

TOWN OF SAN ANSELMO

Minutes of the Meeting of September 22, 1992

6:45 p.m.

Closed session regarding labor negotiations and personnel matters.

7:15 p.m.

Interviews with applicants to the Planning Commission and Historical Commission.

8:00 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER.

Mayor Gus Kanis convened the regular meeting, with Councilmembers Peter Breen, Paul Chignell, Tim Yarish and Maria Zaharoff present.

2. OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION.

Rohana McLaughlin, San Anselmo, said that Mt. Tamalpais Cemetery planned to build three mausoleums on the ridgetop, in County jurisdiction, and she wanted to see the issue discussed at the next Council meeting. She asked if there was another place on the property that they could be built. Town Attorney Roth advised that he did not know how much could be done about the project at this point, with the exception of perhaps some landscaping control. Staff was asked to look into the issue.

Bill DeBisschop, 91 Elm Avenue, said the Public Works crew clears private debris from street, and suggested a notice be published informing people of their responsibilities and the code restrictions, and that the code be enforced.

Susan English asked about the public bar at the American Legion log cabin, and whether anything could be done to control it.

3. CONSENT AGENDA.

- (a) Approve minutes: September 8, 1992.
- (b) Acknowledge and file financial reports through August 31, 1992.
- (c) Announce additional vacancy and extend application period for appointment to the Solid Waste and Recycling Advisory Committee. (3 seats)
- (d) Accept The Alameda repaving project as complete, authorize filing of Notice of Completion and approve final payment.
- (e) Authorize advertisement for bids, Willow Way Storm Drain Rehabilitation Project.
- (f) Approve resolution on application for architectural review of an addition to a single family dwelling owned by Theodore Posthuma, 379 Oak Avenue.
- (g) Approve resolution to conditionally approve Application DR-9212, design review of a new single family residence, Assessor's Parcel No. 7-192-10, 25 South Oak Avenue.
- (h) CONTINUE TO OCTOBER 13, 1992: Second public hearing on fee schedules for planning and police services.
- (i) CONTINUE TO OCTOBER 13, 1992: Introduce ordinance allowing a fee to be charged for the cost of police services responding to an event where alcohol is being consumed by minors and/or an event is a threat to the peace, safety, or general welfare of the public.

Kanis corrected the minutes on page 4, to reflect that the

Town should not assume the risk of damage to the eucalyptus trees.

Items (f) and (g) were pulled from the consent agenda.

M/S, Yarish/Zaharoff, to approve the consent agenda, with the exception of items (f) and (g). Motion passed unanimously, with the exception that Chignell abstained on (a).

- (g) Approve resolution to conditionally approve Application DR-9212, design review of a new single family residence, Assessor's Parcel No. 7-192-10, 25 South Oak Avenue.

Breen expressed concern that the turn on Oak Avenue in the area of 370 Oak was still tight and dangerous, and the roots need to be dealt with; also, a slurry seal may not be adequate for the road.

Public Works Director Wayne Bush said he would always prefer paving to slurry seal, but the question was whether it could be required for this application and at this point. The builder has agreed to widen the roadway around the sharp curve where the eucalyptus trees are located by 4 to 5 feet to allow vehicles to better negotiate that curve. The builder has agreed to ramp over the roots so that the rise in the pavement will be less noticeable. The slurry seal is above and beyond what the Planning Commission required; Bush added a requirement for slurry seal to hide the blemishes from the construction and trenching work.

Michael Cohn, Oak Avenue, asked if the curves that will be destroyed during construction are also going to be fixed. He asked if it was possible for the neighbors to consider additional paving and contribute money towards this effort.

Norman Charles, applicant, said the paving from the Town maintained section to the limits will be done next spring, whereas only the trenching will be done now. If everyone wants to pave that portion of the road, they could do it next spring, when the slurry seal work will be done.

Bush offered Town staff's assistance to the neighborhood for their effort to pave the road.

Cohn expressed concern about the redwood trees being required to screen the house, noting it would shade his house the better part of the morning. He suggested the planting of another native tree that gives protection from the view from downtown that does not grow to 100 to 150 feet.

Chaney noted that other native trees would not necessarily be as fast growing as the redwoods, and therefore would not screen the project as quickly.

It was the consensus of the Council that the redwoods to be planted should be the kind that top out at 35 to 40 feet, and that the condition #12 be amended so require the additional screening and landscaping plan be subject to the review and approval of the Planning Department.

- (f) Approve resolution on application for architectural review of an addition to a single family dwelling owned by Theodore Posthuma, 379 Oak Avenue.

Zaharoff proposed that condition #1, where it makes reference to plans stamped by the Town dated September 17, add that the landscape plan is also a part of that plan.

Chaney said the landscape plan was incorporated as part of

the site plan, but that it could be specified in condition #1.

Regarding condition #4, Zaharoff expressed concern that drainage problems be taken care of at the time that they arise, and requested language clarifying condition #4.

Condition #4 of the resolution was amended to read "...as and when approved..."

M/S, Zaharoff/Breen, to approve (f) and (g) as amended.
Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Breen, Yarish, Zaharoff, Kanis

NOES: (None)

ABSTAIN: Chignell

4. PRESENTATION ON SAN ANSELMO'S STATUS AS A UNITED NATIONS WORLD CITY, BY LUCILE DANDELET.

Ms. Dandelelet explained the history of San Anselmo's designation as a United Nations World City in 1971. She presented the Council with a new United Nations flag, and asked the Council to join other cities in declaring October 24 "United Nations Day." A proclamation was to be prepared for the next regular agenda.

5. APPOINTMENTS:

a. Planning Commission (3 seats)

M/S, Zaharoff/Chignell, to reappoint Spencer Sias and Stan Hayes to four year terms, to expire August 18, 1996.
Motion passed unanimously.

M/Zaharoff, to appoint Mark Cavagnero. Mr. Cavagnero had withdrawn his application, and the motion was withdrawn.

M/S, Yarish/Chignell, to appoint David Israel, to a term to expire August 18, 1995. Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Breen, Chignell, Yarish

NOES: Zaharoff

ABSTAIN: Kanis

b. Historical Commission (5 seats)

M/S, Chignell/Yarish, to reappoint incumbents Larine Brown, Laurie Smith, Jane Crisp Davis, and William Davis, to terms to expire September, 1996. Motion passed unanimously.

M/S, Zaharoff/Chignell, to nominate Robert Madden to a term to expire September, 1996. Motion passed unanimously.

6. RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE CORRIDOR PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED BY THE MARIN DELEGATION OF THE 101 CORRIDOR ACTION COMMITTEE.

Carol Williams, Marin County Planning Department, presented a summary of the recommendations, including: completing HOV (high occupancy vehicle lanes) to Sonoma County; short-term and long-term plans for rail passenger service; high speed ferries; new ferry terminals in Northern Marin/Southern Sonoma; use of the HOV lanes for bus feeders. Since there is no funding source for these projects, priorities have not been set. She reported that several cities have asked for consideration of bike commuter routes.

Hannah Creighton, Marin Advocates for Transit, explained that this 50-member organization wanted more and better transit, and was part of a larger movement against pavement. They were concerned about air pollution, and advocated that Golden Gate Transit not raise local transit fees. She urged the Council to add study of transit options, and preservation of the rail right of way to its recommendations.

Joy Dallaver, Transportation Chairperson, Marin Conservation League, said they supported most elements of the 101 Corridor Plan. They supported better local transit service to capture more riders, provisions for bike routes, and opposed acquisition of the rail right of way. She said only 11 percent of the Sonoma to Marin commuters end their commute in Marin County, and therefore they did not feel that a rail system would have any effect. Noting that light rail used 32 passenger miles to a gallon and buses 62 miles to a gallon, she said improvements in air quality depended more on redesign of automobiles and use of bicycles.

Lea Creighton, 42 Humboldt, opposed the project to add HOV lanes. She said a good public transit system was possible, that and that it was essential that work be done on transit in Marin.

Evelyn Schaaf, said all the HOV lanes do is postpone and compound the problem of pollution and congestion. She said that the wrong end of the problem was being tackled; that this is a problem that involves other issues such as water and land use. The problem that needs to be solved first is land use. She said she would hate to see San Anselmo jump on any side of the issue, but say that it wants land use decisions made before the 101 Corridor issues are addressed.

Williams responded that Marin County is updating its General Plan, that the County has jurisdiction only over land use in its area, and she explained the status of the Countywide Planning Agency.

Teresa Allen, 14 San Francisco Boulevard, explained that "Rails to Trails", a national organization, is trying to keep rights of way from being paved over.

Lucile Dandeleit, Redwood Road, stated her agreement with the prior statements supporting transit.

It was the consensus of the Council to conduct a special meeting in November on the 101 Corridor recommendation.

Hannah Creighton urged the Council to write to the City of San Rafael prior to its scoping hearing on the environmental impact report on the highway widening project, which will take place prior to November.

7. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER REVOKING A PORTION OF AN ENCROACHMENT PERMIT ISSUED TO CARL YEAKEY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A REDWOOD BULKHEAD IN FRONT OF 22 ISLAND DRIVE.

This item was continued to the meeting of October 27, 1992.

8. PUBLIC HEARING ON APPEAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S
CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW, DESIGN
REVIEW, PRECISE PLAN, AND LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT, GILL
PROPERTY AT THE END OF OAK AVENUE, ASSESSOR'S PARCEL
7-154-07.

Lisa Newman, Town planning consultant, presented the staff report. The two primary items of consideration in the appeals were the water tank and public access trail.

Scott Hochstrasser, planning consultant representing the applicant, said that this project has several public benefits. It brings the legal non-conforming use of the property into conformity by eliminating the second unit. It will remove the existing buildings and power poles that are visually prominent on the ridge off the ridge, and the new house to be built in the woods will not be visible. In addition, the project will replace an inadequate water tank with a 40,000 gallon tank that can provide adequate domestic water and water for fire suppression for two homes, but also fire protection for the wildlands in the area if an emergency should arise. The road improvements include turnouts, and repaving the road that is currently unsafe. Redevelopment of this property will also improve the Town's tax base, and upgrade the housing stock.

Regarding the appeals, Newman reported that Mr. Draper has raised the issue of the water tank and the relationship between the applicant's proposed 40,000 gallon water tank to an earlier proposed 120,000 gallon tank proposed to be built by adjacent property owners. Staff has been aware of this application and has been concerned about this much larger tank, which will be a public facility and be built to standards such as a paved access, circular road around the tank, and it is easy to see the significant impacts it would have. In the same spot as the 40,000 gallon tank is proposed is the coincident proposal for a 120,000 gallon tank. There could be some significant environmental and aesthetic impacts. The Planning Director and Town Attorney have been working with MMWD to identify potential impacts. What has been decided is that any environmental impact report (EIR) will be prepared under the auspices of MMWD, and the Town will serve as a responsible agency that will be able to review the draft EIR and comment on it.

Town Attorney Roth said that Mr. Sorensen has said that Mr. Gill does not intend to convey any of the property where the 40,000 gallon tank is to be built to any other person for purposes of allowing the 120,000 gallon tank to be built. Therefore, unless MMWD condemns the property, they are not properly the lead agency for the environmental assessment. MMWD has given Roth the impression that a conveyance will be made. There is some confusion about the environmental process that Roth had to work out with MMWD; otherwise, the Town would be the lead agency and do the environmental assessment, which Town staff would prefer to have happen. The Town has design review over any structure in town. It was his opinion that the Town not hold up this project by what may happen on the future project.

Newman said that as part of the scoping session on the proposed EIR, alternative sites will be explored. The proposed access to the larger water tank is across the Gill driveway, and over a berm proposed on the landscaping plan adjacent to Worn Springs Road. Gill is recommending that MMWD look for alternative access. MMWD has indicated the alternative access may be along a dirt road straight out to Worn Springs Road, but that would have to be approved by the MMWD watershed committee, which would be looking at concerns like creating additional public access through watershed lands, as well as their own internal requirements to create all-weather surfacing, and how that may conflict

with their desire to keep Worn Springs Road a rural trail.

Regarding Mr. Draper's second point, Newman reported that if they were to retain the access to the larger tank, there was potential for conflict with the existing precise plan. Apparently, that is not the case.

Regarding the access easement, Roth said it has been reported that there has been pedestrian use of this area continuously for more than five years by a number of people; if that is a fact, there is an implied dedication to the public as a public way. There are apparently different attitudes on the part of the property owners in that area about the pedestrian use of the area. Mr. Gill has said he would not object to a lawsuit to establish the access, nor would he object to a plan agreed upon by a majority of the neighbors and the Town to provide an access. However, all the neighbors may not be as cooperative as Mr. Gill, and for additional reasons, Roth recommended that the Town should file for declaratory relief along with a quiet title action to establish the access. If it is uncontested, it could cost \$5,000 to \$10,000; if it is contested, it could cost more than \$25,000. John Sharp has suggested he might cooperate with the Town Attorney to work on the case on a reduced basis. Without the legal establishment, the public access will continue to be uncertain. There are gates on the access ways, but there are well-worn paths around the gates indicating that persons have been using the trails. He recommended acceptance of Mr. Gill's proposed language that he will not contest the lawsuit and that he would agree with an access plan approved by the neighbors and Town, predicated on a lawsuit being filed immediately to establish the public access.

Newman reported that Mr. Gill has agree to a new condition that would require him to begin construction on the 40,000 gallon tank within 45 days. Staff recommended approval of this condition.

John Sharp, 22 Santa Barbara, said he did not think that there was any dispute that the Town has jurisdiction to be involved in reviewing the tank proposed for the site, and there is clear evidence that there is a significantly larger tank being proposed for the same land. Irrespective of who has lead agency status and who was on the application for the tank, the same piece of land that is within the Town's jurisdiction and is on the precise plan and design review now before the Council is that piece of land upon which someone proposes to build a different tank. There are two jurisdictions being exercised over the same piece of land at the same time. It was intellectually dishonest to ignore the fact that the other tank was out there. He acknowledged that Mr. Gill has gone a long way to distance himself from the other tank, but the fact remains that on his property there is another proposal for a water tank, and Sharp did not feel that the Town could ignore that issue. Allowing this application to proceed and pretending there is not another application violates the spirit, if not the letter, of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). If the Town has any doubt that this application is for a 40,000 gallon tank, then maybe the Town did not have a complete application before it. There was an unresolved legal question, which should be clarified before approving the application. If there is any further environmental review involved, Sharp said that should be resolved in favor of caution, adding that this was one of the most sensitive areas in town. Regarding open space access, some of the points in Sharp's letter are now moot because of Roth's findings, but added that he was willing to work on the access litigation with the Town Attorney. Given the history of access and the

confusion about the access, legal action for declaratory relief was probably the cleanest and quickest way to answer the easement question. For the sake of being consistent with the Town's policy to preserve open space, and to preserve the integrity of the open space element of the General Plan, the Town ought to move forward in an attempt to establish the open space access.

In response to question from Council, Sharp said he thought the nexus, used in the sense of the Nolan case decision, between the pending application for a 40,000 gallon tank and the proposed 120,000 gallon tank, is that it is the same piece of land. He added that the 120,000 gallon tank would alter the design of the project before the Council. The fact there is another potential adverse impact out there, he believed the spirit of CEQA required the Town to acknowledge that and review it. He acknowledged there may not be a legal decision to support that stand, and that the only way to establish it may be for the Town to pursue it in court, which he recognized was not very feasible for San Anselmo.

Roth advised that he felt the 120,000 gallon tank and this application were two separate projects.

Jerry Draper, 11 Sacramento, said he appealed the application because of the confusion on the tank. He said the house was great, that the applicant had taken steps to screen it. One issue that arose out of the tank was that the access road would breach a berm to get onto Worn Springs Road; the purpose of the berm was to shield the house from the public on Worn Springs Road, so these two proposals were in conflict. That has been resolved by Mr. Gill's request that the road be moved elsewhere. It was Draper's understanding that Mr. Gill could veto the 120,000 gallon tank by not allowing it on his property. He and Mr. Denfield had final say on that tank. The application for the tank precedes the water moratorium so that a reservation of water has already been held aside for the applicants to this tank, which is roughly 15 to 20 homes. Planning Director Chaney wrote three serious letters to MMWD outlining all the impacts of that, it is clear that the Town is concerned about the impact of the 120,000 gallon tank. At the same time, MMWD is saying that to give San Anselmo control over the design of the tank is like giving Mill Valley control over the tank on Horse Hill and no tank will ever be built, and we are never going to give you control over any of our tanks. This is the only project in MMWD's jurisdiction where a water reservation has been made and MMWD is forcing the applicants to a conclusion unlike any other applicant that has a water reservation today. They are saying use it or lose it to the property owners regarding their water reservation, placing the property owners into a difficult situation where they may be unable to get the water reservation back in the future if they do not build the tank now. MMWD is spurring on this project. The beneficiaries of the reservation of water would be the properties around Mr. Gill, and one of the concerns is that Mr. Gill will be in a difficult situation to veto the project because some of his relationships with some of the property owners. The possibility arose from the scoping meeting to build three 40,000 gallon tanks as the need arose, which to Draper seemed like a more palatable option. Draper said that at the scoping meeting last week, it was clear that MMWD would consider irrelevant the impacts the Town raised about the 120,000 gallon tank project. The tank will be looked at regarding height and width, and maybe the road, but there would not be a review about the other impacts of the tank such as development. Regarding the General Plan policies on open space, they were discovering that they were ineffective. Policy 4.7 identifies that if you have a

piece of property that you want to develop, and there is a trail on your property that is on the open space map, it would be appropriate to grant an easement for the trail. Policy 4.4 states that if you have a piece of property and on the other side of the property is some recreation or open space, at the owner's expense, a trail shall be constructed to gain access to that. The trail is actually on Mr. Gill's property. The only reason to put the trail lower was that Mrs. Gill objected to having pedestrian traffic coming up to the driveway where the road to the water tank was going to be. Out of consideration for that privacy concern, the idea arose to place the trail lower.

Roth suggested a deed restriction or agreement prohibiting the transfer to MMWD of the property on which the 40,000 gallon tank is to be built.

Jonathan Braun, Scenic Avenue, said that the Planning Commission found that this plan was consistent with General Plan policy 4.4. He disagreed, and supported Draper's appeal. Policy 4.4 states that when a parcel abuts existing open space, as this done, there shall be a trail system provided; it does not state where the trail will be or how it will be done. One suggestion is that there be a meeting of the minds of the folks who own the rights of way at present, and an alternative be provided for a floating easement, which would create a defined area, but only be put into place at such time as the other parts are put into place. The Town has not done the work to look at all possibilities to provide that access, and therefore the application is not consistent with policy 4.4.

Draper explained that a floating easement provides flexibility on actual placement of a trail within a defined area. He said an unobtrusive, pedestrian trail that does not intrude onto Mr. Hansen's property, up to Worn Springs Road.

Roth said that the owner of the land has to consent to the easement; under the Nolan decision, he advised that the Town did not have a right to insist on the easements. Consequently, it appears that policy 4.4 is not legal under the Nolan decision.

Hochstrasser said that the General Plan policy specifies a trail system, based on the open space map of the General Plan. There is a system for trails, and the trail that Mr. Braun talked about is not defined in the General Plan; it is identified there as a potential trail. To adopt the trail would therefore require a General Plan amendment.

Roth advised the Council to file for declaratory relief on the easement, and get certainty on the 120,000 gallon tank and whether it is going to be located there. He said he would like the applicant to offer a suggestion on how that will not occur as long as Mr. Gill owns the property. If the property owners have the 120,000 gallon tank in mind for this property, than the tank would be part of this project.

Neil Sorensen, attorney for the Gills, made a correction on page 7 to show that the applicants do not own parcel 05. Regarding the 120,000 gallon water tank, he said the Gills are not the applicants for the tank. They intend to build and use a 40,000 gallon tank, and not use the 120,000 gallon tank. The applicants spent a considerable effort to get the 40,000 gallon tank approved by the Ross Valley Fire Department. They requested the building permit in December 1991 to build a tank, and have submitted a letter of intent to the tank company regarding buying a tank. Regarding the CEQA laws on the water tank, and what constitutes a project with respect to the water issue, Sorensen said that the

Supreme Court has ruled that if a project or other action you are seeking to add to the project is a reasonable foreseeable consequence of the initial project, than you have to include in the environmental review; if not, then you do not have to add it in. There is no indication that the 120,000 gallon tank is a reasonable foreseeable future action of this application. There is no indication that the applicant is going to build a 120,000 gallon tank. The Gills have no intention of conveying this triangular parcel to MMWD. They do not own it, so they could not convey it anyway. They own it with Mr. Denfield, who also shares the 7,000 gallon tank currently on the property, so it would have to be the Gills and Mr. Denfield who would convey the property. The Gills have not been approached by MMWD or anybody else with any serious negotiations about price or conveying the parcel. They have no intention of conveying it now. The Gills would not agree to a restriction prohibiting them from conveying the property in the future; that would be an unconstitutional taking of property without just compensation. If the Gills get a good offer from the water district or the water tank applicants, they might want to sell it in the future. He did not believe the Town could restrict their right to sell the property.

Regarding the access issue, Sorensen agreed that it would be settled if the Town Council decides to accept Mr. Gill's language, and then file a lawsuit to establish whatever rights the public may have gained on that parcel. He suggested additional language beyond what was in the letter to condition #12, on page 7, at the bottom, after (a): "...any court action filed by the Town...", they would propose to add : (b) An access plan that is approved by a majority of the property owners with rights over or in said parcel and approved by the Town Council. If the owners up there agree and the Town approves an access plan, the Gills would not object. He said there had to be a connection between the burden on public access that is being created by the project and the easement being requested to mitigate that burden. He said there is no evidence to support the existence of a burden, and in fact the burden was being lessened by this project. He said that with the removal of the second unit, there will be a smaller traffic impact. He urged the Council to accept the Gills' language and file action to determine what rights exist. The present situation of unclarity on rights does not help anyone. It is a factual dispute that should be resolved in a court, and not be resolved by people feuding on the site.

Regarding Mr. Sharp's letter, and regarding his contention that the Gills may have an ownership interest in 05, Sorensen said the nexus may exist for the Town to acquire a dedication over parcel 05. Sorensen said it did not matter who owned parcel 05, because the issue is whether there is something the Gills are proposing to do on their property that affects public access. The Gills do not own it; it was deeded to Mr. Hansen by the Gills.

Roth advised that it was reasonably foreseeable that a 120,000 gallon tank will be built on the property, given that it is now being targeted by MMWD and Mr. Gill is unwilling to cooperate with the Town to prevent that, and therefore the Town could consider that as part of his project, which would require an analysis of that in terms of the whole project. He suggested a continuance to allow him to research this matter.

Chignell urged the Town Attorney and applicant's attorney to discuss whether there was agreeable language on the issue of conveyance.

Zaharoff said the Town could not afford to grant an application in that area with any confusion. She requested

clarification on the easement, and whether there are other alternatives that have not been pursued, such as a floating trail easement.

Sorensen said they would object to a continuance, they felt there was a problem with the permit streamlining act, and would seek a court order to deem the project approved under that act. By Town Code, the Council only has a reasonable amount of time to handle an appeal, and it has been more than 30 days since the appeal was filed.

Breen said that the Town was acting in good faith, that they were almost there, and they were trying to move it quickly.

Lee Stanfley-Torme, 38 Morningside Drive, advocate for access to open space, said she would like to see the Council work with the Gills and vice versa to try to make a public easement come about. She said there was a state law that if the owners dedicate a trail easement through their property, or their neighbors do, they cannot be sued for any accidents that occur on their property. She urged the Council out of sensitivity to their privacy and to the amount of access that occurs through their property, that they consider pedestrian access only, and not equestrian or bicycle access.

Sorensen explained that the Gills had until August, 1993 to build and occupy the home to avoid capital gains taxes.

Dan Goltz, 107 Holstein, said there would be a large cost in litigating the easement, and that the Town Attorney ought to come back with a cost.

It was the consensus of the Council to continue this item to a special meeting, to take place October 1, 7:00 p.m.

9. DISCUSS 1992-93 BUDGET AND SET PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULE.

Town Administrator Jean Bonander reported that the State budget action will result in a 4 percent cut in the Town's 1992-93 revenues. Options for the Council included implementing an across the board 4 percent cut in all programs, cutting the budget four percent in selected programs, or adopting a 92-93 budget that maintains the 1991-92 service levels and use AB702 (PERS) funds to offset the deficit. She recommended the last option, and using the remaining nine months of the budget year to come up with a long-term plan, set priorities, identify consolidation opportunities, organize staffing an program reductions in humane, sensible ways, and implement new fees.

It was the consensus of the Council not to use the AB702 monies, and to look at making cuts in this year's budget.

It was the consensus of the Council to set a workshop for Sunday, October 11, 10:00 a.m. to discuss their priorities for the community.

Public hearings on the 1992-93 budget were scheduled for October 13, 15, 20 and 22.

10. COUNCIL REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS, COMMENTS AND DIRECTIONS TO STAFF; STAFF MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

Signs - Kanis inquired about the signs at the Hub shopping center announcing a festival.

Overnight parking signs - Kanis asked staff to make sure that the overnight parking signs were consistent.

11. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at midnight.

Beth Pollard