

**MINUTES**  
**Joint Regular Meeting**  
**ALHAMBRA CITY COUNCIL**  
**ALHAMBRA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY**  
**January 9, 2012**  
**5:30 p.m.**

**ROLL CALL:** At 5:30 p.m., on Monday, January 9, 2012 the Alhambra City Council and the Alhambra Redevelopment Agency (ARA) met in the Council Chambers of the Alhambra City Hall, 111 South First Street, Alhambra, California.

**CITY COUNCIL/ARA BOARD MEMBERS:**

**PRESENT:** MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA, SHAM  
**ABSENT:** NONE

**Officials Present:** City Manager/ARA Executive Director Fuentes, Assistant City Manager/Personnel Director Bacio, City Attorney/Agency Counsel Montes, City Clerk/ARA Assistant Secretary Myles, Deputy City Manager/Director of Administrative Services Schultz, Director of Community Services Jarvis, Director of Finance Espinoza, Fire Chief Walker, Assistant to the City Manager Hayashi, Assistant to the City Manager Keating

**FLAG SALUTE:** Led by Chairman Sham

**READING OF ORDINANCE TITLES**

Government Code Section 36934 requires that all ordinances be read in full prior to Agency Board/City Council taking action on the ordinance. By listing the ordinance title on the Agency Board/Council agenda, Agency Board/Council may determine that the title has been read.

**Action Taken:** On motion of Mr. YAMAUCHI, seconded by Mr. AYALA, the Agency Board/City Council determined that the titles to all ordinances which appear on this public agenda have been read, and waived further reading. Hearing no objections, the Chairman so ordered.

**PRESENTATIONS**

**1. PROPOSED US STORAGE CENTER AT 2500-2520 HELLMAN AVENUE – F2M11-58**

Staff wished to present to the Agency Board the proposed project located at 2500-2520 Hellman Avenue. US Storage Centers and Westport Properties has recently purchased the property located at the southeast corner of Fremont Avenue and Hellman Avenue. The property owner is proposing to build a self-storage facility at the site. The building

would be four stories with 600 to 800 storage units fully contained inside the building. This project was originally presented at the November 7, 2011 adjourned meeting of the Agency/City Council and is returning with rendering of the project and the material boards for the Board's review.

Deputy City Manager/Interim Director of Utilities **SWINK** reported that this project was previously brought before the City Council at their study session meeting on November 7, 2011. At that time, the Council had asked that the project be brought back so that the building materials could be reviewed as well as the actual illustration of what the project would look like before the project moved forward. After the Council has this opportunity to review project's renderings and make comments, the project will go before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Jaime Alai and project architect, James **GOODMAN** made a brief power point presentation outlining updated details of the project including renderings of the building. A copy of this presentation is available for review in the City Clerk's Office. Mr. Alai explained that the project was a 4-story, self-storage facility of 125,000 square feet on a 1.25 acre site. The building height would be primarily 46 feet with a maximum of 52 feet and there would be an on-site management office with the option of providing an on-site residence for the management team. He continued by stating that architecturally, US Storage was presenting a project with a tasteful office/retail look with a substantial amount of glass incorporated to give it a modern storage look. He noted that the other main exterior materials that will be used for the building were integrally colored masonry as well as architectural metal panel system. It anticipated that the building would be not only be an attractive addition to the neighborhood, but would also help to alleviate freeway noise for the neighbors to the north as well as the nearby school.

**Discussion:** Dr. **PLACIDO** noted that while the design's footprint and size was acceptable, he was not impressed with the design of the building. He did not want to see a building constructed primarily out of cement block walls which was very close to the look of the masonry block Mr. Alai was proposing. He felt the masonry block looked similar to cement garden pavers and this would not be attractive for residents living within a quarter mile area to have to look at from their homes. He asked Mr. Alai to keep in mind that this facility was to be located in a residential community near a school that is comprised primarily of stucco. He felt that the US Storage facility should fit into the look of the surrounding residential neighborhood and not stand out in a negative way by being comprised of cement block and metal paneling with roll up doors that reminded him of the look of a commercial/industrial area. He noted that at the November 7, 2011 study session meeting the Agency Board/Council had directed US Storage to create an office look. The previous rendering contained a large amount of glass and looked like a beautiful office building; while this look was not the same at all. He also noted that the current renderings this evening looked nothing like the renderings that were shown at the November 7, 2011 meeting which had a very nice, office style look of brick and a great deal of glass. This is the look that he was expecting for Alhambra. He did not believe that covering the building with metal panels was a very glitzy/inviting look. He believed that the look of the building should improve the neighborhood, not harm it. He suggested that US Storage consider placing the roll up doors in the back rather than the front of the property. He also asked that they work to redesign the project to match the initial renderings shown on November 7, 2011 rather than those presented this evening. He was certain that US Storage could do better in proposing a building with character that would fit the look of neighborhood and be pleasant to surrounding residents, rather

than clashing with it. Finally, he reiterated the importance of keeping in mind the fact that this was not a commercial area, but rather a residential area with a school nearby when designing the storage facility.

Mrs. **MESSINA** asked if US Storage had any alternatives to the use of roll up doors for their storage facilities and whether they could reconfigure the design to place the roll up doors facing the freeway, rather than the residential area. Mr. **ALAI** replied that unfortunately, they did not, roll up doors were the industry's standard. US Storage was an industrial style product. He noted that placing the roll up doors as Mrs. Messina suggested would require a drive around the perimeter to access them, which created an issue with the width requirements of the Fire Department.

Mr. **YAMAUCHI** asked if the elevators for the facility were all internal and whether the peak in the rendering resembling chimney was an elevator shaft. Responding, Mr. **ALAI** noted that the chimney like protrusion was a stairwell. He added that there were two internal elevators. Mr. **YAMAUCHI** noted that the building, as currently rendered, looked very stark, he suggested that they bring back a rendering that would incorporate the planned landscaping for the site. This may improve the look of the building and solve some of the problems that Dr. Placido had with the look of the facility.

Mr. **AYALA** asked if US Storage could perhaps take pictures of a similar US Storage building in Los Angeles County that the Agency Board could have as a reference and comparison point. Mr. **GOODMAN** stated that there was a new facility in the Torrance area that they could bring for the Agency Board to review. He also noted that perhaps the Agency Board/Council was looking for a warmer color palate of reds and browns, which was the palate used for the building that was shown for reference at the November 7, 2011 meeting, rather than the grays and silvers used for this project. Mr. **AYALA** noted that it did not seem to him that the color palate was the issue, but rather the style of the material, the masonry block and lack of glass. He noted that a glass, office look was much more inviting for the area.

Mr. **SHAM** stated that the US Storage facility should look like an office building with glass, not a prison storage look without windows. The architecture should reflect a look that will make people think of an office building, rather than a storage facility. As far as landscaping, he felt this may improve the look of the facility greatly as long as it was designed nicely and maintained to keep a clean, desirable look. Finally, he suggested that the roll up doors be hidden or masked in some way; perhaps with a screen/shield or strategic landscaping. He encouraged US Storage to be creative in thinking of solutions to fix the aesthetic issues pointed out by the Council this evening.

City Manager **FUENTES** added that one of the problems associated with the project was that the back of the plan fronts Hellman Avenue, a very nice residential neighborhood. He noted that the design as presented this evening looked like a regular storage center; and, understandably, this is not a look that residents will want to see. Mr. **ALAI** thanked the Council for their input on the matter and stated that they would make modifications to try to meet the concerns raised and the suggestions offered.

**Action Taken:** Agency Board received and ordered filed the informational report presented this evening.

## 2. REDEVELOPMENT SUCCESSOR AGENCY – F2M12-20, M2M12-3, R2M12-1

Staff requested that City Council determine to either retain the redevelopment activities within the City as a Successor Agency, or approve a resolution to dissolve the Alhambra Redevelopment Agency. City Manager **FUENTES** reported that the recent decision of December 29, 2011 by the California Supreme Court upheld Assembly Bill X1 26 (ABX1 26) which bars redevelopment agencies from engaging in new business and provides for their windup and dissolution. It further provides that a Successor Agency is vested with any remaining authority, rights, powers, duties and obligations formerly vested to the redevelopment agency and is responsible for concluding the affairs of the former agency, in conjunction with the Oversight Board. The City may elect by resolution not to be the Successor Agency. If the City does not opt to be the Successor Agency, the County, or any City or Special District in the respective county may elect, by resolution, to become the Successor Agency. According to ABX1 26, funding for the Successor Agency's activities will come from future tax increment allocations.

City Attorney **MONTES** reported that if the City did not elect to become the Redevelopment Successor Agency, the successor agency could be Los Angeles County or one of the other taxing entities. The function of the successor agency is largely ministerial as it is assigned certain tasks in terms of liquidating assets and paying debt which is all subject to approval by an oversight committee which has yet to be formed. The oversight committees will consist of seven members and there will be one for every single redevelopment agency going out of business in the State. The City of Alhambra will have two seats on the oversight committee. He noted that although it was difficult to predict how the process would unfold, the popular wisdom seems to be that the City would be better off as the Redevelopment Successor Agency due to the fact that City and Agency staff was going to have to spend a lot of time explaining all of the property and debt to a third-party successor agency if it does not end up being the City. The City can more appropriately carry out the functions of the successor agency and interface with the oversight committee as opposed to a third party interposed between the City and the oversight committee trying to explain matters.

**Discussion:** Mr. **YAMAUCHI** asked how the members of the oversight committee were selected. Mr. **MONTES** replied that by May 1, 2012, the City Council would appoint one member and the Mayor is to appoint a former Redevelopment Agency employee as the second member. He noted that he would have to check on whether this second appointment was subject to City Council approval. Dr. **PLACIDO** asked how the other members of the oversight committee would be selected. Mr. **MONTES** explained that the other seats were taken by Los Angeles County (an appointee of the Board of Supervisors), the Alhambra Unified School District, the local college district and an appointee of the County Superintendent. Mr. **YAMAUCHI** asked whether there was a nomination process set forth for the oversight committee member appointed by the City Council and Mr. **MONTES** replied that the law does not say and; therefore, the Council could decide on the nomination process. He added that if the City chooses not to appoint its two members to the oversight by May 1, 2012, those appointments would be filled by the governor. Dr. **PLACIDO** asked if each of the 400 oversight committees created for each of the 400 redevelopment agencies winding down statewide were answerable to any higher body in the process. Mr. **MONTES** stated that theoretically they would be subject to the State Department of Finance, but with respect to the day to day implementation of winding down redevelopment agencies, the

successor agencies will take matters to the oversight committee for decisions with those decisions being subject to review by the State Department of Finance. Dr. **PLACIDO** noted that this would result in 400 redevelopment agencies being liquidated under the purview of 400 different oversight committees with 400 different paths being taken. City Manager **FUENTES** added that eventually this activity would morph into one oversight committee per county by 2016.

Mayor **AYALA** pointed out that by the City Council choosing to become the successor redevelopment agency, the City would receive a minimum of \$250,000 per year for administrative budget purposes. Mr. **MONTES** noted that this \$250,000 was to fund the activities of both the successor agency and the oversight committee. This meant that whoever the City's oversight committee ended up being would be funded by the City's administrative budget received from tax increment. Mr. **FUENTES** explained that for the current employees of the redevelopment agency, at some point down the road, their jobs will cease to exist. The City will then have to determine whether to absorb those agency jobs into the General Fund or not. This decision had not been made yet and further research was necessary to determine if the funding is available to absorb those positions. At this point, the current employees would continue to work for the successor agency and essentially following the direction of the oversight committee. The oversight committee will tell those employees how and what to do with the Agency's activities as it winds down as well as instruct them on the decisions for selling Agency's properties and assets. These decisions will be completely out of the hands of the Alhambra City Council, the Agency Board and the residents of the City. Decisions will be made by the oversight committee will be reviewed by the employees of the State Department of Finance charged with overseeing the wind down of the Alhambra Redevelopment Agency. Mr. **AYALA** asked about whether the City, as the redevelopment successor agency, could receive up to 5% of property tax revenue that could be allocated towards the payment of the Agency's enforceable obligations. Responding, Mr. **MONTES** explained that the enforceable obligation schedule would be paid from the regular tax increment as well as the liquidation of all of the Agency's assets. The administration costs associated with this would be paid out of the administrative budget including the activities of the successor agency to make sure the bonds get paid; all of the properties get sold etc. along with the activities of oversight committee. More specifically, he stated that the City receives a certain number of dollars in tax increment every year, of those dollars, 5% would go towards the administrative budget, and 95% would go towards paying enforceable obligations. Therefore, the 5% was not an additional amount of money the City would collect by becoming the successor redevelopment agency.

Mrs. **MESSINA** noted that plainly speaking, what this matter meant was that local cities were going to be totally devastated. Redevelopment may have their critics, but redevelopment has created value in communities where there was no value beforehand. For example, Alhambra's Fremont Plaza, home to Toys R Us, Petsmart etc. was an empty piece of property with no value until it was redeveloped into the shopping center it is now. The City also created two parking lots. She felt it was wrong that this value the City created would be snatched up by the State to be sold because they cannot manage their own fiscal "household." She also believed it was important for the public to understand what it meant for cities to not have redevelopment as a tool to create value in their communities. She pointed out that redevelopment allows cities to build low-cost housing and to take care of blight and this ability has now been taken away. She hoped citizens would think about the negative impacts that this will have on their communities.

**Action Taken:** City Council adopted **Resolution No. R2M12-1** entitled: *A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Alhambra, California, opting to become the successor agency to the Alhambra Redevelopment Agency pursuant to ABX1 26*

**Vote:** Moved: YAMAUCHI Seconded: PLACIDO  
Ayes: MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA, SHAM  
Noes: NONE  
Absent: NONE

### 3. **SUCCESSOR HOUSING AGENCY – F2M12-21, M2M12-4, R2M12-2**

Staff requested City Council approval of a resolution to retain the affordable housing assets and functions formerly performed by the Alhambra Redevelopment Agency, within the City of Alhambra. The recent decision of December 29, 2011 by the California Supreme Court upheld the Assembly Bill X126 (ABX1 26) which bars redevelopment agencies from engaging in new business and provides for their windup and dissolution.

City Manager **FUENTES** reported that ABX1 26 provides options for determining the entity that will assume responsibility for housing functions previously performed by the redevelopment agency. The succeeding housing entity must assume all rights, powers, duties, and obligations of the former redevelopment agency's affordable housing function and receive all agency housing assets and obligations. The City has successfully operated a housing program and retaining the Successor Housing Agency will ensure a continued successful and thriving program for the residents of the City. Funding for housing activities will have to come from disposition of housing assets, unless legislation is adopted to allow continued Low/Mod Housing funding.

Continuing, Mr. **FUENTES** explained that if the City does not elect to become the Successor Housing Agency, another agency will be chosen to perform housing services. Staff was recommending that the City Council consider become the successor agency in this regard due to the low/mod income housing Howard Street project currently online in the City. Staff would like to complete this project as well as possibly do some work on a parcel on Chapel Avenue. He noted however, that even if the City Council votes to become the Successor Housing Agency, under the current law, the City would assume the responsibilities and obligations but would not receive the funding that comes along with it. He stated that although it was unsure as to how much housing work the City would be able to do in the future, absent funding, becoming the successor agency for housing would allow the City to finish the projects already underway. Also, if another entity were to become the Successor Housing Agency for the City, they would be able to do housing development in the City with the City Council having very little control over what was to be built. Therefore, from staffs' perspective it is better to at least have some control over what could be built versus leaving to another agency that the City has no relationship with. He noted that there was additional clean up legislation working through the process which may send housing money to the successor agencies, but it had not been passed yet. Hopefully, as the City continues to work with the legislature to restore some of the Agency's activities, housing issues would be addressed as well.

**Discussion:** Dr. **PLACIDO** stated that he believed it was important for the City to become the successor to the housing agency and he made a motion to approve the resolution to allow the City to become the Successor Housing Agency. He asked

whether there would be an oversight committee for the Successor Housing Agency as there was for the Redevelopment Successor Agency and whether the State had the ability to come in and seize Agency projects and make something different out of them. Responding, City Attorney **MONTES** stated that there was no oversight committee for the housing function and that as it stands right now, the assets of the Redevelopment Agency that were acquired with low/mod funds, basically the low/mod housing projects, will remain with whoever decides to become the successor to the housing function. For example, the Howard Street project, if the City chooses to become the Successor Housing Agency, it would have the ability to finish up the project and sell off the units and to the extent that there is income from the sale of those units that would go back into low/mod fund normally, that money will be available to do further housing projects by the City as the Successor Housing Agency. He explained that if the City does not become the successor to the housing function, then other housing organizations and/or entities can become the successor agency and they would have use of those resources to do housing projects in the City.

City Manager **FUENTES** pointed out that although the City was currently projecting that the balance for the low/mod reserve fund would be \$2.7 million at the end of the current fiscal year; that money would not be carried over to the Successor Housing Agency because the money would have to be used to retire debt by the Redevelopment Successor Agency with the oversight committee's approval as well as the State Department of Finance. Dr. **PLACIDO** asked if the retiring debt was for the housing or the Redevelopment Agency. Mr. **MONTES** stated that it would be to retire the Agency's general debt. Dr. **PLACIDO** clarified that this meant that the State was taking the City's housing money to pay off regular (non-housing) debt. Mr. **MONTES** affirmed Dr. Placido's clarification and noted that the State was killing affordable housing.

**Action Taken:** City Council adopted **Resolution No. R2M12-2** entitled: *A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Alhambra, California, electing to retain the housing assets and functions of the Alhambra Redevelopment Agency pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 34176.*

**Vote:** Moved: PLACIDO Seconded: MESSINA  
Ayes: MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA, SHAM  
Noes: NONE  
Absent: NONE

**AGENCY/COUNCIL CONSENT AGENDA (Item Nos. 4 - 6)**

All items listed under the Consent Agenda were considered by the Agency Board/City Council to be routine and, therefore, were enacted by one motion.

**4. SUBMITTAL OF ARA AUDIT REPORT, FISCAL STATEMENTS & HCD LOW/MOD HOUSING REPORT FOR FY 2010-11 PURSUANT TO HEALTH & SAFETY CODE SECTION 33080.1 – F2M12-506**

Section 33080.1 of the California Health and Safety Code requires redevelopment agencies to present a report conveying a wide range of economic and housing information to the Legislative Body (i.e., City Council and Agency Board) within six months of the end of the last fiscal year. Such report, together with the Alhambra

Redevelopment Agency's Component Unit Financial Statements and Supplemental Information for fiscal year ended June 30, 2011, Annual Report of Financial Transactions of Community Redevelopment Agencies, Annual Report of Housing Activity of Community Redevelopment Agencies, Blight Progress Report, Loan Report and Property Report, were conveyed to the City Council and transmitted to the City Clerk prior to December 31, 2011.

**Discussion:** None

**Action Taken:** Agency Board/City Council received and ordered filed the documents filed pursuant to Section 33080.1 of the California Health and Safety Code.

**Vote:** Moved: YAMAUCHI Seconded: AYALA  
Ayes: MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA, SHAM  
Noes: NONE  
Absent: NONE

## 5. MINUTES

**Discussion:** None

**Action Taken:** Agency Board and/or the City Council reviewed and approved as submitted the Minutes of the December 12, 2011 Joint Regular Meeting of the Alhambra Redevelopment Agency and the Alhambra City Council and the Regular Meeting of the Alhambra City Council.

**Vote:** Moved: AYALA Seconded: YAMAUCHI  
Ayes: MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA, SHAM  
Noes: NONE  
Absent: NONE

## 6. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE – F2M12-500

**Discussion:** None

**Action Taken:** Agency Board approved as submitted the Accounts Payable for the period ending December 2, 2011, Check Nos. 11610-11615, in the total amount of \$132,542.07; and the Accounts Payable for the period ending December 16, 2011, Check Nos. 11616-11627, in the total amount of \$231,689.83.

**Vote:** Moved: AYALA Seconded: YAMAUCHI  
Ayes: MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA, SHAM  
Noes: NONE  
Absent: NONE

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:** None

**CLOSED SESSION & CITY ATTORNEY ANNOUNCEMENT re SAME - F2M12-14**

City Attorney/Agency Counsel **MONTES** identified those items listed on this evening's agenda which would be discussed in Closed Session as follows:

***Conference with Real Property Negotiator (Govt. Code Section 54956.8):***

- a) Property: 2500 West Commonwealth Avenue, Negotiating parties: Shin Yen Management and City Manager/ARA Executive Director Julio J. Fuentes & Interim Director of Development Services Swink, Under Negotiation: Instruction to negotiators will concern price, terms of payment or both.
- b) Property: 2 East Main Street, Negotiating parties: Lubert Adler Management West, Inc. and City Manager/ARA Executive Director Julio J. Fuentes & Interim Director of Development Services Swink, Under Negotiation: Instruction to negotiators will concern price, terms of payment or both.

***Conference with Legal Counsel--Existing Litigation (Govt. Code Section 54956.9(a):*** None

***Conference with Legal Counsel - Anticipated Litigation:*** Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Govt. Code Section 54956.9(b): 1 matter. Initiation of litigation pursuant to Govt. Code Section 54956.9(c): 2 matters.

***Discussion of Personnel Matters (Govt. Code Section 54957):*** None

***Conference with City's Labor Negotiator (Govt. Code Section 54957.6):*** Richard Bacio, Personnel Director/Risk Manager, re Management Employees, Alhambra Police Miscellaneous Association, Alhambra Police Association, Alhambra Fire Fighters' Association, and the Alhambra City Employees' Association.

whereupon at 6:32 p.m., the Agency Board and City Council moved into closed session pursuant to applicable law, including the Brown Act (Government Code Sec. 54950, *et seq.*) for the purpose of conferring with the Agency Counsel/City Attorney.

**RECONVENE & ARA RECESS:** At 7:15 p.m., the Agency Board and City Council moved out of closed session with all members present. City Attorney **MONTES** announced that when the Agency Board and City Council moved out of closed session it had not concluded the closed session. Therefore, after the 7:00 p.m. agenda is concluded, the Agency Board and City Council will moved back into closed session. The ARA Chairman then recessed the Agency's meeting until such time as the City Council had completed the public portion of its agenda.

**MINUTES  
Regular Meeting  
ALHAMBRA CITY COUNCIL  
January 9, 2012  
7:00 p.m.**

**RECONVENE & ROLL CALL:** At 7:15 p.m., on Monday, January 9, 2012 the Alhambra City Council met in the Council Chambers of the Alhambra City Hall.

**PRESENT: SHAM, MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA**

**ABSENT: NONE**

**Officials Present:** Deputy City Manager/Administrative Services Director Schultz, Assistant City Manager/Personnel Director Bacio, City Attorney Montes, City Clerk Myles, Deputy City Manager/Director of Utilities/Interim Director of Development Services Swink, Chief of Police Yokoyama, Director of Finance Espinoza, Director of Community Services Jarvis, Fire Chief Walker, Library Director Hernandez, Assistant to the City Manager Hayashi and Assistant to the City Manager Keating

**FLAG SALUTE:** Led by Mayor Ayala

### **READING OF ORDINANCE TITLES**

Government Code Section 36934 requires that all ordinances be read in full prior to City Council taking action on the ordinance. By listing the ordinance title on the Council agenda, Council may determine that the title has been read.

**Action Taken:** On motion of Mr. YAMAUCHI, seconded by Mr. SHAM, the City Council determined that the titles to all ordinances which appear on this public agenda have been read, and waived further reading.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**1. ADOPTION OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE INSTALLATION OF FULL CAPTURE CONNECTOR PIPE SCREENS – F2M11-60, M2M12-1, N2M11-145**

Pursuant to Government Code Section 66017, et seq., and provisions of the Alhambra Municipal Code, this was the time and place set by Notice No. N2M11-145 for the City Council to hold a public hearing to consider adoption of a Negative Declaration for the installation of full capture connector pipe screens at various locations in the City. The State of California is soliciting projects for funding under the State's Proposition 84 Storm Water Program and the City wishes to request funds to install full capture connector pipe screens which will meet the intent of improved storm water quality and comply with the mandate of the NPDES Trash Total Maximum Daily Load.

Deputy Director of Utilities **MEEKER** reported that the City was currently in the process of applying for a grant through the State's Proposition 84 Storm Water Program for the installation of full capture connector pipe screens. As part of the application process, the City must go through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process; and, subsequently, the City has determined that a Negative Declaration is appropriate for the proposed particular project. She noted that in accordance with CEQA requirements,

there was a thirty-day public notification period which began on December 7, 2011 and concluded on January 7, 2012 during which the City received no comments from the public. The Negative Declaration was also circulated also to the State Clearinghouse and several other state agencies and no negative comments were received from those agencies. Ms. Meeker added that it was the recommendation of staff that the City Council open the public hearing to receive any comments from the public and subsequently adopt the Negative Declaration.

**Public Hearing Opened & Closed:** Mayor **AYALA** opened the public hearing; and, as there was no one wishing to speak, he closed the same.

**Action Taken:** Adopted the Negative Declaration for the Installation of Full Capture Connector Pipe Screens. **(M2M12-1)**

**Vote:** Moved: MESSINA      Seconded: YAMAUCHI  
Ayes: SHAM, MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA  
Noes: NONE  
Absent: NONE

**CONSENT AGENDA (Item Nos. 2 - 7)**

All items listed under the Consent Agenda were considered by the City Council to be routine and, therefore, were enacted by one motion.

**2. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR FIRE ENGINE PUMPER AND COMMAND VEHICLE LEASE TO PURCHASE – F2M11-6A, N2M11-153, C2M12-1, M2M12-6**

Staff requested that the City Council award a contract to Emergency Vehicle Group, Inc. in the amount of \$580,405.28 for the purchase of one Type 1 Engine Pumper and one Battalion Chiefs' Command Vehicle. The new vehicles would replace the current 1990 fire engine and a 1999 Battalion Chief's command vehicle. Two bids were received. Following the review, staff found that the lowest responsive bid was from Emergency Vehicle Group Inc. A seven year funding plan for these vehicles is available in the 2011/2012 Capital Improvement Plan.

**Discussion:** Deputy City Manager/Director of Administrative Services **SCHULTZ** clarified that this item was for the approval of a lease to purchase contract.

**Action Taken:** City Council awarded a lease to purchase contract to Emergency Vehicle Group Inc. in the amount of \$580,405.28 for the purchase of one Type 1 Engine Pumper and one Battalion Chiefs' Command Vehicle, subject to final language approval by the City Manager and City Attorney, and directed staff to undertake the steps necessary to finalize Council's action. **(M2M12-6)**

**Vote:** Moved: MESSINA      Seconded: YAMAUCHI  
Ayes: SHAM, MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA  
Noes: NONE  
Absent: NONE

**3. AWARD OF CONTRACT – DESIGN ENGINEERING FOR SARAZEN DRIVE MAIN REPLACEMENT PROJECT – F2M11-22, C2M12-2, M2M12-7**

Staff requested City Council award a contract to Elie Farah, Inc. in the amount of \$23,550, for Engineering Design Services for the Sarazen Drive Main Replacement Project. Funds are available in the Water Fund Balance.

**Discussion:** None

**Action Taken:** City Council awarded a contract to Elie Farah, Inc. in the amount of \$23,550 for the Sarazen Drive Main Replacement Project, subject to final language approval by the City Manager and City Attorney; directed the Finance Director to appropriate funds from the Water Fund balance and allocate the funds to Water Main Replacement account 401.80.8884.90836; and directed staff to undertake the steps necessary to finalize Council's action. **(M2M12-7)**

**Vote:** Moved: MESSINA Seconded: YAMAUCHI  
Ayes: SHAM, MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA  
Noes: NONE  
Absent: NONE

**4. REJECT BIDS & REDISTRIBUTE NOTICES INVITING BIDS: UTILITIES DEPARTMENT WELL NO. 11 REHABILITATION AND WELL NO. 15 PUMP REPLACEMENT PROJECTS – F2M11-61, M2M12-5, N2M11-148, N2M11-149, N2M12-5, N2M12-6**

Staff requested that the City Council reject the one bid received for Utilities Department NIB No. N2M11-148, Well No. 11 Rehabilitation Project and NIB No. N2M11-149, Well No. 15 Pump Replacement Project, and authorize staff to redistribute new Notices Inviting Bids. Each project received one bid, which were both extraordinarily higher than the engineer's estimate and exceeded the amount budgeted to complete the projects.

**Discussion:** None

**Action Taken:** City Council rejected the bids received for the Well No. 11 Rehabilitation Project and the Well No. 15 Pump Replacement Project, and approved the distribution of a new Notices Inviting Bids (N2M12-5 and N2M12-6, respectively), with the bids due no later than 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, February 2, 2012. **(M2M12-5)**

**Vote:** Moved: MESSINA Seconded: YAMAUCHI  
Ayes: SHAM, MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA  
Noes: NONE  
Absent: NONE

**5. CLASS SPECIFICATION: ACCOUNTING MANAGER – F2M12-2, M2M12-2**

Before a class specification becomes effective, it must be approved by the City Council. Therefore, staff requested that the City Council approve the adoption of the following class specification for Accounting Manager.

**Discussion:** None

**Action Taken:** City Council adopted the class specification for the position of Accounting Manager. **(M2M12-2)**

**Vote:** Moved: MESSINA      Seconded: YAMAUCHI  
Ayes: SHAM, MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA  
Noes: NONE  
Absent: NONE

**6. PERSONNEL ACTIONS – F2M12-2**

**Discussion:** None

**Action Taken:** Ratified the actions of the City Manager set forth in that certain Personnel Actions document dated January 9, 2012 showing the various appointments, classifications, salary changes, etc., since the last City Council meeting.

**Vote:** Moved: MESSINA      Seconded: YAMAUCHI  
Ayes: SHAM, MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA  
Noes: NONE  
Absent: NONE

**7. DEMANDS - F2M12-1**

**Discussion:** None

**Action Taken:** Approved as submitted Final Check List (132052 thru 132326) in the amount of \$1,018,864.87 for the period ending December 7, 2011; and, Final Check List (132327 thru 132374) in the amount of \$17,440.80 for the period ending December 8, 2011; and, Final Check List (132375 thru 132524) in the amount of \$534,778.95 for the period ending December 14 2011; and, Final Check List (132525 thru 132648) in the amount of \$297,841.15 for the period ending December 16, 2011; and, Final Check List (132649 thru 132758) in the amount of \$2,276,018.76 for the period ending December 23, 2011.

**Vote:** Moved: MESSINA      Seconded: YAMAUCHI  
Ayes: SHAM, MESSINA, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA  
Noes: NONE  
Absent: NONE

## **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – F2M12-4, F2M11-50**

**Elizabeth SALINAS**, 2202 Montezuma Avenue, stated she was pleased to receive an email letter from Dr. Placido regarding the upcoming January 17, 2012 informational meeting with City Ventures for the Front Porch project at 2400 South Fremont and she asked about when the notices would be sent out to area residents. She noted that if the notices were received by residents tomorrow, it would be exactly one week prior notification. She felt that people needed to have sufficient time to plan to attend such an important meeting. She believed that if the notices did not go out soon, then the City should postpone the meeting to allow for better notification to residents. She also felt that the 6:00 p.m. start time for the meeting was early and that 7:00 p.m. would be a better time if the City wanted concerned residents to show up and provide input at the meeting.

Responding, Deputy City Manager/Interim Director of Development Services **SWINK** explained that the notices had not gone out yet, but it would most likely go out tomorrow via hand delivery by staff. She noted that the 6:00 p.m. start time was selected due to the fact that the last information meeting went long and it had been staffs' experience that the senior citizens attending these meeting like to be home by 9:00 p.m. She added that if residents were not able to attend until 7:00 p.m., the meeting would still be ongoing and it would be unlikely that they would have missed much substantively.

## **COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS (ANNOUNCEMENTS & FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS) F2M12-7**

Mr. Sham, pointing out that the Chinese Lunar New Year was to take place earlier than usual this year, on January 23, 2012, invited Alhambra residents to visit the current Year of the Dragon art exhibit in the Lobby of City Hall. He also encouraged residents to attending the 21<sup>st</sup> annual Lunar New Year Festival and parade taking place on February 4, 2012.

Dr. Placido announced that the January 17, 2012 community meeting regarding the Front Porch project at 2400 S. Fremont would be held in the Community Room of the Alhambra Civic Center Library and noted that the meeting was open to all residents of the City who wished to hear more information on the proposal, ask questions or express concerns. He invited all residents to attend. He noted that it was not a City Council meeting, but informational only to hear the latest proposal from City Ventures on the project.

Mr. Yamauchi wished everyone a happy new year. He also noted that there would be two Councilmembers present at the January 17, 2012 meeting regarding the Front Porch project. He stated that although each member of City Council would like to be able to attend, the Brown Act only allowed for two members of the Council to be present. He wanted the public to know this because all of the Council was interested in the matter, but could not in order to follow the guidelines of the Brown Act.

Mrs. Messina and Mayor Ayala both wished residents a happy new year.

**ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION:** At 7:30 p.m., the Agency Board and City Council moved back into closed session pursuant to applicable law, including the Brown Act (Government Code Sec. 54950, *et seq.*) for the purpose of conferring with the Agency Counsel/City Attorney.

**RECONVENE & ADJOURNMENT:** At 8:15 p.m., there being no further business for the Agency Board or Council to transact, the ARA Chairman and Mayor, with the consent of the Agency Board and the City Council, adjourned their respective meetings to 5:30 p.m., on January 23, 2012, in the Council Chambers of the Alhambra City Hall, 111 South First Street, Alhambra, California.

LAUREN MYLES, CMC  
CITY CLERK/ARA ASSISTANT SECRETARY