MINUTES OF THE REGULAR JOINT MEETING OF THE MONTCLAIR CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND MONTCLAIR HOUSING CORPORATION BOARDS HELD ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2011, AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 5111 BENITO STREET, MONTCLAIR, CALIFORNIA

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor/Chairman Eaton called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked that everyone please silence their cell phones, pagers, and other electronic devices as a courtesy to others while the meeting is in session.

II. INVOCATION

Pastor Josh Matlock, Bethany Baptist Church, gave the Invocation.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Council Member/Director Ruh led those assembled in the Pledge.

IV. ROLL CALL

Present: Mayor/Chairman Eaton; Mayor Pro Tem/Vice Chairperson Raft; Council Members/Directors Paulitz, Dutrey, and Ruh; City Manager/Executive Director Starr; Director of Redevelopment/ Public Works Staats; Director of Community Development/ Agency Planner Lustro; City/Agency Engineer Hudson; City Attorney/Agency Counsel Robbins; Deputy City Clerk/Agency Secretary Smith

V. PRESENTATIONS

A. Introduction of New Employee

Police Chief Jones introduced **Ms. Michelle Terrazas,** who was appointed to the position of Police Dispatcher effective January 24, 2011. He noted Dispatcher Terrazas previously worked for Sign Resource and most recently as a Credit Manager with **Konica Minolta** for almost ten years. She recently completed the Dispatcher Training Program at **Rio Hondo Police Academy,** he added.

Mayor Eaton welcomed Dispatcher Terrazas to the Montclair City family and presented her with a City pin.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Projects and Priorities of Funding for the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Community Development Block Grant Program

Mayor Eaton declared it the time and place set for a public hearing to consider projects and priorities of funding for the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program and invited comments from the public:

There being no one in the audience wishing to speak, Mayor Eaton closed the public hearing and returned the matter to the City Council for its consideration.

Council Member Dutrey asked why Carlton Street was chosen for reconstruction over a number of unfunded Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects.

Director of Community Development Lustro clarified that the decision to propose the reconstruction project on Carlton Street was based on selecting potential projects within the CDBG target areas in Montclair. He noted staff has used CDBG funding in the past several years to address Capital Improvement Program projects within CDBG target areas. He advised that Carlton Street is located in an area that was annexed to Montclair in 2006 and is in very poor shape with deteriorating pavement and no curbs, gutters, and sidewalks; and staff believes it is important to bring the street up to minimum City standards. He noted staff continues to review CIP items each year to see what could potentially be funded with CDBG funds, adding "this one actually was not, but there were no CIP projects within the CDBG target area."

Council Member Paulitz asked how the County of San Bernardino could estimate the CDBG allotments when the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has not yet announced the 2011 CDBG formula grant amounts. He advised that the funding was not appropriated properly last October, so there is no guarantee of funding for the upcoming 2011-12 fiscal year.

Director of Community Development Lustro concurred. He stated that as the City Council is aware, Montclair is not a direct-entitlement city; the County does its best in estimating allotments based on entitlements from the prior year and information from the federal government. He noted the City's allotment for the current fiscal year actually increased; though if the program is authorized to continue, Montclair is estimated to receive just over a 10 percent reduction of this year's allotment.

Council Member Paulitz recalled that the program did not exist when he was first elected to the City Council in 1978 during the Carter administration and that many cities depend on the funding to a certain extent.

Moved by Council Member Ruh and seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Raft that the City Council approve the following projects and priorities for the Fiscal Year 2011-12 Community Development Block Grant Program:

Reconstruction of Carlton Street from Monte Vista Avenue to its easterly Terminus	$203,361
Accessibility improvements to the Community Center including construction of new restrooms and installation of automatic doors	131,932
Graffiti abatement	46,000*
Montclair Golden Express	13,169*
TOTAL	$394,462

Motion carried unanimously as follows:

AYES: Ruh, Dutrey, Paulitz, Raft, Eaton
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

B. Second Reading - Adoption of Ordinance No. 11-920 Levying Special Taxes to Be Collected During Fiscal Year 2011-12 to

Pay the Annual Costs of the Maintenance and Lighting of Parks, Parkways, Streets, Roads, and Open Space and the Operation and Maintenance of Storm Drainage Systems and Public Safety Services Including Fire Protection and Suppression Services and Police Protection With Respect to Community Facilities District No. 2011-1 (Maintenance and Public Safety Services) of the City of Montclair

Approval of *Agreement No. 11-21,* an Agreement With David Taussig & Associates to Provide Financial Consulting Services Related to Community Facilities District No. 2011-1

Mayor Eaton declared it the time and place set for a public hearing to consider the following, after which he invited comments from the public:

1. Adoption of Ordinance No. 11-920 levying special taxes to pay certain public safety service costs and the annual maintenance and lighting costs of public improvements contained in said Community Facilities District.

2. Approval of *Agreement No. 11-21* with David Taussig & Associates to provide financial consulting services related to Community Facilities District 2011-1.

There being no one in the audience wishing to speak, Mayor Eaton closed the public hearing and returned the matter to the City Council for its consideration.

Moved by Council Member Dutrey and seconded by Council Member Paulitz that the City Council take the following actions:*

1. That Ordinance No. 11-920, entitled, **"An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Montclair Levying Special Taxes to be Collected During Fiscal Year 2011-12 to Pay the Annual Costs of the Maintenance and Lighting of Parks, Parkways, Streets, Roads, and Open Space and the Operation and Maintenance of Storm Drainage Systems and Public Safety Services Including Fire Protection and Suppression Services and Police Protection Services With Respect to Community Facilities District No. 2011-1 (Maintenance and Public Safety Services) of the City of Montclair,"** be read by number and title only, further reading be waived, and this be declared its second reading.

   The City Council unanimously waived the reading of the Ordinance.

2. Moved by Council Member Dutrey and seconded by Council Member Paulitz that the City Council approve *Agreement No. 11-21* with David Taussig & Associates to provide financial consulting services related to Community Facilities District No. 2011-1.

Council Member Paulitz inquired as to the accounting process to be applied to the proposed Community Facilities District tax revenues.

City Manager Starr advised that the City would manage the accounting for the new tax revenues. He added that David Taussig & Associates would provide administrative oversight of Community Facilities District properties.

Council Member Paulitz confirmed with City Manager Starr that the tax revenues would be placed in special incoming and outgoing funds and not comingled in the General Fund.

*Second Reading of Ordinance No. 11-920 and approval of Agreement No. 11-21 were unanimously adopted by the following ROLL CALL vote:

AYES: Ruh, Dutrey, Paulitz, Raft, Eaton
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

C. First Reading - Adoption of Ordinance No. 11-921 Amending Section 9.02 and Replacing Section 9.20.700 of the Montclair Municipal Code Related to the City Community Sewer System and Certain Water-Softening Devices

Mayor Eaton declared it the time and place set for a public hearing to consider adoption of Ordinance No. 11-921 amending Section 9.02 and replacing Section 9.20.700 of the Montclair Municipal Code related to the City Community Sewer System and Certain water-softening devices and invited comments from the public.

There being no one in the audience wishing to speak, Mayor Eaton closed the public hearing and returned the matter to the City Council for its consideration.

Mayor Eaton noted he is a member of the Regional Sewer Policy Committee Board, which unanimously supported this item at its last meeting.

Council Member Ruh commented as follows:

1. He disclosed for the record that although he is a gubernatorial appointee to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region, which promulgated the subject regulation, he need not disqualify himself from voting on this item.

2. He noted the Inland Empire Utilities Agency is offering an automatic water softener rebate program in which individuals could receive a $300 to $2,000 automatic water softener removal rebate. He advised that the program offers free disconnection and removal of the appliances to program participants and suggested the City partner with IEUA in this venture.

Council Member Dutrey praised City Manager Starr on his excellent presentation of this item and City Engineer Hudson on his well-written report.

Moved by Council Member Dutrey and seconded by Council Member Ruh that Ordinance No. 11-921, entitled, **"An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Montclair Amending Section 9.02 and Replacing Section 9.20.700 of the Montclair Municipal Code Related to the City Community Sewer System and Certain Water-Softening Devices,"** be read by number and title only, further reading be waived, and this be declared its first reading.

The City Council unanimously waived the reading of the Ordinance.

First Reading of Ordinance No. 11-921 was unanimously adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Ruh, Dutrey, Paulitz, Raft, Eaton
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

VIII. CONSENT CALENDAR

Moved by Council Member/Director Dutrey, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem/Vice Chairperson Raft, and carried unanimously to approve the following Consent Items as presented:

A. Approval of Minutes – None

B. Administrative Reports

1. Receiving and Filing of City Treasurer's Report

The City Council received and filed the City Treasurer's Report for the month ending January 31, 2011.

2. Approval of City Warrant Register and Payroll Documentation

The City Council approved the City Warrant Register dated February 22, 2011, totaling $687,855.41; and the Payroll Documentation dated January 2, 2011, amounting to $630,014.83, with $454,686.20 being the total cash disbursement.

3. Receiving and Filing of Agency Treasurer's Report

The Redevelopment Agency Board received and filed the Redevelopment Agency Treasurer's Report for the month ending January 31, 2011.

4. Approval of Agency Warrant Register

The Redevelopment Agency Board approved the Redevelopment Agency Warrant Register dated 1.01.11–1.31.11 in the amounts of $5,769.39 for Project I; $139.23 for Project II; $700,731.46 for Project III; $30,204.24 for Project IV; $52,099.33 for Project V, and $12,925.61 for the Mission Boulevard Joint Redevelopment Agency Project.

5. Receiving and Filing of MHC Treasurer's Report

The MHC Board received and filed the MHC Treasurer's Report for the month ending January 31, 2011.

6. Approval of MHC Warrant Register

The MHC Board approved the MHC Warrant Register dated 1.01.11–1.31.11 in the amount of $47,944.71.

7. Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors' Authorization of a $177,000 Reappropriation From the City of Montclair Redevelopment Project Area No. 1 1997 Tax Allocation Bond Issue in the Capital Projects Fund for Repayment of Certain Promissory Notes to the City

The Redevelopment Agency Board authorized a $177,000 reappropriation from the City of Montclair Redevelopment Project Area No. 1 1997 Tax Allocation Bond Issue in the Capital Projects Fund for repayment of Promissory Notes 04-1, 07–1, 08–1, 09–1, and 10–1 to the City.

8. Approval of the Filing of a *Notice of Completion* for the Ramona Avenue/Union Pacific Railroad Grade Separation Project

The City Council approved the filing of a *Notice of Completion* with the Office of the San Bernardino County Recorder

related to completion of the Ramona Avenue/Union Pacific Railroad Grade Separation Project.

C. Agreements – None

D. Resolutions

1. Adoption of Resolution No. 11-2874 Authorizing Destruction of Certain Police Department Records Pursuant to the Montclair Police Department Policy for the Retention and Destruction of Records

The City Council adopted Resolution No. 11-2874 authorizing destruction of certain Police Department records pursuant to the Montclair Police Department Policy for the Retention and Destruction of Records.

IX. PULLED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS – None

X. RESPONSE – None

XI. COMMUNICATIONS

A. City Attorney/Agency Counsel

1. Report on Written Decision in the Matter of the Appeal of James Thayn

City Attorney Robbins reported that the written decision has been formalized in the matter of the appeal of **Mr. James Thayn.** She advised that the City Council unanimously denied **Mr. Thayn's** appeal and upheld the decision of the Hearing Officer at the January 20, 2011 hearing, which found that the termination of **Mr. Thayn** had been appropriate.

2. Closed Session Pursuant to Section 54956.8 of the Government Code Regarding Real Property Negotiations

	Property	
	Assessor's Parcel No.	*Address*
	1011-012-04	*10625 Monte Vista Avenue, Montclair*
Negotiating Parties:	*City of Montclair and Delbert Darrrell Foreman*	
	1011-012-03	*10635 Monte Vista Avenue, Montclair*
Negotiating Parties:	*City of Montclair and Evans-Dodds, LLC*	
Negotiators:	*Director of Redevelopment/Public Works Staats and Agency Engineer Hudson*	
Under Negotiation:	*Recommendations Regarding Acquisition of Easements on Subject Properties in Conjunction With the Monte Vista Avenue/Union Pacific Grade Separation Project*	

Agency Counsel Robbins requested a Closed Session regarding real property negotiations pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8.

B. City Manager/Executive Director – No comments

C. Mayor/Chairman – No comments

D. City Council/Agency Board

1. Council Member/Director Paulitz commented as follows:

   (a) He cited an article in a recent edition of the ***Wall Street Journal*** that that illustrated some of the issues in the difference between private industry versus public sector compensation. He gave as examples the differences in average wages (private industry hourly wage: $19.60; public sector hourly wage: $26.25) and retirement benefits (private industry: 74 percent; public sector: 99 percent). He noted the most glaring difference related to medical premiums: 20 percent of medical premiums were paid by private industry employees compared to 11 percent paid by public sector employees. In addition, he advised that private industry employees were given eight paid holidays, while public sector employees were given eleven.

   (b) He cited the lead article in the December 2010 edition of ***Shopping Centers Today*** entitled, "Ontario (Calif.) Mills Raises Sorely Needed Tax Revenue" regarding the **City of Ontario's** recognition of the value of **Ontario Mills** as a draw and catalyst for bringing activity to Ontario, a tax revenue driver, and an important source of jobs and its decision to contribute $4.5 million in redevelopment funds to owner **Simon Property Group's** refurbishment of a section of the mall that had some long-standing big-box vacancies. He suggested the Redevelopment Agency consider if there is a need to work with **General Growth Properties (GGP)** to jointly enhance the **Montclair Plaza.** He disclosed that he does own a small amount of **GGP** stock, which would not affect the Agency's decision to assist with **Plaza** improvements and is not the reason for his suggestion.

2. Council Member/Director Dutrey commented as follows:

   (a) He asked if there will be a workshop to discuss the North Montclair Downtown Specific Plan and the **Montclair Plaza.**

   City Manager Starr noted there is none scheduled for the remainder of the fiscal year, though one could certainly be scheduled in the fall. He advised that staff has been in discussions with **GGP** in an effort to secure its cooperation to complete certain **Plaza** improvements, though the company has not indicated any willingness to share in any cost-related issues regarding such improvements. He noted the few improvements taking place at present have been inspired by City staff including new restaurants that will soon open and access improvements. **GGP** management has consistently refused to cooperate with the City in further **Plaza** improvements, he added; though it certainly welcomes the City's efforts to improve the site.

   City Manager Starr noted reading in a news article today that last year, **Westfield Group** generated a profit in excess of $2.5 billion from its shopping centers, representing a substantial increase in earnings and its first major increase in the last three years and exemplifying improvement in the commercial market for shopping malls. He advised that **GGP** must realize that fact for itself before it will be willing to participate with the City in further improvements to the **Montclair Plaza,**

emphasizing that it is staff's objective in the short and long term to continue to try to engage **GGP** to do so.

Council Member Dutrey suggested a workshop be scheduled in the next two to three months to address the issue.

City Manager Starr stated that staff could certainly schedule a workshop, though he noted reading recently that the state is taking the position that if redevelopment agency funds have not been obligated by March 1, 2011, those funds would not survive appropriation by the state. He added that there is not much time left to obligate Redevelopment Agency funds other than through the actions recommended in a recent memorandum to the City Council.

(b) He noted he met with **Assembly Members Torres** and **Carter** and **Senator McLeod's** Chief of Staff **Vince Marchand** in Sacramento last week, advising that the issue at the state level is closing a $25 billion budget gap and the hope of partially filling the gap with $1.7 billion in redevelopment tax increment revenues by elimination of community redevelopment agencies statewide. He stated that there are some unhappy special interest groups and legislators as a result of the voters' approval of **Proposition 22**—a constitutional amendment that prohibits the state from borrowing or taking funds used for transportation, redevelopment, or local government projects and services—last November, which had some influence in the Governor's decision to eliminate redevelopment agencies so property tax revenues currently allocated to redevelopment agencies could be redirected to offset state **Medi-Cal** and court costs as well as to fund schools and other local agencies.

(c) Council Member Dutrey reported that a group of mayors led by **Los Angeles Mayor Villaraigosa** proposed last week that California should borrow from Wall Street to help ease its $25 billion deficit instead of following **Governor Brown's** budget-cutting proposal to eliminate redevelopment agencies. Under the plan proposed by **Mayor Villaraigosa,** the state would sell $1.7 billion of bonds maturing in 25 years; and redevelopment agencies would pay $200 million a year in debt service on the bonds and give 5 percent of their revenues each year to the state; in exchange, the agencies would not be abolished.

(d) Council Member Dutrey noted meeting last week with representatives of the **League of California Cities** and the **California Redevelopment Association** who believe that California cities have a very strong legal case from the passage of **Proposition 22** last November to challenge **Governor Brown's** proposal should it be adopted. He advised that there are two schools of thought on the matter: to either accept the Governor's proposal or compromise. He stated that it is his opinion that "things are moving quickly, but at the same time, we should not become too anxious and cave in. I think that we should at least discuss compromise at the appropriate time and, hopefully, come up with a solution that both sides can work with. The problem is that if we give up $1.7 billion this year, we'll be asked for another $1.7 billion next year." Noting there have been some meetings of local cities to discuss protecting

redevelopment, he urged the public to call and write to their legislators in strong support of redevelopment. He noted the legislators he spoke with last week told him "they all love redevelopment" because they know it does great things in their districts; they just don't know how to fund the $1.7 billion shortfall.

Council Member Paulitz asked if the $1.7 billion in tax increment revenues the state would receive from elimination of redevelopment agencies would be a one-time payment.

City Manager Starr advised that "the Governor is asking for $1.7 billion for the state and $1.3 billion for the counties and schools this year; the following year, the state would transfer a number of programs to the counties and fund that realignment with tax increment. If the state allows redevelopment agencies to continue, the question on the table is, "What happens to the Governor's plan to realign?"—that we don't know at this point."

Council Member Paulitz commented as follows:

(1) He stated that in some respects, the Governor is better off leaving redevelopment intact, though **Proposition 22** prohibits diversion of transportation, redevelopment, or local government projects and services funds. He noted he does not understand the reasoning behind the Governor's proposal because the state would still be in dire financial straits with the shift of redevelopment tax increment revenues.

(2) He advised that when he was first elected to the City Council in the spring of 1978, the Montclair Redevelopment Agency was in its infancy, having only been established on June 6 the prior year. He noted he was of the opinion at the time that developments such as the Town Center Townhomes in Redevelopment Project Area No. II should be left up to private enterprise, and that it was only after learning of the various impediments to developments that he understood the need for redevelopment tax increment funding of public improvements needed to complete such developments. He stated that he has since been a strong supporter of redevelopment, advising that it becomes a matter of educating the public about the purpose of redevelopment financing to prevent and eliminate urban decay.

(3) He asserted that the 2 percent annual increase in taxable property value should go to the taxing entities and tax increment over and above that amount should go to the redevelopment agencies.

City Manager Starr concurred with most of Council Member Paulitz's comments.

(e) Council Member Dutrey noted he is lobbying in support of redevelopment, and not just because he works in redevelopment for a local city. He stated that "redevelopment is a very important tool for this community. It's done a lot of great things for the City of Montclair and has helped a lot of Montclair residents. In addition to that, there will be a lot of Montclair employees who will

lose their jobs should the Governor's proposal be adopted, so I'm also fighting for those Montclair employees to ensure they keep their jobs." Noting he has been told that consultants have been speaking to Police and Fire unions to garner support for the Governor's proposal, he expressed his belief that the loss of redevelopment funding affects every employee, not just the employees whose salaries are either wholly or partially funded by the Redevelopment Agency. He expressed his hope that City employees will not support the Governor's budget proposal and, instead, will contact their legislators in support of community redevelopment agencies.

3. Council Member/Director Ruh commented as follows:

(a) He suggested local government will have to compromise with the state regarding redevelopment tax increment to help solve the state budget deficit, advising that local government should tell the state "what type of reform we really want" in lieu of eliminating redevelopment agencies, "and I think that will be truly beneficial." He further suggested that individuals who have benefitted by redevelopment should communicate their experiences to the Governor. He spoke in support of continuing redevelopment after witnessing its benefits in senior programs, though there have been instances of abuse.

Council Member Paulitz commented that the problem the state is facing has to do with a structural budget deficit and absolutely nothing to do with redevelopment agency reform. He advised that the Governor just saw a way to shift local funds to help balance the state budget. He concurred that "there were agencies that did abuse redevelopment," emphasizing that Montclair "was not one of those." He noted his intent to visit residents of mobile home parks and senior housing facilities to advise them that they would not have nonprofit owned and operated mobile home parks and redevelopment-financed senior housing without the actions of the Montclair Redevelopment Agency. He concurred that these residents should tell the Governor "you are shooting yourself in the foot in the long run" if redevelopment agencies are eliminated.

Council Member Ruh clarified that he is not implicating the Montclair Redevelopment Agency as an example of redevelopment abuse. He stated that his contact in the Governor's office is advising that cities be willing to agree to changes in redevelopment law to curb abuse.

Council Member Dutrey noted the **California Redevelopment Association** proposed reforms related to the low to moderate income housing set aside during a committee discussion. He noted being told by an Assembly Member that once the budget deficit is resolved, then the state could tackle pension reform. He expressed his opinion that pension reform should be resolved before balancing the budget. He stated that the problem at the state level is its relying on local government to solve its budget problems.

(b) Council Member Ruh concurred "that we have to deal with the realities" at the **Montclair Plaza,** noted the impending closure of **Borders Books & Music** at the **Montclair Plaza** as a result of **Borders Group Inc.** filing for Chapter 11 protection last week. He reported on the

tremendous consolidation of retailing nationwide and that future retail trends depend heavily on the socio-demographics of a region. He suggested there is a need for higher paying jobs in this region so residents will be able to shop here. He noted the nonplussed attitude of **GGP** regarding the **Montclair Plaza.**

(c) He stated that he prefers to think that budgets exist for the sake of the people rather than the reverse. He asserted that "government comes from people, it is elected by people, it is formed by people, it is reformed by people, it is changed—it is created by people. Those budgets exist to do things in the community for those people." He advised that the current federal government budget issues could be blamed on **Congress's** decision in 2001 to cut taxes as a result of a $125 billion surplus, suggesting that future excess revenue be set aside for use in times of unexpected revenue shortfall or budget deficit.

(d) He thanked the Police Dispatchers who tolerated his being filmed for the 2011 State of the City Address in the Police Department Dispatch Center on February 16, 2011. He noted the difficulty of the Dispatchers having to work around the cameras and with the ambient noise during the filming process. Filming continued at the Fire Department truck deck later, he noted, including the activity surrounding a call for service, which added a bit of excitement to the shoot. He thanked both Police and Fire Departments for allowing these interruptions during the workday.

E. Committee Meeting Minutes

1. Minutes of Personnel Committee Meeting of February 7, 2011

The City Council received and filed the Personnel Committee meeting minutes of February 7, 2011, for informational purposes.

XII. COUNCIL/AGENCY WORKSHOP

A. SIMS/NIMS Executive Training

Moved by Council Member Paulitz, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Raft, and carried unanimously to continue this item to an adjourned joint meeting on Monday, March 7, 2011, at 5:45 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT OF CITY COUNCIL AND MONTCLAIR HOUSING CORPORATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

At 7:51 p.m., Mayor Eaton adjourned the City Council to Monday, March 7, 2011, at 5:45 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

At 7:51 p.m., Chairman Eaton adjourned the Montclair Housing Corporation Board of Directors.

At 7:51 p.m., the Redevelopment Agency Board went into Closed Session regarding real property negotiations pursuant to Section 54956.8 of the Government Code.

XIV. CLOSED SESSION ANNOUNCEMENTS

At 8:07 p.m., the Redevelopment Agency Board returned from Closed Session. Chairman Eaton announced that the Redevelopment Agency

Board met in Closed Session, information was provided and direction given to staff, and no further announcements would be made at this time.

XV. ADJOURNMENT OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

At 8:08 p.m., Chairman Eaton adjourned the Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors to Monday, March 7, 2011, at 5:45 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

Submitted for City Council/Redevelopment Agency Board/Montclair Housing Corporation Board approval,

_____

Yvonne L. Smith
Deputy City Clerk