

MINUTES
Regular Meeting
ALHAMBRA CITY COUNCIL
July 25, 2016

ROLL CALL: At 5:36 p.m., on Monday, July 25, 2016 the Alhambra City Council met in the Council Chambers of the Alhambra City Hall.

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

Officials Present: City Manager Yokoyama, City Clerk Myles, Administrative Services Director Paulson, Public Works Director Chavez, Assistant City Attorney Murphy, Management Assistant Kespradit, Environmental Resources Director Jarvis, City Risk Manager Bacio, Deputy City Manager Binnquist, Community Services Director Ray, Finance Director Espinoza, Library Director Hernandez, Human Resources Director Schultz, Development Services Director Pace, Police Captain Mar, Police Chief Gomez-Whitely, Fire Chief Phelps

FLAG SALUTE: Led by Mayor Messina

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. Hearing no objections, the Mayor so ordered.

CLOSED SESSION & CITY ATTORNEY ANNOUNCEMENT re SAME - F2M16-14

City Attorney **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): None

Conference with Legal Counsel-Existing Litigation (Govt. Code Section 54956.9(d)(1)): Jiamin Zhu v. Cities of Alhambra and Monterey Park, LASC Case No. BC601358; Kenneth Thai & Xu Yang v. City of Monterey Park/City of Alhambra, LASC Case No. BC565253; Ying Chen & Fu Xiang Li v. City of Monterey Park/City of Alhambra, LASC Case No. BC556199; Leading Insurance Services v. Cities of Alhambra and Monterey Park, LASC Case No. EC065140; CJ Café Enterprises dba Lu's Dumpling House, et al v. Cities of Alhambra/City of

Monterey Park, LASC Case No. BC558259; City of Gardena v. Regional Water Quality Control Board, City of Alhambra (as a Real Party in Interest), LASC Case No. BS156342; and, Nelly DeFatima Reyes v. City of Alhambra, LASC Case No. BC569108.

Conference with Legal Counsel - Anticipated Litigation: Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Govt. Code Section 54956.9(d)(2): 1 matter. Initiation of litigation pursuant to Govt. Code Section 54956.9(d)(4): 1 matter.

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

Conference with City's Labor Negotiator (Govt. Code Section 54957.6): Tara Schultz, Assistant City Manager/Director of Human Resources, re Management Employees, Alhambra Police Miscellaneous Association, Alhambra Police Officers' Association, Alhambra Police Management Association, Alhambra Fire Fighters' Association, and the Alhambra City Employees' Association

whereupon at 5:38 p.m., the 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 City Attorney.

RECONVENE: At 7:11 p.m., the City Council moved out of closed session with all members present.

CEREMONIAL

- 1. SWEARING-IN CEREMONY: CHIEF OF POLICE JACKIE GOMEZ-WHITELEY & FIRE CHIEF TOM PHELPS – F2M16-3, F2M10-50, F2M-71**

Introduction of Chief of Police Jackie Gomez-Whiteley & Fire Chief Tom Phelps

**by
Mark Yokoyama, City Manager**

Administration of Oath of Office by City Clerk to Incoming Chief of Police & Fire Chief

Pinning of Badges for Chief of Police and Fire Chief

Remarks were made by Chief of Police Gomez-Whiteley

Remarks were made by Fire Chief Phelps

Remarks were made by Mayor Messina and Councilmembers

PRESENTATIONS

2. UPCOMING CITY EVENTS – F2M16-16

Staff provided an update to the City Council regarding the various new and returning special events being planned for the remainder of 2016 and provided details on each of the events such as Mainfest, the Alhambra Pumpkin Run and the Latino Heritage Festival. Administrative Services Director **PAULSON** delivered a PowerPoint presentation, which is available at the City Clerk's office.

Citizen Input: Lola **ARMENDARIZ** made several comments regarding events held at Alhambra Park. She stated that she observed that the Chinese movie event did not have sufficient restrooms provided on one of the nights, and that the noise level of the movie was loud. She questioned why staff was not present to monitor the sound system. She commented that the noise level improved with the next event. She also made comments regarding the Summer Serenade concert series and again commented that the noise levels were too high. She stated that she spoke with staff, and did not feel the noise levels were being properly monitored. She stated the events in the parks should entertain the people in the park, but not the surrounding areas. She said that she has made similar statements and requests for each of these events, and has felt that these concerns were not met. She also requested that staff resume taking decibel readings to monitor the sound levels.

Mayor **MESSINA** asked Community Services Director Ray, if staff has continued to take decibel readings at park events. He responded that when changes were made to the noise ordinance, he was asked to not to record decibel readings. However, he stated that staff can resume the practice if desired by the Council. He also stated that the independent company organizing the Chinese movie nights had their own decibel reader, and that they were taking readings. He stated that he also felt that the first movie was loud, and after staff input, they corrected the volume. Regarding the lack of portable restrooms, he stated that there was a mistake the first night, but it was corrected by the second event.

Action Taken: City Council received and ordered filed the informational report presented.

3. ALMANSOR PARK IMPROVEMENT PROJECT – F2M16-42

Director of Community Services **RAY** made a presentation for Council consideration providing options for improvements to Almansor Park; which is available at the City Clerk's office. Almansor Park is one of Alhambra's most heavily utilized parks. It hosts activities such as Little League which has over 250 participants, AYSO which hosts over 900 players from between 450 to 500 different families, and contains a walking/jogging trail, a gymnasium, basketball courts, tennis courts, and lawn bowling. With all of these activities available, hundreds of people visit Almansor Park daily. He noted that the initial goal was to develop and maintain accessible parking that reduced traffic and placed visitors of the park in a safe environment as efficiently as possible. Historically, there were many complaints about the parking in and around Almansor Park as well as how the parking had pushed into the surrounding neighborhood streets. The

Almanson Park Improvement Project was to assist in alleviating that issue while improving the park. Staff had considered several options to improve Almanson Park and has sought City Council's direction on which option or combination of options to pursue.

He explained that currently Almanson Park has three separate parking lots. The north parking lot has 35 stalls, the south Parking lot has 62 parking stalls and the lower parking lot has 70 stalls, for a total of 167 on-site parking spaces. From July 1st to July 14th a parking survey was performed. The lots were monitored daily at 8:00 am, 5:00 pm and 8:00 pm. He stated that on average, parking was 60% occupied at 8:00 am; 75% at 5:00 pm, and 80% occupied at 8:00 pm. There were 25 occasions when at least one parking lot was 100% occupied. Mr. RAY stated that in order to capture all of the various activities that occur at the facility, a full year of data would need to be collected. He stated that at the time of the presented statistics, Almanson park was between Little League and AYSO seasons, the latter of which begins in the middle of August and continues until mid-December.

Next, he outlined the proposed options before Council. The first would be to keep the status quo, and leave the park as it is. Secondly, would be to add to the available parking by increasing the surface parking through the expansion of the North parking lot and connect it to the South parking lot by eliminating the existing tennis courts, which would create a larger surface parking area that could have 237 parking stalls where there are currently 97 stalls. This would provide an increase of 140 spaces. It would be designed to be in conformance with all current building regulations; including the new Low Impact Development regulations which would have the new lot retain any run off on-site and allow rain water to percolate into the ground. This concept also includes the planting of over 40 new trees and a new path of travel for vehicles to traverse from the upper lot to the lower lot without exiting back on to Almanson Street. The City Engineer has estimated this project cost at approximately three million dollars.

Another option entailed replacing the existing North and South parking lots and tennis courts with a one story parking structure. The City Engineer estimates that by using the land area of the two existing lots and combining them with the existing tennis court area between them a two level parking structure could be constructed that would increase the parking to approximately 400 spaces. The overall height of the structure could be kept under 19 feet and trees and foliage could be planted all around the structure. The City Engineer estimated this project to cost approximately seven million dollars.

The last option for managing the parking situation in Almanson Park was to contract with Emmaus Church for part time use of one or both of their existing parking lots. Emmaus Church has two separate parking lots that they are willing to lease to the City weekdays on a limited schedule. The back lot has 60 spaces and is conveniently close to the Los Higos entrance of the park. The City had leased this lot from 1982 to 2013 when due to the condition of the lot, Emmaus terminated the lease. The City has proposed terms that are acceptable to both parties to begin a new lease; however the City will need to invest in the replacement of the existing surface. The estimated cost to replace the rear parking lot is \$80,000 and staff has identified available funding for this project. Emmaus has also offered to lease the front parking lot. This lot has 80 parking stalls and would also require an investment to replace the existing surface. The estimated cost to replace this parking lot is \$140,000.

As a result of the parking options which would affect the tennis courts, he also provided possible plans for a redesign of the area around the Almansor Park gymnasium which could include new tennis and basketball courts, restroom facility, lawn bowling green, irrigation and lighting. This proposed project would include new turf for the lawn bowling green, three tennis courts, improved basketball area, additional shade and seating areas, a new restroom facility, all new irrigation, as well as electrical and energy efficient LED lighting. The estimated cost of this project is two to two and a half million dollars.

Finally, he noted that these options were not exclusive of one another and could be considered both individually and in combination with one another.

Discussion: Vice Mayor **PLACIDO** asked the linear number of feet from the current edge of the parking lot to the proposed expanded edge of the surface lot, and if the grass area is currently utilized. Mr. **RAY** responded that it would be a setback of 70 feet and that the grass area has a slight downgrade and therefore not often utilized by the public for picnics. He did state that at the steeper part of the hill, public will often gather to watch the baseball games, but that that area will not be affected by the proposed lot. Dr. **PLACIDO** also asked if the proposed one level parking structure height of 19 feet would be comparable to a single family home. Interim Director of Development Services **PACE** responded that without looking at the specifics of building code, she estimated the maximum height of a single family home at 25 feet.

Councilmember **AYALA** asked for the number of spaces in the surface lot expansion option. Mr. **RAY** replied that the proposed expansion, in addition to the spaces in the existing lot to the South, will accommodate approximately 90 parking spots total.

Mayor **MESSINA** asked for the total number of parking spots available in existing Almansor Park parking when combined with the parking spaces offered in the proposed Emmaus Lutheran Church lease agreement. Mr. **RAY** responded that the total would be approximately 307 parking spots.

Councilmember **YAMAUCHI** asked for the total desired number of spaces to accommodate park patrons. Mr. **RAY** stated that the estimated required parking for parks and sports facilities vary according to the City Engineer with regards to size of the park facilities. It was estimated that Almansor Park currently has 5.6 parking spaces per park acre. Mr. **RAY** also stated that parking demand varied according to the sports season for AYSO and Little League, which meant that there were a higher number of park patrons for those 4 months out of the year. Mr. **YAMAUCHI** asked if there was a desired goal in mind at the start of the project. Mr. **RAY** stated that in working with Development Services, there were no documented guidelines for required parking spaces as there were for other building projects.

Dr. **PLACIDO** asked if the completed parking analysis of Almansor Park included the number of park patron cars parked in the street and encroaching into the neighborhoods around Almansor Park, or if it was just the number of cars parked in the parking lots. Mr. **RAY** stated that the analysis was performed utilizing the number of cars parked only in the designated parking spaces inside the park. He stated that Adams Street, which borders the park, is fully utilized in the mornings for park goers, but that the number of cars was not counted as part of the study. Dr. **PLACIDO** commented that even though the parking lots are recorded as being 80-100% filled, by not including the number of

cars parked in the surrounding neighborhood, the demand on the park could be much higher than what was recorded. Mr. **RAY** stated that that estimation was correct, and that the department is aware of a long history of parking complaints from residents, and Adams Street in particular.

Councilmember **SHAM** asked for clarification regarding the number of parking spots in the one level parking structure, in comparison to the surface expansion proposal and why the parking increased so dramatically. Mr. **RAY** explained that the parking structure would be an at-ground level of parking, plus an additional parking level which would bring the total number of spaces to 400 and almost double the number of spaces of the surface lot expansion.

Councilmember **AYALA** stated that he would like to save his comments until the end of the public comment portion, but wished to reiterate that none of the proposed options presented were decided upon, that they were not exclusive of one another, and that they can be considered both individually and/or in combination with one another. He asked of the public in attendance, that speakers focus on constructive suggestions and solutions, rather than direct opposition. He stated that he would like to have public input on which to base his decisions.

Dr. **PLACIDO** asked if the presentation given was a complete conceptual vision, and if it presented all possible ideas for the enhancement of the park. He asked if there were any potential options omitted from the presentation, and if the artist rendering was complete. Mr. **RAY** responded that the presentation offers only a few possible options for development, and that they can be altered based on direction from Council. He also stated that there were originally other options discussed but were omitted. An example was for underground parking, which proved to be too costly. He further stated that there was a miscommunication with the conceptual artist and that the renderings presented were not the final draft of the design. Dr. **PLACIDO** stated that therefore not all of the information was provided in the current presentation. He also asked if it was possible for Story Park to play a role in addressing the reorganization of Almansor Park. Mr. **RAY** stated that there were renderings for utilizing Story Park for lawn bowling, but ultimately it was decided to keep lawn bowling at Almansor Park. Dr. **PLACIDO** asked if Mr. **RAY** would make another presentation at a future Council meeting which would incorporate a more complete and comprehensive vision which might utilize Story Park and the Joslyn Center for a brand new lawn bowling facility. Dr. **PLACIDO** stated his belief that the presentation given was not complete and his preference for more options before making a final decision. He stated that it is not appropriate to not have all the information available and to make a decision. Mr. **RAY** responded that he would return with a new presentation which would provide more options.

Mayor **MESSINA** stated that the purpose of the meeting was not to present a total vision of a finished project, but to give direction to staff. She stated her preference that Council would receive input from the public, and then have further discussion with Council, before providing direction to staff.

Citizen Input:

- 1) Vikki **ORLANDO**, 731 Almansor Street, spoke against the proposed parking options and objected to the use of the word "improvement" in the description of the proposed

project. She stated her experience and observation of parking structures as a gathering place for drunks and vagrants. She stated that the addition of a parking structure would lead to an increase of traffic and expressed that she is against the loss of any green space in the park. She stated that a covered one level parking structure would encourage criminal activity. She stated that although many have commented on the size of the park, most of the acreage is devoted to the golf course, and not the park. She stated that people are more inclined to park on the street, and many dislike parking in a structure. She stated that most of the residences on Sierra Vista and Almansor are rental properties and renters park on the street more than park patrons. She concluded that she would be willing to think of more solutions for the park.

- 2) Sean **MCMORRIS**, of San Gabriel representing the Alhambra Bowls Club, asked for the study methods used in assessing the parking situation, if it would be available to the public, and if it included the Almansor Court and Alhambra Golf Course Driving Range in the study. He stated that these public spaces should not be excluded from the parking studies. He stated that Almansor Park is overused by the City and that this has led to the congestion problems which will be amplified by the construction of a parking structure. He stated that according to a Los Angeles County needs assessment report for public parks, Alhambra is a high need city. Therefore, construction of a parking structure would be at the expense of much needed park green space. He stated his belief that City money should be invested in more parks rather than parking places. He addressed that regardless of the height code and the limitation of 19 feet to the one level parking structure, residents located across the street will be impacted. He thanked the City for returning to the drawing board based on public outcry, but continued to speak to the desire for public input. He continued his statements regarding the treatment of the lawn bowling greens within the park. He spoke regarding the use of CDBG funds and the propriety of their allocation. He stated his opinion that the City has not done enough outreach to the all residents and again stated that public input is required. He stated that people who vote in Alhambra are closely interested in how Council addresses this issue.
- 3) Alex **RIVEST**, a resident on Almansor Street, stated his opinion that the clearest option to accommodate parking would be a lease agreement between the City and Emmaus Lutheran Church. He stated that this would provide the same number of additional parking spots as the parking lot expansion, but is \$2.75 million less. He addressed Mr. Yamauchi's and Dr. Placido's comments as to the overall goal for this project and how the parking is assessed in the neighborhood. He stated neither of these issues have been properly addressed. He repeated comments that the City has not properly addressed the input of the residents. He stated that there have been several concerns regarding transparency not only between residents and the City, but also between the Council and the plans put forth. He stated that the coalition of residents have accomplished more outreach to the residents than the City. He presented a petition of concerned people who do not want a parking structure. He stated that there is no demand for a parking structure, there are no existing parking structures in other parks, and his belief that the proposed parking structure does not properly utilize City funds. He stated that if the City moves forward with the structure, the coalition of residents will collect enough signatures to undo the structure and call for the recall of City Council members. He asked the Council how this project fits into the national goals of HUD and CDBG funds. He again commented as to a lack of

transparency with the City, as exemplified by the repeated cancellation of Parks and Recreation Commission meetings and the HCDA meetings. He repeated his request for the HCDA meetings to be recorded and transcribed.

- 4) Gisela **ADAMS**, 837 S. Hidalgo Avenue, stated the lack of justification to build a parking structure which takes away from green space, and adds to the unsightly construction throughout the City. She urged the Council to consider an agreement with Emmaus Lutheran. She stated that a large number of percentage of people using the park are not Alhambra residents and that the park should not be made more accessible to them to the detriment of residents. She stated that rather than adding more parking, the City should encourage walking and that the clubs using the park should encourage carpooling. She also suggested a shuttle system which would pick up people parking in other parking structures around Alhambra. She stated that the removal of greenspace further removes oxygen.
- 5) Sandra **DELGADO**, 1004 S. Hidalgo Avenue, also spoke to her experience and observations of other parking structures and the criminal and vagrant element it attracted. She stated that the park gates on Los Higos used to be kept locked and were opened recently to address public complaint, which has in turn led to the high volume of people parking on the street. She stated that based on her own observations of the weekend parking situation, there are not enough cars present to justify a parking structure. She stated that the overcrowding generated by various sporting seasons only exist for a short period of time, and that the lots are largely underutilized during the day. She proposed many ideas such as a lease agreement to use Emmaus Lutheran parking, construction of a parking structure closer to the golf course, use of the ACT bus to bring people to the park, and moving sports to other parks. She also stated that the majority of people using the park are not Alhambra residents, and should not be accommodated. She stated that the proposal did not include the number of parking spaces around the park. She stated that she believed the Council is guilty of wrong-doing.
- 6) Cheri **CABOT**, representing the Alhambra Bowls Club, also spoke against the parking structure. She stated that she was pleased that the lawn bowling green would remain intact throughout the proposed Almansor park renovations, but continued to criticize the City for not responding to the public outcry sooner and for continuing to entertain proposals for a parking structure. She repeated earlier comments of speakers by stating that the parking structure will not address the over-congestion and overdevelopment in the park.
- 7) Gerry **FAGOAGA**, 2020 S. Stoneman Avenue, spoke against the parking structure proposal, but agreed with previous speaker's comments. She also spoke in agreement with Dr. Placido's comments that there should be more options presented. She criticized the City for lack of communication with residents on this matter and asked that the City work with all of the groups using Almansor Park.
- 8) Tia Fang **XU**, 108 N. Chapel Avenue #10, spoke against a parking structure and stated that the project would cost too much money. She repeated earlier comments that the parking lots are not currently overused.

- 9) Craig **ATHON**, 1616 W. Hellman Ave., spoke against the parking structure and stated that of all the options presented, the most logical would be to maintain the status quo by not making any changes to the park. He expressed his opinion that the money required for this project would be too high and that the City would be better served saving the money.
- 10) Gloria **VALLADOLID**, 1500 South Raymond Avenue, spoke against the parking structure and the continued overdevelopment of the City which takes away from greenspace. She stated that the City should discourage traffic congestion by not building a parking structure which would make it easier for people to drive. She stated that instead the City should work to make it easier to walk and ride bicycles.
- 11) Sue **JANTZ**, 2408 Whitney Dr., spoke against the parking structure and also referred to an article which pointed out the inadequacy of parks in the San Gabriel Valley. She spoke to a general dislike of the recent overdevelopment within Alhambra. She expressed that she would prefer Alhambra to remain a small town. She also spoke against the 710 freeway expansion. She repeated other speakers' comments regarding a desire for more greenery and more park space.
- 12) Bertha **RIVERA**, spoke against the parking structure. She spoke to her pride at living in Alhambra, but insisted that the City Council must listen to the community before constructing major projects.
- 13) Efren **MORENO**, 1712 W. Ramona Road, commented on the difficulty in making a decision which satisfies all groups, and addressed an idea from a previous year to create a bike plan for the City, which would connect all the parks in Alhambra and partially alleviate the parking demands. He also spoke against the use of CDBG funds and HUD funds for this project by saying that this project is not in keeping with the original intent of those funds. He indicated that the most logical solution would be to lease the Emmaus Lutheran parking lots or to build a parking structure closer to the golf course.

Mayor **MESSINA** took a moment to clarify to the public, regarding the use of CDBG funds for the Almansor Parking proposed project. She stated that the circumstances are unique in that the funding is from the sale of property at Fremont Plaza, and that it cannot be used for housing or regular HUD projects. She stated that the money must be used on a capital project within two years, or they will have to return it to the State.
- 14) Dora **KESS**, 125 S. Bushnell Avenue, spoke to her use of the tennis courts at Almansor Park, and the availability of parking. She stated that the tennis courts are heavily used, and felt that the loss of the courts would be unfortunate and the construction of new courts would be too expensive.
- 15) Mike **LAWRENCE**, 1136 S. Monterey Street, recalled that the situation at hand is similar to a project for the construction of condominiums near Story Park. He echoed previous statements that Alhambra is a park poor city and that the City needs to exercise more creativity in development projects. He also criticized the City for lack of communication with the residents. He also restated previous comments regarding

the need for more transparency, more progressive projects to increase greenspace, and misuse of funding.

Mr. **AYALA** spoke to remind the public that Council has not fully formed their opinions regarding this project and that he welcomes constructive input from the public. He echoed that the purpose of the project is to improve the park and the experience of park goers. He also stated that the parks would remain open to the public, regardless of their residence.

- 16) Leslie **LEVY**, 737 S. Almansor St. #A, offered many suggestions in response to Mr. Ayala's request to provide ideas for the parks. She stated that rather than encouraging competitive sports, to make room for non-competitive activities which would improve overall health and wellness such as Qi Qong, Yoga, and Tai Chi. She suggested converting the lawn bowling area into a martial arts arena, or a swimming pool. She suggested landscaping and converting the area by the Pascual wash into a pedestrian and bike area by the railroad trestle. She suggested using the CDBG funding for the construction of a monorail system or mass transit system that would connect to Union Station. She also encouraged the further planting of trees as well as an avian refuge, wildlife habitat, a botanical garden, or an expanded community garden in place of the golf course.
- 17) Linda **MERCHAIN**, 725 S. Almansor Street, conveyed a short story reflecting her own past and experiences in Almansor Park throughout her life. She spoke against the parking structure and encouraged that the City maintain the overall beauty and tranquility of the park.
- 18) Janet **ERVIN**, 901 N. Bushnell Avenue, spoke to her disappointment that an agreement had not been reached, and in the staff report presentation which was not complete. She stated that based on the information provided, there was no clear indication of the necessity of this project. She stated that a more detailed cost outline should have been presented. She thanked Mayor Messina for her clarifications regarding the use of the CDBG funds, but that the overall opinion is that the money would be better used for recreational space. She suggested the addition of bike lanes or a new swimming pool.
- 19) Cecilia **DODD**, 2409 Snead Dr., spoke as a member of Emmaus Lutheran Church as well as the Chairperson of the Emmaus School Board. She stated that the main reason she is against the parking structure is due to the safety of the children at the school. She stated that a parking structure will increase the threat against the students, and its proximity will adversely affect them. She stated that Emmaus dissolved the prior agreements for use of the parking lots because in her opinion, the City abused the agreement.
- 20) Robert **DODD**, 2409 Snead Drive, spoke against the parking structure. He suggested building a parking structure closer to the Golf Course. He also spoke to the prior agreement regarding the Emmaus parking lots. He cautioned that ultimately any new agreement would have to be approved by the Church Council and not solely dictated by the City. He stated that his recollection of the prior agreement was that the City would maintain the parking lot and keep it clean however, this was not the case, and the City refused to conduct the full rehabilitation of the lot. He stated that the

Church's opinion was that due to a lack of response from the City, the Church closed the gates. He suggested building a parking structure closer to the Golf Course, which would include a third underground level, and shuttle people into the park.

Mr. **SHAM** asked Mr. Dodd for clarification regarding the Emmaus parking lots. He asked if when the parking lots were closed to park patrons, were the parking lots in use by the church or school. Mr. **DODD** responded that the gates were not used for parking, due to a lack of need, and were instead used for basketball for the students. Mr. **SHAM** then asked whether Emmaus would lose the basketball courts if they agreed to a new lease with the City. Mr. **DODD** responded that that was not part of the proposal, and that in addition to the repaving of the parking lots, the City would also re-stripe the lots for basketball as well. He clarified that the daycare program at the school is conducted until 6:30 p.m. and that the parking lots should not be available to the rest of the public until the children are safely out of school.

RECESS & RECONVENE: At 9:31 p.m. Mayor Messina declared a recess and the meeting reconvened at 9:42 p.m. with all Council members present.

Discussion: Mayor **MESSINA** asked Deputy City Manager Binnquist to provide clarification regarding the use of HUD funds in the City. Ms. **BINNQUIST** stated that while CDBG funds can be used for a variety of programs throughout the calendar year, the City is currently in the second year of the five-year consolidated plan which established different priorities for the City. Regarding the annual spending of these funds, she noted that each program established must coincide with different spending caps as well as federal regulations tied to them. She stated that capital improvements are no different in terms of regulations, except that when the consolidated five-year plan was put together, the funding for these projects would be taken from any program income or additional funding that the City has received to the program. Therefore, at this time there is additional funding that the City has received through the sale of Fremont Plaza and so that funding is designated for capital improvements, as laid out in the consolidated five-year plan.

Mr. **SHAM** stated that not all areas within the City qualify for use of this funding, which Ms. **BINNQUIST** further clarified by stating that there are census block groups which are CDBG eligible, as well as the City-wide tally which dictates funding.

Dr. **PLACIDO** asked if it is wrong, under the rules of CDBG and HUD funding, to use these funds for parking improvements at Almanson Park, and Ms. **BINNQUIST** responded that it is not wrong at all, and that off-site parking was designated as a priority within the heading of capital projects. She went on to recount that when the idea of a parking structure was presented, the City invited the HUD representative of the City as well as the program manager to Almanson Park to conduct a walk-through and listen to the national objectives as well as the criteria. To that end, HUD concurred with the City's opinion that funding would be eligible for off-street parking improvements for the area. Dr. **PLACIDO** again addressed the earlier comments by the public that HUD funds were misappropriated, and stated that based on this information, the claims for misuse were misinformed. He cautioned against half-truths and half statements regarding the use of HUD funds without the proper information.

Mayor **MESSINA** asked if the City is in good standing with HUD, and for the number of times which the City has been audited. Ms. **BINNQUIST** replied that the City is in good standing, and that the City is audited every three years, while cities which were high-risk are audited every year. She stated that the City has never been considered high risk to her knowledge. She stated that the City, as well as all of the projects and programs which utilize HUD funding have passed through all monitoring without fail.

Mr. **SHAM** spoke to the responsibility of elected officials to look after the community's welfare. He stated that when additional money comes into the City, there is an opportunity for investment. He reiterated that the parking improvement project was only one potential project proposed which qualified for this funding. He stated that the goal was to look for different alternatives, and that the parking lot has not been decided upon definitively. He stated that his direction to staff was to continue negotiating the lease agreement with Emmaus Lutheran Church. In addition, he stated that this money must be utilized or given back to the federal government, and that it would be better to reinvest the money back into the City. Therefore, he asked staff to return with other potential capital improvement projects which this funding qualifies for. He stated that to that end, they may find another project in another area, and the status quo in Almansor Park would be maintained.

Mr. **AYALA** began his comments by thanking the members of the public who remained to hear the Council's response. He stated that for the last four or five years, he has been a volunteer coach at Almansor and Granada park. He stated his recollection that the idea to address the on-site parking at Almansor Park was in response to complaints from park patrons who felt there was a lack of available parking. He stated that it would be a mistake to take away greenspace just for the purpose of parking. He stated that he would love to create additional parks if there were adequate space. He also reiterated no decision has been made regarding a parking structure. He stated that he does not support a parking structure, and that it is not necessary. He stated that the parking structure should not be an option for the park. He went on to state that he does support the addition of parking to Almansor Park, and believed that the first step should be to continue negotiations with Emmaus Lutheran Church.

Continuing, he referred back to the presentation, with regards to surface lot expansion option. He stated that while it might be possible to relocate the tennis courts, he was opposed to the reduction of greenspace and removal of trees from the area bordering the parking lot. He stated that the area around the gym could be renovated to be more efficiently used by all groups. He also took a moment to speak to the demands placed on the park by programs like AYSO on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. He proposed that to break up the parking congestion, perhaps the playing schedule be adjusted to spread out the times and days of practicing. He then referred to the rendering of the possible redesign and renovation of the area by the gym in Almansor Park. He referred to the new addition of paved and covered squares for open use such as tai chi, as well as the expansion of basketball courts and the relocated tennis courts. He stated that he saw this as an attempt to satisfy a number of groups, and while not complete, this proposal maximizes recreational space and seeks to address various issues. He stated that his direction moving forward would be to consider the redesign of the gym area to satisfy all groups, as well as maximize the available area for parking. He stated that he agreed with Mr. Sham that staff should return with more options, especially to expand greenspace.

Mr. **YAMAUCHI** stated that he has for the most part not participated in any discussion regarding the proposed project, due to the fact that the sale of the Fremont Plaza was not complete, and therefore the funding was not immediately available for use. He stated that he also did not want to make a decision without having all the facts to base it on. He also directed staff to return with more options and a more complete proposal at the next meeting.

Dr. **PLACIDO** restated his direction for a more complete presentation regarding any parking improvement, which would include a parking structure. He stated the importance of reviewing the proposal with all information available and to not make assumptions. He stated that there were comments made which were not based in either truth or fact. He cautioned that it would be unwise to make uninformed decisions. He stated that he would like a complete proposal which would include the possibility of a new lawn bowling facility, options for repurposing the Story Park pool area for lawn bowling, and essentially a more comprehensive idea for the use of greenspace in the park. He stated that once there is a clearer picture of what parking means for repurposing at Almansor, there might be a better picture overall. He stated that while it has been discussed in the Parks and Recreation Commission meetings, this is the one of the first times this proposal has been before Council as well as the first time Council has been able to provide any direction to staff. Therefore, he stated that he would like to look at this more completely at the next meeting and further address all concerns and eventually move forward.

Mayor **MESSINA** stated her opinion that the object of the meeting was to provide direction to staff on how to proceed with this project and to narrow down the list of ideas presented. She stated that she was never in favor of a parking structure and therefore would like to see it removed as an option, and based on input from the current meeting, the better options to explore would be to expand surface lot parking, to contract with Emmaus Lutheran Church, and to redesign the gym recreation area to accommodate all concerned parties. She asked Council for a consensus regarding this issue.

Dr. **PLACIDO** again stated that he would not like to form an opinion without receiving all possible information and iterations of the project. Mayor **MESSINA** replied that it would be beneficial to provide staff with clear direction as to proceed. Dr. **PLACIDO** appealed to City Manager Yokoyama for input regarding procedure. Mr. **YOKOYAMA** stated that Council could direct staff to present more options, or narrow down the options already presented. Dr. **PLACIDO** reiterated that it would not be appropriate to make a decision without having all information presented. Mr. **AYALA** stated his preference to eliminate the parking structure concept from the presented ideas. Mr. **YOKOYAMA** referred to the Assistant City Attorney Murphy for direction. Mr. **MURPHY** stated that there appeared to be two main directions from Council: to narrow down from the options presented in the meeting and/or to return with more information, and that a consensus must be reached. Mr. **SHAM** stated that he would like to continue negotiations with Emmaus Lutheran Church, but that given the overall reaction to the parking solutions, the City might be better served to examine other uses for the funding, perhaps not connected to Almansor Park and to address other areas of the community. He directed staff to return to a following meeting with other options, for Almansor park parking enhancement and including the options currently present, as well as options for other projects throughout the City. Dr. **PLACIDO** agreed with this statement.

Action Taken: City Council directed staff to return with this item at the August 22, 2016 meeting to review all proposals for Almansor parking improvements, Almansor Gym renovations, as well as proposals for potential capital projects that may utilize CDBG funding outside of Almansor Park area.

CONSENT AGENDA (Item Nos. 4 – 12)

All items listed under the Consent Agenda, except Item No. 5, were considered by the City Council to be routine and were enacted by one motion.

4. NIB: ALMANSOR PARK RESTROOM REHABILITATION PROJECT – F2M16-41, N2M16-115

Staff requested that the City Council authorize a Notice Inviting Bids for the Almansor Park Restroom Rehabilitation Project. The park restrooms at Almansor Park are old and deteriorated. They have been painted many times, however they are in need of a complete rehabilitation. The restrooms are located adjacent to a picnic shelter, the children’s play area and three baseball fields. Plans and specifications have been prepared to rehabilitate the Almansor Park restrooms which include; removal of all current fixtures and replacement of the flooring, lighting, plumbing fixtures, partitions and the placement of a graffiti resistant coating on the walls.

Discussion: None

Action Taken: City Council approved the distribution of a Notice Inviting Bids to qualified contractors for the Almansor Park Restroom Rehabilitation Project, with bids due no later than 10:30 a.m. on August 25, 2016 and opened publicly at 11:00 a.m. the same day; and, directed staff to undertake the steps necessary to finalize Council’s action.

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

5. PULLED

NIB: CITY HALL LANDSCAPING PROJECT - F2M15-42, N2M16-116

Staff requested that the City Council authorize a Notice Inviting Bids for the City Hall Landscaping Project. California continues to face severe drought conditions, creating an extremely parched landscape. Plans and specifications have been prepared by a landscape design firm to re-design the existing landscapes. The proposed design will remove 6,000 square feet of the current turf grass, install California native and water-wise vegetation, install water-wise irrigation systems and incorporate public demonstration gardens. The cost of the project will be covered by grant funding from the San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District.

Citizen Input: Lola **ARMENDARIZ** asked if there was to be a formal presentation for the project, and if the drawings would be on display for the public to review. She recalled that the original presentation was given at the library, but that she was told by staff that the plans had not been finalized. She stated that there was a redesign of the plan, and had previously discussed with former City Manager Swink that the public had not been privy to the new plans for the Civic Center. She suggested that this item not be approved until it had been made available to the public. She discussed the lack of open discussion between the City and the residents, and that in her opinion, the public deserves to be aware of the project. She raised the point that often items are discussed in study sessions, but the general public is not made aware of these items. She further advocated for greater communication and public input.

Discussion: Mayor **MESSINA** asked Management Assistant Kespradit if this project could be put on hold until a presentation has been given. He responded that the item can be put on hold, and that the only pending deadline was connected to the grant funding from San Gabriel Water District to be completed by middle of next year, and that the planting take place in the fall of the current year.

Action Taken: Item was pulled from the consent agenda and no action was taken. Mayor **MESSINA** opted that the item be moved to the August 8, 2016 City Council meeting for further discussion.

6. DESIGNATION OF VOTING DELEGATE AND ALTERNATE FOR THE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES ANNUAL CONFERENCE – F2M16-13, M2M16-116

Staff requested that the City Council designate the voting delegate and alternate for the League of California Cities Annual Conference. The League of California Cities Annual Conference is scheduled for October 5th through 7th in Long Beach, California. During the Conference the League conducts its Annual Business Meeting during which the membership considers and takes action on resolutions that establish future League policy. In order for the City to have a vote at the Annual Business Meeting, it is necessary for the City Council to designate the voting delegate and alternate. It was proposed that Mayor Messina be appointed as the Voting Delegate for the City and Vice Mayor Placido be appointed as the Voting Delegate-Alternate, should Mayor Messina be unable to serve on the City's behalf at the meeting.

Discussion: None

Action Taken: City Council adopted **Minute Order No. M2M16-116** as follows:

RESOLVED by the Alhambra City Council that this Council hereby designates and appoints Mayor Barbara A. Messina as Voting Delegate and Vice Mayor Placido as Voting Delegate Alternate for the October 5th through 7th League of California Cities Annual Conference's Business Meeting; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Alhambra City Council that this Council hereby directs the City Clerk to attest to the designation and

appointment of Mayor Barbara A. Messina as Voting Delegate and Vice Mayor Placido as Voting Delegate Alternate and send the 2016 Annual Conference Voting Delegate/Alternate Form to the League of California Cities.

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

7. EXTEND CONTRACT: EMERGENCY MEDICAL/PARAMEDIC TRANSPORTATION BILLING & COLLECTION SERVICE AGREEMENT – F2M5-100, C2M5-80, M2M16-117

Staff requested City Council authorization to amend and extend the existing contract with Wittman Enterprises, LLC (C2M5-80) for five years for emergency medical/paramedic transportation billing and collection services. Wittman Enterprises has agreed to continue their services at a reduced rate of 5.15% of net collections compared with the current 5.5% rate.

Discussion: None

Action Taken: Approved that certain Amendment to Agreement for Professional Services between the City of Alhambra and Wittman Enterprises, LLC (**Contract No. C2M5-80**), subject to final language approval by the City Manager and City Attorney, to include a five year agreement (July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2021) with a rate reduction from 5.5% to 5.15% for emergency medical/paramedic transportation billing and collection services for the City of Alhambra; and, directed staff to undertake the steps necessary to finalize Council's action. (**M2M16-117**)

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

8. CONTRACT EXTENSION: PROFESSIONAL TREE MAINTENANCE SERVICES FOR ALHAMBRA GOLF COURSE AND VARIOUS CITY SITES – F2M9-67, C2M9-30, M2M16-118

Staff requested that the City Council award a two-year contract extension to West Coast Arborist Inc. (C2M9-30) for Professional Tree Maintenance Services at the Alhambra Golf Course, Almansor Court and Alhambra Parks. In September 2009 West Coast Arborist Inc. (WCA) was awarded a contract for professional tree maintenance for the Alhambra Golf Course, Almansor Court and Alhambra Parks after being declared the lowest responsible bidder. Staff has been satisfied with the quality of service provided by WCA. WCA has proposed to continue to provide services at the same rate provided in the City's public works contract, which is a reduction from the current contract pricing. The term of the contract is to be for twenty-four (24) months starting July 1, 2016 and

terminating on June 30, 2018.

Discussion: None

Action Taken: City Council approved a two-year contract extension, subject to final language approval by the City Manager and City Attorney, by and between the City of Alhambra and West Coast Arborist for professional tree maintenance services, in an amount not to exceed \$55,000; and, directed staff to undertake the steps necessary to finalize Council's action. **(M2M16-118)**

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

9. CLASS SPECIFICATION: HUMAN RESOURCES ASSISTANT – F2M16-2, M2M16-119

Before a class specification becomes effective, it must be approved by the City Council. An assessment by the Human Resources Department sustained the need to create a new position of Human Resources Assistant and to accurately reflect the duties and qualifications of the classification. Therefore, staff requested that the City Council approve the adoption of the class specification for the position of Human Resources Assistant.

Discussion: None

Action Taken: City Council adopted the class specification for the newly established position of Human Resources Assistant as described in the Assistant City Manager/Human Resources Director's July 25, 2016 report on file in the office of the City Clerk; and, approve the salary of \$4,182 - \$5,447 per month for the position. **(M2M16-119)**

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

10. TREASURER'S REPORT - F2M16-1

Discussion: None

Action Taken: City Council received and filed as submitted the Treasurer's Report prepared by the Director of Finance for the month of June, 2016, listing all of the City's investments as of June 30, 2016.

Vote: Moved: YAMAUCHI Seconded: SHAM
Ayes: SHAM, YAMAUCHI, PLACIDO, AYALA, MESSINA

Noes: NONE
Absent: NONE

11. PERSONNEL ACTIONS – F2M16-2

Discussion: None

Action Taken: City Council ratified the actions of the City Manager set forth in that certain Personnel Actions document dated July 25, 2016 showing the various appointments, classifications, salary changes, etc., since the last City Council meeting.

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

12. DEMANDS - F2M16-1

Discussion: None

Action Taken: City Council approved as submitted Final Check List (174539 thru 174714) in the amount of \$1,551,913.60 for the period ending June 30, 2016; Final Check List (174797 thru 174956) in the amount of \$336,082.47 for the period ending July 1, 2016; Final Check List (174957 thru 175061) in the amount of \$213,985.06 for the period ending July 7, 2016; and, Final Check List (175062 thru 175105) in the amount of \$15,787.00 for the period ending July 8, 2016.

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

ORDINANCES – SECOND READING

13. CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 10.04 OF THE ALHAMBRA MUNICIPAL CODE PERTAINING TO BICYCLES – F2M16-16, O2M16-4698

Staff requested that the City Council consider second reading and adoption of an ordinance amending Chapter 10.04 of the Alhambra Municipal Code pertaining to bicycles. Chapter 10.04 of the Alhambra Municipal Code was added to the code over thirty years ago. At the request of the Alhambra Police Department, the City Attorney's office reviewed the chapter for consistency with the California Vehicle Code. Certain provisions are superseded by State law. Additionally, the bicycle licensing program described in the Chapter is not being utilized by the City. Accordingly, this ordinance will repeal those provisions of the Chapter that are inconsistent with the California Vehicle Code, as well as repeal the bicycle licensing program.

Discussion: Mr. **YAMAUCHI** asked for clarification regarding the ordinance and if it affected the licensing or it pertained to new Los Angeles County Metro standards. Mr. **YOKOYAMA** stated that this is the second reading on an amendment of the Alhambra Municipal Code regarding bicycle licensing.

Action Taken: City Council directed the City Attorney to give second reading by title only to the following ordinance entitled:

Ordinance No. O2M16-4698: An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Alhambra, California, amending Chapter 10.04 of the Alhambra Municipal Code pertaining to bicycles

after which the Council adopted Ordinance No. O2M16-4698.

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

14. CONSIDERATION OF THREE ORDINANCES PERTAINING TO CERTAIN PERSONNEL REORGANIZATION ISSUES – F2M16-2, O2M16-4695, O2M16-4696, O2M16-4697

Staff requested that the City Council consider second reading and adoption of three ordinances pertaining to certain personnel reorganization issues. On June 27, 2016, the Alhambra City Council adopted three urgency ordinances to implement certain reorganizations of management personnel/positions proposed by the City Manager. The background for such ordinances was set forth in staff reports accompanying the June 27, 2016 City Council agenda. Historically, the City Council has considered and adopted non-urgency versions of urgency ordinances to ensure that the substance of such ordinances is implemented, in the event of a future challenge to the urgency versions of such ordinance.

Action Taken: City Council, by one motion, took the following actions:

A. Directed the City Attorney to give second reading by title only to the following ordinance entitled:

Ordinance No. O2M16-4695: An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Alhambra, California amending Chapter 1.04 of Title I of the Alhambra Municipal Code to include a definition of City Departments and establish the newly created Environmental Resources Department; Human Resources Department and Risk Management Department and amending Chapter 2.16 of Title II by establishing the office and duties of the newly created Department Heads and amending and restating the office and duties of existing Department Heads

after which the Council adopted Ordinance No. O2M16-4695; and,

B. Directed the City Attorney to give second reading by title only to the following ordinance entitled:

Ordinance No. O2M16-4696: An Ordinance of the Alhambra City Council amending Ordinance No. O2M16-4689 to update the definition of General Non-Department Head Managers to include Human Resources Analyst and amending salary and benefits for Non-Department Head Management Employees from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017

after which the Council adopted Ordinance No. O2M16-4696; and,

- C.** Directed the City Attorney to give second reading by title only to the following ordinance entitled:

Ordinance No. O2M16-4697: An Ordinance of the Alhambra City Council amending Ordinance No. O2M15-4680 to update the definition of Executive Management and Confidential Employees and amending salary and benefits for Executive Management and Confidential Employees from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017

after which the Council adopted Ordinance No. O2M16-4697.

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

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – F2M16-4

- 1) Lola **ARMENDARIZ** wished to recognize and show her appreciation for Alhambra Police Department's Crime Prevention Specialist Sharon Williams, who after working for nearly 22 years will retire the end of July 2016. She recalled her association with Ms. Williams, who was not only the Neighborhood Watch Coordinator, but also created the Alhambra Citizen's Police Academy in 1995. She noted her belief that long time employees of the City deserve recognition.
- 2) Adriel **SANDERS**, 1239 S. Third Street, provided several ideas for how the City of Alhambra can become more community-centric. He echoed previous comments regarding a bus line which would provide service to a major Metro station. He reasoned that the elderly and those unable to drive should be able to take public transportation to reach major transportation hubs to travel anywhere in Los Angeles County. He stated that 17% of Alhambra's population is low-income, and a way to help is to provide upward mobility through better transportation systems. He also suggested a new community center for public use. Another suggestion is for the City to provide ESL classes for residents. He stated that 50% of residents are immigrants from non-English speaking countries and discussed the difficulties for immigrants to advance while still learning a new language. He stated that the City could also subsidize private businesses which could teach the ESL classes.
- 3) Olga, 807 Lindaraxa Park, wished to discuss the $\frac{3}{4}$ acre piece of open greenspace at Lindaraxa Park and the state of the trees. She questioned why the area is not designated as a park. She stated that the residents have always considered the area to be a small

park, especially due to the name of the area, but were informed by the Community Services Department that the area was irrigation was turned off for the area because it is a traffic median. She asked why the area is not considered a park, and when that designation changed. She stated that the many trees, such as pine/evergreens and liquid amber trees, in the median are suffering from the lack of water. She referred to previous comments regarding the lack of greenspace, and stated that the greenspace that does exist has to be maintained regardless of the definition of a median versus a park. She stated that as the trees die, they will attract termites and have to be removed. She suggested that the CDBG funding referenced by earlier speakers could be used to maintain the greenspace and cited the City of San Marino as an example for the use of different types of irrigation. Dr. **PLACIDO** addressed Olga by recalling that they had previously worked together to address concerns regarding the stone pillars in the Lindaraxa Park area. He reminded Olga that she is able to call him directly to address any concerns immediately. He stated that the greenspace at Lindaraxa Park is a park space, and will ask staff to look at options.

Mr. **SHAM** stated that he also spoke to a resident concerning this issue and that he was able to address it with the City Manager the same afternoon. Mr. **YOKOYAMA** updated the Council on this item and stated that he was working with staff to reach out to the landscaping contractor to update the irrigation system as well as other watering systems for the area. He stated that renovations were already underway.

- 4) Marisol **GRIER**, 815 Lindaraxa Park North, also spoke to the Council regarding the greenspace area at Lindaraxa Park. She stated that she went directly to speak with Mr. Sham regarding this issue and thanked Council for the respect granted her. She spoke on behalf of the residents that it was not their intention for the greenspace to be watered more than the State mandated water restrictions allow. She expressed her concerns for the fire risk the dry vegetation poses in proximity to the neighborhood. Mayor **MESSINA** asked for Director of Public Works Chavez to speak about a similar situation near Story Park on Woodward. Ms. **CHAVEZ** stated that the grassy area on Woodward Avenue is a part of Story Park, and Community Services has continued irrigation for that area in accordance with water regulations.
- 5) Sean **MCMORRIS** of San Gabriel, wished to speak regarding the use of CDBG funds in Alhambra. He first offered his appreciation for Council and their comments regarding Agenda Item No. 3, the proposed Almansor Parking Improvement Project. He stated that the coalition of residents which he represents looks forward to further discussion with Council regarding this matter. He referred to the previous statements of Mayor Messina and Ms. Binnquist regarding the record of proper usage of CDBG funds in Alhambra, and offered that he had conducted his own research into their usage and remarked that it was dense material and it cannot easily be simplified by staff to the public. He commented that the use of the funds, regardless of the City's intent, must still adhere to national guidelines and objectives. He offered his research to Council, and stated that although the City has not been found culpable of wrongdoing, there may have still been violations which would come to light in a more in depth investigation by the HUD Inspector General. He stated that Alhambra, more than any other city in Los Angeles County over the last 12 years, has used CDBG funding for subsidizing business and commercial development. He stated his opinion that although the City was allowed to use the funding for those projects, it was not an appropriate use of funds, which are earmarked for low-income residents. He stated his belief that the money could be used for a variety of different

programs, as stated by previous speakers. He stated the money should go to its original intended purpose which is low income housing. He stated that 22% of Alhambra's population is made up of low-income people. He advocated for greater transparency, better education of the HUD program, and to begin recording the HCDA Citizen's advisory committee meetings.

- 6) Bertha **RIVERA**, proposed to have the coalition of protesters against the parking structure meet with Council at the Church to further address their concerns.

ADJOURNMENT: At 10:51 p.m., there being no further business for the Council to transact, the Mayor, with the consent of the City Council, adjourned their meeting, to **8:00 a.m.** on **Wednesday, July 27, 2016**, in **Ruth C. Reese Hall** (Community Room) at the Alhambra Civic Center Library, 101 South First Street, Alhambra, California for the purpose of meeting to discuss and update the City's Strategic Plan. (**Notice No. N2M16-113**).

LAUREN MYLES, CMC
CITY CLERK