

**LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING  
MINUTES  
October 9, 2007**

CALL TO ORDER	Mayor Hearn called the regular meeting of the City Council to order at 6:01 p.m.
ROLL CALL	<p>Present: Council Members: Jeffra, Sileo, Smith, Vice Mayor Visokey, Mayor Hearn</p> <p>Staff Members: Assistant City Manager, Interim Assistant City Manager, City Attorney, City Clerk, Planning Director, Public Works Director, Parks, Recreation &amp; Arts Director, Finance Director, Economic Development Director, Housing Director, Senior Management Analyst</p>
AGENDA ITEMS TO BE REMOVED	None
APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR	On a motion by Council Member Sileo and seconded by Vice Mayor Visokey, the City Council approved the Consent Calendar by the following vote: 5-0-0-0; AYES: Jeffra, Sileo, Smith, Visokey, Hearn; NOES: None; ABSTAIN: None; ABSENT: None
CC 1. ORDINANCE WAIVER	Waived further reading of any proposed ordinances. (This permits reading the title only in lieu of reciting the entire text.)
CC 2. MINUTES	Approved the Regular meeting minutes of September 25, 2007.
CC 3. CHECK AND WIRE REGISTERS	Approved the Check and Wire Registers (September 9, 2007 through September 22, 2007) in the amount of \$4,075,268.52.

CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 9, 2007

---

<p><b>CC 4.</b> ACCEPTANCE OF MAINTENANCE FOR LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS TRACT NOS. 31613; 54201; 060905; 061756</p>	<p>Approved and accepted for maintenance the work and materials for the landscape improvements for Landscape Maintenance District No. 1, Annexation No. 067, installed for Tract No. 31613, located on the southeast corner of Lancaster Boulevard and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street East, Owner: First Pacifica Housing, Corporation; Annexation No. 251, installed for Tract No. 54201, located on the northeast corner of Lancaster Boulevard and 35<sup>th</sup> Street West, Owner: Pulte Homes Corporation; Annexation No. 309, installed for Tract 060905, located on the southeast corner of Jackman Street and 35<sup>th</sup> Street West, Owner: Pulte Homes Corporation; Annexation No. 306, installed for Tract No. 061756, located on the south side of Avenue H-8, approximately 120 feet west of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street East, Owner: Larwin Company.</p>
<p><b>CC 5.</b> ACCEPTANCE OF STREETS FOR MAINTENANCE TRACT NO. 54276; SITE PLAN REVIEW NO. 05-10</p>	<p>Approved the developer constructed streets and accepted the streets for maintenance by the City for Tract No. 54276, located on the northeast corner of Avenue K and 62<sup>nd</sup> Street West, Owner: Standard Pacific Corporation, and Site Plan Review No. 05-10, located on the north side of Avenue L-8, approximately 335 east of 12<sup>th</sup> Street West, Owner: Dennis D. Pursley and K. Christine Pursley.</p>
<p><b>CC 6.</b> ACCEPTANCE OF INTERIOR STREET TREES FOR MAINTENANCE TRACT NO. 060450-01</p>	<p>Accepted the interior street trees for maintenance by the City for Tract No. 060450-01, located on the west side of 60<sup>th</sup> Street West, approximately 660 feet south of Avenue K, Owner: Capital Pacific Holdings, Inc.</p>
<p><b>CC 7.</b> MONUMENTATION WORK FOR TRACT NO. 52762; 54202</p>	<p>Approved the monumentation work for Tract No. 52762, located on the southeast corner of Challenger Way and Avenue J-8, Owner: Challenger Way, LLC., and Tract No. 54202, located on the southwest corner of Lancaster Boulevard and 30<sup>th</sup> Street West, Owner: West Lancaster Development, LLC.</p>
<p><b>CC 8.</b> ACCEPTANCE OF PWCP NO. 06-015 DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS</p>	<p>Accepted the work constructed by Sierra Cascade Construction, Inc., for <b>Public Works Construction Project No. 06-015</b>, Avenue H-4 at 10<sup>th</sup> Street West Drainage Improvements, directed the City Clerk to file the Notice of Completion for the project; authorized payment of the 10 percent retention 35 days after recordation, provided no stop notices, as provided by law, have been filed.</p>

---

CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 9, 2007

---

<p><b>CC 9.</b> ACCEPTANCE OF PWCP NO. 06-023 CITYWIDE STRIPING AND PAVEMENT MARKINGS</p>	<p>Accepted the work constructed by Sudhakar Company International, for <b>Public Works Construction Project No. 06-023</b>, Citywide Striping and Pavement Markings, directed the City Clerk to file the Notice of Completion for the project; authorized payment of the 10 percent retention 35 days after recordation provided no stop notices, as provided by law, have been filed.</p>
<p><b>CC 10.</b> ACCEPTANCE OF PWCP NO. 06-043 WHIT CARTER PARK NORTH PERIMETER WALL AND FENCING</p>	<p>Accepted the work constructed by Harris Steel Fence Company, <b>Public Works Construction Project No. 06-043</b>, Whit Carter Park North Perimeter Wall and Fencing; directed the City Clerk to file the Notice of Completion for the project; authorized payment of the 10 percent retention 35 days after recordation provided no stop notices, as provided by law, have been filed.</p>
<p><b>CC 11.</b> SUBSTITUTION OF SUBDIVISION UNDERTAKING AGREEMENT AND SECURITIES TRACT MAP NO. 54369</p>	<p>Approved and accepted substitution of the Subdivision Undertaking Agreement and securities submitted by Richmond American Homes in place of the Subdivision Undertaking Agreement and securities submitted by Reserve at Lancaster, LLC for Tract Map No. 54369, located on the south side of Avenue L, between 72<sup>nd</sup> Street West and 70<sup>th</sup> Street West.</p>
<p><b>CC 12.</b> SUBSTITUTION OF SUBDIVISION UNDERTAKING AGREEMENT AND SECURITIES TRACT MAP NO. 54370-01</p>	<p>Approved and accepted substitution of the Subdivision Undertaking Agreement and securities submitted by Richmond American Homes in place of the Subdivision Undertaking Agreement and securities submitted by Reserve at Lancaster, LLC for Tract Map No. 54370-01, located at the southeast corner of Avenue L and 72<sup>nd</sup> Street West.</p>
<p><b>CC 13.</b> EXTENSION OF UNDERTAKING AGREEMENT AND IMPROVEMENT SECURITIES TRACT MAP NO. 060147</p>	<p>Extended the Undertaking Agreement and Improvement Securities to August 1, 2008 for Tract Map No. 060147, located at the northwest corner of Avenue J and 25<sup>th</sup> Street East.</p>

---

CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 9, 2007

---

**CC 14.**  
EXTENSION OF  
UNDERTAKING  
AGREEMENT AND  
IMPROVEMENT  
SECURITIES  
TRACT MAP NO.  
060524

Extended the Undertaking Agreement and Improvement Securities to August 1, 2008, for Tract Map No. 060524, located on the east side of 60<sup>th</sup> Street West, approximately 300 feet south of Avenue K-8.

**CC 15.**  
EXTENSION OF  
UNDERTAKING  
AGREEMENT AND  
IMPROVEMENT  
SECURITIES  
TRACT MAP NO.  
060811

Extended the Undertaking Agreement and Improvement Securities to August 1, 2008, for Tract Map No. 060811, located on the northeast corner of 60<sup>th</sup> Street West and Avenue K-12.

**CC 16.**  
POLICY  
REGARDING  
WIRELESS  
COMMUNICATION  
DEVICES

Approved City Council Policy on Wireless Communication Devices.

**PH 1.**  
ORD. NO. 888  
DEVELOPMENT  
AGREEMENT  
NO. 07-01  
KAISER  
FOUNDATION  
HOSPITALS

Mayor Hearn opened the Public Hearing. The Planning Director presented the staff report regarding the Development Agreement No. 07-01, with Kaiser Foundation Hospitals.

Council Member Sileo requested clarification regarding the time frames for this project.

The Planning Director stated that under the proposed Development Agreement, Kaiser would be obligated to commence construction of what is known as the hospital support building no later than December 31, 2015. If Kaiser fails to meet that deadline they would have to reimburse the City for 50% of the Amargosa Channel Improvement costs plus an inflation component which is included within the Development Agreement. They are also obligated to begin construction of the hospital itself no later than December 31, 2018. Should they fail to commence construction of the hospital by that date they would be required to pay an additional 20% of those construction costs. Should Kaiser at some point choose to sell off all or a portion of the site and not pursue the hospital, they would be required to reimburse the City for all costs for the channel improvement or a pro rata share.

Council Member Sileo requested clarification regarding the Phase III time line.

The Planning Director stated that it would be within the overall 25 year time frame of the Development Agreement itself and it is not called out separately within the agreement.

There being no further testimony, Mayor Hearn closed the Public Hearing.

On a motion by Mayor Hearn and seconded by Council Member Jeffra, the City Council introduced **Ordinance No. 888**, approving Development Agreement No. 07-01, with Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, by the following vote: 5-0-0-0; AYES: Jeffra, Sileo, Smith, Visokey, Hearn; NOES: None; ABSTAIN: None; ABSENT: None

**NB 1.**  
**WATER SUPPLY**  
**PROGRAMS**

The Public Works Director presented a status report on Water Supply Programs in the Antelope Valley.

Mayor Hearn inquired as to the status of the lawsuit.

The Public Works Director referred to a Settlement Agreement that had formally been arrived at between L.A. County Sanitation District 14 and 20 with Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Council Member Sileo stated that he attended the Sanitation District meeting and there is another deal in the works that may be quite favorable to the City but he could not elaborate on this matter at this time. He stated that the City has done a good job of watching the water issue and attacking this challenge from every side, whether it be facilitating working groups, workshops, and recycled water systems, however the challenge is that the lawsuit could hold up a lot of things like ground water recharge is the adjudication process.

Council Member Sileo requested an overview of where the City is at in the process; what steps need to be taken and how long this case could drag out.

The Public Works Director gave a brief history of these types of lawsuits and stated that he feels the City has a good judge working on the process – Judge Komar. He has kept things on track so far but the individual participants to the law suit, the public agencies, the land owners and so forth, have come to an understanding that perhaps the agencies shouldn't just let this thing run itself, let the attorneys battle it out, run this slow process, so instead there have been a couple of meetings held where agencies are proposing to bring in a facilitator that would work with the specific parties and this process may speed everything else up.

Council Member Jeffra stated that he and the Public Works Director attended several meetings about three years ago and it was everybody for themselves. Now it has come around to being more of a regional approach to this issue and there are many more agencies involved in this.

Vice Mayor Visokey inquired as to what makes this year so much more dire than previous years, when there has been several years where there was not much rainfall.

The Public Works Director gave details on the two different types of droughts. The one type is the climatological drought and the concern or the fear of the global warming issue. There are different opinions about global warming but the issue basically suggests that if the temperatures were to rise, the snowpack, even though it may be similar in amount or in water content as in the past, would run off quicker and get to the ocean quicker.

**NB 1.**  
WATER SUPPLY  
PROGRAMS  
(continued)

The Public Works Director stated that the other one is the judicial drought system. He mentioned the Delta Smelt and what that has resulted in. When talking about water, generally that water comes through the contracts of AVEK, through Littlerock Irrigation District, Palmdale Water District, it totals around 140,000 acre feet. That contract just says that is the maximum entitlement, so in any given year, that is the most that can be taken. What it doesn't say is – that the actual ability of the present plumbing system to produce that water averages only about 70% of that 140,000. So, right away there is a drop to about 97,000 acre feet that is available on an average year. With the Delta Smelt issue and also the salmon issue that is also being looked at in greater detail, the judge has decided to reduce the amount that would come to the area.

Council Member Sileo stated that it would be good to involve the Planning Commission in a workshop and also to include other agencies. This could set some good ground work and keep the lines of communication open. If there are enough other agencies involved and buy into the discussion, a workshop would be a good idea.

The Public Works Director stated that about 23,000 homes presently have entitlement through either a final map or a tentative map and that means 23,000 acre feet more of water would be necessary. There are several projects under construction and that will generate 25,000 acre feet. Palmdale has an equivalent number of homes that they want to build; the issue of industry, retail and commercial developments has not been addressed, so it is a serious issue that needs to be discussed.

Council received and filed this report and gave direction to staff to come back as soon as possible with a plan for a workshop that would include the Planning Commission and other agencies to discuss and hear in more detail some of the immediate and long-term water challenges and to brainstorm policy direction that may be appropriate to improve water supply for Lancaster citizens and business interests.

**NB 2.**  
RESO. NO. 07-181  
SUPPORT OF  
MEASURE W

Council Member Smith stated that he has talked with the City Attorney and he does not have a legal conflict on this matter but because of some of his professional relationships and he does not want to give an appearance of conflict, he would abstain from discussion on this matter.

Assistant City Manager, Mark Bozigian presented the staff report regarding consideration of a resolution in support of the Antelope Valley Joint Union High School District Bond issue.

Council Member Sileo – Inquired as to Measure W and how much it is per \$100,000.00 of assessed value.

The Assistant City Manager stated that the maximum is \$30.00 per every \$100,000.00.

Vice Mayor Visokey – Requested clarification regarding the matching funds.

The Assistant City Manager stated that if the bond passes it is projected that the state would provide an additional \$80 million dollars. The \$80 million would not be in the bond issue, it would be provided by the state.

Addressing the Council on this matter:

Donita Winn – Presented clarification of state funding; importance of Council and community support to build schools; measure would help to complete and/or build additional schools.

Council Member Sileo - Inquired as to developer impact fees for schools and are these fees as high as they can be.

Ms. Winn stated that at this time the fee is as high as it can be.

Vice Mayor Visokey - Inquired as to how much does it cost to build a new high school.

Ms. Winn stated that the costs can be as much as \$140 million dollars.

James Shanbrom – Urged Council not to support this bond as a Council; it is not appropriate and it is up to the individual voters to decide the bond. Concerns regarding the unethical campaign process surrounding the bond and the school board should not be asking for support from the Council; Union leadership is out of touch.



CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 9, 2007

**NB 2.**  
RESO. NO. 07-181  
SUPPORT OF  
MEASURE W  
(continued)

Council Member Jeffra – Stated that it is too little, too late and every state in the union owes the public that it is supposed to serve four different things: schools; hospitals; prisons and courts. There should not be a bond floated in order to house more students and this has been going on forever. Every year more tax money is placed on the citizen's assessments and the state has done a very poor job in education. Everyone wants to see it pass but this is the wrong way to do it.

Vice Mayor Visokey – Agreed with Council Member Jeffra and stated that it is unfortunate that the state has put school districts in this situation. He stated that he supports this because the city is growing and the schools are overcrowded but it is a shame that the districts are forced to go out and ask the taxpayers to fund the bill for additional schools. He stated that maybe the school districts along with cities should follow-up and send a resolution to the state saying they strongly disagree with the way this is being handled and the way they are handling business. He stated that he will vote for this, however he does agree with the comments that were made by Mr. Shanbrom earlier. He stated that the Council does not have a vote but as individuals they do. He will support this, however he does not feel these items should be brought before the Council. This is something the citizens need to decide.

Council Member Sileo – Agrees with what has been said by his colleagues. The state is not playing fair; the percentage is going to go down. The state legislature has passed laws that have created a ceiling of how much a school district can charge for new residential construction, for money that can go to schools and this number is not high enough. He stated that he will support this because the children need to be housed and they need to be schooled. He does not like this but pragmatically it must be supported or there will not be children in schools and the downside of children not receiving a proper education is a much bigger negative than upping the property taxes.

Mayor Hearn – Stated that it is unfortunate that cities must come to the aid of the state time and time again. He felt that possibly by working through the Desert Mountain Division with a resolution and hopefully working it all the way to the state level as to how cities feel about this kind of operation would be an important endeavor. In the meantime, he stated that he would support this.

On a motion by Mayor Hearn and seconded by Council Member Jeffra, the City Council adopted **Resolution No. 07-181**, in support of the Antelope Valley Joint Union High School District Bond issue, Measure W, by the following vote: 4-0-1-0; AYES: Jeffra, Sileo, Smith, Visokey, Hearn; NOES: None; ABSTAIN: Smith; ABSENT: None

**CA 1.**  
**DISCUSSION**  
**REGARDING MEDIA**  
**TRAINING FOR**  
**CITY COUNCIL**  
**MEETINGS**

Council Member Sileo requested Council reconsideration/modification of media training regarding televised City Council Meetings. He stated that originally the vote had been split regarding training for Council and staff. He stated that since then he has given this a lot of thought and presented a proposal. He stated that it is fair that staff receive media training, as they do not have a choice on whether to be on television or not and he would not want to put staff in the position where they don't look the best they can, given the tools to do their job. Council knew from day one they would be interacting with reporters; television cameras and the public. He would like to re-visit the contract for media training to see if it can be modified by removing training for the Council Members and leaving the training for staff and in doing so, cut the costs for training as well.

Mayor Hearn stated that he did not have a problem with this as long as the upper hand can be given to every staff member possible to be the best they can be.

Council Member Smith stated that he agrees with Council Member Sileo on this and that staff does a wonderful job. They will need all the training they can get and the senior staff that does a lot of the talking should be trained. They are all highly trained now and this would benefit them. The budget for travel and registration and to go to seminars and for staff development is almost two-thirds of a million dollars. He stated that he would vote for appropriating more money for staff training if the senior staff and the City Manager feel that the video training is more important than attending an outside seminar than that is what staff must decide. A very large budget was passed and he is not willing to spend any more money on it.

Vice Mayor Visokey stated that he agrees with Council Member Smith, he understands what Council Member Sileo is saying. A lot of money is being spent on travel and training so given the flexibility of that, use that money for the media training.

Mayor Hearn asked if this proposal would reduce the \$22,000.00.

The Assistant City Manager stated that the maximum was \$22,000.00. The proposal was actually \$18,000.00. If the Council component is removed, the amount would be \$12,000.00 that would train a pool of 30-40 staff in a group setting and approximately 8 staff members in individual training. This will include two trainers; video operators; travel; equipment and after-sessions.

CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 9, 2007

**CA 1.**  
DISCUSSION  
REGARDING MEDIA  
TRAINING FOR  
CITY COUNCIL  
MEETINGS  
(continued)

Council Member Jeffra stated that he is not very happy with the idea of televising meetings anyway and that staff always comes through no matter what is asked of them. He stated that as far as he is concerned, he thinks staff should be approached and asked if they want the training. If the money needs to be given to staff for training, he does not have a problem with this. He stated that he agrees with what has been said, Council knew they would be presented in the public eye and that is just the way it is.

Council Member Smith stated that he is opposed to this and the \$12,000.00 should be taken out of the current training budget, however if the motion is to reduce the amount of money that is being spent, he will support this. He will not support any of the money being spent, it should come out of the budget that is already passed, but he will support to reduce it.

Council Member Sileo stated that this is his motion – to remove the Council Members from the media training and thereby reduce the overall costs as well and leave the rest of the proposal alone.

On a motion by Council Member Sileo and seconded by Mayor Hearn, the City Council approved removing the Council Members from the media training, thereby reducing the overall costs and to leave the remainder of the proposal as it is, by the following vote: 5-0-0-0; AYES: Jeffra, Sileo, Smith, Visokey, Hearn; NOES: None; ABSTAIN: None; ABSENT: None.

**CA 2.**  
SENIOR CITIZEN  
OMBUDSMEN

Council Member Smith requested discussion of a Senior Citizen Ombudsmen.

He stated that he has discussed this with other staff members and researched what other cities have done and he would like to get a consensus of the Council regarding this matter. If it is necessary for it to come back for formal approval at a later date, that is not a problem. The proposal is basically for a Senior Citizen Representative or Ombudsmen. The senior citizen population of Lancaster is growing. Talking with many senior citizens, they cannot make it to meetings, they feel disconnected with the City and it's hard for the Council to get out there to all of the citizens. A number of cities have this kind of representative, so he proposed that Council adopt a Senior Citizen Liaison or Ombudsman that would be appointed by the Council for one year and re-appointed every year; they would report to the Mayor and Vice Mayor, not as a staff member but more as a conduit for better communication with the Council. He also proposed that the City give the representative up to a \$100.00 a month mileage for driving and also supply them with a cell phone with a number that can be given out to the senior centers and he proposed that these costs be re-appropriated out of the Council travel/registration budget.

CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 9, 2007

**CA 2.**  
SENIOR CITIZEN  
OMBUDSMEN  
(continued)

Council Member Jeffra requested clarification regarding the use of the Council budget to handle the ombudsmen expenditures.

Council Member Smith stated that the Council budget would be able to cover these expenses. He also clarified that this representative would report to the Mayor and Vice Mayor, however this is not exclusive; this person can also go to staff or anyone that he needs information from.

Council Member Sileo requested clarification that this person would serve in an advisory role to the Council and Council Member Smith confirmed this.

Mayor Hearn stated that once a month he goes to the Senior Center, takes questions, comes back and if need be, he gets information from staff to make sure the Senior Center is up-to-date. Having an ombudsman is a very good idea to keep the senior citizen population in the loop.

On a motion by Council Member Smith and seconded by Mayor Hearn the City Council approved an annual appointment of a Senior Citizen Ombudsmen/Representative that would report to the Mayor and Vice Mayor, not as a staff member but more as a conduit for better communication with the Council and that the City give the representative up to \$100.00 a month mileage for driving and also supply them with a cell phone with a number that can be given out to the senior centers and that these costs be re-appropriated out of the Council travel/registration budget, by the following vote: 5-0-0-0; AYES: Jeffra, Sileo, Smith, Visokey, Hearn; NOES: None; ABSTAIN: None; ABSENT: None.

**CA 3.**  
APPLICATIONS OF  
SPECIFIC PLANS

Council Member Smith requested discussion of applications of Specific Plans for Lancaster Highlands and Bolthouse. He stated that he put this on the agenda and it was in the newspaper yesterday and he wanted to make a comment about the article. He wanted to make it clear that the article states: that he said he wanted these plans go forward regardless of water and he never said that. The water issues in this valley are probably, besides crime, one of the number one future things that this City must look at. This is going to affect everything that the City does. Having all of the players engaged in this conversation is important and one of the partnerships is with the developers that want to someday build schools, build shopping centers and build hospitals. All of these issues are going to take water and the City needs to get them engaged now so discussions can take place as a community. This isn't for a decision tonight; this is to get a consensus from the Council to actually put it on for the next agenda to actually take a vote on it. This would be for these two large developments – it would be for Lancaster Highlands and Bolthouse.

CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 9, 2007

<p><b>CA 3.</b> APPLICATIONS OF SPECIFIC PLANS (continued)</p>	<p>Council Member Jeffra stated that this water issue and large development projects comes up simultaneously. This is not the first time and it certainly won't be the last time. It is important to note what has taken place as far as where the water issues are concerned and this is now a regional issue and it will be dealt with in a regional manner. He stated that he did not see a problem in placing this on the next agenda for discussion.</p>
	<p>Council Member Sileo stated that he would support bringing this to the next agenda to discuss and requested that staff address if these projects are not likely to start growing out of the ground in 3 to 5 years, how does this tie into the current General Plan update process and does it disturb the process and what is the affect on that process to complete, versus if the two projects are interjected into the ongoing update process.</p>
	<p>Addressing the Council on this matter:</p>
	<p>Cleo Goss – Against these projects; against the money that will be spent; developers never lose; there are water shortages; housing shortages; wrong to approve these projects.</p>
	<p>It was the consensus of the Council to have staff bring this matter back to the next agenda for further discussion and decisions.</p>
<p>ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER ANNOUNCEMENTS</p>	<p>Thanked staff for the Bark at the Park event; over 6,000 people attended and it was an excellent event.</p>
<p>CITY CLERK ANNOUNCEMENT</p>	<p>The City Clerk provided the public with the procedure to address the City Council regarding non-agendized items.</p>
<p>PUBLIC BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR NON-AGENDIZED</p>	<p>Addressing the Council at this time:</p> <p>Nicole Parson – public safety; students; need for efficiency; provisions of the County.</p> <p>David Paul – school overcrowding; bond measures; progressive age of politics; people are more connected and more aware of what is going on.</p> <p>Sherry Marquez – concerns regarding a liquor store establishment; citizens do not feel safer; importance of an ordinance regarding concealed weapons; more development means more crime.</p>

CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 9, 2007

<p>PUBLIC BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR NON-AGENDIZED (continued)</p>	<p>Cleo Goss – concerns regarding income levels in the Antelope Valley; subprime loans; crime in the area; increase of Section 8; increase of foreclosures; against proposed supercenters on west side.</p> <p>Richard Hecker – concerns regarding information on health care for Wal-Mart employees.</p> <p>Vickie Nelson – representing Antelope Acres Town Council. Concerned with housing developments at 90<sup>th</sup> Street West as well as at 80<sup>th</sup> and 110<sup>th</sup> Street West; overcrowding of schools; lack of infrastructure.</p> <p>Michael Husarek – invited Council to attend the Business Expo in Cal City on October 13, 2007 from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Thanked Council and staff for all of their hard work.</p> <p>Francine Duggan – recent newcomer to the Antelope Valley; impressed with the manner in which Council meetings are run; concerns regarding children and campus safety; urged Council to consider student committees to help prevent future crime.</p>
<p>COUNCIL COMMENTS</p>	<p>Council Member Sileo thanked staff for the neighborhood clean-up project in the Piute area; this was a tremendous effort and a great project.</p> <p>Mayor Hearn discussed the incident at Pete Knight High School and his interest and the importance of keeping the community involved rather than people who are not part of the community. He stated that he had some discussion with the Union High School District and also Mayor Ledford and several people who talked about Mr. Bob Woodson. He has been obtained by the City of Palmdale and the School District to look at how they could help in the schools by developing school/student mentors to each other.</p> <p>He stated that since the Union High School District covers the entire Antelope Valley, he would like an item on the next agenda or the meeting in November to consider joining Palmdale along with the Union High School District to make sure the City can get all of the mileage out of this and see what can be done for all of the high schools.</p>
<p>CLOSED SESSION</p>	<p>None</p>

CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 9, 2007

ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Hearn's adjourned the meeting at 8:22 p.m. and announced the next regular meeting of the City Council would be held on Tuesday, October 23, 2007 at 6:00 p.m.

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
GERI K. BRYAN, CMC  
City Clerk  
City of Lancaster

\_\_\_\_\_  
HENRY W. HEARNS  
Mayor  
City of Lancaster

STATE OF CALIFORNIA            )  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES    ) ss  
CITY OF LANCASTER            )

**CERTIFICATION OF MINUTES**  
**CITY COUNCIL**

I, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ of the City of Lancaster, CA, do hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of the original City Council Minutes, for which the original is on file in my office.

WITNESS MY HAND AND THE SEAL OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER,  
on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

(seal)

\_\_\_\_\_