

**MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING  
Wednesday, February 9, 2011**

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Mayor Detrick called the regular City Council meeting of February 9, 2011 to order at 6:06 p.m.

Present: Mayor Detrick, Vice Mayor Cooper, Council Members Davis, Hume, and Scherman.

Absent: None.

Cub Scout Pack 118 led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor Detrick asked that a moment of silence be observed.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

***Motion: M/S Scherman/Davis to approve the agenda as presented. The motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: 5; Noes: 0.***

**CLOSED SESSION**

None.

**PRESENTATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

4.1 Mayor Detrick presented a certificate of recognition to Sacramento County Sheriff Scott R. Jones.

4.2 Youth Commissioners Salvador Rosas, Benjamin Arriraga, Nermeen Rehimtoola, Ryan Stewart, Matt Banicki, Daniel Dixon, Mikaela DeRose, Chake'ra Bacon, and Nasayha Rehimtoola gave a presentation and provided an update on the Youth Commission.

With the aid of an overhead presentation (filed), Youth Commissioners provided an overview of accomplishments this year as well as highlighted upcoming workshops. The Youth Commission fulfilled a Gabby Grant project proposal by producing a second viral video to create awareness on the issue of teen alcohol use which was posted on the City website. A retreat was held providing team building and communication exercises, and teen interest groups were identified that commissioners then volunteered to be representatives to conduct outreach to those

groups. A Youth Master Plan executive committee was formed, comprised of a partnership between the Elk Grove Unified School District, the Cosumnes Community Services District, the City Youth Commission, and had started to collect data to conduct a youth needs assessment. The next step for the Youth Master Plan was creation of a vision and mission statement, and development of goals. The Youth Commission held a teen town hall meeting on November 9, 2010 to receive feedback on teen social issues, safety, perceptions, and to identify resources and services either existing or needed in Elk Grove, summarized in the handout (filed) titled *Teen Services Needs Assessment*. The issue of bullying was of high concern and the Youth Commission created a one year strategic plan, commencing with hosting an Internet Safety and Cyber-Bullying Workshop on March 8, 2011, and a Bullying Film Preview and Panel Discussion on April 12, 2011.

Mayor Detrick offered that he and Vice Mayor Cooper would like to partner with the Youth Commission on the cyber-bullying workshops.

Vice Mayor Cooper commended the Youth Commissioners for their involvement and commitment to the community. He believed communication to youth was essential to raise awareness of issues such as teen alcohol use and date rape. He thanked the Youth Commission for their outreach and concern towards fellow youths, and noted the Youth Commission decisions to raise awareness to the teen community were on topical items encountered in law enforcement, working towards prevention of crime trends in child pornography and internet crimes against children.

Council Member Scherman requested the Youth Commission consider addressing future topics related to teen dating, noting that the month of February was Teen Dating Abuse Awareness Month.

Council Member Davis appreciated development of the Youth Master Plan as a founding document to guide the Youth Commission.

Council Member Hume noted a concern that was raised in the *Teen Services Needs Assessment* was tension between citizens and law enforcement, and requested a future update on communication between the Elk Grove Unified School District Police and the Elk Grove Police Department. He stated his previous suggestion of creating a "positive ticketing" campaign for officers to recognize citizens for good behavior in order to promote positive interactions between police and youth.

4.3 With the aid of an overhead presentation (filed), Mona Schmidt, Senior Customer Service Specialist, gave a presentation on the new customer service program, *Ask Elk Grove*.

Ms. Schmidt stated a new customer service program *Ask Elk Grove* would be implemented February 14 to connect residents calling the City with customer service representatives who would serve as the initial point of contact to address non-emergency City services requests. The customer service representatives would initiate service requests, or connect residents with subject matter experts as needed. A software system would track calls and service requests to ensure performance standards were met. The system had four methods of contact: 1) the phone number 916-691-CITY (916-691-2489), 2) the City's main phone number (916-683-7111), 3) via e-mail [askelkgrove@elkgrovecity.org](mailto:askelkgrove@elkgrovecity.org), and 4) via requests submitted on the City web page at [www.askelkgrove.org](http://www.askelkgrove.org). Ms. Schmidt noted mobile phone application software was being explored to provide the ability for residents to directly submit service requests through mobile phones. The program provided language interpretation in more than 240 languages and dialects, and a customer service survey was available online for customers to provide feedback.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Brad Driggers provided information on *Shot Spotter*, a private service that utilized an array of sensors to provide notification to law enforcement of firearms discharged in the covered area of the service. He noted the service was responsive within three to 15 seconds of a firearm being discharged, and accurate in locating the source to within 20 feet. Service benefits included mapping the location of where the shot occurred, documenting when the shot occurred, providing an additional tool for alerting law enforcement of incidences involving firearms, and providing an additional documentation source of any firearm exchanges.

Julie Alexander believed the Cosumnes Community Services District (CCSD) was mismanaging public land, and spoke in opposition to land use decisions of the CCSD permitting placement of cell phone towers near public parks. A current project was considering location of a cell phone tower near Feickert Park. She did not believe any resident would want a home near such a tower, and speaking as a homeowner, Ms. Alexander stated she would never had purchased her home had she known such a tower would be installed. She stated she had a petition of 115 signatures opposing the tower, but noted last August, even with citizen opposition, a similar tower was approved by the CCSD near Luttig Park. She believed there were other, alternate locations for such towers that were not near parks, schools, or residences. She believed the CCSD was only approving these towers in order to lease land and generate revenue, and by allowing placement near parks, schools, and residences these actions would devalue surrounding property.

Mayor Detrick noted that regulation of cell phone towers fell under the regulatory jurisdiction of the federal government.

City Attorney Susan Cochran continued that such projects did require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) issued by the City, and if approved by the CCSD would return before the City Council at a public hearing for review of the CUP.

### **GENERAL ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION**

City Manager Laura Gill reviewed the February 9, 2011 Administrative Report (filed).

### **COUNCIL COMMENTS / REPORTS / FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Council Member Hume had nothing to report.

Vice Mayor Cooper attended the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation Board of Directors meeting which discussed rate increases and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

Council Member Scherman attended the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Board meeting, noting the February meeting had been canceled, and attended the Sacramento Public Library Authority Board meeting which held elections for Chair and Vice Chair for the Board, and Ms. Scherman was elected as Vice Chair. She attended the ribbon cutting for the Ford dealership, and the Senior Center Board meeting which discussed its budget and upcoming interview process for the Director position. Ms. Scherman requested a future informational agenda item to discuss digital billboards, and in particular any revenue generating potential of such displays.

By consensus the City Council agreed to hear an informational item on digital billboards, though members noted an inclination to not allow such displays as they were currently prohibited under the City Municipal Code, and that the existing Auto Mall digital billboard had been a contentious issue when considered in the past.

Council Member Davis attended the *New Partners for Smart Growth* conference hosted by the Local Government Commission, gaining education on topics such as safe street design, aging demographics and residential real estate trends, crime rate reduction in relation to healthy community design, and mixed-use land use designations integrated as values within visioning processes (citing a long term planning example of the City of Pasadena planning for light rail in connection with its Civic Center, though light rail wasn't realized until 15 years later). Mr. Davis met with a committee of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) to discuss opposition to regional jurisdiction implementations of "crash taxes," local laws to recuperate costs for sending first responder crews to accident scenes. The committee saw the proposed "crash taxes" as having residents subsidize police and fire services of the responding agencies, and the committee sought to open a policy discussion to address what could become a regionally divisive issue.

Mayor Detrick attended the ribbon cutting for the Ford dealership, participated in a ride-along with the Elk Grove Police Department, attended one of the City Community Budget Meetings, and attended the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Elk Grove Lions Club. He noted the Sacramento Metropolitan Cable Television Commission Board meeting was canceled, and he attended the Sacramento Metro Chamber 16<sup>th</sup> Annual Dinner & Business Awards.

In reply to Mayor Detrick, City Manager Laura Gill noted that at the meeting of February 23 an agenda item would be review of Council goals and accomplishments to date, which would provide an opportunity to review citywide objectives and strategies, and to also consider holding a future retreat for the City Council.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS**

***Motion: M/S Davis/Scherman to approve the Consent Calendar as presented, with the exception of Item 8.2 which Vice Mayor Cooper abstained as he was not in attendance at the January 26, 2011 Special City Council meeting. The motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: 5; Noes: 0 (Abstention noted for Vice Mayor Cooper in relation to Item 8.2).***

**Agenda Item No. 8.1:** Received Automatic Clearing House Nos. 2796 through 2945 dated January 1, 2011 through January 31, 2011, General Warrant Nos. 57030 through 57873, and Electronic Fund Transfer Nos. 2011107 through 2011118

**Agenda Item No. 8.2:** Approved January 26, 2011 Special City Council Meeting Minutes

**Agenda Item No. 8.3:** Received report on City Manager approved purchases and contracts authorized by Elk Grove Municipal Code Chapter 3.42 Contracts and Purchasing, filed through February 2, 2011

**Agenda Item No. 8.4:** Received report on Requests for Proposals, Qualifications, and Bids

**Agenda Item No. 8.5:** **Ordinance No. 4-2011** adopted amending the City of Elk Grove Zoning Map from RD-4 to RD-5 for the Fieldstone South Amendments project (EG-10-018) APNs 134-0110-136; 134-0110-137; 134-0110-138 (**Second Reading**)

**Agenda Item No. 8.6:** **Ordinance No. 5-2011** adopted adding Chapter 1.15 (Claims Against the City) to Title 1 (General Provisions), adding Chapter 1.18 (Tax and Fee Appeals) to Title 1 (General Provisions), amending Chapter 1.11 (Appeals) to Title 1 (General Provisions), amending Section 3.08.110 (Appeal) to Chapter 3.08

(Uniform Transient Occupancy Tax) to Title 3 (Revenue and Taxation), adding Section 3.12.110 (Appeal) to Title 3 (Revenue and Taxation), and amending Sections 3.40.190(C) (Refunds) and 3.40.200(A) (Appeals) of the Elk Grove Municipal Code regarding establishing procedures for processing claims filed against the City, its officers, employees, agents and volunteers and regarding the "Pay First" rule from Article XIII, Section 32 of the California Constitution (**Second Reading**)

**Agenda Item No. 8.7:** Approved cancellation of the regular City Council meeting of May 11, 2011 due to an anticipated lack of a Council quorum related to participation in the Sacramento Metro Chamber's "Capitol to Capitol" program

**Agenda Item No. 8.8:** **Resolution No. 2011-22** adopted authorizing the Finance Department to enter into a City Community Grant with the Elk Grove High School Music Department to assist with upcoming events and low income student activities in the amount of \$5,000

**Agenda Item No. 8.9:** Authorized recruitment to fill one vacancy on the Youth Commission

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Agenda Item No. 9.1:** A public hearing to consider the Tree Ordinance Update to introduce an ordinance repealing and replacing Elk Grove Municipal Code Chapter 19.12 (Tree Preservation and Protection) and repealing Chapter 19.04 (Regulations)

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Commission recommends (5-0) that the City Council introduce and waive the full reading, by substitution of title only, an Ordinance repealing and replacing Chapter 19.12 and repealing Chapter 19.04 of the Elk Grove Municipal Code.

With the aid of an overhead presentation (filed), Christopher Jordan, Planning Manager, provided an overview of the staff report and recommendation. The proposed ordinance was an update to tree preservation and protection in the City focusing on four areas: 1) designation of tree types, 2) permit requirements, 3) application process, and 4) mitigation. The types of trees addressed by the ordinance were trees of local importance, landmark trees, secured trees, and trees in the public right-of-way or on City property. Trees of local importance (the former heritage tree designation in existing regulation) covered seven species, primarily species of oak, as well as two additional native species unique to the Elk Grove area. Landmark trees were those specifically requested by the community or by a property owner to be designated for preservation or protection, which would be finalized through formal adoption of resolution by the City Council. Secured trees

were those protected either through environmental review of a project, or planted as a requirement to satisfy a mitigation requirement. Tree permits would be required for work proposed within the critical root zone of a tree, or for cutting down, removal, topping, or relocation when applied to any of the four tree type categories. Exemptions from the permit process were as follows: trees of local importance were exempt when not part of a discretionary development project, trees within parks, pathways and easements owned, leased or managed by the Cosumnes Community Services District (CCSD), removal and pruning work performed by utility providers for all types except landmark trees, and in certain cases of emergency.

Mr. Jordan reviewed the proposed application process, which would be conducted through the Planning Department and decided by the Planning Director (with review conducted and recommendations made by the City arborist). For tree permits in conjunction with development projects, those actions and permits would carry with the land entitlement and would go before the Planning Commission and/or City Council for action. Mitigation would occur at a one inch (0'01") to one inch (0'01") ratio and options included replanting on- or off-site, relocation, payment of an in-lieu fee, or credit for retaining existing trees smaller than the minimum size requiring protection. An alternative mitigation program was offered for instances of root systems uplifting sidewalk, roadway, or foundations, and for instances where the City arborist determined replanting was not viable on the property. Mr. Jordan noted the mitigation program was structured to incentivize planting younger trees through mitigation equivalent replacement plants, as younger trees had a better opportunity to become established, as opposed to relocation of older trees.

Mayor Detrick inquired if any requirements under the proposed ordinance would be triggered under a minor lot split, or by tree removal done by a property owner prior to their application for a discretionary project to the City.

Mr. Jordan noted that tree removal by a property owner was not regulated by the City when removal involved trees not listed in the ordinance as a protected tree type, and when tree removal was conducted either prior to, or separate from, any development action applied for having discretionary review under the jurisdiction of the City.

Planning Director Taro Echiburú clarified that if no development was associated with an action initiated by a property owner, then there would be no mitigation requirements. The City would only seek mitigation on private property when tree removal was proposed in conjunction with entitlements being sought. He clarified that a lot split triggering a parcel map would qualify under City definitions as a development project, but if there was no tree removal component associated with that action, then there was no mitigation requirement applied. Mr Echiburú stated that, as the ordinance was proposed, a property owner could remove trees before applying for a subdivision or parcel map, and if the tree(s) were not of a designated type, such removal would not be regulated by the ordinance.

Mr. Jordan noted that the Planning Commission recognized that the ordinance could lead to situations of a property owner with numerous trees on their property wanting to develop, and subsequently removing all trees prior to applying to develop the property to avoid tree mitigation, but the Planning Commission believed such occurrences would be rare.

Mayor Detrick declared the public hearing open.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Leo Fassler supported the proposed ordinance. He noted serving on the stakeholder committee and commended the compromise reached by interested parties involved in the process. Mr. Fassler believed the proposed ordinance provided protections for individual property owners and the development community.

Mayor Detrick declared the public hearing closed.

Council Member Hume appreciated the process and compromises made to date. He raised disagreements on two issues concerning trees of local importance and equivalent sizes for new trees planted for mitigation. With trees of local importance he believed the six inch (0' 06") diameter was low, especially in the case of multi-trunked trees, and would unnecessarily add numerous trees required to be mitigated for future development. Regarding mitigation equivalents he disagreed with the use of combining smaller sized equivalents to match larger plant equivalents, and that the proposed system of equivalents marginalized consideration of planting larger sized, new trees for mitigation. Mr. Hume believed the scenario outlined by Mayor Detrick of owners attempting to bypass mitigation requirements through early removal of trees may encounter other environmental regulatory compliance issues that may discourage such behavior.

***Motion:*** ***M/S Scherman/Davis*** to introduce and waive the full reading, by substitution of title only, **Ordinance No. 6-2011** repealing and replacing Chapter 19.12 and repealing Chapter 19.04 of the Elk Grove Municipal Code. ***The motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: 5; Noes: 0.***

**Agenda Item No. 9.2:** Request to conclude, with no action, a public hearing to consider resolution declaring 8679 Adamstown Way a public nuisance and directing a Certificate of Nuisance be placed on the title of the property for continuing Nuisance Code violations for abandoned / vacant buildings or structures and attractive nuisances [APN: 115-1790-009]

**RECOMMENDATION**

Open and close the public hearing for this item. No action will be necessary as the item is requested to be pulled. A future abatement lien item will be coming to Council on this issue at a yet to be determined date.

Shane Diller, Code Enforcement Manager, provided an overview of the staff report and recommendation. Mr. Diller noted the issues surrounding the item would be considered for an abatement lien, and the public nuisance certification was no longer being pursued at this time.

Mayor Detrick declared the public hearing open.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None.

Mayor Detrick declared the public hearing closed.

No action was taken by the City Council on Item 9.2.

**Agenda Item No. 9.3:** A public hearing to consider a Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act (TEFRA) Hearing regarding issuance of multifamily housing revenue bonds by the California Statewide Communities Development Authority for the Laguna Ridge Apartments on behalf of St. Anton Partners and Pacific Housing, Inc. and consider adopting a resolution approving the issuance of multifamily housing revenue bonds for the purpose of financing the acquisition and construction of the Laguna Ridge Apartments

**RECOMMENDATION**

Adopt resolution approving the issuance of multifamily housing revenue bonds not to exceed twenty million dollars by the California Statewide Communities Development Authority (CSCDA) for the purpose of financing the acquisition and construction of the Laguna Ridge Apartments.

With the aid of an overhead presentation (filed), Jennifer Estrella, Senior Finance Analyst, provided an overview of the staff report and recommendation. The California Statewide Communities Development Authority (CSCDA) requested that the City hold a public hearing to consider issuing tax-exempt multifamily revenue bonds for the Laguna Ridge Apartments project. The proposed project was to be located at the north-west corner of Big Horn Boulevard and Civic Center Drive, with a total of 204 units. The project applicants were St. Anton partners and Pacific Housing, Inc. The applicants had received approval for a rezone and project entitlements on December 8, 2010 and had been approved for a conditional loan from the City for \$9.7 million on November 10, 2010. The Internal Revenue Code required local jurisdictions of a proposed project to hold a hearing to approve issuance of tax-exempt bonds. CSCDA's request of tax-exempt bond obligations would not exceed \$20 million, and there would be no fiscal responsibility placed upon the City for approval of this bond issuance. Ms. Estrella noted the CSCDA documents reflect Ridge Elk Grove LP as the borrower as that was the legal entity to be formed that would apply for the bonds, and that entity would include the project applicants and investment limited partners.

Mayor Detrick declared the public hearing open.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None.

Mayor Detrick declared the public hearing closed.

***Motion:*** ***M/S Davis/Scherman*** to adopt **Resolution No. 2011-23** approving the issuance of multifamily housing revenue bonds not to exceed twenty million dollars (\$20,000,000) by the California Statewide Communities Development Authority (CSCDA) for the purpose of financing the acquisition and construction of the Laguna Ridge Apartments. ***The motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: 5; Noes: 0.***

**REGULAR AGENDA ACTION ITEMS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Agenda Item No. 10.1:** Consider resolution approving a funding commitment in the amount of nine million six hundred fifty-two thousand two hundred seventeen dollars (\$9,652,217) and authorize the City Manager to execute other necessary documents per the Affordable Housing Loan Program for the Laguna Ridge Apartments project

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt resolution approving a funding commitment in the amount of nine million six hundred fifty-two thousand two hundred seventeen dollars (\$9,652,217) from the City's Affordable Housing Fund and Very Low Income Housing Trust Fund, and authorizing the City Manager to execute other necessary documents for the development of the Laguna Ridge Apartments project.

Taro Echiburú, Planning Director, provided an overview of the staff report and recommendation. A continuance request was received by staff from the project applicant to provide time to work through business points in the final loan documents, with a requested date to return February 23, 2011.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None.

***Motion:*** ***M/S Davis/Scherman*** to continue the item to the regular meeting of February 23, 2011. ***The motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: 5; Noes: 0.***

**Agenda Item No. 10.2:** Receive the Fiscal Year 2010-11 mid-year budget review and amend the Fiscal Year 2010-11 Budget, Fiscal Year 2010-15 Capital Improvement Plan and position list

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Review the adopted Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Budget's mid-year financial status and amend the FY 2010-11 Budget, FY 2010-15 Capital Improvement Program (CIP), and position list as needed.

Katy Baumbach, Budget Manager, provided an overview of the staff report and recommendation. Ms. Baumbach noted that revenues and expenditures were at expected levels, and that the proposed amendments to the Fiscal Year 2010-11 Budget, 2010-15 Capital Improvement Program (CIP), and position list were largely administrative in nature.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None.

*Note: Action on the resolution for this item was missed, and considered prior to consideration of Item 10.4.*

**Agenda Item No. 10.3:** Consider resolution awarding a sole source contract with Selectron Technologies, Inc. for provision of Interactive Voice Response (IVR) Solutions Technology software and maintenance in the amount of \$130,550 over a five year period

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt resolution waiving the bidding requirements and authorizing the City Manager, or her designee, to execute a contract with Selectron Technologies, Inc. for Provision of Interactive Voice Response (IVR) Solutions Technology software and its maintenance in the amount of \$130,550 over a five year period.

With the aid of an overhead presentation (filed), Andrew Keys, Finance Analyst, provided an overview of the staff report and recommendation. Interactive Voice Response (IVR) would provide a phone push button response system providing automated customer service to access customer utility account information, and would expand to offer 24-hour, after business hours service. The system would alleviate demand, minimize service coverage averages, and provide for redirecting labor resources within the Utility Billing Department. Mr. Keys noted that the recent Turn Off Trash (TOTR) program placed an increased workload on staff, and the IVR system would provide a means to efficiently serve phone customers while alleviating staff to address the added workload of TOTR applications and customer inquiries. Mr. Keys reviewed case study data of government use of IVR programs, noting such programs increased call volume on the system, but effectively decreased manual labor processing time.

Mayor Detrick noted the ability to increase customer service to a 24-hour a day service through the IVR system was a valuable investment on its own. Mr. Keys confirmed the return on investment would be realized in under two years.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None.

***Motion: M/S Cooper/Hume*** to adopt **Resolution No. 2011-24** waiving the bidding requirements and authorizing the City Manager, or her designee, to execute a contract with Selectron Technologies, Inc. for Provision of Interactive Voice Response (IVR) Solutions Technology software and its maintenance in the amount of \$130,550 over a five year period. ***The motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: 5; Noes: 0.***

In relation to Item 10.2, City Clerk Jason Lindgren noted a resolution was prepared, but missed, for City Council action to amend the Fiscal Year 2010-11 Budget, Fiscal Year 2010-15 Capital Improvement Program, and Position Classification Plan. Mr. Lindgren requested Item 10.2 be reopened for consideration to adopt the resolution.

Mayor Detrick reopened consideration of Item 10.2.

***Motion: M/S Scherman/Cooper*** to adopt **Resolution No. 2011-25** amending the Fiscal Year 2010-11 Budget, Fiscal Year 2010-15 Capital Improvement Program, and Position Classification Plan. ***The motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: 5; Noes: 0.***

**Agenda Item No. 10.4:** Consider resolution waiving the competitive bidding process and authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract amendment with Granicus, Inc. for installation and support of a Legislative Management Suite, in the amount of \$50,479.20 *[for a total compensation amount not-to-exceed \$104,917.01 covering a two-year, eight month period]*

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt resolution waiving the competitive bidding process and authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract amendment with Granicus, Inc. for installation and support of a Legislative Management Suite in the amount of \$50,479.20 *[for a total compensation amount not to exceed \$104,917.01 covering a two year, eight month period]*.

Jason Lindgren, City Clerk, provided an overview of the staff report and recommendation. Mr. Lindgren noted item was returned from the September 8, 2010 meeting which continued consideration of the item after the mid-year budget review.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None.

***Motion: M/S Hume/Scherman*** to adopt **Resolution No. 2011-26** waiving the competitive bidding process and authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract amendment with Granicus, Inc. for installation and support of a Legislative

Management Suite in the amount of \$50,479.20 [for a total compensation amount not to exceed \$104,917.01 covering a two year, eight month period]. **The motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: 5; Noes: 0.**

**Agenda Item No. 10.5:** Consider introduction of an ordinance amending various chapters of Titles 14, 15, and 16 of the Elk Grove Municipal Code relating to code enforcement and cost recovery

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Introduce and waive the full reading, by substitution of title only, an Ordinance amending Chapters 14.05, 15.12, 16.18, 16.20, and 16.22 of the Elk Grove Municipal Code.

Shane Diller, Code Enforcement Manager, provided an overview of the staff report and recommendation. Mr. Diller noted the action requested was for clean-up of the Elk Grove Municipal Code (EGMC) including: revising Government Code section references that had referred to county authorities to update for city authorities, to recognize the new branding of the division from Community Enhancement to Code Enforcement, and revised the Nuisance Code to remove obsolete sections either covered by amendments adopted under other sections of the EGMC in the past, or rested in state or common law and were not necessary to have restated in the EGMC. Mr. Diller confirmed that no new violations had been added to the Nuisance Code under this requested revision, nor had any violations been removed.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

None.

**Motion:** *M/S Scherman/Davis* to introduce and waive the full reading, by substitution of title only, **Ordinance No. 7-2011** amending Chapters 14.05, 15.12, 16.18, 16.20, and 16.22 of the Elk Grove Municipal Code. **The motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: 5; Noes: 0.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no additional business to conduct, the February 9, 2011 City Council meeting was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

  
JASON LINDGREN, CITY CLERK

ATTEST:

  
STEVEN M. DETRICK, MAYOR