

**LARKSPUR CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES
APRIL 4, 2007**

CITY COUNCIL: PRESENT: Mayor Ron Arlas, Larry Chu, Kathy Hartzell,
Dan Hillmer, Joan Lundstrom

STAFF: PRESENT: City Manager Jean Bonander, City Attorney
Sky Woodruff, Planning Director Nancy
Kaufman, Planning Consultant Diane
Henderson

Mayor Arlas called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR

The City Clerk certifies that this Agenda has been posted in accordance with the requirements of the Government Code

Approval of Warrants

Approval of Minutes: March 21, 2007

Response to 2007 Grand Jury Report: Hogtieing: A Lethal Restraint?

Affirm Direction to Staff regarding LAFCO's Recommendation to remove San Quentin Property from Larkspur's Sphere of Influence (SOI)

M/s, Lundstrom/Hillmer and approved 5-0 to approve the Consent Calendar as submitted.

CITY MANAGER'S ORAL REPORT

The City Manager stated neither she nor the Planning Director would be able to attend the LAFCO Committee meeting that was scheduled for Thursday, April 12th and she asked if a Councilmember would be available. LAFCO would be discussing the Sphere of Influence (SOI) issue. She stated the League of California Cities North Bay Division meeting would be held on April 30th at Stonetree in Novato. Mayor Arlas stated he would like to attend. The auditors

have concluded their preliminary work on the 2006/07 Financial Statements ahead of schedule. No problems were identified. The Twin Cities Police Council meeting would be held on April 26th at 7:30 p.m.

COUNCILMEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

Councilmember Lundstrom reported the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) has received a Federal Grant of \$25 million for the Non-Motorized Pilot Program. A number of comments have been made and adopted by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) including recommendations that there should be more emphasis on multi-use pathways, a "Share the Path" program, and serious consideration to geographic equity, in particular to the East/West corridor. They also questioned the commitment of nearly \$1 million to study the feasibility of opening the Alto Tunnel. The Board of Supervisors would be reviewing these recommendations on April 17th.

Councilmember Hillmer stated the Marin Telecommunications Agency reviewed and approved a request for information to vendors for a wireless broadband network for the County. This would bring high-speed broadband service to transit corridors, commercial districts, and other public places. This would be implemented through the Marin General Services Administrations and would be a big step towards improving the infrastructure. Councilmember Chu stated he was on the JPA Oversight Committee and they identified several public policy issues related to the technology portion of this issue that would need to be addressed in the future.

Councilmember Hartzell stated she attended the recent Community Development Block Grant Priority Setting Committee meeting. There were two projects that received funding including Marin Service for Women and Ecumenical Association for Housing.

Councilmember Hartzell invited everyone to attend the April 17th meeting of the Centennial Committee at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. The Steering Committee had a very productive meeting this week.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. INTRODUCE AND WAIVE FIRST READING OF ORDINANCE NO. 953, AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF LARKSPUR AMENDING VARIOUS SECTIONS OF CHAPTER 18 OF THE LARKSPUR MUNICIPAL CODE TO RESOLVE INCONSISTENCIES IN THE CODE, PROVIDE REFINEMENT OF AND CLARIFICATION ON CURRENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, AND

ADDRESS RECENTLY ENACTED STATE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT LAW REQUIREMENTS

The Planning Director presented the staff report.

Councilmember Hillmer had questions about the Heritage Preservation Board's plan to update the Historic Resources Inventory and whether or not property owners would be noticed prior to the Public Hearings. The Planning Director stated those meetings would be held in May and staff is preparing the notices. The Heritage Preservation Board has set three Public Hearings and an alternative fourth meeting.

Councilmember Chu referred to page 3 of the Draft Ordinance, #10, "Home Occupations Restrictions", the last sentence which states "No sound shall be audible beyond the parcel boundary" and asked if this is meant to be more restrictive than the existing Noise Ordinance. The Planning Director stated that was not staff's intent. Councilmember Chu stated he was not sure how to distinguish the "business" from the "home" aspect. The Planning Director stated staff would review this section and come back with a recommendation.

Councilmember Chu referred to page 6, # 18, "Temporary Uses", E.2. "Nuisance Factors" and asked if they should add anything associated with the characteristics of the anticipated group or attendees in terms of crowd control. The Planning Director stated that was covered in E.9., "Public Safety".

Councilmember Hartzell referred to page 11, #27, "Parking Requirement", and stated some accessory buildings might accommodate a Home Occupation and she asked staff to look at whether or not this would warrant an examination of the parking. The Planning Director stated they would still be required to meet the parking requirements and this has been added to #10, "Home Occupation Restrictions".

Councilmember Hartzell referred to page 18, #67, "Sign Definitions", #18, "Political Signs" and suggested that the word "measures" be included. She suggested they increase the number of days that a political sign can be up from 30 to 45 days.

Mayor Arlas opened the meeting to public comments

There being no comments, Mayor Arlas closed the meeting to public comments.

Councilmember Lundstrom referred to page 7, #19, "Recycling Space Allocation", A. 4. and suggested the following wording: "The enclosures..... *where possible*". She referred to page 9, #21, "Performance Standards", I. 4. and was concerned that construction is allowed 365 days of the year. She would like to see what other communities are doing. She referred to page 10, J,

“Property Maintenance Standards” and asked how the term “freedom of expression” would be defined. She questioned including this in an ordinance. Mayor Arlas agreed and asked staff to look into this. She stated the suggestion made by Councilmember Hartzell to allow political signs to stay up for 45 days was a good one.

M/s, Hartzell/Lundstrom and approved 5-0 to continue this item to April 18th.

2. CONSIDER A PROPOSED AFFORDABLE HOUSING ALTERNATIVE EQUIVALENT ACTION BY CAMPUS PROPERTIES, LLC, DEVELOPERS OF THE RESIDENTIAL PROJECT KNOWN AS 2000 LARKSPUR LANDING CIRCLE, TO FINANCE THE PURCHASE AND SEISMIC UPGRADE OF THE 23-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING LOCATED AT 210 LOWER VIA CASITAS AND THE CONVERSION OF THE PROPERTY TO A 24-UNIT HANDICAP ACCESSIBLE RENTAL PROJECT TO MEET 24 OF THE 25.2 UNIT AFFORDABLE REQUIREMENT PLUS A CASH CONTRIBUTION OF \$150,000 TO THE CITY’S HOUSING TRUST FUND TO MEET THE BALANCE OF THE AFFORDABLE REQUIREMENT (1.2 UNITS).

The Planning Consultant presented the staff report.

The Planning Director stated staff received three items of late mail. They were placed on the Council dais.

Councilmember Hillmer asked for clarification about how the proposal would relate to the ABAG allocations. The Planning Director stated the City has a certified Housing Element that runs through 2007. She was informed by the State that this proposal would not qualify under the current element but that it would likely qualify under the next Housing Element and round of allocations. Councilmember Hillmer asked if this would help out the City. The Planning Director stated this proposal would not help significantly given the numbers the City would likely receive.

Councilmember Lundstrom asked the Planning Director to cite the housing goals from the General Plan.

Councilmember Chu had questions about the in-lieu fee and asked for the staff recommendation. The Planning Director stated staff would not have a recommendation until Council direction is given after discussion of item #3.

Councilmember Chu stated the last allocation figure from ABAG was 574 units and 58% for the next round would equal 332 units.

Councilmember Lundstrom asked how the cash contribution of \$150,000 would be used. The Planning Director stated it could be used to leverage other funds or as a direct contribution to the non-profit organization that is trying to provide

affordable housing. Councilmember Lundstrom asked if it could be donated to the Ecumenical Association of Housing towards the Larkspur Landing affordable housing project. The City Manager stated “yes” but the dollar amount would not buy much in terms of leverage.

Councilmember Hillmer noted the Council has the sole discretion in deciding on this matter and he was concerned about setting precedent. The City Manager stated these issues would be decided on a case-by-case basis since each project is individual to the community and would have a unique set of characteristics. She did not think this would be a precedence setting action. The City Attorney agreed and stated each case would be a discretionary decision by the Council. Councilmember Hillmer stated he was concerned about “the law of unintended consequences”. Mayor Arlas agreed and stated the Council needs to make some findings as a basis for their decision.

Mayor Arlas opened the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Robert Upton, representing Campus Properties LLC, stated there seemed to be general support for the proposal at the August meeting. There were two issues: 1) lack of support from the tenants, 2) absence of confirmation about the eligibility towards the City’s housing needs. He stated they have dealt with both items. They have a signed agreement from all 21 of the tenants agreeing to the Tenants’ Assistance Program. They have an opinion from the law firm of Goldfarb and Lipman that the proposal would count towards meeting the City’s share of regional affordable housing need. He stated the necessary findings could be made. They believe the proposal would further the affordable housing opportunities in the City. The units would be for rent and not for sale and he believes that is a big plus for the City. The cash payment \$150,000 is not an in-lieu fee but is part of the “package”.

Councilmember Hillmer noted Mr. Upton was discussing the economics of the project and he asked how their position would improve relative to the other project.

Mr. Michael Hooper, representing Campus Properties LLC, stated their sole motivation was to reduce their losses on the for-sale BMR’s. Councilmember Hillmer asked what their losses would be under the normal inclusionary rules. Mr. Hooper stated more than the proposed in-lieu fees. Councilmember Chu stated it would be at least \$8.5 million. Mr. Hooper stated they would not be doing this if it were not a benefit.

Mr. Hooper thanked Marin Housing Authority and Mr. Joseph Morelli for his work as the tenant leader. They have 21 signed agreements and 9 tenants that qualify and have been certified as very-low income, low, or moderate income. He discussed the demographics of the tenants that qualify and stated they are targeting this program towards working households. There are 12 existing

tenants that do not qualify and are participating in the Tenant's Assistance Program. He stated these units would clearly be delivered ahead of the 2000 Larkspur Landing Circle units and would apply to the upcoming ABAG housing allocation. They believe that the rentals are a better solution than the for-sale solution. They feel they are very qualified to own and manage this property.

Councilmember Chu had questions about the \$150,000 cash contribution since they did not consider it to be an in-lieu fee. Mr. Hooper stated it was a cash payment that was calculated by looking at the amount of money they could put towards the deal to reduce the losses on the BMR's at 2000 Larkspur Landing Circle. Councilmember Chu asked if staff is of the opinion that the in-lieu fee for the 1.2 units still exists. The Planning Director stated they were offering a "package" in lieu of the 25.2 units for the project. It was up to the Council to decide whether or not that "package" was sufficient. Councilmember Chu stated it was a matter of semantics. The Planning Director stated they believe that their offer for more low and some very low income units is a benefit to the community over the low and moderate for sale. They are throwing in the \$150,000 as an additional contribution.

Councilmember Hillmer referred to the for-sale units and asked how many parking spaces were being provided per unit. The Planning Consultant stated she did not recall the exact number but it was over one per unit. Mr. Hooper stated it would conform to code. Councilmember Hillmer asked how many spaces would be provided at 210 Via Casitas. The Planning Consultant stated they would be short three parking spaces. Councilmember Hillmer asked if there was a shortfall for the existing units. The Planning Consultant stated "yes". The Planning Director stated they would be applying for a variance to the parking requirement. Councilmember Hillmer asked how many bedrooms they would be adding. The Planning Consultant stated they would be adding eleven bedrooms including the den conversions. Councilmember Hillmer was concerned about adding to the parking problem. Mr. Hooper stated parking was well used but not at total occupancy.

Ms. Nancy Lovelady, Upper Via Casitas, stated this was all about "lining Campus Properties pockets". The proposal would negatively impact her home and the neighborhood. She lives in and manages an eight-unit apartment building and it is very difficult to find tenants near low-income housing.

Mr. Brian Cohan, owner of Lower Via Casitas, stated the success of the neighborhood was very important to him and bringing in low-income housing was a concern. Poor management could negatively impact the neighborhood if not done correctly.

Mr. James Holmes, Madrone Avenue, stated there were several reasons why this proposal would not conform to the legal standard of "furthering affordable housing opportunities in the City to an equal or greater extent than what is

currently required”: 1) if the current requirements were implemented the City would have a) an apartment building which is comparatively affordable due to market conditions, and b) on-site affordable housing due to the planning requirements; 2) the original proposal offers more diversity and variety in the type of affordable housing; 3) the original plan proposes affordable housing integrated on-site with the market rate housing; 4) the original proposal gives you economic integration while the new proposal gives you economic segregation; 5) there are minimal management concerns with the original plan but more potential problems with the new plan. The new proposal is a gamble and includes conversion issues, Stated qualification issues, and management issues. The money is minimal, the precedent is worrisome, the parking falls short, and the proposal does not promote Larkspur’s affordable housing to the same extent as the existing, current requirements.

Ms. Mia Polanski, Via Casitas, stated she bought her first condominium in San Francisco with the help of the Redevelopment Agency. Giving people the right to buy a home was more satisfying than renting.

Mr. Joseph Norelli, Lower Via Casitas, stated he served as the negotiator for the tenants and the “do no harm” clause was the dominant theme of the negotiations. He stated a representative from Marin Housing Authority told them that the low income “for rent” need in Marin County is far greater than the low income “for sale” need. There is a four-year waiting list for people who qualify for low-income rental housing.

Councilmember Hillmer asked Mr. Norelli if the tenants would be harmed if this new proposal did not go through. Mr. Norelli some would be harmed and some would not be harmed. Councilmember Hillmer asked about the significant change between the former and new proposal. Mr. Norelli stated obviously the cash payment was a very big factor. He noted the contract was quite lengthy and contained a number of points.

Councilmember Hartzell asked if the building would continue to be on the market should proposal did not go through. Mr. Norelli stated “yes”. Councilmember Hartzell asked how that would affect the existing tenants. Mr. Norelli stated they were told the rents would be raised. Councilmember Hartzell stated there was no assurance that they would not be priced out if the building goes back on the market.

Mr. Nick Morris, Lower Via Casitas, stated he was quite overwhelmed when he first found out about the proposal. Campus Properties has come up with an equitable and fair solution for the tenants. He stated they need to keep an appropriate perspective and what is considered very low income in Marin County is considered middle class in the rest of the country.

Ms. Morgan Loy, Lower Via Casitas, stated he moved to Marin County years ago and a rental assistance program would have been very helpful.

Ms. Barbara Kautz, representing the legal firm of Goldfarb and Lipman, stated this would not be Section 8 housing and most of the rents would be at 80% of medium income or close to \$60,000 per year. Studies have shown that affordable housing has almost no effect on adjacent property values. She referred to the 2007 to 2013 ABAG allocations and stated the City would end up getting credit for a total of 150 units (126 units on site plus the 24 units here) instead of 126 if they were provided on site. If the housing is not built and received a Building Permit by the end of 2006 it goes regionally into the next periods housing need. The Planning Director stated some of the sites need General Plan Amendments and rezoning and they need to have those in place this year in order to count them in the next round. Mr. Kautz stated the Campus Properties project could be "rolled over".

Mayor Arlas closed the meeting to public comments.

Councilmember Hillmer stated the core question remains: Is it the City's job to create new kinds of affordable units or is this Alternate Equivalent Action something that should be considered as achieving their housing objectives. He asked if this proposal would undermine what they are trying to do which is to integrate and create new, affordable housing stock as opposed to substituting almost affordable units. He was concerned that they would be getting only half of what they were supposed to and what might come to them in the future.

Councilmember Lundstrom stated they need to make a decision that is in the best interests, overall, for the City. The City Council has approved a number of very low and low-income affordable housing throughout the City and they have not had problems. Low and moderate-income levels are childcare, clerical, middle management employees, etc. She is concerned about the precedence this may set and she would want assurance that this would be "in perpetuity". She read the provision that states, "The City of Larkspur shall have the reasonable right of approval over any successor...". The City Attorney stated the Council could approve the proposal and include a regulatory agreement recorded on the property that required these remain affordable rental units "in perpetuity". This would prevent the sale of the property for a purpose other than for affordable rental. In terms of succession, the Council would have the first right of refusal and the ability to disapprove a transfer. Councilmember Lundstrom asked staff if the City should get into the "housing business", has it been done before, and what are the ramifications. The City Manager stated "no" although the City has partnered with Marin Housing and EAH to work cooperatively on projects. These organizations handle the daily activities and management of the properties. Larkspur staffing is quite lean and they focus on the core responsibilities. Councilmember Lundstrom stated she was concerned about the precedence this may set and being able to have this "in perpetuity".

Councilmember Hartzell stated she was in favor of this proposal for several reasons. She believes it is in the best interest of the community to serve a lower income sector in this manner than the “for sale” requirements would. She also believes this provides a form of housing security for the residents who qualify because the required repairs would likely displace the residents. She stated it was important to live up to the goals of the Housing Element including converting existing market rate to affordable housing. She is not concerned about setting a precedent because each situation is unique.

Councilmember Chu stated these Statewide mandates often place a burden on staff and he would like to minimize these impacts. The question posed to the Council remains: Does the proposal provide equal or greater compliance with inclusionary requirements? The issue of affordable housing is very emotional and they are trying to provide affordable housing to a segment of the population that might not be able to afford it due to the escalation of housing prices. This proposal provides additional units at the lower end of the scale where they are most needed and thus equals the compliance to the affordable housing requirements. He has concerns about specific issues that were raised including cash reserves. He could not comment on the issue regarding the in-lieu fee or contribution until they discuss the next agenda item but he felt \$150,000 was on the low side for the equivalent of 2 units. He stated it will be very difficult for Larkspur to satisfy the housing needs allocation and the best they can do is make a good faith effort to find affordable housing. This proposal serves the lower rather than the moderate end of the spectrum and provides a better benefit. He could support the proposal.

Mayor Arlas disagreed with Councilmember Chu and Hartzell. He stated Mr. Holmes raised some good points and they need to look at the “macro” view and what is best, overall, for the City and community. One of their goals has been to integrate different levels of housing types and affordability and he was concerned about setting a precedent. Removing this component from the 2000 Larkspur Landing site would stratify and remove any type of integration. In addition, one of the reasons for escalating housing prices is the lack of housing stock and he was concerned about eliminating units. He was also concerned about allowing a developer to circumvent current requirements. He discussed the issue of “ownership” vs. “rental” and stated there is a great benefit to owning a home. He did not think that seven units were enough to eliminate 25 units of affordable, purchasable homes. The proposal was not a greater benefit to the community and he could not vote for it.

Councilmember Hillmer stated any development proposal could be seen as a risk assessment for the City and the developer. The developer has spread his risk around and is asking the City to trade new, affordable housing units for ownership. Many years ago the developers asked the City to consider intensifying the entitled designated land uses because they were going to bring a

lot of benefits to the community including affordable housing. The development capacity was doubled because of the promise of benefits. The City is being asked to give up the other affordable component. He does not see the sharing of the risk or development of the affordable units. He does not see the equivalent benefit.

M/s, Chu/Hartzell and denied 3-2 (Mayor Arlas, Hillmer, and Lundstrom voted no) to accept the Affordable Housing Equivalent Action proposed by Campus Properties subject to additional review by the Council of some of the issues of concern.

The Council took a 5-minute break at 10:00 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 10:05 p.m.

3. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF AN AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN-LIEU FEE STUDY PREPARED BY ECONOMIC & PLANNING SYSTEMS (EPS) FOR THE CITY OF LARKSPUR TO DETERMINE THE APPROPRIATE METHOD OF CALCULATION AND AMOUNT OF AN AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN-LIEU FEE TO BE ESTABLISHED PURSUANT TO SECTION 18.31.040 D. AND F. OF THE LARKSPUR MUNICIPAL CODE

The Planning Director presented the staff report.

Mayor Arlas opened the meeting to public comments.

Mr. Darin Smith, representing Economic and Planning Systems (EPS), referred to Table 2 and stated the information presents the ultimate findings in terms of the affordable housing in-lieu fee per affordable unit that would be required. They have done the calculations a number of different ways based on HUD and Marin County standards for income as well as with and without the profit position. If a developer is paying the in-lieu fee instead of building the units they get that increment of additional market-rate units upon which they make profits. There is a different requirement for projects of five to fourteen units than for fifteen and above. He briefly explained the difference between the HUD and Marin County income limits and noted that HUD gives a boost to the allowable median income for a family of four of up to \$113,000. Marin County uses the figure of \$91,000 as the standard. He further discussed and explained the figures in Table 2.

Mr. Michael Hooper, Madrone Avenue, commended EPS for their analytical ability. He noted the ordinance calls for the use of the HCD numbers. He stated there were a number of assumptions that should be reviewed including the cost of parking and some of the assumptions related to density. He offered his help on this matter.

Mayor Arlas closed the meeting to public comments.

M/s, Hillmer/Lundstrom and approved 5-0 to continue this item to a date uncertain.

BUSINESS ITEMS

1. DISCUSSION OF SMART'S AD HOC COMMITTEE REQUEST TO MEET WITH LARKSPUR ON SMART TRAIN ISSUES

The City Manager presented the staff report.

Mayor Arlas asked for comments about the type of meeting (public or private), who should attend, and when it should occur.

Councilmembers Chu stated the first meeting should occur with the elected officials minus the staff.

It was the consensus of the Council to meet with the committee.

Mayor Arlas stated he did not like private meetings that have to do with public topics and he would like to invite the committee for a workshop discussion.

Councilmember Hillmer stated both types of meetings should be part of the process. They should meet privately first and then hold a public workshop.

Councilmember Lundstrom stated the SMART representatives have been talking about setting up this meeting since January. The meeting would include two Supervisors from Sonoma County, one from Marin County, and San Rafael Mayor Al Boro (Chair of the committee). It is difficult to get everyone together but it is important to include the Sonoma County representatives. The only way to accomplish this would probably be a private meeting. She stated a public workshop must include very clear guidelines and structure. She would be open to a private meeting.

Councilmember Hartzell stated it would be better to meet with only the elected officials and then hold a public workshop. It was important for the SMART representatives to hear the communities concerns.

Councilmember Chu agreed that there should be as much public input as possible. However, Larkspur has been the only municipality along the rail that has had little representation in the decision-making and a private meeting might be a better way to get more of a participatory voice in the process. Mayor Arlas and Councilmember Lundstrom, as the Transportation Authority of Marin representative, should attend the meeting. A public meeting could then be held including the SMART representatives.

Mayor Arlas stated the Council would like SMART to agree to a public workshop subsequent to any private meeting.

The City Manager discussed the composition of the SMART committee and stated they met today with the Novato representatives. She was told it was a productive meeting and that SMART's intent was to listen. The Sonoma County Supervisors have agreed to clear their calendars to meet with Larkspur. The meeting could take place in May or June.

Mayor Arlas reiterated his opposition to discussing public business in private.

Mayor Arlas opened the meeting to public comments.

Mr. Matthew Stevens, SMART Committee Outreach Consultant, stated the committee intends to bring a report to the SMART Board on April 18th. Mayor Arlas asked Mr. Stevens why the committee waited so long to come to Larkspur. Mr. Stevens stated he did not know.

Mr. Steve Stein, Birch Avenue, stated he agreed that public business should be conducted in public and he supported the Council suggestion. He discussed the history of the project and asked the Council to keep in mind that there is a lot of support for the project. There are issues that need to be considered, including placement of the station and whether or not the figures in the EIR need to be revised. He welcomed further discussions and looked forward to the public workshop.

Mr. John Berk, San Rafael, encouraged the Council to meet with SMART and to keep an open mind. He is very concerned about traffic and supported the project.

Mr. Lionel Campbell, Novato, stated the focus of the first meeting should be on information with the SMART representatives and their consultants. A workshop meeting could occur after that.

Mayor Arlas closed the meeting to public comments.

M/s, Chu/Hartzell and approved 5-0 that the Mayor, the Council representative of TAM, and the City Manager represent Larkspur in a meeting with the ad hoc committee of SMART on the condition that the SMART representatives come back for a workshop to discuss the outcome in a public setting.

Councilmember Hillmer stated he would like Mr. Campbell's insightful comments attached to the proposal.

ADJOURN MEETING TO CLOSED SESSION

The City Council and the City Manager adjourned to closed session at 10:45 p.m. to discuss the following items:

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL- EXISTING LITIGATION
(Government Code Section 54956.9) McLeran Properties, LLC vs. City of Larkspur (Marin County Superior Court action number CV- 050529)

ADJOURN MEETING OUT OF CLOSED SESSION AND NOTE ANY REPORTABLE ACTION TAKEN

The Mayor adjourned to open session at 11:22 p.m. and indicated that no reportable action had been taken.

ADJOURN MEETING

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 11:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Toni DeFrancis
Recording Secretary