TUESDAY, MAY 29, 2001

A regular meeting of the Council of the City of Burbank was held at the Fire Training Center, 1845 North Ontario Street, on the above date. The meeting was called to order at 4:06 p.m. by Mr. Kramer, Mayor.

CLOSED SESSION

Present- - - - Council Members Laurell, Murphy, and Kramer.

Absent - - - - Council Members Golonski and Ramos.

Also Present - Mr. Ovrom, City Manager; Mr. Barlow, City Attorney; and, Ms.

Alvord, Assistant City Manager.

Oral Mayor Kramer called for oral communications on Closed

Communications Session matters at this time.

Citizen Comment Appearing to comment was Kevin McCarney, on the oral communication process.

4:11 P.M. The Council recessed at this time to the Fire Training Center Recess Conference Room to hold a Closed Session on the following:

a. Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation:

Pursuant to Govt. Code §54956.9(a)

Name of Case: In the matter of the application of Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority – Administrative (Variance) Hearing conducted by Cal Trans.

Case No.: OAH No. L-9701269

Brief description and nature of case: Administrative review of Airport noise variance standards.

b. <u>Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation</u> (City as possible plaintiff):

Pursuant to Govt. Code §54956.9(c)

Number of potential case(s): 1

c. <u>Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation</u> (City as potential defendant):

Pursuant to Govt. Code §54956.9(b)(1)

Number of potential case(s): 1

Regular Meeting Reconvened in Council Chambers The regular meeting of the Council of the City of Burbank was reconvened at 6:33 p.m. by Mr. Kramer, Mayor.

Invocation

The invocation was given by Reverend Harry Durkee, First

United Methodist Church.

Flag Salute

The pledge of allegiance to the flag was led by Ms. Alvord, Assistant City Manager;

ROLL CALL

Present- - - Council Members Golonski, Laurell, Murphy, Ramos and

Kramer.

Absent - - - - Council Members None.

Also Present - Mr. Ovrom, City Mana

Mr. Ovrom, City Manager; Mr. Barlow, City Attorney; Ms. Alvord, Assistant City Manager; and, Mrs. Sarquiz, City Clerk.

6:40 P.M. Hearing Mayor Kramer stated that "this is the time and place for the hearing on Planned Development No. 2000-4, related Development Agreement, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The Applicant plans to build an 183-unit senior housing facility."

Notice Given The City Clerk was asked if notices had been given as required by law. She replied in the affirmative and advised that no written communications had been received.

Staff Report Mr. Forbes, Associate Planner, reported on the request from the applicant, C & P Properties #7, LLC (Cusumano Real Estate Group) for approval of a Planned Development and Development Review to construct a four story 183-unit senior housing project at 466 East Olive Avenue on the site of the former Thompson Memorial Hospital and Vencor. He said that all the projects' units would be restricted to persons age 55 and over, and 25 percent of the units would be restricted to seniors of low and moderate income. He further said the proposed project would have two floors of semi-subterranean parking with a parking ratio of 1.2 spaces per unit for tenant parking and eight guest parking spaces.

He explained that the applicant is requesting to deviate from various multiple family development standards of the Burbank Municipal Code. He said these deviations include density, parking, setbacks, lot coverage, open space, landscaping, and amenities. In addition, he said the applicant is requesting to allow the nearby Belmont Village project to place a billboard on the project site, which is prohibited by Code, and is requesting that a cap be placed on the amount of Art in Public Places fees and that the project be exempt from the Community Facilities Fees that would otherwise be required.

Mr. Forbes said that the Planning Board considered this project at its March 26 and April 23, 2001 meetings. He discussed that the Board recommended several modifications to the proposed conditions of approval dealing with parking, landscaping, open space requirements, time requirements for the low/moderate income component of the project, and Art in Public Places Fees. He noted that the Board then voted 4-1 to recommend that the City Council approve the proposed project.

He said that staff believes that the project site's location on a major street in a commercialized area near downtown makes it well suited for high density senior development. He said the project will recycle an underutilized and long-vacant property while serving an important community need by providing housing for seniors at various income levels. He further said that a parking study has been prepared that shows that the proposed parking will be adequate to meet the anticipated demand, and a traffic study has been completed that concludes that there will be no significant impact on the surrounding street system from the proposed project. He then noted that staff believes that most of the requested Code deviations and the overall project design are appropriate and well tailored to the specific needs of senior residents.

Lastly, Mr. Forbes said that aside from the requests to cap Art in Public Places fees, place a billboard on the subject property, and exempt the applicant from payment of Community Facilities Fees, staff is supportive of the requested deviations from Code-based development standards and believes that the resulting project will be beneficial to the community.

Applicant

Michael Cusumano, Cusumano Real Estate Group, began by stating the City is facing an upcoming crisis in the area of housing for our elderly population. He noted that we are facing both an aging population and projections for an overall increase in the population of our community and the result is and will continue to be a significant shortage in the availability of dedicated senior housing. He said that while the City has encouraged, promoted and even subsidized low-income and very low-income senior housing over the past ten years, there has not been any new development of moderate rate senior housing units over that same period of time.

With the strength of the national economy, he said many seniors have assumed personal incomes that exceed the thresholds that are permitted in existing senior housing projects in the community and that condition has disqualified a number of active seniors that would like to live in these types of projects. He then noted that their project was designed to meet the needs of those seniors in the community and would be done at no cost to the City.

Mr. Cusumano said the project is located at the southwest corner of Olive Avenue and Fifth Street. He said there are 183 units with 25 percent of them available to low and moderate income seniors. He then said the project will provide amenities including the following: large lap pool, large outdoor recreation/barbecue/seating/entertainment area, large indoor community room with kitchen facilities, card room, library, large theater room, and a dedicated gymnasium that overlooks the pool. He further said that they will also provide interactive social programs that are designed to promote and support a meaningful and rewarding quality of life including: community barbecues, periodic trips or excursions, holiday and birthday parties, community newsletter, bible studies, exercise classes, water aerobics, continental breakfast, bingo nights, movie nights, art/craft classes, wellness seminars and other programs. He then noted his belief that the project was unique in that it is located near large medical/dental facilities and is close to the Belmont Corp. project, a new assisted living facility, which will allow their tenants to move to the Belmont project when they are no longer able to care for themselves. As a result of the close proximity to the Belmont project, he said they were proposing the construction of a sign in the landscaping of their project to help direct people to the Belmont facility as well as differentiate the two projects.

Next, Mr. Cusumano discussed that the current site is commercially zoned but is designated as high-density multifamily residential in the Land Use Element of the General Plan and is thereby capable of supporting a dense residential land use. He said the density impact generated by senior apartments is significantly lower than the impacts of nonsenior apartments. He then noted that the density of the proposed project at 140 units per acre is comparable to a number of other senior communities throughout the City such as the Golden Palms, Verdugo Towers, Pacific Manor and Olive Court. Further, he said approval of this project will facilitate the recycling of a blighted, antiquated and nonfunctional facility with a well-integrated project.

He said that all of the requested development standard modifications are absolutely necessary in order for this project to proceed and noted that any deviation from these modifications will have a dramatic impact on the project. He then noted his belief that the requested deviations are equitably offset by the public benefit that is produced by this project.

Next, Mr. Cusumano explained that this project meets both the City and State definitions of projects that are entitled to density bonus and significant development concessions and incentives which include reductions in setbacks, parking ratios and architectural design standards in order to promote low income or senior housing within the State. He noted that the project and proposed deviations are consistent with both the letter and intent of the State law.

He then said that they are in general agreement with both the Planning Board and staff recommendations regarding the project with the following exceptions: he believes the Burbank Municipal Code (BMC) clearly exempts this type of project (low and moderate income senior housing) from paying the Community Facilities Fee (staff does not agree); 30 year covenant for maintenance of the low and moderate income proposed versus the staff and Board recommendation that the covenant run in perpetuity for the life of the project; multifamily BMC requirement used for common open space as there is no Code requirement for senior projects (staff has recommended more open common space); and, requested waiver from Art in Public Places project (staff does not agree);

Mr. Robert Bowne, attorney representing the applicant, discussed the request for a cap to be placed on the Community Facilities Fee (CFF). He discussed that the Burbank Municipal Code related to exemptions of the CFF says that fees imposed on low and moderate income housing projects in accordance with the density bonus law are exempt from paying the CFF. He said that the Government Code requires that there be a density bonus in at least one regulatory concession for projects with 50 percent senior component and the BMC requires the same for a project with a 25 percent low and moderate income component. He then noted that this project meets the criteria and should be exempt from paying the CFF. Lastly, he said that when the ordinance was adopted by the City Council in 1993, the exemptions were spelled out in accordance with the density

bonus law and thus, noted his belief that this project is exempt from the CFF and said there should be no discretion in this matter. He then noted that they were not disputing the Council's actions as a legislative function as this is important for them to take action and said they are not challenging their discretionary power in this matter either, rather they are concerned that they have to strain to construct a legal argument to not impose a CFF on such a worthy project that in their judgement is demonstrably exempt under the Code.

Hearing Closed

There being no response to the Mayor's invitation for oral comment, the hearing was declared closed.

Staff Response

Mr. Forbes clarified the following issues regarding the CFF: the Code specifies that residential projects are exempt from transportation fee payments so the fees required of this project would be for libraries, parks, police and fire; and, the density bonus law as referred to in the CFF Ordinance allows for a minimum of 25 percent density bonus but noted that because this project exceeds the 25 percent density bonus that's required by State law and the BMC, the project moves beyond being a density bonus project and becomes a discretionary project. He said staff feels a project of this nature may have a greater impact on some City services including paramedics and should therefore pay for those impacts.

Mr. Garcia, Assistant City Attorney, further said this project is not a "by rights" density bonus project because in the Government Code, Section 65915, it refers to a 25 percent bump up over the allowable density for that zone and general plan designation. He noted that this is a commercial zone and the request is to allow a planned development rezone from a commercial zone and, as such, staff did not feel that this was a density bonus project allowing the exemption to the CFF as well as automatic approval of a density bonus for the project.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Golonski, seconded by Mrs. Murphy and carried that "the conditions be amended to provide that guest paring be increased to require a minimum of 18 parking spaces outside the fence and that 10 of those may be counted as tenant parking spaces and applied to the 1.2 parking ratio."

Motion

It was moved by Mrs. Murphy, seconded by Mr. Laurell and carried with Mr. Golonski voting no that "the conditions be amended to allow the directional sign to be constructed substantially in conformance with the drawing presented to the Council.

Motion

It was moved by Mrs. Murphy and seconded by Mr. Laurell that "the following resolution be passed and adopted:"

1702

RESOLUTION NO. 26,015:

Planned Dev. 2000-4 (466 East Olive Ave.) A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK ADOPTING THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION PREPARED IN CONNECTION WITH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT NO. 2000-4 AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT RELATED THERETO (466 EAST OLIVE AVENUE).

Adopted

The resolution was adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: Council Members Laurell, Murphy, Ramos and Kramer

Noes: Council Member Golonski. Absent: Council Members None.

Ordinance Introduced It was moved by Mrs. Murphy and seconded by Mr. Laurell that "the following ordinance be introduced and read for the first time by title only and be passed to the second reading." The ordinance was introduced and the title read:

1702 Approve PD 2000-4 (466 E. Olive Ave.) AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK APPROVING PLANNED DEVELOPMENT NO. 2000-4 AND A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT RELATED THERETO (466 EAST OLIVE AVENUE).

Motion Carried

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Council Members Laurell, Murphy, Ramos and Kramer

Noes: Council Member Golonski. Absent: Council Members None.

Motion

It was moved by Mrs. Murphy, seconded by Mr. Golonski and carried that "the ordinance be amended to allow the City Attorney to prepare the appropriate language to provide the developer with the flexibility to reduce the Community Facilities Fees and Art in Public Places Fees from 25 percent up to 50

percent if the corresponding percentage of units are maintained as affordable in perpetuity."

Reporting on Closed Session

Mr. Barlow reported on the items considered by the City Council and Redevelopment Agency during the Closed Session meetings.

Oral Communications Mr. Kramer called for oral communications at this time.

Citizen Comment

Appearing to comment were Esther Espinoza, opposing any change to the oral communication process, and on concern that no minorities were appointed to City Boards and Commissions; Robert Juarez, opposing any change to the oral communication process noting the importance of providing a person with their Constitutional rights regardless of the content and tone of the speech; Irma Loose, playing a video recording of statements made at previous Council meetings regarding oral communications, opposing any change to oral communications, and on concern with the replay of the recent Council meeting causing a problem with her video tape; Bob Behr, asking whether the City has plans to become more of a bicycle friendly community, and on concern with speeding traffic on Riverside Drive and asking the City to look into this matter; Celeste Francis, on concern with jaywalking in the Magnolia Park area, on concern with the right turn at Hollywood Way and Olive Avenue, and opposing any change to the oral communication process and noting her belief that the credibility of some of the oral communication speakers has caused the Council to look into changing the entire oral communication process; Don Elsmore, on a meeting of the City Environmental Oversight Committee this day related to air quality and stating that the matters discussed at these Committee meetings should be placed on the Council agenda for public consumption and further suggesting that other Boards, Commissions and Committees be provided with the opportunity to present reports to the Council when matters of public interest arise, and discussing an Air Quality Management District Rule that requires toxic levels from school buses to be reduced and suggesting the City meet with the School District to discuss this rule; R. C. "Chappy" Czapiewski, on the importance of the Restore Our Airport Rights (ROAR) initiative, stating public records requests do not need to be made in writing and citing a recent court case that upheld that standard, on a public record request he made regarding the safety of motorists near the Airport, and playing a video tape of an interview with former Mayor Bill Wiggins

regarding the Airport and refuting comments made at that interview; Marie Paino, opposing any change to the oral communication process; C. L. Stack, on the importance of freedom in our Country, and supporting some change to the oral communication process but noting the need to respect Constitutional rights; Molly Hyman, on the importance of allowing people to discuss their concerns before the Council and noting her belief that the problems with the process will be corrected if the Council more strictly enforces the requirement that comments pertain to City business; and Stan Hyman, on the importance of the freedom of speech, and stating the problem related to oral communications can be fixed if the Council strictly enforces the rules provided to them.

8:47 P.M. Recess The Council recessed at this time. The meeting reconvened at 8:59 p.m. with all members present.

Citizen Comment Continued Howard Rothenbach, Chairman of ROAR, opposing any change to the oral communication process and on the importance of citizens having the right to address their government, and asking whether the Governor could use martial law to take the City's energy away; Ron Vanderford, supporting the Council/Mayor enforcing the requirement that comments pertain to City business during oral communications and opposing any restrictive changes to the process, and stating his belief that the ROAR initiative replaces the City Council 21st Century Plan for the Airport and stating he believes that not all provisions of ROAR need to be adopted and asking whether the Council, pursuant to Measure B, can amend the ROAR initiative should a deal be reached with the Airport following the public vote on the matter; Ted McConkey, opposing any change to the oral communication process, on concern that citizens were not included in the decision making process related to a proposed change in oral communications, and on the importance of citizen participation; Mark Barton, supporting a change in the oral communication process, and on concern with the comfort of the public seating in this facility; Bob Etter, opposing any change to the oral communication process; Dr. David Gordon, on the sacrifice made by citizens to have the right to address their government, stating concern with some speakers who abuse their rights and as such noting that when speakers area out of line they should have their speech restricted, and on the importance of having an oral communication process; Kevin Muldoon, opposing any change to the oral communication process, and on concern with safety as a result of the dirt and dust near the Five Point Intersection Improvement Project; David Piroli, opposing the staff recommendations on the oral communication process noting his belief that recommendations do not directly affect the civility, tone and tenor of speech; Mike Nolan, stating the oral communication process has allowed the City to prosper and have valuable assets due to productive input from the public over the years and opposing any change to the process; Dr. Theresa Karam, on the importance of veterans and their sacrifice to our Country, opposing any change to the oral communication process, and asking a question on how to procedurally address Police Department misconduct; and Larry Applebaum, stating the entire oral communication process should not be changed due to the few speakers who do not respect the process and on the importance of the Council hearing differing points of view.

Staff Response

Members of the Council and staff responded to questions raised.

Motion

It was moved by Mrs. Murphy and seconded by Mr. Golonski that "the following items on the consent calendar be approved as recommended.

Minutes Approved

The minutes for the adjourned meeting of April 13, 2001 were approved as submitted.

1301-3 2001 Sidewalk Repair Project -Phase 2 (B.S. 1088)

RESOLUTION NO. 26,016:

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK APPROVING AND ADOPTING CONTRACT DOCUMENTS, PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS, AND DETERMINING THE LOWEST RESPONSIBLE BIDDER, ACCEPTING THE BID, AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT FOR SIDEWALK REPAIR, BID SCHEDULE NO. 1088.

204-4 All-Mail Ballot Election

RESOLUTION NO. 26,017:

County Sycs. for A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK REQUESTING THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES TO PERMIT THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS TO RENDER ELECTION SERVICES TO THE CITY OF BURBANK RELATING TO SPECIAL ALL-MAIL BALLOT ELECTION TO BE HELD OCTOBER 9, 2001.

Adopted

The consent calendar was adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: Council Members Golonski, Laurell, Murphy, Ramos

and Kramer.

Noes: Council Members None. Absent: Council Members None.

201-1
Option Relating to Oral
Communications

Mr. Barlow reported that, in response to recent concern expressed by Council Members and others in the community over the significant degeneration of the tenor and civility at Council meetings, staff was directed to look into both the legal and practical options relating to oral communications and the difficult environment that has been generated. He noted that in addressing this Council direction, staff looked at the following matters pertaining to speech: profanity, racially derogatory comments, relevance, repetition, disruptive conduct, and speaking time.

Following research of various court cases Constitutional rights afforded to the citizenry, he said that staff reviewed what type of actions the Council can legally take to improve the overall decorum of City Council meetings, while still protecting the basic first amendment rights of the speakers, and remaining in compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act. He then noted that the following options are only some of the many that the Council could consider: Strictly enforce the requirement that comments must pertain to City business; Limit first orals to only agenda items, allowing second orals to be utilized for general City business issues; Reduce first orals from 5 to 3 minutes; At the beginning of oral communications call for all speaker cards, and then limit oral communications to only those whose cards have been received to that point; Cease television broadcast of oral communications, either first orals or second orals, or both; Limit the period of first orals to a set time period such as 30 minutes or 45 minutes; Rather than respond to individual speakers, refer them to the appropriate department to handle their inquiry; Provide that if a speaker is not present when his or her name is called then his or her speaker opportunity for that period is lost; and, Provide that the microphone automatically cuts off at the designated time limit so that some speakers don't push the time limit that others follow.

Lastly, Mr. Barlow said that the City Manager, City Clerk and himself met and are recommending that the Council take the following significant steps on a trial basis with an evaluation of the effectiveness at the end of a six-month period: a) More specifically enforce the "City Business" requirement and, in addition to the Mayor and Council, also direct the City Attorney to raise the issue during the oral communications when it appears to him that the speaker has strayed from the subject matter jurisdiction; b) Limit first orals to only agenda items, allowing second orals to be utilized for general City Business issues. To accommodate those who come just to make a community announcement, such announcements can be coordinated in advance through the Community Assistance Coordinator and be placed on the presentations portion of the agenda. In addition, since many speakers come to the Council because they don't know where else to lodge a request or complaint regarding City services, the City will prepare and make available a resource guide to direct residents where common questions regarding City services can best be handled and cards will also be made available for residents to register concerns or complaints which will mean that they will be able to specify their concern on the card and turn it in to the City Clerk and need not remain at a Council meeting during a long series of speakers, or wait until the meeting has been completed; c) Reduce first orals from 5 to 3 minutes; d) At the beginning of the oral communications make a final call for all speaker cards, and then limit oral communications to only those whose cards have been received to that point; e) Limit the period of first oral communications to no more than 60 minutes and divide the 60 minutes by the number of speaker cards and allow each speaker to speak for that period of time, with a maximum of 3 minutes each; f) Direct that a speaker must be present when his or her name is called or the speaking opportunity for that period is lost; and, g) Provide that the microphone automatically cuts off at the designated time limit so that some speakers don't push the time limit that others follow.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Golonski, seconded by Mrs. Murphy and carried with Mr. Kramer and Mrs. Ramos voting no that "the City Attorney be directed to prepare a resolution which provides for the following change to the oral communication process: a first period of oral communications providing for one minute to speak on any matter concerning the business of the City; a second period of oral communications providing for four minutes to speak on agenda items only; a third period of oral communications at the end of the meeting providing for three minutes to speak on any matter concerning the business of the City; however, if a speaker chooses to speak during the first

oral communication period, they will not be able to speak at the third period; and, the process shall be reviewed 60 days after it is implemented.

704
Golf Professional
Mgmt. and
Operation Svcs.
Agmt. at DeBell
Golf Course

Mr. Flad, Park, Recreation and Community Services Director, reported that on October 31, 2000, Mr. Phil Scozzola, Golf Professional at the DeBell Municipal Golf Course, announced his intent to retire. With that announcement, he said a Request for Proposals (RFP) was prepared, the submitted proposals were reviewed and it was the consensus of the Review Committee that Mr. Scott Scozzola provided the best combination of experience, skills and program balance. He noted that based on that consensus, the Park, Recreation and Community Services Board and City Council subsequently approved directing staff to initiate negotiations with Scott Scozzola for the Golf Professional Management and Operation Services Agreement.

Pursuant to that direction from the Council to determine the terms and conditions for the Golf Professional Management and Operation of the DeBell Municipal Golf Course, he said that staff has negotiated a proposed agreement that represents several changes from the previous agreements with the out-going Golf Professional including: the development of annual goals and objectives, performance measures, additional revenue and expenditure accountability, proposed capital improvements, program enhancements. and reporting requirements. He further noted that the proposed agreement requires the Golf Professional to provide the City with the following services for the 18 hole course, 9-hole Par 3 course driving range: operator services, furnishing and merchandising, golf instruction, golf carts, junior golf program, golf course starter services, golf tournaments, marshaling, building and equipment maintenance services, grounds maintenance services, and monthly and annual financial reporting including annual Certified Public Accountant certified audit.

Lastly, Mr. Flad explained that the agreement proposes changes in the monthly compensation which realize a substantially higher percentage of revenue for the City, as well as to provide incentives for the Golf Professional to increase public patronage of the DeBell Golf Course facility. He noted that based on the annual history of rounds played, annual compensation for the Golf Professional is projected at \$705,475 for Fiscal Year 2001-02 which represents a difference of \$163,165 or 19 percent less than the previous

Golf Professional's annual compensation. He then noted that the compensation for the Golf Professional is incorporated into the annual budget process with all funding provided by the Golf Enterprise Fund,

Motion

It was moved by Mrs. Murphy and seconded by Mrs. Ramos that "the following resolution be passed and adopted:"

704

RESOLUTION NO. 26,018:

Approve Agmt. w/ S.S. Golf, Inc. for DeBell Golf Course

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK APPROVING THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF BURBANK AND S.S. GOLF, INC. FOR THE MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION OF DEBELL GOLF COURSE.

Adopted

The resolution was adopted by the following vote:

Council Members Golonski, Laurell, Murphy, Ramos Ayes:

and Kramer.

Council Members None. Noes: Absent: Council Members None.

Ordinance Submitted It was moved by Mr. Laurell and seconded by Mrs. Murphy that "Ordinance No. 3579 be read for the second time by title only and be passed and adopted." The title to the following ordinance was read:

1701

ORDINANCE NO. 3579:

1411-1 1204-2 PD 2001-2,

AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK APPROVING PLANNED DEVELOPMENT NO. 2001-2 AND A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT RELATED THERETO (BOB HOPE Tent. Parcel Map CENTER PROJECT).

No. 26258, V-336 (Bob Hope Center)

Adopted

The ordinance was adopted by the following vote:

Ayes: Council Members Golonski, Laurell, Murphy, Ramos

and Kramer.

Council Members None. Noes: Absent: Council Members None.

Public Comment Mr. Kramer called for the second period of oral communications at this time.

Citizen Comment

Appearing to comment were Mark Barton, on concern that the action taken by the Council related to oral communications was confusing for the public; Irma Loose, playing a tape recording of statements made at a previous Council meeting regarding staff hiring practices; Esther Espinoza, on concern that the Council did not appoint minorities to City Boards, Commissions and Committees; Kevin Muldoon, reiterating concern with dirt surrounding the Five Point Intersection Improvement Project; Bob Etter, opposing the Council changes to the oral communication process, asking about City medical benefits for Council Members particularly related to nonmarried couples, and asking questions about what occurs if a Council Member is found to violate their oath of office; Robert Juarez, stating his belief that the action taken by the Council this evening to change the oral communication process was unconstitutional; Celeste Francis, stating the public should be allowed to speak at the first and third oral communications, stating the agenda should be more broadly defined to allow citizens to speak about the business of the City that may not necessarily be an agenda item, on the need for the public to refute comments from the Council at the end of the meeting, and asking how a person would be able to address the Council for longer than four minutes; Howard Rothenbach, asking for an update on the Chandler Accessway project, and asking the Council Members to address any concerns they have with the ROAR initiative; David Piroli, opposing the changes made by the City Council this evening to the oral communication process and noting his belief that the changes will not address the concern over profanity and racial epithets, and asking whether the there was a discrimination case filed against the City; and Mike Nolan, on concern with the department heads the meeting prior to second period of oral communications, stating offensive comments are allowed at the podium, and stating concern with dirt on the streets due to the Five Point Intersection Improvement Project.

Staff Response Members of the Council and staff responded to questions raised.

301-2 Memorial Adjournment There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 11:25 p.m. in memory of Michael McIninch, and to Thursday, May 31, 2001, at 6:00 p.m. at the Fire Training Center, 1845 North Ontario Street, to conduct a Budget Study Session including discussion of the Budget for the Police Department, Budget Summary Discussion (Final Decision Making) and Overflow Items.

Judie Sarquiz, City Clerk

APPROVED JULY 24, 2001

Mayor of the Council of the City of Burbank