

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BRADBURY, HELD ON TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2011, AT  
7:00 PM IN THE STAFF LOUNGE AT ROYAL OAKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
2499 ROYAL OAKS DRIVE, BRADBURY, CA 91008**

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting of the City Council of the City of Bradbury was called to order by Mayor Hale at 7:02 PM.

**ROLL CALL:** PRESENT: Mayor Hale, Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis, Councilmembers Lathrop, Pycz and Barakat

ABSENT: None

STAFF: City Manager Keith, City Attorney Reisman, Deputy City Engineer Gilbertson, City Planner David Meyer, City Clerk Saldana and Management Analyst Petsas

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:** Councilmember Barakat made a motion to approve the agenda to proceed with City business. Councilmember Lathrop seconded the motion which carried 5-0.

**DISCLOSURE OF ITEMS REQUIRED BY GOV. CODE SECTION 1090 & 81000 ET SEQ.:** In compliance with the California Political Reform Act, each City Council Member has the responsibility to disclose direct or indirect potential for a personal financial impact as a result of participation in the decision making process concerning agenda items.

Mayor Hale reported a conflict on Item #2 (169 Circle Drive Appeal) due to the fact that he spoke at the Planning Commission Hearing on behalf of the Bradbury Estates Homeowners Association. Councilmember Barakat stated that he has a conflict with item #5 (Award of Landscape Architect Contract) due to his proximity to the project site. Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis disclosed that he has done work with the firm which employs the tenant and they have occasionally dog sat for his dog in Item #2. City Attorney Resiman stated that he is looking at case law to see if he would have to recuse himself for that item, but he doesn't believe the matter is material.

City Attorney Reisman reported that he was not aware of any other conflicts of interests with any of the items on the agenda.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** All items on the Consent Calendar are considered by the City Council to be routine and will be enacted by one motion unless a Council Member request otherwise, in which case the item will be removed and considered by separate action. All Resolutions and Ordinances for Second Reading on the Consent Calendar are deemed to be "to waive further reading and adopt."

- A. Minutes- Regular City Council Meeting of December 21, 2010
- B. Financial Statement for the month of December 2010
- C. Resolution No. 11-01- Demands and Warrants for January 2011

- D. Final Acceptance of the Mount Olive Sewer Project
- E. Approval of the Memorandum of Understanding with the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments for the SCE Grant
- F. Disaster/Emergency Accounting Policy
- G. Approval to Release Performance Bond for 428 Old Ranch Road
- H. Approval to Release Performance Bond for 1433 Royal Oaks Drive North

**DISCUSSION:**

Councilmember Lathrop stated that on page 4 of the December 2010 minutes he didn't state that "including moving a Police Officer to the Gardi/Mount Olive Drive Intersection as long as the City has funding to do so" in regards to the Mount Olive Project.

Also, Councilmember Lathrop recalls making the motion for the project, not Councilmember Barakat. Councilmember Barakat agreed and he recalled seconding the motion.

**MOTION TO APPROVE  
CONSENT CALENDAR:**

Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis moved to approve the Consent Calendar as amended. Councilmember Barakat seconded the motion, which was carried by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Mayor Hale, Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis, Councilmembers Lathrop, Pycz and Barakat

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

**ITEM #2: APPEAL OF  
PLANNING COMMISSION'S  
DECISION REGARDING  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
APPLICATION NO. AR 10-  
253, NEIGHBORHOOD  
COMPATIBILITY  
APPLICATION NO. NC 10-  
93 & VARIANCE  
APPLICATION NO. V 10-68**

On October 27, 2010 the Planning Commission, by a 3-2 vote adopted Resolution No. 10-206.PC conditionally approving plans to construct a new three-story 15,791 square foot single-family estate dwelling unit with a subterranean attached garage containing 3,887 square feet; a detached single-story accessory dwelling unit containing 2,267 square feet with an attached 441 square foot garage; a detached cabana; a lighted tennis court and a swimming pool. The subject property is located at 165 Circle Drive in the A-5 zone. The subject property contains 2.04 acres of land area.

The City Council shall conduct a De Novo Public Hearing upon the request of Allan DeVault regarding the construction of a new single family residence.

On November 4, 2010 the owner of a property located within 500 feet of the subject property, Mr. Alan DeVault 244 Barranca Road, filed an appeal of the Planning Commission's decision in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 9.02.050 of the Bradbury Municipal Code. The City is required to hold a De Novo Public hearing upon said project and thereafter shall approve, conditionally approve or deny the same. A De Novo hearing is a type of appeal where the City Council holds a new public hearing. In addition to the testimony received at the public hearing, the City Council also considers the record of the Planning Commission.

The basis of Mr. DeVault's appeal claims that the proposed development will significantly impact existing views enjoyed by the residents of 169 Circle Drive and a concern about larger homes being built on non-conforming lots.

The Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 10-206 conditionally approving the proposed development project with three Commissioners approving the Resolution and two Commissioners opposed. The Planning Commission made the findings that the view from the property addressed as 169 Circle Drive was of vacant developable land (the subject property) and that of distant mountain areas not normally visible. Further, the Planning Commission found that the subject property possesses development rights within the parameters of the City's Development Code and that the nonconforming size of the site and its unusual shape provide the basis for approving deviations or variances from the City's Hillside Development standards.

**DISCUSSION:**

City Attorney Reisman stated that after conducting his research that Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis does not have a conflict on the project and that it is up to him to decide whether he can impartially decide and vote on the on the project. Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis stated that he could.

Mayor Hale recused himself from the table and joined the audience.

**PUBLIC HEARING  
OPENED:**

Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis opened the public hearing and invited those wishing to speak to come forward and be heard.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Alan DeVault, the appellant, 244 Barranca Road, referred to his letter in terms of why he is appealing this project. He stated that it is not that he doesn't want anything built on the project site, he just wants to make sure his views of the mountains and his privacy is protected with whatever is built on the property next to his.

Mr. DeVault felt that the Planning Commission's decision was wrong and invalid because the poles that show the height of the project relative to neighboring properties were not installed in enough time. In summary, Mr. DeVault stated that the project was overdevelopment for the size of the lot.

Robert Tong, 255 E. Santa Clara St, #200 Sanyao International, Project Architect, stated that this project and its current design is the result of working with the HOA for 2 years in coming up with a design that pleases the HOA and the neighbors. The project applicant has compromised a lot from the initial design. They have moved the garage underground and have reduced the overall height of the building from what was originally proposed. Mr. Tong stated that he didn't understand this opposition because the HOA approved the project and in fact the appellant's wife is the one who made the motion to approve the project on the HOA board.

Patti DeVault, 244 Barranca Road & Member of HOA, stated that the HOA and the applicant did work with them over the several years that

the project was being reviewed to get things resolved; however, there were items that when she or a fellow board member had a question about they asked Mr. Hale or Mr. Hernandez about, they were told “ask planning”, referring to ask the City’s Contract Planner. After getting the run around for several months, they decided to just approve the project and let it go before the Planning Commission so that their questions could be answered.

Mrs. DeVault also stated that there was insufficient time to review all the material submitted to the City Council and said that the information should have been released earlier.

Chris Kopcsak, renter of 169 Circle Drive (owned by the DeVaults), stated that this project will allow for a huge house on a small piece of property. He suggested that the project should eliminate the guest house or tennis court and then consider moving the location of the home. Also Mr. Kopcsak stated that he disagrees with the City Planner and Project Architect in regards to impervious material and believes that there is approximately 90% impervious material on the project site.

Tina Nemeth, 306 Old Ranch Road, she asked what the color of the roof is since it is the only thing that she will be seeing if the project is approved. She stated that her home is the highest in the area and wanted to make sure the roof is designed appropriately. She suggested that the project architect should study the property (340 Old Ranch Road) and see how they addressed the roof design.

Maria Mak, 215 Barranca Road, stated that she looks up onto the subject property and is concerned greatly about several things. First, privacy. she is concerned about the owners being able to look in her house when she and her kids are changing clothes and not having the ability to enjoy their backyard without someone watching them. Second, she is concerned about compatibility. The project is just to big for the site. She stated that her house is the size of the project’s guest house. Why does anyone need a house that big, no house should be that big. Third is the fact a hydrology study was requested. She stated that this means the project will be flooding her property when it rains. She also didn’t see a detailed landscape plan for the project.

Frank Hernandez, 333 Sycamore Lane and member of the HOA and Planning Commission, stated that he was shocked by the statements being made by the others today. He stated that neighbors will disagree and fight all the time and we can’t make everyone happy. Any construction that takes place on the project site will affect at least one person. The project as it is currently is the best for the situation and the architect, Mr. Tong is one of the best people who could come up with a solution to the complex situation.

Dick Hale, 564 Deodar and HOA president, stated that he has listened to the complaints and thought it would be important to understand that when the A-2 zone was introduced in 1986 this is one of the properties that was impacted. The property was originally much larger and subdivided into smaller non-traditional A-2 lots. It’s a difficult lot

requiring some creativity. Mr. Hale stated that people have the right to build on their property.

Mr. DeVault, the appellant, agreed with all of the comments previously stated in opposition to the project and left the City Council with the thought that this is the largest house on the smallest piece of property that has ever come before the City Council and Planning Commission.

Mr. Robert Tong responded to some of the comments made and stated that there was a landscape plan included with the submittal and noted that the footprint of the house equates to 10% of the total lot size.

**PUBLIC HEARING  
CLOSED:**

There being no more public testimony, Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis declared the public hearing closed.

**DISCUSSION:**

City Manager Keith stated that in response to some of the comments regarding not having enough time to review the documents, the City follows all regulations in terms of noticing and that the Public can not have a copy of the documents until the City Council receives their packet of information, which for Bradbury and every city in similar size is on the Friday before the City Council meeting.

Councilmember Barakat stated that a smaller house would still look big on that lot.

Councilmember Lathrop asked if the project exceeded the maximum impervious area. City Planner Meyer stated it didn't exceed the 30%.

Councilmember Pycz stated the lot should fit the house, not the house fit the lot. He explained why a flat roof is not allowed. Councilmember Pycz asked how high the roof could technically be under the code requirements. City Planner Meyer said it could lawfully be 35 feet tall, but it is proposed at 25 feet. Councilmember Pycz suggested that the project should be sent back to the architect or planning commission for further review. The fact that the project was approved with 8 variances was a specific concern.

Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis stated that the view is compromised no matter what. We can't tell homeowners how to design their homes.

Councilmember Lathrop made a motion to send the project back to the Planning Commission and have them work with the owner to reduce impervious material, and resolve the flat roof issue.

Councilmember Barakat asked why the City Council didn't want flat roofs to begin with. City Planner Meyer stated that the ban on flat roofs was approved so that homeowners would not have to look down on neighboring roofs with equipment on them, the typical use for a flat roof. The challenge is that when this ban was proposed the idea of Normandy style roofs for this project were not thought of and there is no equipment on this roof.

City Planner Meyer stated that he wanted to make sure he understood Councilmember Lathrop's motion correctly in that the City Council wants to direct the Planning Commission to consider no equipment on roof, setbacks on the northern and southern side and reducing the impervious material of the project. Councilmember Lathrop Concurred.

Councilmember Pycz Seconded Councilmember Lathrop's motion.

**MOTION TO PROVIDE  
DIRECTION TO STAFF:**

Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis called for a roll call vote on Councilmember's Lathrop motion to send the project back to the Planning Commission for consideration:

Councilmember Lathrop: Aye

Councilmember Pycz: Aye

Councilmember Barakat: Aye

Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis: Aye

Mayor Hale: Absent

Motion passed 4-0.

Mayor Hale returned to the meeting and there was a brief recess from 8:35 pm to 8:42 pm.

**ITEM #3: PUBLIC  
HEARING, INTRODUCTION  
AND FRIST READING OF:  
ORDINANCE NO. 319-  
ADOPTING AMENDMENTS  
TO THE BRADBURY  
MUNICIPAL CODE:**

The proposed ordinance is the routine, three-year cycle update when California cities adopt the updated California codes. The State's Health and Safety Code (Section 17958) mandates that the California Building Standards Commission adopts and publishes the California Building Standards Code every three (3) years. State law requires that the California codes become effective in January 2011. State law also requires that local amendments to the California Building Standards Codes, as stated in Section 17958.7 of the Health & Safety Code, be enacted only when express findings are made that such modifications or changes are reasonably necessary because of the local climate, geological or topographical conditions.

The Building Standards Commission introduced and adopted two new references which are the California Residential Code (CRC) and the California Green Code (Cal Green).

The changes to the Building Code, Plumbing Code, and Mechanical Code and Electrical Code are minor in nature.

The 2010 Los Angeles County Consolidated Fire District Fire Code outlines several new items for the 2010 Edition. Most pressing is that the new code introduces the requirement of installing fire sprinklers in home renovations adding 50% or more to the existing square footage of a residence. Exempt from this are homes that are located less than three miles from an existing LA County Fire Station, garages of less than 200 square feet and separated from other structures by a minimum of six feet as well as detached gazebos, pergolas and carports open on more than two sides that are separated from other

structures at a minimum of six feet.

The California Green Building Code has mandatory requirements for new residential and non-residential buildings. The Cal Green Code contains requirements for construction sites, stormwater control during construction, construction & demolition waste reduction, indoor water use reduction, material selection, natural resources conservation and site irrigation conservation.

Due to the extra work it will take contract staff to review the CA Green Code and verify compliance with the mandatory measures in the new code, a recommended fee of 10% of plan check is proposed. While it is understood that each jurisdiction must determine what fee is appropriate for their jurisdiction, the recommended 10% is a starting point. This amount is based upon similar fees assessed for other supplemental reviews conducted by the City.

Staff is recommending adopting the mandatory measures which are in Chapter 4 of the Green Code, Residential Mandatory Measures. The voluntary measures are not required to be adopted unless the local jurisdiction chooses to do so.

The California Health and Safety Code require cities to adopt these new requirements by January 1, 2011 as was done with Urgency Ordinance No. 318 in December 2010. This Ordinance is allowing for the City Council to conduct public noticing and hold a public hearing to receive feedback from residents and make any changes as they deem necessary. It is also recommended that with the adoption of Ordinance No. 319, that the City Council repeal Ordinance No. 318.

**DISCUSSION:**

Councilmember Barakat inquired as to what portions of the Green Code were being adopted. City Manager Keith stated that the portions being adopted were those under the mandatory sections of the code.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED:**

Mayor Hale opened the public hearing and invited those wishing to speak to come forward and be heard.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED:**

There being no public testimony, Mayor Hale declared the public hearing closed.

**MOTION TO INTRODUCE AND READY BY TITLE ONLY ORDINANCE NO. 319:**

Councilmember Lewis made a motion to introduce Ordinance No. 319- Adopting and approving the Los Angeles County versions of the 2010 California Building Code, Electrical Code, Plumbing Code, Mechanical Code, Fire Code, Residential Code, Green Building Standards Code and Health Code and repeal Urgency Ordinance No. 318. Councilmember Barakat seconded the motion which passed by the following roll-call vote:

AYES: Mayor Hale, Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis, Councilmembers Lathrop Pycz and Barakat.

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

Motion Passed 5-0

**ITEM #4: DISCUSSION-  
APPROVAL OF PLANS  
AND AUTHORIZATION TO  
RECEIVE FORMAL BIDS  
FOR MOUNT OLIVE DRIVE  
AND LEMON AVENUE  
RESURFACING PROJECT**

Deputy City Engineer Gilbertson stated most of the streets within the City were slurry sealed because the pavement condition was at a level where this treatment is a cost effective maintenance option. Several of the streets such as Mount Olive Drive and a portion of Lemon Avenue have a worse pavement condition and will require an asphalt overlay in lieu of a slurry seal.

The formal plans and specifications for the resurfacing of Mount Olive Drive and Lemon Avenue have been completed. Staff is requesting approval of the formal plans and specifications by the City Council as well as authorization to advertise and receive formal bids.

The project consists of a full-wide cold planning of the upper portion of existing asphalt, the installation of new reinforced pavement fabric and 2' asphalt overlay. This process is more economical and environmentally advantageous than just breaking up the old asphalt surface and starting from scratch.

This section of Lemon Avenue is shared with the City of Monrovia. Staff contacted the City of Monrovia to determine their interest in resurfacing the entire roadway width in lieu of only the city's northerly half. The City of Monrovia desires to resurface this portion of their streets, but does not have the funds available for such work.

The engineer's estimate for construction is as follows:

1. Mount Olive Drive	\$310,000.00
2. Lemon Avenue	<u>\$ 45,000.00</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$355,000.00</b>

Approximately \$270,296 is available in Proposition 1B funds. There is also approximately \$70,000 in Measure R funds and staff has confirmed with MTA the use of those funds for a project of this nature.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis asked if the City had enough money for this project. City Manager Keith stated that we won't fully know until we receive the bids.

Mayor Hale asked if the City will have monies available for this type of work next year. City Manager Keith said there might be funds available.

Mayor Hale stated that maybe we should delay the Lemon Avenue portion of the project.

Deputy City Engineer Gilbertson stated that it is possible to adjust the thickness of the asphalt added on Mount Olive Drive to lower the costs and not impact the overall life of the road. The project is being bid out as alternatives to provide the City flexibility of funding available.

**PUBLIC COMMENT OPENED:** Mayor Hale opened for public comment and invited those wishing to speak to come forward and be heard.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED:** There being no public testimony, Mayor Hale declared the public comments closed.

**MOTION TO APPROVE PLANS AND AUTHORIZE CITY ENGINEER** Councilmember Barakat made a motion to approve the plans and authorize the City Engineer to receive formal bids for the resurfacing of Mount Olive Drive and the westerly 1,350 feet of Lemon Avenue. Councilmember Pycz seconded the motion which passed by the following roll-call vote:

AYES: Mayor Hale, Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis, Councilmembers Lathrop Pycz and Barakat.

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

Motion Passed 5-0

**EXCUSAL FROM MEETING** Councilmember Barakat excused himself from the meeting to abstain from Item #5 due to his proximity to the project site.

**ITEM #5: DISCUSSION- PROFESSIONAL LANDSCAPE DESIGN SERVICES-CIVIC CENTER REMODEL PROJECT** As part of the comprehensive reconstruction of the Bradbury Civic Center the site should be landscaped in a manner that complies with the Los Angeles County Fire Department Fuel Modification Plan and the City's Water Efficient Landscape Regulations that were adopted to comply with State Law.

Staff solicited bids for professional landscape design services from licensed landscape architects who have worked for or within the City. The City received two design proposals and both firms indicated that they could adapt to and meet the City's schedule for the preparation of the landscape and irrigation construction plans.

The proposals include the preparation of concept designs to be approved by the City, the preparation of construction bid documents; and the supervision and observation of construction activity.

The two bids are as follows:

1. Armstrong & Walker, Landscape Architecture: \$3,880.00
2. Environs, Inc., Landscape Architecture: \$5,450.00

As part of the construction and installation of the landscaping and irrigation system the City will be required to prepare an audit of the irrigation system in order to verify that the irrigation system is operating as designed. The cost of the irrigation audit will be part of the construction proposals.

**DISCUSSION:** City Manager Keith stated that staff is pursuing grant opportunities for the landscaping material to help lower the costs since we are going to be using drought tolerant landscaping.

Mayor Hale wanted to make sure that this drought-tolerant landscaping wouldn't look like certain locations in Monrovia where the place looks abandoned. City Manager Keith stated that she would ensure that the project will not turn out like that.

**PUBLIC COMMENT OPENED:** Mayor Hale opened for public comment and invited those wishing to speak to come forward and be heard.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED:** There being no public testimony, Mayor Hale declared the public comment closed.

**MOTION TO AWARD CONTRACT FOR LANDSCAPE DESIGN SERVICES:** Councilmember Lathrop made a motion to authorize the City Manager to execute an agreement with Armstrong & Walker, Landscape Architecture in the amount of \$3,880.00 as well as authorize a contingency amount of 10% (\$388) in the event that the City Manager is convinced that additional funds are need for project related costs or services and \$500 for landscape plan check for a total budget of \$4,768.00. Councilmember Pycz seconded the motion which passed by the following roll-call vote:

AYES: Mayor Hale, Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis, Councilmembers Lathrop and Pycz

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Councilmember Barakat

Motion Passed 4-0

Councilmember Barakat rejoined the meeting.

**ITEM #6: DISCUSSION-CIVIC CENTER REMODEL PROJECT- ADOPTION OF BUDGET FOR INTERIOR FINISHES & EQUIPMENT AND AUTHORIZATION TO SOLICIT BIDS AND INCUR COSTS** The City Council previously approved a contract with Rasmussen Brothers Construction Company to construct the new Civic Center Facility. Additionally, the City Council approved a Contingency budget of \$122,408 to cover unforeseen construction related costs based on the approval of the design committee. Now that construction of the Civic Center is nearing completion the City Council should consider the cost to furnish the new building, provide window coverings and to purchase audio, visual and IT equipment.

The new facility should be ready for occupancy in March of this year. The lead time for acquiring the furniture and equipment is approximately 6 weeks and staff will need approximately two to three weeks to solicit competitive bids for the furniture and equipment.

**DISCUSSION:** City Planner Meyer presented samples of the items being considered for approval. Several of the Councilmembers requested that the items be brought to the joint retreat on the upcoming Saturday.

Councilmember Barakat inquired on where the project was in terms of meeting the projected budget. City Manager Keith stated that it was currently under budget.

**PUBLIC COMMENT  
OPENED:**

Mayor Hale opened for public comment and invited those wishing to speak to come forward and be heard

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None

**PUBLIC HEARING  
CLOSED:  
MOTION TO ADOPT  
BUDGET FOR  
FURNISHINGS AND  
AUTHORIZE CITY  
MANAGER TO SOLICIT  
BIDS**

There being no public testimony, Mayor Hale declared the public comment period closed.

Councilmember Lathrop made a motion adopt a budget of \$65,000 to fund the purchase of office furniture, window coverings, audio visual equipment and information technology equipment for the new civic center and authorize the City Manager to solicit bids for the identified fixtures and equipment and incur costs as approved by the Design Committee. Councilmember Pycz seconded the motion which passed by the following roll-call vote:

AYES: Mayor Hale, Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis, Councilmembers Lathrop, Pycz and Barakat

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

Motion Passed 5-0

**MATTERS FROM THE  
CITY MANAGER:**

City Manager Keith reminded the City Council of the Joint Retreat this upcoming Saturday with the Planning Commission.

Also, City Manager Keith stated that the Civic Center grand open is tentatively scheduled Thursday April 7, 2011 from 5pm to 7pm

She added that LACFD has withdrawn from the MS4 permit as the principal permittee. Monrovia is taking the lead to put a group together of Cities for moving forward.

Friday, February 4<sup>th</sup> City Hall is closed for furloughs.

**MATTERS FROM THE CITY COUNCIL:**

**MAYOR HALE:**

Reported that the HOA has decided against installing a fountain as the gift from HOA for the new Civic Center due to the maintenance that would be required. Instead the HOA has decided to install a bench outside the Council chambers.

**MAYOR PRO-TEM LEWIS:**

Mayor Pro-Tem Lewis reported that in Governor Brown's new budget he plans to eliminate redevelopment funds. Overall it is depressing the future of California.

**COUNCILMEMBER  
LATHROP:**

Reminded everyone that the District 4 meeting is next Thursday on January 27<sup>th</sup>. He also asked his fellow councilmembers if they would

be interested in putting on the next agenda an item about the Vulcan Mining Project, specifically a Resolution declaring the desire of the City to protect the natural hillside. No councilmembers expressed interest in doing so.

**COUNCILMAN PYCZ:** Nothing to report

**COUNCILMEMBER BARAKAT:** Councilmember Barakat stated that the Sanitation fee for waste haulers will be increasing and that it should equal a 19 cent per month increase for Bradbury residents.

**ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS:** None

**ADJOURNMENT:** At 9:34 pm Councilmember Barakat motioned to adjourn the meeting to a Regular Meeting at Royal Oaks Elementary School, 2499 Royal Oaks Drive, Bradbury, CA on Tuesday, February 15, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Pycz and carried unanimously.

---

**MAYOR – CITY OF BRADBURY**

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
**CITY CLERK – CITY OF BRADBURY**