



COUNCIL AGENDA - CITY OF BURBANK
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2005
5:00 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; Unrepresented, and Appointed Officials.

Summary of Labor Issues to be Negotiated: Contracts and Retirement Issues.

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

Pursuant to Govt. Code §54956.9(c)

Number of potential case(s): 1

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:

Pastor Paul Clairville, Westminster Presbyterian Church.

The Courts have concluded that sectarian prayer as part of City

Council meetings is not permitted under the Constitution.

FLAG SALUTE:

ROLL CALL:

MOMENT OF SILENCE: In honor of all municipal employees who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

PRESENTATION: ANIMAL SHELTER RABIES CLINIC.

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).

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 action items on the agenda 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 Action Agenda items only.)

COUNCIL AND STAFF RESPONSE TO AGENDA ITEM ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

RECESS for the Redevelopment Agency, Housing Authority, Parking Authority and Youth Endowment Services Fund Board meetings.

RECONVENE for the City Council meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR: (Items 1 through 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.

1. TREASURER'S REPORT:

The City Treasurer's report on investment and reinvestment of temporarily idle funds for the quarter ending September 30, 2005.

Recommendation:

Note and file.

2. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE SHEAKLEY UNISERVICE, INC. FLEXIBLE BENEFITS PLAN ADOPTION AGREEMENT, THE CITY OF BURBANK FLEXIBLE BENEFITS PLAN SUMMARY PLAN DESCRIPTION, AND SHEAKLEY UNISERVICE, INC. FLEXIBLE BENEFITS PLAN BASIC PLAN DOCUMENT:

Staff is requesting that the Council approve revisions to the Sheakley Uniservice, Inc. Flexible Benefits Plan Adoption Agreement, the City of Burbank Flexible Benefits Plan

Summary Plan Description, and Sheakley Uniservice, Inc. Flexible Benefits Plan Basic Plan Document to include the following new Internal Revenue Code (IRC) provisions:

- A two and one-half month extension beyond the plan year for participants to incur eligible medical expenses pertaining to the medical reimbursement flexible spending account;
- Amending the definition of “eligible medical expenses” to allow for Health Savings Accounts (HSAs);
- Amending the definition of “eligible medical expenses” to include over-the-counter drugs; and,
- Rules governing the disclosure of health information as governed by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA).

Periodically, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) updates regulations pertaining to §125 Flexible Benefit Plans. Staff recommends that the City Manager, or her designee, be given the authority to make plan amendment changes, from time to time, as necessary to meet future IRC provisions.

The cost to the City for amending these documents is \$100. In addition, staff anticipates that adoption of these IRS provisions will encourage more employees to participate in the City's §125 Flexible Benefit Plan. Increased participation will reduce Federal, State and Medicare tax liability for the participating employees, and to the extent that participation in the Plan increases, the City's Medicare tax liability will also decrease.

Recommendation:

Adoption of proposed resolution entitled:

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK APPROVING REVISIONS TO THE SHEAKLEY UNISERVICE, INC. FLEXIBLE BENEFITS PLAN ADOPTION AGREEMENT, THE CITY OF BURBANK FLEXIBLE BENEFITS PLAN SUMMARY PLAN DESCRIPTION, AND SHEAKLEY UNISERVICE, INC. FLEXIBLE BENEFITS PLAN BASIC PLAN DOCUMENT.

3. APPROVAL OF CONTRACT DOCUMENTS AND AWARDED A CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FOR THE PUBLIC WORKS FLEET SERVICES REPAIR SHOP MODIFICATION PROJECT – BID SCHEDULE NO. 1126:

Staff is requesting Council approval of contract documents and award of a construction contract for Bid Schedule No. 1126, Public Works Fleet Services Repair Shop Modification Project. In accordance with the Council's strong commitment to a clean environment, the City has purchased 78 alternative fuel vehicles over the past five years including refuse trucks, street sweepers, sedans and several other light and heavy-duty vehicle types.

In order to provide a safe working environment in which to repair and maintain the Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) and hydrogen fueled vehicles, the Fleet Services Repair Shop must be modified. Unlike diesel fuel and gasoline, CNG and hydrogen fuels are of a gaseous nature and are lighter than air. Any fuel which may leak would rise and collect at the ceiling of the repair shop, creating potentially hazardous working conditions. Installing a full time, sensor-monitored and activated air ventilation system will provide six new air changes per hour inside the shop to create a safe working environment.

Bid Schedule No. 1126 was advertised in the Burbank Leader on May 28, 2005 and June 1, 2005. Seven copies of the bid were taken out, and only one bid was returned. Weaver Electric, Inc. of Anaheim, California submitted a bid of \$1,396,193, which is 32 percent higher than the original engineer's estimate of \$950,000. It is the opinion of staff and its consultant that re-bidding the project will likely result in substantially higher bids due to the recent rise in construction costs.

Recommendation:

Adoption of proposed resolution entitled:

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 TO WEAVER ELECTRIC INC. FOR THE PUBLIC WORKS FLEET SERVICES REPAIR SHOP MODIFICATION PROJECT, BID SCHEDULE NO 1126.

4. TERMINATION OF THE LOCAL EMERGENCY DUE TO THE WILDFIRES AND MUDSLIDES:

On Thursday, September 29, 2005, the Director of Emergency Services proclaimed a local emergency due to the wildfires in the hills of the City, in accordance with Burbank Municipal Code (BMC) Section 10-106 (the "Local Emergency"). The Council ratified that action on October 4, 2005. On or about October 17, 2005, weather patterns shifted dramatically from hot, dry Santa Ana winds, to rain showers and wind. While the threat of any additional fires ended, the burnt hillsides began to experience severe mudslides. On October 17, 2005, at approximately 4:00 p.m., heavy rain showers began to jeopardize the stability of the hillside areas damaged by the fires, threatening severe mudslides and causing a new condition of extreme peril to the safety of persons and property directly below the burnt hillside. The Director of Emergency Services modified the scope of the existing Local Emergency by the Director of Emergency Services, when the Council was not in session, and proclaimed the existence, or threatened existence, of a disaster within the hill area of said City at that time due to the mudslides. Such modification was reviewed by the Council on October 18, 2005, and the Council declared that such Local Emergency, as modified, was to continue at that time. On October 19, 2005, and in accordance with BMC Section 10-106(6)(i), the Director of Emergency Services adopted certain emergency rules and regulations, waiving bidding requirements during

existence of a local emergency as to emergency contracts related to the mudslides. On November 1, 2005, the Council reviewed the Local Emergency, as modified, and declared that it was to continue, and ratified the adopted rules and regulations. In accordance with Government Code Section 8630, the governing body is required to proclaim the termination of the local emergency at the earliest possible date that conditions warrant. The Council is being requested to terminate the Local Emergency, as modified, at this time.

Recommendation:

Adoption of proposed resolution entitled:
A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK TERMINATING THE EXISTENCE OF A LOCAL EMERGENCY.

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR *** *** ***

REPORTS TO COUNCIL:

5. FIRST STEP FOR CONSIDERATION OF DUPLEXES N THE 300-FOOT RADIUS SEPARATION FOR SECOND DWELLING UNITS:

At the September 27, 2005 meeting, Mayor Vander Borcht requested that staff bring back a one-step, two-step agenda item regarding second dwelling units (SDUs). Specifically, the Mayor requested that the Council consider an amendment to the Burbank Municipal Code (BMC) to include legal non-conforming duplexes in the separation requirement for SDUs in the R-1 Zone, such that an SDU could not locate within 300 feet of another SDU or a legal non-conforming duplex.

In response to changes in the State laws that govern the regulation of SDUs, the Council in 2003 adopted an amendment to the BMC that changed the City's requirements for the establishment of SDUs in the R-1 Zone. One of the standards adopted by the Council was a spacing requirement between SDUs in an effort to limit their proliferation in single-family neighborhoods. The BMC stipulates that no SDU may be established on a lot located within 300 feet of another lot on which an SDU is located. Once a property has been approved for an SDU and the unit is constructed, no other property within a 300-foot radius of that property may be approved for an SDU so long as the structure remains in place and the property owner does not elect to abandon the SDU approval.

In addition to SDUs, there are other situations where more than one unit is present on a lot. A number of R-1 properties in the City have actual duplexes that were legal when constructed and are now considered legal non-conforming. There are also a small number of properties that have two single-family homes built on them, some of which have been approved through the Conditional Use Permit process (as currently allowed by the BMC on lots of 11,750 square feet or greater). Further, a large number of R-1 lots

contain “guest houses,” which were at one time legally permitted in the R-1 Zone.

If the Council wishes to consider the inclusion of duplexes or other such structures in the SDU separation requirement, the Council may direct staff to return with a second step report that would seek Council direction to initiate a Zone Text Amendment. Staff would provide the Council with additional information on this matter in the second step report. However, staff offers two points for the Council to consider:

1. The City’s current separation requirement for SDUs is not explicitly authorized by State law, and as such carries with it some risk. The City is largely preempted by State law in its regulation of SDUs, and the recent changes to the SDU law have left this area with a great deal of legal uncertainty.
2. BMC provisions governing legal non-conforming uses and structures provide that if a legal non-conforming duplex in the R-1 Zone were destroyed, it could not be reconstructed because there would be no way to do so in compliance with current Code requirements (since duplexes are prohibited in the R-1 Zone). Staff believes that there is a question of equity and fairness associated with including such structures in the separation requirement since all properties within a 300-foot radius of the duplex would be denied the opportunity to construct a new SDU because their neighbor maintained a duplex that would not be legal to construct under current standards.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Council determine whether the matter be placed on a future agenda. Staff seeks direction from the Council on what additional information would be included in the second step report to assist in deliberations on whether to initiate a Zone Text Amendment on this matter.

6. REVIEW OF THE GENERAL FUND’S FINANCIAL STATUS AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2005 AND THE CITY’S FIVE-YEAR FINANCIAL FORECAST:

The purpose of this report is to provide the Council with a review the City’s General Fund financial status as of September 30, 2005 and the City’s Five-Year Financial Forecast.

For the first quarter of the Fiscal Year (FY), the General Fund received \$19,940,534 in recurring revenue, which represents 16.2 percent of the original estimated revenues. To put this figure in perspective, the City received only 14.5 percent within the first quarter of FY 2004-05.

Overall, the General Fund has expended approximately 25 percent of recurring appropriations as of September 30, 2005. For comparison, on September 30, 2004, General Fund expenditures also represented 25 percent of recurring appropriations for FY 2004-05.

Based on the re-estimation of anticipated revenues and the adopted FY 2005-06 appropriations, the following is a recap of the FY 2005-06 budget:

Total Recurring Revenues	\$122,908,815
Less – Use of UUT & In-Lieu Set Aside	<u>(2,059,000)</u>
Net Recurring Revenues	120,849,815
Less:	
Recurring Appropriations	(121,950,096)
Potential Impact of Anticipated MOUs (BCEA, BMA, Z, Execs)	(2,126,275)
Plus:	
Savings from Frozen Positions	2,203,981
Recurring Balance/(Deficit)	<u>(1,022,575)</u>
Use of PERS Stabilization Fund to balance the budget	1,022,575
RECURRING BALANCE	<u>\$-0-</u>
Undesignated Fund Balance, July 1, 2005	\$7,277,482
Plus: Use of Set-aside UUT & In-lieu Set Aside	<u>300,000</u>
SUBTOTAL	7,577,482
Less:	
Budgeted one-time items	(1,215,353)
Estimated cost for recent fire and flood damage	(1,000,000)
Increase in working capital reserves	(1,141,000)
Increase in emergency reserves	(374,000)
Compensated absences	(800,000)
Retiree Medical trust appropriation (year 4)	<u>(407,600)</u>
Total Non-Recurring Uses	(4,937,953)
Available Non-Recurring Balance	2,639,529
Plus Available Recurring Balance (from above)	<u>-0-</u>
ESTIMATED AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE, JUNE 30, 2006	<u>\$2,639,529</u>

Due to the combination of the overall economic climate and the City's expected spending, staff believes that the City is in a stable, although tentative, fiscal position for FY 2005-06, with a projected recurring deficit of over \$1 million at the end of FY 2005-06 (balanced by the PERS Stabilization Fund). The overall ending balance is expected to be \$2.6 million, but this excludes any departmental mid-year appropriation requests. The budget gap in FY 2009-10 is projected to be \$4.3 million.

Over the next five years, revenues are expected to increase at an average of 3.5 percent, and costs at an average of four percent. In the meantime, staff is continuing to look at options via revenue enhancement, efficiencies and/or cost cutting to assist in the balancing of future fiscal year budgets.

Recommendation:

Note and file.

7. INFORMATION ON PROPOSED SEWER IMPROVEMENTS BY THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES AFFECTING THE CITY OF BURBANK:

The City of Los Angeles (LA) is undergoing a long-term water resources planning process referred to as the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) that is intended to meet the integrated water, wastewater and stormwater runoff needs of LA through the year 2020 and beyond.

As part of the IRP, LA released a four-volume Facilities Plan in July 2004, which explains the water resource challenges facing LA in the year 2020 and sets forth various capital projects that could address those challenges.

In order to evaluate the various project options, a stakeholder Steering Group was organized which included Public Works Department staff. The Stakeholder group narrowed the Facilities Plan options down to the following four:

- Alternative 1: Hyperion Water Treatment Plan expansion
- Alternative 2: Tillman and Los Angeles-Glendale Water Replenishment Plant expansions
- Alternative 3: Tillman Water Replenishment Plant expansion without cisterns
- Alternative 4 – Tillman Water Replenishment Plan expansion

One of the needs identified in the IRP process is additional capacity of the LA sewer collection system. To address this need, large diameter sewer tunnels must be built from the Hyperion Treatment Plant in Playa Del Rey to the San Fernando Valley. One section of this sewer tunnel project is proposed to extend from the Los Angeles Zoo to Toluca Lake. The construction of the sewer tunnel project, known as the Glendale-Burbank Interceptor Sewer (GBIS), is part of each of the four alternatives presented in the Facilities Plan.

The proposed GBIS project is a buried tunnel located between the vicinity of Valley Spring Lane and Forman Avenue and the LA Zoo. The GBIS tunnel will divert all flow from an existing LA sewer to the new GBIS. This will allow for the rehabilitation of the existing LA sewer line. The GBIS will consist of 5.75 miles of eight-foot diameter pipe and is designed to carry approximately 50 million gallons per day of average dry weather flow.

There are two alternative alignments for the GBIS. The South Alignment does not enter Burbank except under a corner of the Lakeside Golf Course. The North Alignment would cut through the southern portion of Burbank and would include a shaft near the intersection of Bob Hope Drive and Riverside Drive. The North Alignment also includes shafts at the dirt lot near Valleyheart Drive and Reese Place and in the park near Victory Boulevard and the State Route 134 freeway. The North Alignment would also consist of an air treatment facility at the Valleyheart Drive and Reese Place site.

Of these two alternatives, it appears that the South Alignment would not create significant construction impacts on the residents of Burbank. The North Alignment, however, may include construction-related impacts and would include tunneling under Burbank residences and businesses along with the placement of several maintenance holes in Burbank streets. Other concerns with the North Alignment include the diversion of construction-related traffic onto residential streets for as many as four years and the loss of the use of the Valleyheart Drive and Reese Place dirt lot for exercising horses and the access of horse trails if an air treatment facility is placed at this site.

Public Works staff has already submitted comments on an Administrative Draft of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Facilities Plan, including the GBIS, and LA has already held several information public meetings, including one at the Buena Vista Library on October 13, 2005. The Draft EIR is expected to be officially released near the end of November. LA is allowing for a 90-day comment period where any interested person may submit comments. Public Works staff will coordinate comments from all City departments, including concerns regarding the North Alignment, and forward them to LA so that they will be addressed in the Final EIR. As part of the EIR process, three public meetings will be held regarding the IRP. The Draft EIR will be made available at all Burbank libraries for residents to review prior to submitting comments. Any interested person is encouraged to make comments regarding the Draft EIR, including the proposed alignments for the GBIS.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends Council direction to continue working with the City of Los Angeles.

ADOPTION OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE:

8. PROJECT NO. 2005-51 ZONE MAP AMENDMENT AND GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT – 1112-1118 WEST BURBANK BOULEVARD:

The applicant, David Augustine, requested approval of a Zone Map Amendment (ZMA) and a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to allow a zone change for a section of the property at 1112-1118 West Burbank Boulevard (three lots) from Limited Industrial (M-1) to Burbank Center Commercial Manufacturing (BCCM) and a General Plan designation change from Restricted Industry to Mixed Commercial/Office/Industrial. The applicant

proposes to build a new 5,884-square foot retail building with 21 parking spaces.

The proposed zone change is needed to permit the proposed retail use. The retail building cannot be built on the lot with the current M-1 zoning designation. The General Plan designation change is needed to preserve General Plan consistency.

This ordinance was introduced at the November 8, 2005 Council meeting.

Recommendation:

Adoption of proposed ordinance entitled:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BURBANK APPROVING ZONE MAP AMENDMENT FOR PROJECT NO. 2005-51 (1112-1118 West Burbank Boulevard; Applicant: David Augustine).

RECONVENE the Redevelopment Agency, Housing Authority, Parking Authority, and Youth Endowment Services Fund Board meetings 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. To Tuesday, November 22, 2005, at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber , for an Inclusionary Housing and Density Bonus Study Session

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