

MINUTES OF THE
SPECIAL MEETING – CITY COUNCIL
NOVEMBER 21, 2006

The special meeting of the City Council of the City of Benicia was called to order by Mayor Steve Messina at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 21, 2006, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 250 East L Street, complete proceedings of which are recorded on tape.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Council Members Hughes, Patterson, Schwartzman, and Mayor Messina

Absent: Council Member Whitney (arrived at 6:31 p.m.)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Mayor Messina led the pledge to the flag.

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS:

A plaque stating the Fundamental Rights of each member of the public is posted at the entrance to the Council Chambers per Section 4.04.030 of City of Benicia Ordinance No. 05-6 (Open Government Ordinance).

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CLOSED SESSION:

Lisa Wolfe, City Clerk, read the announcement of Closed Session.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

CLOSED SESSION:

- A. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – INITIATION OF LITIGATION (Subdivision (a) of Government Code Section 54956.9)**
- B. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION (Subdivision (a) of Government Code Section 54956.9)**

Name of case: Royal v. City of Benicia

ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Messina adjourned the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING – CITY COUNCIL
NOVEMBER 21, 2006

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Benicia was called to order by Mayor Steve Messina at 7: 04 p.m. on Tuesday, November 21, 2006, in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, 250 East L Street, complete proceedings of which are recorded on tape.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Council Members Hughes, Patterson, Schwartzman, Whitney, and Mayor Messina

Absent: None

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Mayor Messina led the pledge to the flag.

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS:

A plaque stating the Fundamental Rights of each member of the public is posted at the entrance to the Council Chambers per Section 4.04.030 of City of Benicia Ordinance No. 05-6 (Open Government Ordinance).

ANNOUNCEMENTS/APPOINTMENTS/PRESENTATIONS/PROCLAMATIONS:

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Action taken at Closed Session:

Ms. McLaughlin stated that the following actions were taken:

- A. Council authorized initiation of litigation against the law firm of Liebert Cassidy.
- B. Council took no action.

Openings on Boards and Commissions:

- People Using Resources Efficiently (PURE) Committee:
One immediate opening
- Open Government Commission:
One unexpired term to December 6, 2007
One unexpired term to December 6, 2008
- Sky Valley Open Space Committee:
One full term to September 30, 2010
- Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Commission:
One full term to January 30, 2011
- Civil Service Commission:
One full term to January 30, 2010

Council Member Patterson stated that she was concerned about the stability of the recent appointments to the Open Government Commission that had been made. She was hoping there would be some appointments soon. There are a lot of applications for the commission on file. Some of the people are retired and are not subject to be moved or

relocated. She asked if Council would see some appointments in December. Mayor Messina stated that he would do his best and thanked Council Member Patterson for her comments. He would revisit some of the applicants.

APPOINTMENTS:

Council Member Patterson stated that she wanted to explain why all three of her votes for the appointments would be 'no.' She stated that it was not a reflection on the individuals. She does not like appointing individuals who are already serving on commissions. She would also like to get more diversity on the commission for the City. She feels there could have been a stronger effort to reach out to new folks in the community

RESOLUTION 06-172 - A RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE MAYOR'S APPOINTMENT OF ULF WERNER TO THE BUILDING BOARD OF APPEALS TO A FULL TERM ENDING NOVEMBER 30, 2010

The above Resolution was adopted, on roll call by the following vote:

Ayes: Council Members Hughes, Schwartzman, Whitney, and Mayor Messina

Noes: Council Member Patterson

RESOLUTION 06-173 - A RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE MAYOR'S APPOINTMENT OF MICHAEL WHITE TO THE BUILDING BOARD OF APPEALS TO A FULL TERM ENDING NOVEMBER 30, 2010

The above Resolution was adopted, on roll call by the following vote:

Ayes: Council Members Hughes, Schwartzman, Whitney, and Mayor Messina

Noes: Council Member Patterson

RESOLUTION 06-174 - A RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE MAYOR'S REAPPOINTMENT OF PATRICK DONAGHUE TO THE BUILDING BOARD OF APPEALS TO A FULL TERM ENDING NOVEMBER 30, 2010

The above Resolution was adopted, on roll call by the following vote:

Ayes: Council Members Hughes, Schwartzman, Whitney, and Mayor Messina

Noes: Council Member Patterson

PRESENTATIONS:

Presentation from the Benicia Tula Sister City Association

Ms. Maria Bitagon Reyes, President, Benicia Tula Sister City Association, read the following prepared statement:

“First and foremost, I want to express my gratitude to each and every one of you for the strong support given to the Benicia-Tula Sister Cities Association during the July 2006 visit of our guests from Tula De Allende, State of Hidalgo, Mexico. Our guests were very impressed and touched to see that the government of Benicia is very supportive in the relationship we have with our sister city.

In September of 2006, a delegation from Benicia participated in the Mexican Independence Day Parade in Tula. We were very privileged to have in our delegation former Mayor Warren O'Blennis, who represented the Mayor, Council, and the City of Benicia, Lauren Bird, who represented Valero Refining Company of California. I had the honor of walking side by side with Professor Juan Cardenas Oviedo, Mayor of Tula, and to carry with great pride our American flag held on the same level as the Mexican flag.

Mayor Juan Cardenas Oviedo of Tula sent his greetings to historic Benicia and its beautiful people for the kind and generous welcome to his Tula delegation.

Former Mayor Warren O'Blennis, Lauren Bird, and I agree to invite a school band composed of 20 children to visit and participate in Benicia's Torch Parade in July of 2007 as part of our Cultural Exchange Program.

We had the honor and opportunity to be invited to visit the State of Hidalgo. I, as well as former mayor Warren O'Blennis, had the privilege of addressing the Congress of the State of Hidalgo. The President of the Congress expressed that they were honored to recognize Benicia as Tula De Allende's sister city.

The Members of the Benicia Tula Sister Cities Association had a very productive visit. I would like to acknowledge Mayor Steve Messina as our Honorary Chairman. We have prepared some pictures which are reflective of our recent visit to Tula.”

Ms. Eileen Stern, Benicia Tula Sister City Association, reviewed a slide show of the pictures from the recent trip to Tula.

Mayor Messina applauded Ms. Reyes for her efforts.

People Using Resources Efficiently (PURE) Update

Mr. Bob Craft, Chair of PURE read the following prepared report:

“I will begin by saying simply that since PURE's last report to Council, there has been a very significant and negative development with respect to the water recycling project. PURE's consultant, CDM Corporation, has revised the cost estimates. CDM now estimates that costs at the probable bid date will range from at least \$23 million for a 1 MGD capable system to as much as \$40 million for a 2 MGD version. The new projections are essentially twice as much as the earlier figures.

Blamed for the increase were, for example, material shortages and resulting price volatility, energy costs, and foreign demand. PURE's only guaranteed source of funding for the project is from Valero. As part of the VIP approval process and related settlement agreement, Valero committed to provide approximately \$15 million for the water reuse project with the proviso that they receive at least 1 MGD of recycled water. The agreement specified that the \$15 million and 1 MGD was the benchmark at which they would consider the project economically feasible. An earlier commitment from them specified that the project had to be economically, regulatorily, and technically feasible.

Clearly, the \$23 million cost projected for a 1 MGD system is well beyond what was agreed to as economically feasible with respect to Valero's commitment. Thus, unless additional funding sources can be identified promptly, the latest estimates seem to represent a poison pill.

Even if such funding could be found, there is now a serious question with respect to the overall cost effectiveness of the project. PURE has determined that its preferred design is feasible from both the technical and regulatory standpoints, but the economic hurdle appears to be insurmountable. Other designs were examined early in the process and offer no economic relief.

Thus, it appears that approximately \$9 million in additional funding is required. The PURE Committee does not have the wherewithal or charter to pursue the funding amounts necessary to supplement the Valero commitment.

There is one possible bit of good news. One of the original drivers for the project was to mitigate the impact of increased water usage by the VIP project by conserving water through the recycling project. The primary reason for the increased water use was the scrubber for air quality impacts. This scrubber as envisioned for the VIP was a water hog. Valero already routinely uses about 40% of the water used by Benicia.

As VIP planning has progressed, advanced engineering techniques have been and are being explored which might minimize much of the water usage envisioned in the original scrubber concept. Valero will provide PURE with a current status on this issue at the December PURE meeting.

PURE will refine its thinking on the project and its status in December. PURE's plan is to provide recommendations to Council with respect to how it believes the City might choose to proceed."

Vice Mayor Schwartzman asked how the fish were doing with the testing. Mr. Craft stated that the testing was well within the regulatory standards. The costs are up; however, the Committee is not sure if the motivation is down.

Mayor Messina stated that this item might have to be put on a future agenda so some actions could be taken.

PROCLAMATIONS:

None

ADOPTION OF AGENDA:

On motion of Vice Mayor Schwartzman, seconded by Council Member Patterson, the Agenda was adopted as presented, on roll call by the following vote:

Ayes: Council Members Hughes, Patterson, Schwartzman, Whitney, and Mayor Messina

Noes: None

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

WRITTEN:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

1. Council Member Patterson – Council Member Patterson stated that she wanted the public to know that at the December 5, 2006 Council meeting, she would be asking Council to consider an ordinance for formula based stores. She has done some research, along with some of the citizens and the City Attorney. She is prepared to present the information to Council so it could decide whether or not to pursue that.

Mayor Messina stated that at the December 5, 2006 Council meeting, Council will decide if it wishes to discuss the matter. If so, it would be placed on a future agenda. By agreeing to discuss it, Council would authorize Staff time to put together information on this item to present to Council. The public is welcome to attend the meeting on December 5, 2006. However, it would be most important that they attend the actual meeting when the item is agendaized for discussion. It is okay to speak to the item tonight and on December 5, but the time it would have the most impact is when the item is actually discussed.

2. Lee Klare – Mr. Klare thanked Council for bringing this item up so quickly (at the 12/5 Council meeting). It is not just Starbucks – there are a lot of formula based companies coming into small communities. Benicia needs to maintain its individuality. Formula based company's come because they see money. By keeping formula based companies out, we would be saying families come first.
3. Matt Macintyre – Mr. Macintyre stated he was here to support Rrags Café. Supporting small businesses is important. Benicia already has three Starbucks. Rrags has good, kindhearted people working there.
4. Mr. Russo – Mr. Russo stated that his problem with formula based businesses tend to crush other businesses. Corporate based businesses such as Starbucks stifle other businesses. There is a certain nature to this town that we would like to keep. On another level, formula based businesses are bad for the community. They do not put money back into the community. Such businesses tend to wipe out other businesses. It is hard to make a living with a small business. He thinks a large portion of this town would support the small businesses.
5. Dan Russo - Mr. Russo stated that Benicia was a unique place. Formula based businesses tend to crush other small businesses. Corporate based businesses can take a financial bath and the initial object is to stifle small businesses. There is a certain nature to this town that we love. Formula based businesses are bad for the community. They don't have an allegiance to the community. If they are not profitable, they withdraw from the community. It is hard for small businesses to make a living in Benicia.
6. Harry Newhall – Mr. Newhall stated that Benicia is a unique place. He thanked Council Member Patterson for taking this item on. He would like to see the other Council Members to weigh in on this before a decision is made. A lot of times,

the citizens don't know where Council stands on things. Starbucks could be another potential contributor to elections. They could have an effect on future elections. That should be considered since Council is working on fair campaign practices. Corporate based businesses are predators.

7. Gary Moss – Mr. Moss stated many people don't trust Council. When the citizens don't trust the City Council or the Mayor, there is a problem. The citizens supported one or two Starbucks. Allowing another Starbucks to come in is crazy. Why not just allow a Wal Mart or Trader Joes to be put in on First Street? There was an article in the San Francisco Chronicle about Benicia being one of the top ten cities. The bottom line is that the citizens don't trust Council. The citizens will be watching Council. They kicked IT out of the City. They cleaned up Rose Drive and the Arsenal. They built the field of dreams at the end of First Street. Where does Council think the notoriety came from? From the people who are here and worked hard for the community. They will be damned if Council is going to take it away.

Mr. Erickson stated that there was no discretionary decision by Council to permit or not permit another Starbucks from going in. A permit never came before Council regarding a Starbucks application. There are zoning regulations that allow for another Starbucks. There was no discretion Staff or Council has to disallow that. Whether anyone likes it or not, the present state of the law does not allow Starbucks in this area. With the present state of the law, the City does not have the discretion to say no to such businesses.

8. Jeanine Seeds – Ms. Seeds stated that Staff must have known before the citizens knew about this. Staff could have initiated a law against such occurrences. She discussed numbers of patrons at each Starbucks. She suggested having a new bakery in town. Free enterprise implies equal starting places. At this point, if you are a self-employed person, you could not compete. The local businesses have been here for a long time. The person that owns the Blockbuster building lives in Stockton or Modesto.
9. Sue Hurley – Ms. Hurley submitted a written document (on file). She stated her concerns with another Starbucks going in.
10. Karen Burns – Ms. Burns stated that she did not disagree with the property owner's ability to lease to whomever they want to. However, care and concern for the surrounding businesses should be taken into consideration. Large companies put smaller ones out of businesses. Size and purchasing power make it so that independent business owners are unable to compete. Numerous cities have laws that prevent large companies such as Starbucks from doing business in their cities. She would like to see Council Member Patterson's issue move forward quickly. Does the City want to be known for discouraging and killing small businesses? She requested the City bar Starbucks and other multi-million dollar businesses from coming into Benicia.
11. James Milburn – Mr. Milburn stated that three Starbucks are sufficient for Benicia. Small businesses should be first and foremost on the list, not multi-million dollar businesses.

12. Susan Street – Ms. Street echoed the comments that had been made. Starbucks going into the Blockbuster building and on Rose Drive? She urged Council to explore alternatives. Maybe there is something the City could do that would prevent us from looking like every other town. An ordinance preventing this from happening again is needed. She hopes Council will take the comments made in a generic manner. It is not just saving the local coffee shops, but the character of Benicia.
13. Wayne Kohler– Mr. Kohler stated that he trusts Council; however, he has trouble with President Bush. He has never heard anyone talking about quaint experiences at ‘Starbucks.’ Starbucks is not the answer. Five Starbucks would be enough to run the small businesses out of town. It is like a tsunami of Starbucks coming into town. Council should look at this closer.
14. Rosemary Moore – Ms. Moore stated that this is not just about Starbucks, but also about the integrity of this town and what we want for Benicia.
15. Citizen – The citizen stated that other small communities have ordinances that restricted the amount of formula based businesses coming into their towns. She does not want Benicia to become any town USA. She is not against Starbucks, but this type of business will erode what we find dear about Benicia.
16. Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that he owns a small business and is very sensitive to the plights of small businesses. A few meetings ago, he tried to bring something forward to limit the size of any large commercial enterprise businesses. As far as for coffee, he supports the local coffee shops. He was concerned when the First Street Starbucks opened up. He does not know how Java Point was doing. He thought Café Voltaire was doing okay. If we frequent the places we want to go to, it will have the effect we are looking for. He asked about the timing of an ordinance. He asked Staff if Starbucks had submitted an application for the Blockbuster building. Staff confirmed that a tentative permit had been approved. Vice Mayor Schwartzman asked if the City does an ordinance soon, would that prevent this Starbucks from moving forward. Staff confirmed that no, it was already in the works. Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that right now, it would be difficult to stop this from moving forward. He recommended frequenting the businesses we feel appropriate. He suggested citizens contact Starbucks, the property owner, or the broker, to let them know how they feel. Maybe they don’t know that many citizens don’t want another Starbucks. Maybe that would affect the change.
17. Citizen – The citizen’s daughter works at Java Point Café. Java Point has suffered greatly due to the opening of Starbucks. She would like Council to take this issue very seriously – as a sign the citizens want to stop the invasion of businesses affecting this town. She asked Council to please listen to the citizens.
18. Mary Wika – Ms. Wika stated that four years ago, the Southampton Starbucks’ manager came by and offered her employees employment information. She contacted Starbucks, who then told her they would stop, but they were opening more Starbucks in the near by area. They have affected 40-50% of her business.
19. Elizabeth Troy – Ms. Troy stated that when she moved here five years ago, it was a ‘home’ town feel. She urged Council to forge ahead with the ordinance so this does not happen again.

20. Jackie Klare – Ms. Klare stated she was saddened to hear of the progress and approval of the Starbucks going in the Blockbuster building. Council does not appreciate the ethnic diversity in town. There is not a corporate diversity does not support the ethnic diversity in town.
21. Council Member Patterson – Council Member Patterson listed her email address epatterson@ci.benicia.ca.us so that citizens could contact her with comments or concerns. She would send anyone interested notices that deal with this issue. She encouraged the citizens to stay in touch and try to touch bases with the Council.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

On motion of Vice Mayor Schwartzman, seconded by Council Member Patterson, the Consent Calendar was adopted as presented, on roll call by the following vote:

Ayes: Council Members Hughes, Patterson, Schwartzman, Whitney, and Mayor Messina

Noes: None

The minutes of November 7, 2006 were approved.

Council approved the Denial of the claim against the City by Liezel Ramirez and Liezel Ramirez for Julius Ramirez (minor) and referral to insurance carrier.

ORDINANCE 06-15 - AN ORDINANCE AMENDING BENICIA MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 17.70.270 (AFFORDABLE HOUSING DENSITY BONUS)

RESOLUTION 06-175 - A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE CAMEL BARN RE-ROOF PROJECT, AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO SIGN THE NOTICE OF COMPLETION AND CITY CLERK TO FILE SAME WITH THE SOLANO COUNTY RECORDER

Council approved the request for time extension for the Robert Semple Safe Routes to School Project grant.

Approval to waive the reading of all ordinances introduced and adopted pursuant to this agenda.

(END OF CONSENT CALENDAR)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None

ACTION ITEMS:

Reject the bid for the Commandant's Residence Improvement Project Phase I:

Mike Alvarez, Parks and Community Services Director, reviewed the Staff report.

Council Member Hughes stated that he was disappointed and frustrated that the City only received one bid. He asked if there was ways for the City to be more aggressive about finding potential bidders for this project. Mr. Alvarez stated that Staff was equally frustrated. Staff sent notifications to four building exchanges, which get notices out to

contractors. Several contractors took out bid packages. Several contractors attended a mandatory pre-bid conference. Some of the feedback the City received was related to the insurance issues surrounding the building being a historic structure. Some contractors were concerned about the unknowns that might come up since it is an historic structure. The one bid we did receive was from the same firm that is working on the police department. He listed the two options the City has at this point. One option is to scale back the project, doing the stabilization and exclude the seismic work. The key there is that the City would not be able to seismically stabilize the building. The state is interested and has expressed a willingness to change the scope of the project. That would be a good back up option. It would move the City into Phase 2, which would put it into the state library and the City would not have to modify the grant. The other option would be to re-bid the project and ask for more funding. The original estimate firm is standing by their original bid of \$2.3 million. If this is rejected tonight, the City could act as the general and begin to work with subcontractors to do the work. It would be more labor intensive in terms of labor management of the staff. Staff is capable of doing that, but it would be a burden at this point.

Council Member Patterson stated that staging the project was previously discussed. Is Staff thinking about that? Would it be possible to write a bid package stating there were unknowns and that those unknowns would be dealt with on a time/materials basis? If the contractors were concerned about the unknowns, maybe this approach would help get this more in alignment with the cost Staff was thinking about. Mr. Alvarez stated that it was an interesting approach. Council Member Patterson stated that they could do time and materials with a not to exceed amount. She asked if Staff was writing grant proposals for Prop 84. Mr. Alvarez stated that Staff was monitoring Prop 84. They do not have all their categories yet. He was not prepared to discuss that aspect tonight.

Council Member Whitney stated that after watching projects come and go around here, it seems that doing them in stages makes the costs go up. If we sat down and said we wanted to do it all, would it cost us less because it would be a larger project? Generally in construction projects, you start to begin to receive the economy of scale at that point. If the City were to proceed with stabilization work and not the seismic work, the City would have to come back and do the seismic work later and would have to destroy some of the stabilization work that was completed. Council Member Whitney stated that the City would have a large amount of money coming in from Valero and maybe it should look at that. That is something to consider. Mr. Alvarez stated that with the two phases, the building would look nice from the outside. There would probably be another bump of \$500,000 to complete the interior. He used the estimate of \$1.5 million for Phase 1 and \$1.2 million for Phase 2. The total project would be about \$3 million. Of that \$3 million, the City has \$1.6 million in the bank.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that it seemed to him that the appropriate course was to reject the only bid. He is of the opinion that the City should go out to rebid to see if it can get this job done for what we have available. Trying to do it all right now – there are too many other things going on right now.

Mayor Messina asked if there were some portions of the bid that the City was willing to accept/reject. Could the City do that? Mr. Alvarez stated that it was Staff's and the Consultant's opinion to reject the bid in total. They do not believe it is a viable bid. If the City rejects it, it could renegotiate. At that point, the City could renegotiate the bid.

Council Member Patterson stated that it is not wise to just send this out for rebid. The City has already lost six months. She hopes when Staff comes back to Council, there are more options available. Going out to rebid was her least favorite choice. Mr. Alvarez stated that it would come back with the choices of does the City proceed with the seismic work or should it be moved and then it could move forward with the stabilization. With moving forward on the stabilization, the City is only off about \$60,000. That is the big decision. Staff will give information based on risk and other similar public buildings that are not seismically reinforced. Mr. Erickson stated that Council would be updated and briefed on this at the December 5 Council meeting.

Council Member Hughes stated that doing nothing or slowing this down is costing the City money. Eventually Council and the community will have to make a tough decision. The City does not have extra money sitting around. The City will either save the building or not. He does not want to spend more money than needs to be spent.

Mayor Messina asked if the roof work could be broken out. In terms of using the grant money, could the work be segmented? Mr. Alvarez stated that the State Office of Historic Preservation has granted the City \$400,000 to seismically stabilize and retrofit the building. They are willing to re-scope the project for stabilization. They will not allow the City to break up the project. They want the roof, electrical, ventilation, porches, etc. as one unit. They want to see some activity of construction. Mayor Messina stated that he did not want to jeopardize the grants or funding. When Staff comes back with recommendations, if there are portions of the project that are urgent, they should be addressed in the report.

Council Member Patterson discussed phasing the project. She would like that sorted out by Staff. The State might be more lenient and flexible if they see that the City is trying to sort that out.

Vice Mayor Schwartzman stated that the roof issue sounded interesting. If the seismic work were taken out at this point, would it be done prior to doing the work on the interior/inside? Mr. Alvarez stated that some of the finishing work that was done for the stabilization would have to be taken out. Walls that have been painted, refinished, etc. would have to be taken out to install bolts, etc. Vice Mayor Schwartzman clarified that Phase 1 could be the stabilization, Phase 2 could be the seismic work, and Phase 3 could be the interior/finishing work. Mr. Alvarez stated that could be looked at. Staff asked the designer if phases could be done in particular sequences so that work would not be ruined. That is being looked into.

Council Member Whitney stated that he was absolutely opposed to spending dollars on something that would be ripped out. The City has to spend its dollars smartly, efficiently,

and effectively. He suggested the City continue grant writing for Prop 84. He would like Council to seriously consider moving forward with the whole project.

RESOLUTION 06-176 - A RESOLUTION REJECTING THE SOLE BID FOR THE COMMANDANT'S RESIDENCE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT PHASE I

On motion of Vice Mayor Schwartzman, seconded by Council Member Patterson, the above Resolution was adopted, on roll call by the following vote:

Ayes: Council Members Hughes, Patterson, Schwartzman, Whitney, and Mayor Messina

Noes: None

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

Reports from the City Manager:

Report of Results - National Citizen Survey. (City Manager)

Due to technical difficulties, this report was continued to the next meeting.

Council Member Committee Reports:

1. Mayors' Committee Meeting (Mayor Messina) - Next Meeting Date: December 20, 2006
2. Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) (Mayor Messina) - Next Meeting Date: January 18, 2007
3. Audit & Finance Committee (Vice Mayor Schwartzman and Council Member Hughes) - Next Meeting Date: December 8, 2006
4. League of California Cities (Mayor Messina) - Next Meeting Date: January 25, 2007
5. School District Liaison (Council Members Whitney and Hughes) - Next Meeting Date: December 14, 2006
6. Sky Valley Area Open Space (Council Members Patterson and Whitney) - Next Meeting Date: December 6, 2006
7. Solano EDC Board of Directors (Mayor Messina) - Next Meeting Date: December 14, 2006
8. Solano Transportation Authority (STA) (Mayor Messina) - Next Meeting Date: December 13, 2006
9. Solano Water Authority/Solano County Water Agency (Mayor Messina) - Next Meeting Date: December 14, 2006
10. Traffic, Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Committee (Council Members Patterson and Hughes) - Next Meeting Date: January 18, 2007
11. Tri-City and County Regional Parks and Open Space (Council Member Whitney) - Next Meeting Date: December 11, 2006
12. Valero Community Advisory Panel (CAP) (Council Member Hughes) - Next Meeting Date: January 25, 2007
13. Youth Action Task Force (Vice Mayor Schwartzman and Council Member Whitney) - Next Meeting Date: November 23, 2006
14. ABAG/CAL FED Task Force/Bay Area Water Forum (Council Member Patterson) - Next Meeting Date: December 18, 2006

COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Messina adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Lisa Wolfe, City Clerk