



COUNCIL AGENDA - CITY OF BURBANK
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2004
4:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER – 275 EAST OLIVE AVENUE

This agenda contains a summary of each item of business which the Council may discuss or act on at this meeting. The complete staff report and all other written documentation relating to each item on this agenda are on file in the office of the City Clerk and the reference desks at the three libraries and are available for public inspection and review. If you have any question about any matter on the agenda, please call the office of the City Clerk at (818) 238-5851. This facility is disabled accessible. Auxiliary aids and services are available for individuals with speech, vision or hearing impairments (48 hour notice is required). Please contact the ADA Coordinator at (818) 238-5021 voice or (818) 238-5035 TDD with questions or concerns.

CLOSED SESSION ORAL COMMUNICATIONS IN COUNCIL CHAMBER:

Comments by the public on Closed Session items only. These comments will be limited to **three** minutes.

For this segment, a **PINK** card must be completed and presented to the City Clerk.

CLOSED SESSION IN CITY HALL BASEMENT LUNCH ROOM/CONFERENCE ROOM:

- a. Conference with Labor Negotiator:
Pursuant to Govt. Code §54957.6
Name of the Agency Negotiator: Management Services Director/Judie Sarquiz.
Name of Organization Representing Employee: Represented: Burbank City Employees Association, Burbank Management Association, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Burbank Firefighters Association, Burbank Firefighters Chief Officers Unit, and Burbank Police Officers Association; Unrepresented, and Appointed Officials.
Summary of Labor Issues to be Negotiated: Current Contracts and Retirement Issues.
- b. Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation:
Pursuant to Govt. Code §54956.9(a)
Name of Case: Nolan v. Alvord.
Case No.: BS092136
Brief description and nature of case: Injunctive relief.
- c. Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation (City as potential defendant):
Pursuant to Govt. Code §54956.9(b)(1)
Number of potential case(s): 1
- d. Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation (City as possible plaintiff):
Pursuant to Govt. Code §54956.9(c)

- Number of potential case(s): 1**
e. **Public Employee Performance Evaluation:**
Pursuant to Govt. Code §54957 and 54957.6
Title of Employee's Position: City Manager.

When the Council reconvenes in open session, the Council may make any required disclosures regarding actions taken in Closed Session or adopt any appropriate resolutions concerning these matters.

6:30 P.M.

INVOCATION:

The Courts have concluded that sectarian prayer as part of City Council meetings is not permitted under the Constitution.

FLAG SALUTE:

ROLL CALL:

ANNOUNCEMENT: WEDNESDAY NIGHT PRIME TIME PROGRAMS.

PRESENTATION: DONATION FROM TARGET STORES TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

RECOGNITION: YOUTH PROGRAMS SUPPORTER RECOGNITION CEREMONY.

PROCLAMATION: NATIONAL TEEN READ MONTH.

PRESENTATION: STATE OF THE STATE ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACK SCOTT.

COUNCIL COMMENTS: (Including reporting on Council Committee Assignments)

INTRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEMS:

At this time additional items to be considered at this meeting may be introduced. As a general rule, the Council may not take action on any item which does not appear on this agenda. However, the Council may act if an emergency situation exists or if the Council finds that a need to take action arose subsequent to the posting of the agenda. Govt. Code §54954.2(b).

6:30 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING:

1. APPEAL OF PLANNING BOARD APPROVAL OF PROJECT NO. 2004-42 (CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT) AT 1209 EAST ELMWOOD AVENUE (DR. RAFFI MARGOSSIAN, APPLICANT):

The purpose of this item is to consider three appeals of the August 9, 2004 Planning Board approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Project No. 2004-42.

In March 2004, Dr. Raffi Margossian applied for a CUP to allow grading for the expansion of an existing level building pad in the hillside area by 2,784 square feet (sf) and to allow construction of a 396 sf accessory structure on his property at 1209 East Elmwood Avenue in the R-1 Zone. The applicant intends to build a 7,290 sf house on the enlarged building pad. The property is accessed via a 20-foot wide private driveway serving this and three other lots created by Parcel Map No. 25082 in 1999.

The Planning Board held a public hearing on this application on July 12, 2004. The hearing was continued to August 9, 2004 to allow staff time to research several questions the Board raised in response to public testimony. The Planning Board approved the CUP subject to several conditions, including completion of a traffic safety study for the access driveway with recommendations for installing a guardrail, and required that a guardrail be installed before approval of a grading permit. The Board provided that the guardrail requirement could be waived upon review of the traffic engineer's report.

Dr. Raffi Margossian, applicant and appellant, is appealing the condition for the traffic engineer's study and installation of the guardrail. He notes that the expense is onerous and should be shared by all users of the driveway. He also notes that a CUP for a neighboring property was approved for similar grading last year and was not required to improve the driveway.

Mr. Lyle Hall, owner of 722 Wilson Court adjacent to the access driveway, is appealing the language of this condition to clarify the ability of the Board to waive the guardrail requirement, and to keep the option of further legal action open.

Mr. Garnik Mnatsakayan, owner of adjoining property at 1203 East Elmwood Avenue, is appealing the approval of the accessory structure because of its potential visual and audible impacts on his property.

Staff finds that the traffic safety improvements should be installed and implemented as recommended by the traffic engineer. The City has no authority to require that other property owners share in the cost, as previous approvals regarding the access driveway (including the Parcel Map) cannot be revisited at this point, and the City is not party to the maintenance declaration recorded for the property. Staff is recommending against approval of the CUP with respect to the accessory structure.

A Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project was prepared by staff in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and was posted on July 28, 2004.

Recommendation:

Adoption of proposed resolution entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK APPROVING THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT OF PROJECT NO. 2004-42 (1209 East Elmwood Avenue).

REPORTING ON CLOSED SESSION:

INITIAL OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OF ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: (Two minutes on any matter concerning City Business.)

There are four segments of Oral Communications during the Council Meeting. The first precedes the Closed Session items, the second and third segments precede the main part of the City Council's business (but follow announcements and public hearings), and the fourth is at the end of the meeting following all other City business.

Closed Session Oral Communications. During this period of oral communications, the public may comment only on items listed on the Closed Session Agenda(s). A **PINK** card must be completed and presented to the City Clerk. Comments will be limited to **three** minutes.

Initial Open Public Comment Period of Oral Communications. During this period of Oral Communications, the public may comment on any matter concerning City Business. A **BLUE** card must be completed and presented to the City Clerk. NOTE: Any person speaking during this segment may not speak during the third period of Oral Communications. Comments will be limited to **two** minutes.

Agenda Item Oral Communications. This segment of Oral Communications immediately follows the first period, but is limited to comments on agenda items for this meeting. For this segment, a **YELLOW** card must be completed and presented to the City Clerk. Comments will be limited to **four** minutes.

Final Open Public Comment Period of Oral Communications. This segment of oral communications follows the conclusion of agenda items at the end of the meeting. The public may comment at this time on any matter concerning City Business. NOTE: Any member of the public speaking at the Initial Open Public Comment Period of Oral Communications may not speak during this segment. For this segment, a **GREEN** card must be completed and presented to the City Clerk. Comments will be limited to **two** minutes.

City Business. City business is defined as any matter that is under the jurisdiction of the City Council. Although other topics may be of interest to some people, if those topics are not under City Council jurisdiction, they are not City business and may not be discussed during Oral Communications.

Videotapes/Audiotapes. Videotapes or audiotapes may be presented by any member of the public at any period of Oral Communications or at any public hearing. Such tapes may not exceed the time limit of the applicable Oral Communications period or any public comment period during a public hearing. The playing time for the tape shall be counted as part of the allowed speaking time of that member of the public during that period.

Videotapes must be delivered to the Public Information Office by no later than 10:00 a.m. on the morning of the Council meeting in a format compatible with the City's video equipment. Neither videotapes nor audiotapes will be reviewed for content or edited by the City prior to the meeting, but it is suggested that the tapes not include material that is slanderous, pornographic, demeaning to any person or group of people, an invasion of privacy of any person, or inclusive of material covered by copyright.

Printed on the videocassette cover should be the name of the speaker, the period of oral communication the tape is to be played, and the total running time of the segment. The Public Information Office is not responsible for "cueing up" tapes, rewinding tapes, or fast forwarding tapes. To prevent errors, there should be ten seconds of blank tape at the beginning and end of the segment to be played. Additionally, the speaker should provide the first sentence on the tape as the "in cue" and the last sentence as the "out cue".

As with all Oral Communications, videotapes and audiotapes are limited to the subject matter jurisdiction of the City and may be declared out of order by the Mayor.

Disruptive Conduct. The Council requests that you observe the order and decorum of our Council Chamber by turning off or setting to vibrate all cellular telephones and pagers, and that you refrain from making personal, impertinent, or slanderous remarks. Boisterous and disruptive behavior while the Council is in session, and the display of signs in a manner which violates the rights of others or prevents others from watching or fully participating in the Council meeting, is a violation of our Municipal Code and any person who engages in such conduct can be ordered to leave the Council Chamber by the Mayor.

Once an individual is requested to leave the Council Chamber by the Mayor, that individual may not return to the Council Chamber for the remainder of the meeting. BMC §2-216(b).

Individuals standing in the Council Chamber will be required to take a seat. Also, no materials shall be placed in the aisles in order to keep the aisles open and passable. BMC §2-217(b).

Your participation in City Council meetings is welcome and your courtesy will be appreciated.

COUNCIL AND STAFF RESPONSE TO INITIAL OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OF ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

AGENDA ITEM ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: (Four minutes on Agenda items only.)

COUNCIL AND STAFF RESPONSE TO AGENDA ITEM ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

JOINT MEETING WITH THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY:

2. BID SCHEDULE NO. R-1167 (DOWNTOWN WAYFINDING SIGNAGE PROGRAM):

The purpose of this report is to request the Council and Redevelopment Agency Board to approve the Downtown Wayfinding Signage Program and adopt a resolution awarding Bid Schedule (BS) No. R-1167 to Fluoresco Lighting & Signs Inc. The intent of the Wayfinding Signage Program is to guide visitors from the freeway exits to Downtown Burbank, as well as guide motorists to various destinations and available parking in Downtown Burbank.

The Wayfinding Signage Program consists of 101 signs which include freeway off-ramp directional signs, primary and secondary directional signs, parking identification and district identification signs. BS No. R-1167 was advertised on July 28, 2004 and July 31, 2004 in the Burbank Leader. A mandatory pre-bid meeting was held on August 9, 2004. Fourteen sets of plans were sold to prospective bidders, eleven of which attended the mandatory walk through. Ultimately, staff received only two bids as follows:

Fluoresco Lighting & Signs Inc.	\$134,905.05
Absolute Sign Inc.	\$249,651.05

Staff and Hunt Design Associates have reviewed the competitive bids submitted for the Downtown Wayfinding Signage Program. Initially, the difference in the cost of the two proposals seemed unusual; however, based on comments received by Hunt Design Associates, the difference in cost can be attributed to a conservative estimate by Absolute Sign Inc. across every individual bid item. Further, Absolute Sign Inc. has the added cost of subcontracting out some of the work, whereas Fluoresco Lighting & Signs Inc. will not have any subcontractors on the project. It is the opinion of Hunt Design Associates that the bid submitted by Fluoresco Lighting & Sign Inc. is appropriate. Currently, Fluoresco Lighting & Sign Inc. is working on two other projects that were designed by Hunt Design Associates for the cities of Los Angeles and Long Beach, who have not experienced any problems with Fluoresco Lighting & Signs Inc.

The Wayfinding Signage Program is funded by the Downtown Property-Based Business Improvement District, known as Burbank Partners.

Recommendation:

Adoption of proposed City Council resolution entitled:
A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK APPROVING THE
DOWNTOWN WAYFINDING SIGNAGE PROGRAM.

Adoption of proposed Redevelopment Agency resolution entitled:
A RESOLUTION OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY 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 THE
DOWNTOWN WAYFINDING SIGNAGE PROGRAM, BID SCHEDULE NO. R-1167.

CONSENT CALENDAR: (Items 3 and 4)

The following items may be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a Council Member so requests, in which event the item will be removed from the consent calendar and considered in its normal sequence on the agenda. A **roll call** vote is required for the consent calendar.

3. ACCEPTING A DONATION TO THE BURBANK POLICE DEPARTMENT AND
AMENDING THE FISCAL YEAR 2004-05 BUDGET FOR THE PURPOSE OF
APPROPRIATING THESE MONIES:

Staff is requesting Council approval and appropriation of monies donated to the Burbank Police Department by Target Stores.

In August 2004, the Police Department received a donation from Target Stores in the amount of \$1,580 to fund replacement equipment for the Youth Services Child Protection Program. The Department would like to appropriate this money to replace equipment in the McGruff Program, which helps officers teach elementary school children about avoiding strangers and pedestrian safety.

Recommendation:

Adoption of proposed resolution entitled:
(4/5 vote required)
A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK AMENDING FISCAL
YEAR 2004-2005 BUDGET FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACCEPTING TARGET STORES'
DONATION OF \$1,580.

4. APPROVAL OF AN AGREEMENT WITH STEVE STARLEAF INC. AS THE OPERATOR OF THE BURBANK TENNIS CENTER:

The purpose of this report is to obtain Council approval of an agreement between the City of Burbank (City) and Steve Starleaf, Inc. for the operation of the City-owned Burbank Tennis Center located at McCambridge Park.

Steve Starleaf, Inc. has been operating, under an agreement with the City, the Burbank Tennis Center at McCambridge Park since 1997. The agreement expired in October 2002. At the request of the Park, Recreation and Community Services Department, Steve Starleaf, Inc. agreed to continue providing facility operations under the same terms and conditions of the expired agreement on a month-to-month basis. This interim agreement facilitated the uninterrupted delivery of services at the Burbank Tennis Center, as well as the tennis lesson program conducted at five public tennis facilities located at Olive Park, Verdugo Park, Brace Park and John Burroughs High School.

It is staff's determination that Steve Starleaf Inc.'s management of the facility is of significant benefit to the City. The dedication and commitment to providing quality service to the patrons of the Burbank Tennis Center, as well as the Burbank Tennis Instruction Program, is directly reflected in the strong participation level and in the wide varieties of programs and services offered through the framework of the agreement. Additionally, Steve Starleaf Inc. has made a significant commitment to the effective use and care of the City's public facilities and has annually supported the fundraising and programming efforts of various non-profit agencies including Burbank Center for the Retarded, Burbank Family Services Agency and the Burbank Kiwanis.

Staff has reviewed and revised the various terms and conditions of the previous operating agreement. There were no major changes made to the proposed agreement from the previously-executed agreement. This agreement reflects the terms and conditions which staff believes will provide for the effective and efficient management of the Burbank Tennis Center at McCambridge Park and will yield a multi-faceted offering of tennis programs for the community.

Recommendation:

Adoption of proposed resolution entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK APPROVING THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF BURBANK AND STEVE STARLEAF, INC. GRANTING AN EXCLUSIVE RIGHT AND LICENSE TO USE THE BURBANK TENNIS CENTER AND TO OPERATE A TENNIS PROGRAM.

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR

*** *** ***

REPORTS TO COUNCIL :

5. STATUS REPORT ON THE INTERIM DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ORDINANCE FOR R-1, R-1-E AND R-1-H SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONES:

The purpose of this report is to provide an update to the Council on the status of the Interim Development Control Ordinance (IDCO) that provides interim development standards for the R-1, R-1-E and R-1-H single-family residential zones. The Council is not required to take any action regarding the IDCO. A public hearing has been scheduled on October 26, 2004 for the Council to consider extending the IDCO. The public will again have the opportunity to provide input at that hearing.

On September 14, 2004, the Council adopted an IDCO (Ordinance No. 3646) establishing interim development standards for the R-1, R-1-E, and R-1-H zones while staff completes work on the ongoing study of single-family development standards. The interim standards decreased the maximum allowed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 0.6 including the garage to 0.45 not including the garage, and decreased the maximum allowed height from 27 feet to the ceiling and 35 feet to the top of the roof to 22 feet to the top plate and 29 feet to the top of the roof.

The IDCO is valid for 45 days, after which it must be extended by the Council or expire. Unless extended, the IDCO will expire on October 29, 2004. Pursuant to the California Government Code, a written report must be issued at least ten days prior to the expiration of the IDCO to describe the measures taken to alleviate the condition which led to the adoption of the IDCO. Staff continues to work on the ongoing study of single-family standards to formulate recommendations for the permanent standards. However, staff will not be prepared to present revised standards to the Council or solicit adequate community input before the IDCO expires on October 29, 2004. As such, staff will return to the Council on October 26, 2004 to hold another public hearing for the Council to consider extending the IDCO.

There has not yet been adequate time to assess the full impact of the interim standards on single-family development. Of the 62 single-family homes that were awaiting plan check at the time the IDCO was adopted, seven would not have met either the interim FAR and/or height standards. One of the projects submitted for plan check since the adoption of the IDCO exceeds the interim 0.45 FAR; all other submittals have complied with the interim standards.

Staff anticipates having a revised set of proposed standards ready for public review by November 2004. However, given the challenges of soliciting effective public participation during the holiday season, staff intends to schedule another community meeting on this issue in January 2005. As with the October 26, 2004 hearing and with the previous community meetings on this issue, staff will utilize all available means to provide notice to the community.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Council note and file this report.

6. COUNCIL MEMBER GOLONSKI'S REQUEST TO RECONSIDER THE KENNEL ATTENDANT POSITION FOR THE POLICE DEPARTMENT:

During the City's Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05 budget process, the Police Department eliminated one Kennel Attendant position. Kennel Attendants work at the Animal Shelter, and are responsible for the hands-on care of the animals and maintenance of the shelter. Historically, the Animal Shelter operated with one Kennel Attendant, but in FY 2000-01, the Police Department increased staffing to two Kennel Attendants due to more animals entering the shelter and animals being kept for longer periods of time. Animal care and maintenance are continuing duties that must be undertaken seven days a week. When Kennel Attendants are not available, Animal Control Officers are required to perform the duties, decreasing patrol time and extending response time to calls for service. With a new Lieutenant overseeing the Animal Shelter and animal adoption rates increasing, the need for the second Kennel Attendant has never been more necessary. Cutting the Kennel Attendant has directly affected service to the public.

Council Member Golonski requested that the issue of the Kennel Attendant position be agendized again. This is the first step in the one-step, two-step agenda process.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Council discuss the matter and provide direction.

7. COMMENT LETTER ON THE AIRPORT AUTHORITY'S MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AND RELATED ACTIONS:

The purpose of this report is for the Council to provide input for the City's comment letter regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared by the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority (Authority) for the proposed Development Agreement between the Authority and the City of Burbank (City).

As the public agency primarily responsible for carrying out the projects included within the Agreement, the Authority is acting as the lead agency responsible for preparing and approving the environmental document. The City is also a public agency with the responsibility of approving the Development Agreement and related actions. Any public agency other than the lead agency that has discretionary approval authority over a proposed project is considered a "responsible agency" under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). As such, the City is acting as a responsible agency.

Because a responsible agency does not prepare its own environmental document, it must rely upon the lead agency's environmental analysis and make its own determination regarding the adequacy of the document. Generally, the City's duties as a responsible agency are as follows:

- Consult with lead agency: The Authority as the lead agency must consult with the City during the preparation of the environmental document.
- Comment on the document: The City may submit comments to the Authority regarding the proposed document along with members of the public and other public agencies.
- Determine adequacy of the document: Once the document is approved by the Authority, the City must determine if the document adequately evaluates the possible environmental impacts of the project. If the City deems the MND to be adequate, the City must rely upon the document when making its own decisions regarding the project. If the City determines that the document is inadequate, it generally must pursue an immediate legal challenge to the MND or waive all claims regarding adequacy of the document. Aside from legal challenge, there are several options available to the City under CEQA; however, these other options are applicable under very limited circumstances.
- Consider document and impacts: Before making any decision on the proposed project, the City must consider the environmental impacts of the project, just as it would consider the impacts of a project for which it is the lead agency.

Pursuant to the second item above, staff will prepare a comment letter regarding the MND based upon an analysis of the document, comments received from the City Council and input received from the Planning Board at its meeting of October 4, 2004. Staff seeks direction from the Council on any specific issues that the Council would like addressed in the letter and seeks authorization to prepare a letter based upon that direction for submittal to the Authority.

It is important to note that the City did not prepare the proposed MND, will not approve the document and is not in a position to accept comments regarding the document. Comments provided at this Council meeting or to the City in general, whether verbal or written, cannot be considered official comments on the MND. The City will not forward comments submitted to the City to the Authority. All persons wishing to submit official comments regarding the MND must do so directly to the Authority by or before October 18, 2004. The Council will not make any decision at this meeting regarding the MND or the Development Agreement itself. The Authority is scheduled to hold its own public hearing on Monday, October 25, 2004 to consider adoption of the MND. The Planning Board and Council will both hold public hearings later this year to consider the Development Agreement and related project approvals.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Council provide input for the City's comment letter on the proposed MND and authorize staff to prepare the letter and submit it to the Authority.

ADOPTION OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE:

8. GREEN BUILDING AND SUSTAINABLE ARCHITECTURE ORDINANCE AND CONSTRUCTION AND DEMOLITION DEBRIS DIVERSION ORDINANCE:

The purpose of this report is to request Council adoption of the Green Building and Sustainable Architecture Ordinance and the Construction and Demolition Debris Diversion Ordinance. Both ordinances are voluntary and are designed to encourage the efficient use of building materials, use of recycled content materials, recycling of debris, maintenance of indoor air quality, energy efficiency and water conservation. The ordinances include standards established by the Regional Water Quality Board for storm water pollution control, minimum landfill diversion rates developed by the Integrated Waste Management Board and sustainable building practices designed by the United States Green Building Council. The Green Building Ordinance, which incorporates all three standards, establishes three levels of compliance based on the size and type of project and offers incentives to encourage homeowners and private developers to practice sustainable building practices. The Ordinance provides incentives for participation in the program by offering fee reductions based on the project's level of compliance, including certification as a Certified, Silver or Gold Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) structure. An additional incentive was added by the Council at its October 5, 2004 meeting for certification as a Platinum LEED structure. The ordinances will be additions to Chapter 7 of the Burbank Municipal Code. The Green Building Ordinance has been developed by the Building Division. The Debris Diversion Ordinance has been developed jointly by the Building Division and Public Works Department.

This ordinance was introduced at the October 5, 2004 Council meeting.

Recommendation:

Adoption of proposed ordinance entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK ADDING ARTICLE 20 TO CHAPTER 7 OF THE BURBANK MUNICIPAL CODE RELATING TO THE VOLUNTARY GREEN BUILDING AND SUSTAINABLE ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM.

RECONVENE the Redevelopment Agency meeting for public comment.

FINAL OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OF ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: (Two minutes on any matter concerning the business of the City.)

This is the time for the Final Open Public Comment Period of Oral Communications. Each speaker will be allowed a maximum of **TWO** minutes and may speak on any matter concerning the business of the City. However, any speaker that spoke during the Initial Open Public Comment Period of Oral Communications may not speak during the Final Open Public

Comment Period of Oral Communications.

For this segment, a **GREEN** card must be completed, indicating the matter to be discussed, and presented to the City Clerk.

COUNCIL AND STAFF RESPONSE TO THE FINAL OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OF ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

ADJOURNMENT.

**For a copy of the agenda and related staff reports,
please visit the
City of Burbank's Web Site:
www.ci.burbank.ca.us**