and communications, that this technology is still in its infancy, and even his 2003 GPS system did not know the streets in Hidden Hills, until he upgraded this year.

Mayor Freedland asked about the response times for the incident at the pool. Chief Graham informed everyone that both the engine and the squad were out of quarters when the call came in, resulting in the squad arriving within three minutes, and the engine within five minutes.

Ms. Grycan had several additional comments:

When calling 911, if it happens to ring three or more rings, stay on the line; do not hang up, as it will get answered; previously when all cell phone 911 calls were going to the CHP, it was a huge problem since they were so overloaded; sometimes the call would ring endlessly, you could get a busy signal, or get a recording asking you to call back; this is why the issue was recently addressed, although it appears there are still some "bugs" in the system that need to be worked out; in a perfect world, on the 101 corridor, a 911 cell phone call would still go to the CHP, since that organization governs the freeway; from a land line, one should always call 911, not the Station number; however, from a cell phone, if residents know the Lost Hills number (818.878.1808), they can certainly call there direct in an emergency.

**B. Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Report - June**

Lt. John Benedict presented the following report:

There were two Part I crimes during the month of June; one was a burglary from a locked vehicle near Long Valley Road; the lock was pried and two back seats were taken; the other was a grand theft in the 5500 block of Hoback Glen with a package being taken from the mailbox; five false alarms occurred during the month; one collision occurred on 6/20/08 near Long Valley and Oakfield; a vehicle swerved off the road due to unsafe

speed and hit the gatehouse; 67 citations were issued, with 53 of those being hazardous, 7 non-hazardous, and 7 parking; four incidents were reported to the STTOP Deputy; three of those have been contacted, with the other, in West Hills, being sent a letter.

Lt. Benedict then addressed the 911 issue as follows:

The system is set up so that when 911 is dialed, it is supposed to go to the local law enforcement agency in your area; the problem with Hidden Hills is that it sits multi-jurisdictional; the City is close to the freeway so some of the calls still go to the CHP, and also close to the City of Los Angeles, so some calls go to LAPD; residents can certainly dial the Lost Hills Station directly when calling from a cell phone, but he would suggest that when using a land line, 911 should be called; these calls will go directly to the Lost Hills Station where they have four live dispatchers to answer the calls; 911 lines continue to roll over and are all answered; sometimes when there are numerous calls regarding the same incident, they will add staff throughout the Station to answer those calls; if a Fire Department response is required, a link is set up to them; the Lost Hills Station will dispatch whatever personnel is needed, as will the Fire Department; the Sheriff's Station stays on the line to get as much information as possible, and does not hang up until they are at the site; they can also help provide CPR over the line, as all deputies are trained in CPR, with some also being EMTs.

**C. Consideration of Proclamation for National Night Out 2008**

Lt Benedict explained that the City is being asked to provide a proclamation (as it is every year) declaring August 5, 2008 as National Night Out, during which residents are asked to turn on their lights, get to know their neighbors and the Deputies, and to talk about crime prevention. Upon MOTION of Mayor Pro Tem Weber, seconded by Council Member Siegel and unanimously carried, it was resolved to issue a proclamation (as read by Mayor Pro Tem Weber) declaring Tuesday, August 5, 2008 as National Night Out in the City of Hidden Hills.

**D. Recognition of New Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Members**

Los Angeles County Fire Department Community Services Representative Maria Grycan presented certificates of completion to new CERT members, resident Monica Wolfe and Round Meadow School teacher Julianne Feeney, both of whom were issued the oath of office and given a CERT backpack by Emergency Services Director Jim Doran. Mr. Doran again stated that two

CPR/AED classes were being scheduled in August and September, to hopefully be followed by a first aid class.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **A. Consideration of Approval of an Application for Vesting Tentative Map 63567 Including a General Plan Amendment, Pre-zoning, and City Annexation of Approximately 7.8 Acres of Property from the County of Los Angeles**

Mayor Freedland provided general ground rules for this public hearing as follows:

There are no speaker cards required; everyone who wants to speak will get a chance to do so; after the staff report, he will ask the EIR consultant for their presentation, followed by the applicant's presentation; if there is a representative here from the opposition group, that representative will then be given the same amount of time for a presentation, after which anyone else will be able to speak; he would ask that comments be limited to three minutes or less, and that repetition be avoided if at all possible; he does not anticipate finishing the hearing this evening, but it could happen; all comments and questions should be addressed to the Mayor and Council, not the audience; if necessary, he will ask the appropriate person to respond; please be courteous and respectful to everyone, even if you do not agree with their position.

Mayor Freedland then opened the public hearing and asked City Engineer Dirk Lovett for a staff report, which he provided as follows:

The developer Ashley Construction is requesting approval of Vesting Tentative Map 63567 (VTM); the proposed project would subdivide approximately 18 acres into 8 residential lots and 1 lot for the Bridle Trail Road extension and "A" court; 1 single family residence would be replaced, resulting in a net increase of 7 residences; the project is located 1/3 mile north of the 101 freeway and 1/10 mile south of Long Valley Road; the project involves reconfiguring 6 existing parcels (1 which already has a residence on it) into 8 new parcels; of the 6 parcels, 5 are within Hidden Hills and are zoned RA-S; the other 7.8 acre parcel is in unincorporated Los Angeles County and would require annexation into Hidden Hills; the project would also require a general plan amendment, pre-zoning of the 7.8 acre parcel, and approval of the VTM; the pre-zoning and VTM would be conditioned on approval of the annexation by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO); the proposed homes would be custom-built, single family detached residences, with lot areas ranging from 1.06 acres to 3.92 acres; buildings would be no more than two stories not exceeding 30' in height; lots would be clustered around the Bridle Trail Road extension and "A" court, both ending in cul-de-sacs; an EIR was required for the project; the draft EIR (DEIR) was prepared by Rincon Consultants under



contract with the City; during the 45 day review period, several comments on the DEIR were received; Rincon prepared responses to the comments which have been incorporated into the final EIR (FEIR); the City has complied with all legal requirements regarding public input to the EIR; this public hearing has been scheduled to consider the FEIR, the general plan amendments and pre-zoning of the property proposed for annexation, and the application for the VTM; notice of the public hearing was posted and mailed to owners of the properties within 500' of the project, per City code requirements; in addition, all persons or agencies that submitted written comments on the project and DEIR were notified of the time and date of the public hearing; the developer will be required to develop the site and install necessary public improvements including roads, storm drains, water mains, sewers, trails and utilities; he would like to mention some of the design elements; the project will require 177,200 cubic yards of grading over the majority of the site; grading will be generally balanced on site; many of the existing prominent topographic features on site such as hilltops, valleys and swales will be cut and filled; on lot 3 the hill will be lowered nearly 55'; on lot 8 the pad will be raised nearly 44'; lots 5 and 6 do not meet the Municipal Code requirements, as they have less than 20,000 square feet of ungraded area that does not exceed the natural grade of 25% and are less than two acres; to approve this lot configuration the Council must find that "by reason of circumstances peculiar to the proposed subdivision for the use proposed to be made of the property in the subdivision, the public peace, health, safety and welfare will be protected adequately by lots of lesser frontage or area than that specified" in Section 5-3G-3 of the Municipal Code; the Council has to determine if this finding can be made due to the remote location and the steep topography of the property and whether other residents will be adversely impacted by the proposed lot configuration; 9 of 21 oak trees are proposed for removal, 7 of which have trunk diameters in excess of 4"; 28 new oak trees will be planted (a ratio of 4:1); regarding drainage, runoff towards Bridle Trail will be collected and treated prior to entering an existing County maintained 48" pipe that deposits into an existing wash, east of Bridle Trail Road, determined to be a wetlands; some surface runoff is proposed to run down Lasher Road to the Long Valley drain; runoff toward Lasher Road will be collected and deposited into an infiltration trench system, with overflow being connected to the County maintained pipe in Lasher Road; closed storm drain systems will be transferred to the County, or the developer shall implement a maintenance plan; the property east of Bridle Trail, in the area to be annexed, is considered a wetlands; the project avoids grading and development in the wetland area, but if agencies such as the California Department of Fish and Game, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Army Corp of Engineers, or the Regional Water Quality Control Board determine the project is within any of their jurisdictions, the applicant will be required to obtain any necessary permits; many of the comments received on the project were related to the proposed lowering of the hill on lot 3, the majority of which is on the property to be annexed; one of the goals of the City's general plan is "to protect the natural ridgeline and hillside areas....it is the goal that lot size be governed by the

natural slopes”; the City has no established ridgeline definition or map, but this hill is designated as a significant ridgeline per the County of Los Angeles in its Santa Monica Mountains North Area Plan (NAP); the County wants any development of this property to remain consistent with the NAP; the Council has to determine if the proposed subdivision and grading are consistent with the City of Hidden Hills general plan; the Hidden Hills Community Association (HHCA) has not formally reviewed the project, but has provided informal comments and suggestions regarding the streets, rights-of-way, and bridle trails; the HHCA has informed the City and the developer that the bridle trails are not acceptable as shown; the proposed conditions of approval require compliance with HHCA requirements where applicable; the Council must make three determinations in connection with the FEIR; they must determine that the document is either complete and satisfies the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or that additional information is required; if the FEIR is determined to be adequate, the Council should certify it as complete; staff has reviewed the FEIR and believes that it meets the requirements of CEQA and should be certified; regarding impacts that have been identified as potentially significant, the Council must determine if those impacts have been mitigated to the extent feasible through the adoption of mitigation measures and/or alternatives; for any unavoidable impacts, the Council must determine if the project should be approved despite those impacts; if so, the Council must adopt a “Statement of Overriding Considerations”; with this project, there will be unavoidable significant environmental impacts to aesthetics due to extensive grading of the hillsides; for the Council to approve or conditionally approve the project, they must find that the project complies with the City’s general plan, and conforms to the land use designation of the general plan, promoting general plan policies and goals; the Council should consider if the proposed development meets Goal 5 of the Land Use Element, and Policy 5.1 of that Element; Goal 5 provides that, in order to protect the natural ridgeline and hillside areas, it is the City’s goal to require that lot size be governed by natural slopes; Policy 5.1 provides that the City should require minimum land disturbance and larger lot sizes when necessary to accomplish this Goal; because a portion of the project is not presently within the borders of the City, and thus not covered by the City’s general plan, the City must take an action to amend its general plan; should the FEIR and project be approved, including annexation of the 7.8 acres not currently in the City, the 7.8 acres will need to be incorporated into the general plan and designated RA-1; this action will be contingent on the approval by LAFCO of the annexation; if the annexation is denied, the general plan amendment would be voided; if the FEIR and project are approved, including annexation of the 7.8 acres not in the City, the 7.8 acres will need a zoning designation; because zoning is contingent on the parcel’s annexation, the Council would need to pre-zone the 7.8 acres as RA-S; but should the annexation be denied by LAFCO, the pre-zoning would be voided.

City Engineer Lovett then recommended that the Council do the following:

Receive public testimony on the FEIR, general plan amendment, pre-zoning, and VTM 63567; determine whether or not the FEIR is adequate and complete per CEQA; if the FEIR is deemed adequate, determine if the potentially significant impacts have been mitigated to the extent feasible and if any unavoidable impacts are outweighed by the benefits of the project; determine if by reason of circumstances peculiar to the proposed subdivision for the use proposed to be made of the property in the subdivision, the public peace, health, safety and welfare will be protected adequately by lots of lesser pad area than that specified in the City's Municipal Code; determine if the VTM conforms with the City's general plan; determine whether to incorporate the 7.8 acres proposed for annexation into the general plan by designation RA-1; if the annexation is denied by LAFCO, the general plan amendment would be voided; determine whether to pre-zone the 7.8 acres to be annexed as RA-S; again, should the annexation be denied, the pre-zoning would be voided; determine whether to approve the VTM subject to the attached conditions, or as modified by the Council; provide direction to staff to prepare necessary resolutions and documents to reflect Council actions on the aforementioned items; if no decision can be made at this meeting or if additional information is requested, the Council may wish to continue this matter to the next Council meeting.

As this was the end of Mr. Lovett's staff report, Mayor Freedland informed everyone of the following:

Public testimony will be taken until 9:30 p.m.; if there are still people wishing to speak at that time, the public hearing will be continued to a future Council meeting and they will be the first in line to speak at that meeting; since the August 11, 2008 Council meeting has been cancelled, the next Council meeting will be held on Monday, August 25, 2008; if the public hearing is continued, it will be continued to that meeting on August 25<sup>th</sup>; anyone still wishing to speak at that time will be able to do so, even if they were not in attendance at this meeting tonight.

Mayor Freedland announced that a letter was received late today from the attorney representing the Hidden Hills Citizens Group, which suggested a possible violation of the Brown Act due to the wording on the agenda for this item. Mayor Freedland asked the City's Special Counsel Larry Wiener to address this. Special Counsel Wiener stated the following:

The Brown Act is the California open meeting law or sunshine law as called by some; the purpose of the Brown Act is to ensure that the public's business is done in public, not behind closed doors; one of the requirements of the Brown Act is the need for each item to be discussed at a Council meeting to be listed on a published agenda; that agenda is to contain a brief description, generally not to exceed 20 words per the Brown Act, of what

is to be discussed; the agenda for this item for tonight's meeting states that this is a public hearing for "Consideration of Approval of an Application for Vesting Tentative Map 63567 Including a General Plan Amendment, Pre-Zoning, and City Annexation of Approximately 7.8 acres of Property from the County of Los Angeles"; that is about 30 words, does include a general description of the item to be discussed, and he believes, gives anyone who is interested in the project notice that tonight is the night that this is going to be discussed; and whether anyone is concerned about the environmental impacts or has other concerns about the project, this tells them that tonight is the night they should come and share their thoughts with the Council; in addition, public hearing notices were sent and posted throughout the City; these notices did specifically mention the EIR and are much lengthier in nature; that said, if the public hearing is not concluded tonight, which the Mayor has indicated is possible, he is sure staff would have no objection in providing a lengthier description on the next agenda; so for those who did not realize that the agenda description meant that if you were interested in this project that you should come and speak this evening, they will have an opportunity to do so at the next meeting if the hearing is continued; the Council meetings are broadcast as well, so if anyone missed tonight's meeting and wanted to hear the discussion, they should be able to obtain a copy of the video.

Rincon representatives Cori Thomas and Principal Joe Power made a nine minute power point presentation discussing the proposed project, the EIR process, CEQA requirements, impacts, alternatives, comment letters, etc. (see presentation attached to minutes).

Mike Ashley, developer and applicant, provided the following information:

He has been working on this project for a long time; it was initially approved years ago under a different configuration with 9 lots; this was an opportunity to look at other alternatives, which resulted in the plan before the Council this evening which lowered the number of lots from 9 to 8; he elected to stay out of the wetlands area; there is now a 2.2 acre per lot average; the present subdivision on Bridle Trail averages 1.5 acres per lot; he changed access from Lasher Road, which is 19' wide, to Bridle Trail, which has a 60' right-of-way and 32' of paving; it is a fairly small piece of property; of the 8 proposed lots, 5 already exist; in considering what was needed for the Fire Department, balancing dirt on site, geology, etc., this determined the current proposed project; he believes it is a good and responsible plan; it is consistent with the properties on all three sides of Hidden Hills around it; the road access is considered a service level A, and will remain a level A per the traffic study; the project clears up a unique situation; the 7.8 acre parcel is in unincorporated Los Angeles County, but is accessed through Hidden Hills and has been for 30-40 years; this project would bring that parcel into the City and also into the Association where it would have the same CCRs and Architectural review and

requirements; the 2.5 acre parcel north of the 7.8 acres in the County is in the City, is a separate building parcel, but is not in the Association; this project would add it to the Association.

Mr. Ashley introduced his attorney Ken Ehrlich and Engineer Richard Doss, who provided a short power point presentation (attached to minutes), after which Mr. Ehrlich asked if the Council would reserve time for him at the end of the public comment period to respond.

Next to address the Council was Meredith Lobel-Angel of Angel Law representing the Hidden Hills Citizens Group, who made the following comments:

She provided the letter regarding the Brown Act, so will not reiterate everything in that letter; she appreciates that if the hearing is continued, that the agenda will be revised; she believes other cities are more clear on their agendas, and this would be a process improvement for this City; CEQA is not just about the environment, but citizens trying to get a better project; her clients recognize that Mr. Ashley is a good developer and a part of the community, and they are not anti-development, but they want a better project; saying yes to Mr. Ashley may not mean that he gets everything he wants; perhaps there are aspects of the project that should be scaled back; her clients want to see no development on lot 3, as they do not want the 55' ridgeline to come down; they are concerned with the noise impact after that would happen; she has gone through in her letter other pieces for the EIR consultant to address with more specificity and to provide less conclusory statements and more analysis; her clients just want a better project and can better speak on what they want to see in relation to this project; she would like to reserve some time at the end of the public comments, as was requested by Mr. Erlich, to respond; she does not believe the Council should take any action tonight, but should listen to what her people have to say; the Council should look at the project and not approve it as is, and should not certify the EIR until these matters have been addressed.

Mayor Freedland asked if anyone from the Community Association or any governmental agencies was in attendance and wished to speak.

Resident and recent Chairman of the Association's Equestrian Services Committee (ESC) Marv Landon addressed the Council:

The ESC reviewed and opposes the current layout of the project in relation to the trails, and the use of parkways as alternate trails; it might have been said that the trails system

has been adapted to meet the ESC requirements, but they are not aware of that happening; they would definitely not approve the trails in their present form.

Mayor Freedland commented that the conditions for the project would require Mr. Ashley to meet all of the appropriate requirements of the Association and ESC. He then invited anyone from the general public to step to the podium to provide any comments.

The following comments were provided by Britt Aaronson on behalf of herself and her husband Craig:

They are new residents who live on Bridle Trail, and are not really for or against the project; as a new neighbor, they would like to express some concerns; their property is directly adjacent to "A" court, and their lot line will be changed by this project; they are concerned with the ridgeline grading, and would like to see any grading on watered land, not dry, to lessen the dust and dirt resulting in possible air pollution affecting health; the DEIR does not show landscaping at a mature level, and they would want the landscaping guaranteed by bond no matter who might eventually own the properties; the change to their property line by the extension of Bridle Trail is between Mr. Ashley and them, but she's assuming also by agreement of the City; they would want Mr. Ashley to mitigate all legal and other costs related to planting, fencing, hardscape, irrigation, etc. due to this property line change; the increase of traffic on Rolling View and Bridle Trail is a concern, especially regarding lights and speeding in front of the homes; they understand Mr. Ashley's right to build on his own property, and understand the quality of homes that he builds; but they moved here to escape mansionization in surrounding communities and would hope that Hidden Hills would not allow lots and residence size just to accommodate the developer; they would hope the Council would consider the needs and concerns of the neighbors; they have had a wonderful interaction with Mr. Ashley, and are not part of any group (she then submitted a letter to the Council).

Council Member Siegel asked Ms. Aaronson if they were aware that these lots could be built on and were not permanent open space when they purchased their home. Ms. Aaronson replied that they were aware of that fact, and that Mr. Ashley had been very forthcoming about it.

Next to address the Council was Scott Robertson resident Margaret McNeely:

There is no doubt that this development will impact the quality of life in their area; the seclusion of their area is why they and many of their neighbors bought houses in that location; the EIR states that the noise due to the removal of the hillside will not be

significant; they feel it will; the hill to be graded and the lots built on one by one will result in years of construction; she would like the Council to consider that they came here and paid lots of money for the quality of life that she believes should adhere to higher standards than the status quo; she supports the Hidden Hills Citizens Group; removing the 55' hill will impact the quality of life; she understands Mr. Ashley's right to build on land he owns, but the way the project is now, it will significantly affect the lives of those who live in that area; she believes the project should be scaled back.

Bridle Trail resident Deborah Vangelos added her comments (reading from a letter) on behalf of her and her husband as a personal statement, even though she is part of the Citizens Group:

They are in support of working together to find a plan beneficial to everyone and have shown this by stating that they understand why the City would be in favor of the annexation, and by agreeing that it is in the interest of all parties to complete a plan and proceed; they feel they have shown a willingness to compromise by agreeing to the annexation under the right conditions and the access to a few more homes through their area; however, there are concerns that they feel compelled to express; the scope and impact of this project are too large and favor the developer at the expense of the residents; they understand the right of the developer to build in a manner in which to maximize profits; they do live in a gated community and would hope that the City leaders would offer the residents protection for their rights and quality of life; when they moved in they were told that four or five homes would be built across the street, and that the hill, which is crucial to the feeling of Bridle Trail, would remain; it would be ideal to annex the hill and build to the stated intentions of the community; they would be very supportive of a project that would keep the standards for this hill in closer alignment with the NAP, which it is currently protected under; while it is true that only 3 homes will be added to the community, when building is complete, the number of homes accessing Scott Robertson, Rolling View, and Bridle Trail will double to 10; it may not seem important overall, but to the neighbors where there are only 15 homes now, with an expected peak of 20, this will be a major impact; the issue comes down to what is value; they chose Bridle Trail because of the rural feeling offered by the hill and the end of the street, as well as it being a double cul-de-sac; Hidden Hills states its intention and commitment to preserving the rural feeling and states that grading and building should follow the natural lay of the land; if the current plan is approved, at least 6 homes will lose two special elements, the rural feeling provided by the hill and the cul-de-sac status, at great benefit to the developer; is it worth annexing a beautiful hill simply to put in a road through it so the developer can access three more properties; they feel there is room for creative compromise and would support a plan that would be more balanced in favor of the current residents; they feel everyone can work together to make both sides feel more supportive and positive about the project.

Ms. Vangelos then asked if it would be possible to move forward with the annexation without having a specific plan in place. Special Counsel Wiener replied as follows:

The City would typically want to indicate what the general plan designation and zoning would be, but it would not be required to have a subdivision approved to annex property; as a matter of fact, in this case, there are no specific construction plans for individual units that are being proposed.

Ms. Vangelos then had a question regarding the easement on Bridle Trail to the new property, and whether or not the fact that two homes were already on Lasher would not show access. It was not clear exactly what was meant by that statement. Mayor Pro Tem Weber thought she was referring to the fact that Mr. Ashley has claimed that the County has access rights to the unincorporated County parcel across Bridle Trail Road. Special Counsel Wiener stated that he had not seen an easement document, and did not know if the referred to easement would allow access if the property was not annexed.

Mayor Freedland asked generically, not in relation to this project, how access did work to a landlocked piece of property. Special Counsel Wiener explained that there is no one answer to that question and just because a property may currently not have access does not mean it is landlocked; you would have to look at the history of how the property got to its current state and what other access was possible, even if a road needed to be built.

Ms. Vangelos had one last comment as follows:

With the hill coming down, in addition to the hills coming down in the Gonen project, she feels this is very significant and will have a major impact, even though the EIR states it is not significant; maybe once everything is completed the impact will not be great, but now it is, and especially the noise.

Mayor Freedland suggested Ms. Vangelos look again at the EIR, as he was sure it did address the cumulative affects.



Steven Weber, a Bridle Trail resident, stated that it seemed like the EIR favored the project and that he heard recommendations to approve the project. Mayor Freedland immediately explained that was not the case by stating the following:

There has been no recommendation to approve the project; the EIR was prepared by a consultant hired by the City; no one has said they are in favor of the project or opposed to the project; the Council does not make any decisions until all the information is presented, public testimony heard, and the EIR and project reviewed; the recommendation from the City Engineer was to find that the EIR was adequate, which is not saying that there should be approval of the project.

Mr. Weber went on to make the following statements:

He would like the Council to move forward on this project as it is pitting neighbor against neighbor in what is really a great neighborhood; Mr. Ashley does beautiful projects, has built most of Bridle Trail, and has the best interests of the residents in mind as he also lives in the neighborhood; he is concerned with access to the property, especially if the property can be accessed from Bridle Trail even if in the County; if Mr. Ashley would sell the property to someone else, it could be developed without the City's or Association's control; if the 2.5 acres is not in the Association, it could also be bought by someone else and not have to comply with Association requirements; he would enjoy less traffic.

Next to speak was Bridle Trail resident Laura Goldwasser:

She wished to thank Ms. Vangelos for her time, effort, and money spent to keep residents informed about this project; she just returned from Greece so is very concerned with preservation; this project will potentially ruin a significant ridgeline that is now protected by the County; we have a unique opportunity since this is not currently a part of Hidden Hills; we should honor the commitment to preserve this important piece of land and to preserve our general plan policies which state that significant natural land forms should be maintained, grading practices should minimize potential safety hazards while maintaining aesthetic qualities and natural land forms, and property owners should be encouraged to design houses to fit the natural terrain; they are looking for a win/win/win situation; by annexing the finger of land surrounded by Hidden Hills, everyone benefits; Mr. Ashley can then develop land that was previously not a part of Hidden Hills; Mr. Ashley does build beautiful homes, one of which she lives in; the environment can win if the ridgeline is preserved; many people are preservation minded, as witnessed by the 183 people who signed the petition to voice their preference not to prevent some new construction or annexation, but to avoid the destruction of the protected ridgeline; she would encourage the Council to hear the voices of the people; no matter how the impacts are mitigated, the EIR says the one significant unavoidable problem is the destruction of

the protected ridgeline; once it is gone, it is gone, and is that necessary; couldn't many of the positive aspects of this project be accomplished with a revised version; maybe the annexation could occur first and then the problems could be worked on and the issues addressed; maybe the two properties on Lasher (which are Mr. Ashley's properties) could be accessed from Lasher, eliminating the need for a new road off of Bridle Trail; and most importantly, preserve the ridgeline.

Gordon Gregory, another Bridle Trail resident, addressed the Council:

He lives in a delightful Ashley built house; he is speaking on behalf of himself and his wife, as they are residents of this beautiful community; they are affected by this development and have strong feelings; they enjoy looking at the ridgeline out their window, and would hate to see it go; from their second story, they already get freeway noise, and do not want more noise; if the ridgeline comes down, the noise would go up, so they would be affected both orally and visually; they favor annexation and development; this community stands out in all respects, and they support Mr. Ashley; they believe this can be a win/win situation; they would support cutting back the project by one or two lots; they are concerned with access, and feel that there were decisions made on the Gonen project that cut off access to this development, and this needs to be considered; they would like to see the one or two sites currently serviced from Lasher continued to be serviced from that street, rather than Bridle Trail; he needs a better understanding of what grading and landscaping would require relative to mature trees and what the conditions are for building permits; he would like a time frame for grading and landscaping once it starts – how long before it finishes; this has the potential for a long term noise program with the grading, landscaping, construction, and development; he would like to see some connection between completion of grading and completion of construction so it is finished in a reasonable time period; he was glad to hear that the setback and height restrictions will be the same as those next door; he would suggest reasonable hour restrictions on both grading and construction, which should also be limited to five days a week; they are concerned with increased traffic and safety, especially since there are many children and grandchildren in the area; procedures should be in place to make sure landscaping is maintained, even if ownership changes; they are big fans of Mr. Ashley and in favor of development.

As it was now after 9:30 p.m., Mayor Freedland announced that the public hearing on this matter would be continued to the City Council meeting on August 25, 2008, and informed those that were not able to speak this evening that they would be first to speak at the continued hearing at that meeting. Special Counsel Wiener wished to make it clear that this meeting tonight would be adjourned, but the public hearing itself would be continued.

At this time, the Council took a short recess, with the meeting being reconvened by Mayor Freedland at 9:51 p.m.

**B. Variance No. V-374 (Continued from 6/9/08 and 7/14/08)  
24814 Jacob Hamblin Road  
Swimming Pool and Retaining Walls within the Side Yard Setback**

Mayor Freedland recused himself at this time, as he lives next door to this property. City Engineer Dirk Lovett was then asked by Mayor Pro Tem Weber for a staff report, which he presented as follows:

When this public hearing was continued on 7/14/08, it was thought that the Community Association would have addressed this project by now; it has been approved by the Architectural Committee, but will be going to the Board of Directors on 8/19/08; per the Permit Streamlining Act, the Council was scheduled to take action on this project no later than July 30, 2008, so an extension would be needed at this time; a letter was received from the applicant waiving the requirements of the Permit Streamlining Act and requesting a 90-day extension; he would recommend approving this request and continuing the public hearing to 8/25/08.

As there was no one who wished to speak on this matter, and there being no objections, the Council agreed to the waiver of requirements and extension request from the applicant, with Mayor Pro Tem Weber continuing the public hearing to the 8/25/08 City Council meeting. Mayor Freedland rejoined the meeting at this time.

**C. Consideration of Approval of 2008 Congestion Management Program (CMP) Self-Certification Resolution and Adoption of Local Development Report**

Mayor Freedland opened the public hearing, and hearing no comments, closed the hearing. Upon MOTION of Council Member Cohen, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Weber and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adopt by title only Resolution No. 812 entitled: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HIDDEN HILLS FINDING THE CITY TO BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE CONGESTION MANAGEMENT

PROGRAM (CMP) AND ADOPTING THE CMP LOCAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65089.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

- A. City Council Minutes – July 14, 2008**
- B. Demand List**

Upon MOTION of Council Member Cohen, seconded by Council Member Siegel and unanimously carried on roll call vote, it was resolved to approve items A and B of the consent calendar as submitted.

**MATTERS FROM CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS**

- A. Report from 7/15/08 Las Virgenes Malibu Council of Governments Meeting**

Council Member Siegel, who is the President of the COG, provided the following report:

Later on this agenda, the Council will be discussing possible membership in LASQP; at the next COG meeting, experts from all of the cities will be in attendance to discuss water related issues; he knows that the Mayor would like to attend this meeting, and wanted Special Counsel Larry Wiener to discuss whether or not other Council Members could attend if they wished.

Special Counsel Wiener stated the following:

Per the Brown Act, any time a majority of Council Members gather in one place to discuss the City's business, the meeting needs to be noticed and an agenda must be posted; there are some exceptions which do allow a majority to gather in one place; a majority of Council Members can attend a noticed open public meeting of other agencies; therefore, a majority of the Council could attend the COG meeting (as it is a noticed open public meeting) to hear the discussion regarding storm water quality issues; they can ask question of the experts, but cannot as a side issue gather together and discuss the issue in relation to the City.

**B. Report from 7/15/08 Hidden Hills Community Association Board of Directors Meeting**

Board Member and City liaison Ron Wolfe provided the following information:

The meeting was brief; they are looking for volunteers to serve on the Parks and Recreation Committee; if anyone is interested they should contact the Association or Bret Katz, the Committee Chairman; a nominating committee has been formed to recommend candidates to be considered for the Board at the November election; if anyone is interested in serving on the Board, they should contact him or the Association; a filming permit was recently approved, with the daily fee being increased to \$3500, which seemed to be more in line with what is charged by other communities.

**C. Consideration of Membership in the Los Angeles Stormwater Quality Partnership (LASQP) and Approval of Related Memorandum of Understanding**

Council Member Siegel informed the Council of the following:

There seems to be a bit of a misunderstanding between the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and cities, particularly in this region; a group called CPR was formed by some cities, with the group seemingly in non-stop litigation, most of which has been lost except for one recent case; this has also caused polarization of different organizations; cooler heads are prevailing, and eight cities (Agoura Hills, Beverly Hills, Calabasas, La Mirada, Monrovia, Norwalk, Westlake Village, and Rancho Palos Verdes) have now joined together to form LASQP; the group has a two-pronged approach, including lobbying in Sacramento, and working here in this region with the Regional Board.

Council Member Siegel asked Special Counsel Larry Wiener to provide additional information, which he did as follows:

Council Member Siegel did a good job of summarizing the issue, which is about the implementation of the Federal Clean Water Act; this Act requires that cities look at how storm water flows through their cities, hits the streets, gathers pollutants, and eventually through the storm drains flows into the ocean; the permit system for regulating this is called the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES); the original purpose was to prevent flooding, but when storm water flows, it also gathers pollutants; everyone supports the effort of having water as clean as possible; but the relationship between the cities and the RWQCB, in implementing the Clean Water Act, has become polarized; the polarizing issue has been money; who is going to pay to clean the water is a contentious issue; one group, CPR, has approached this with a litigation bent which has

not been particularly successful or productive in establishing a working relationship to accomplish the goals of the Act that everyone supports; so the above mentioned cities have established an alternate organization called the Los Angeles Stormwater Quality Partnership (LASQP); they are seeking to approach this matter with a different perspective, looking at what can be done (rather than always saying that something cannot be done) and talking to the Regional Board; LASQP is trying to advance an agenda that everyone would support, which is finding ways to get funding to make sure the water is clean with reasonable efforts; the cities that join LASQP pay into a pool to hire experts to help with efforts both locally and at the state level; the budget, based on 9 cities (Hidden Hills would be the 9<sup>th</sup> city to join) is about \$2500/month with a one-year commitment; if more cities join, that number will be reduced proportionately, as the costs are shared equally by all the cities; the Council is being asked to consider an agreement that would limit the expenses to no more than \$2500/month; in addition, the agreement allows for the possibility, if 2/3 of the cities agree, to expend another \$5000/month, to again be divided equally among the cities.

In response to a question from Council Member Fisher, Mayor Freedland stated that the group, rather than being adversarial, would try to negotiate reasonable solutions to the problems which would be both affordable to cities and still effective in reaching the clean water goals. Special Counsel Wiener added the following:

The regulations to implement the Act are still being developed, and this group feels it is important to actively participate in the process to help find a proactive approach rather than just challenging everything; there is a scientific debate about what can be done and how to clean up the water; somewhere between doing nothing and building sewage treatment plants for every drop of rain is what will be debated.

Council Member Siegel stated the following just for the Council's information:

In the recent Arcadia decision, one of the few victories for the CPR group, the court said the RWQCB would have to go back and consider certain things regarding the requirements they were imposing on cities; the Regional Board then decided that they would no longer issue any permits, which was not the intent of the decision; neither side at this time is willing to go back and ask the judge to clarify the decision and the interpretation, so if anyone needs a permit, they cannot get one.

Council Member Cohen stated that this organization seemed to be the right way to approach this issue, but asked if the City had recently joined another similar organization or talked about LASQP. Council Member Siegel suggested that the COG was currently involved very much in

discussions regarding water quality, with Special Counsel Wiener pointing out that the Council previously was given information on LASQP, but did not take any action to join. Council Member Cohen also thought that other CPR cities might benefit from LASQP without joining. Special Counsel Wiener agreed, suggesting that if any progress was made by LASQP, all cities would most likely benefit. As there was no further discussion, upon MOTION of Council Member Cohen, seconded by Council Member Siegel and unanimously carried on roll call vote, it was resolved to join the Los Angeles Stormwater Quality Partnership (LASQP) and to approve the Memorandum of Understanding.

#### **MATTERS FROM STAFF**

##### **A. Consideration of Approval of Memorandum of Agreement for the Administration and Cost Sharing of the Coordinated Monitoring Plan for the Los Angeles River and Tributaries Metals Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)**

Environmental Coordinator Kevin Powers provided the following staff report:

At a prior meeting, the Council considered the Los Angeles River metals TMDL special studies, which was an optional program; since the cost sharing formula has now been worked out, the Council needs to consider the Coordinated Monitoring Plan Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), which is mandatory for all 42 cities in the Los Angeles River basin; the total cost for the first year is \$589,702, with the City's portion being \$4000; the City's cost for year two is \$1500, and for each of years three and four, \$1300; each city pays \$500 per \$100,000 for the base fee, and then an allocation based on square miles in the watershed; the Gateway Cities COG will administer the MOA; the contract is for all four years; basically the cities are doing the science for the Regional Board; he will return later to the Council to discuss special studies.

In response to Council Member Siegel, Mr. Powers explained that just in the Los Angeles River watershed, there are still TMDLs for trash, metals, and bacteria, which will be more troublesome. Council Member Siegel commented that the City will have to spend a lot of money for all these TMDLs and special studies, and then also for all of the TMDLs in the Malibu Creek watershed. As there was no further discussion, Upon MOTION of Mayor Pro Tem Weber, seconded by Council Member Cohen and unanimously carried on roll call vote, it was resolved to approve the Memorandum of Agreement between the Gateway Cities Council of Governments

and the City of Hidden Hills regarding the administration and cost sharing of the Coordinated Monitoring Plan for the Los Angeles River and Tributaries Metals TMDL.

**B. Consideration of Proposed Ordinance Regarding the Designation of a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone**

Upon MOTION of Council Member Siegel, seconded by Council Member Cohen and unanimously carried, it was resolved to give second reading to and adopt by title only Ordinance No. 325 entitled: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HIDDEN HILLS REGARDING THE DESIGNATION OF A VERY HIGH FIRE HAZARD SEVERITY ZONE.

**C. Consideration of Proposed Ordinance Regarding City's Filming Requirements**

Upon MOTION of Council Member Siegel and seconded by Council Member Fisher, it was resolved on a 3-1-1 vote (with Mayor Pro Tem Weber voting against and Council Member Cohen abstaining) to give second reading to and adopt by title only Ordinance No. 326 entitled: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HIDDEN HILLS REGARDING MOTION PICTURE, TELEVISION AND PHOTOGRAPHIC PRODUCTIONS AND AMENDING CHAPTER 9 OF TITLE 2 OF THE HIDDEN HILLS MUNICIPAL CODE.

**D. Consideration of Submittal of Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report for City of Calabasas 2030 General Plan**

City Engineer Dirk Lovett presented the following staff report:

The City of Calabasas sent a Notice of Completion for a draft EIR for that city's general plan amendment; any comments are due by 8/20/08; in the general plan amendment the City of Calabasas is including an area west and south of our City, which is in the Hidden Hills sphere of influence (SOI); more specifically, Calabasas has specified its intent to annex Craftsmen's Corner, with mixed uses proposed; there is no obligation to comment, but the Council may wish to direct staff to prepare a letter for the Mayor's signature, reminding Calabasas that this area is in the City of Hidden Hills' SOI, and that Hidden Hills has no interest at this time in relinquishing that SOI.



At this time, Mayor Pro Tem Weber recused himself, as his business is located in Craftsmen's Corner. Upon MOTION of Council Member Cohen, seconded by Council Member Siegel and unanimously carried, it was resolved to direct the Mayor to send a letter to Calabasas reminding that city that Craftsmen's Corner is within the City of Hidden Hills Sphere of Influence (SOI) and that Hidden Hills has no intent at this time in relinquishing that SOI. Mayor Pro Tem Weber returned to the Council Chambers at this time.

**E. Consideration of Approval of Amendment to Agreement with All City Management Services for Crossing Guards at Round Meadow School for the 2008-2009 School Year**

The City Manager explained the following:

The hourly cost per guard is not being increased; it will remain at \$14.98 per hour per guard, as it has been for many years; however, All City Management is increasing the minimum of 3 hours per day per guard to 3.5 hours per day per guard, which will result in an additional cost of \$4,044 for the year; they have trouble getting crossing guards for Round Meadow School as the afternoons are longer than at other schools; guards would rather go to one of those schools and work less time, but get paid more money; the Public Safety Commission has approved the increase and is recommending that the Council do the same.

Upon MOTION of Council Member Siegel, seconded by Council Member Cohen and unanimously carried on roll call vote, it was resolved to approve the Amendment to Agreement between All City Management Services, Inc. and the City of Hidden Hills for Providing School Crossing Guard Services at a cost for providing 1890 hours of service (3 guards at 3.5 hours per day for 180 days a year) at not to exceed \$28,312 (\$14.98 per hour per guard).

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Council, upon MOTION of Council Member Cohen, seconded by Council Member Siegel and unanimously carried, it was resolved to adjourn the regular meeting of July 28, 2008 at 10:23 p.m.

---

Steve Freedland, Mayor

ATTEST:

---

Cherie L. Paglia, City Manager/City Clerk