

TOWN COUNCIL MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Fredericks called the regular meeting of the Tiburon Town Council to order at 7:38 p.m. on Wednesday, June 16, 2004, in Town Council Chambers, 1505 Tiburon Boulevard, Tiburon, California.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: COUNCILMEMBERS: Berger, Fredericks, Gram, Slavitz, Smith

PRESENT: EX OFFICIO: Town Manager McIntyre, Director of Community Development Anderson, Associate Planner Lynch, Advance Planner Bryant, Director of Public Works/Town Engineer Echols, Chief of Police Odetto, Director of Administrative Services Bigall, Administrative & Financial Analyst Stott, IT Coordinator Chad Monterichard, Town Clerk Crane Iacopi

INTERVIEWS – Planning Commission Vacancy

- 7:00 – Jim Hermann, 52 Red Hill Circle
- 7:10 – Christopher Wand, 5 Burrell Court
- 7:20 – Chris Benedicktsson, 2352 Mar East
- George Salerno, 25 Andrew Drive, #93 – *continued to July 7, 2004*

Mayor Fredericks announced that the Council had interviewed the applicants listed above.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Janice Fenster, 34 Marsh Road, said she objected to the rezoning of the Open Space area adjacent to her property for the proposed Library expansion. She quoted from the Innisfree dedication documents, stating that the area would “be free from permanent structures at any time.”

Steve Fraser, attorney representing Mr. and Mrs. Fenster, said that the Town had accepted the premises of its agreement with the Innisfree company, and even though it later accepted a reversionary agreement, Lot 10 was still shown as open space on the recorded map which precluded any other “public use.”

Mr. Fraser said that there were other issues, such as inadequate parking, for the 17,000 square foot library expansion which he said was actually going to be a “community center.”

He said that the Town was still obligated, under the Innisfree agreement, to maintain the Railroad Marsh and had paid \$125,000 to the developer in the past for its failure to do so. In the end, Mr. Fraser said that the land was still “a public trust.”

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. **Approval of Town Council Minutes** – June 2, 2004
2. **Recommendation by Traffic Safety Committee** – Installation of Crosswalk at Reed Ranch Road & Corte Palos Verdes; Relocation of Stop Sign from Corte Las Casas to Corte Palos Verdes
 - a) A Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Tiburon Authorizing the Installation of Stop Controls and Crosswalk At the Intersection of Reed Ranch Road and Corte Palos Verdes
3. **Recommendation by Director of Community Development** – Approve Amendments to Point Tiburon Precise Plan Pertaining to the Belvedere-Tiburon Library Expansion Project
 - a) A Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Tiburon Amending the Point Tiburon (Northwestern Pacific Railroad) Precise Plan (PD#42) to Accommodate an Expansion of the Belvedere-Tiburon Public Library Located at 1501 Tiburon Boulevard
4. **Recommendation by Planning Manager** – Adoption of Resolution Memorializing Denial of Appeal of Planning Commission Decision relating to Property located at 207 Paradise Drive
 - a) A Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Tiburon Memorializing the Denial of an Appeal by Susan Olson and Paul Ortner of the Planning Commission’s Denial of a Precise Plan Amendment for Property located at 207 Paradise Drive

MOTION: To approve Consent Calendar Items 1-4 above.

Moved: Smith, seconded by Berger

Vote: AYES: Unanimous

PUBLIC HEARING

5. **Recommendation by Town Manager** – Adoption of Fiscal Year 2004-05 Municipal Budget
 - a) A Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Tiburon Adopting a Municipal Budget for the Town of Tiburon and the Tiburon Redevelopment Agency for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2005
 - b) A Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Tiburon Repealing Resolution No. 24-2003 and Adopting an Amended Management Recognition and Incentive Compensation Program
 - c) A Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Tiburon Repealing Resolution No. 25-2003 and Adopting an Amended Mid-Management, Professional & Confidential Employees Recognition and Incentive Compensation Program
 - d) A Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Tiburon Establishing an Appropriations Limit for the Fiscal Year 2004-2005 Pursuant to Article XIII B of the Constitution of the State of California (Gann Limit)

Analyst Stott updated the Council on the changes from the last Council meeting. He said that an additional amount (\$43,000) had been added to the capital improvement budget for the Stewart Drive bus stop improvements, per Council's action on June 2. In addition, Council had authorized an amount for compensation and benefit adjustments for the management and mid-management employees of the Town in the operating budget.

Mr. Stott said that the \$10 million budget continued to be balanced with an estimated operating surplus of \$96,000.

Mayor Fredericks opened and closed the public hearing on the item. There was no public comment.

MOTION: To adopt Resolution approving 2004-05 Municipal Budget [Item 5a]

Moved: Gram, seconded by Berger

Vote: AYES: Unanimous

MOTION: To adopt Resolution approving 2004-05 Management Incentive and Compensation Program [Item 5b]

Moved: Slavitz, seconded by Berger

Vote: AYES: Unanimous

MOTION: To adopt Resolution approving 2004-05 Mid-Management Incentive and Compensation Program [Item 5c]

Moved: Berger, seconded by Smith

Vote: AYES: Unanimous

MOTION: To adopt Resolution approving establishing 2004-05 Gann Limit [Item 5d]

Moved: Gram, seconded by Smith

Vote: AYES: Unanimous

6. **Report by Associate Planner** – Appeal of Planning Commission Decision to Deny an Appeal of Site Plan and Architectural Review of the Construction of Additions to an Existing Single-family Dwelling, with Variances for Reduced Side Yard Setback and Excess Structure Height

Project Address: 5047 Paradise Drive
Applicant: John & Leigh Schuberth
Appellant: Douglas & Jeannie Stiles
Assessor's Parcel No. 038-021-08

Associate Planner Lynch gave the report. He said that the proximity of the additions to the west side of the Applicants' property had raised concerns with the Board and adjacent neighbors. At its April 1, 2004 meeting, the Board asked for a property line survey and the Applicants were further directed to revise their application to address the privacy concerns of their neighbors, who subsequently became the Appellants in the matter.

The Applicants, Mr. and Mrs. Schuberth complied with the requests of the Board, according to Lynch, and subsequently submitted a revised design on May 6, 2004 which was approved.

Mr. Lynch said that an appeal filed by the neighbors, Mr. and Mrs. Stiles, claimed that the Board had not required adequate landscaping to shield them from the Schuberth's proposed roof deck atop the garage only three feet from their property line.

However, Mr. Lynch said that the Board had found during its deliberations that there were no significant privacy or view issues or negative impacts on any of the adjacent residences. He therefore recommended that the Council uphold the Board's decision in its approval of the revised design submitted by the Schuberths on May 6, 2004.

Prior to opening the public hearing, Mayor Fredericks asked for questions from the Council.

One question from Councilmember Smith concerned the height variance approved by the Board. Planner Lynch clarified that the existing garage structure already exceeded the Town's height limitations so that in order to extend the existing roof eave, a further variance was needed (and was granted by the Board).

Mayor Fredericks stated that if the rail on the roof of the existing garage was needed in order to create a deck, the granting of the variance would [in fact] allow the roof of the existing garage to be used as a deck.

Planner Lynch said that the Board's action could be interpreted that way, however, he stated that the Applicant had suggested that the placement of the rail was also for aesthetic purposes. Lynch also noted that the existence of a door leading onto the roof of the garage from the house, would require [through the Uniform Building Code] a guardrail be installed, as well.

Vice Mayor Berger asked if simply an improved surface atop that garage, rather than a deck, would require a rail. Planner Lynch said that it would as long as the area was accessible by foot.

Councilmember Smith asked if the door were removed whether the rail would then be required [by Uniform Building Code]. Planner Lynch said that other changes, such as adding a barrier to block access to the area, would be required.

Councilmember Smith also asked on whose property the existing landscaping was on. Mr. Lynch said that it was on both the Schuberth's and the Stiles' properties.

Councilmember Slavitz asked whether the rail could remain in the design without building an actual deck behind it. Planner Lynch said that the rail [height] would still require a variance.

Mayor Fredericks opened the public hearing.

Len Rifkind, attorney representing Mr. and Mrs. Stiles, said that the main issues were the landscaping and the roof deck on the garage. He asked the Council to limit activity so close to the Stiles' property and to require the Schuberths to assume responsibility for some of the landscaping on the property line by planting some of their own.

Mr. Rifkind said that the Schuberths already had 4,000 square feet of deck space and that an additional 240 square feet was not important. He said that the Design Review Board had stated that the garage should not have been built in the first place. He asked the Council to eliminate it as an outdoor living space because "enough was enough" and there was no good reason for another deck.

Mr. Rifkind proposed a way to do this—to require a different roof surface on the garage such as copper or, alternatively, to make it sloped so as not to be accessible. In addition, he suggested that the door be removed from the bedroom and that the link to the existing deck be removed as well. Rifkind said that these actions would “stem the incremental erosion of privacy along the property line.”

In reference to some photographs provided to the Council by Rifkind, Vice Mayor Berger asked which of the existing vegetation would have to cut down in order for the Schubertths to plant new vegetation [on the property line].

Michael Heckmann, architect retained by the Stiles, said that his clients might put a fence along the property line in the future and that some of the landscaping should be cut back so that the Schubertths could “assume responsibility” for some of the screening as a first “line of defense.”

Councilmember Smith asked if the existing fence was on the Stiles’ property and whether the new fence being referenced was going to be [moved] onto the property line itself. If so, Smith wondered how the Schubertths could plant anything there.

Councilmember Smith noted that the existing landscaping already provided a “tremendous privacy screen” on the Stiles’ property which was in fact controlled by them. He said he had trouble figuring out how the Schubertths could add to this landscaping, unless it was removed and replaced by “mature landscaping.”

He also noted that the fence was not the subject of the current application.

Appellant Doug Stiles said that he and his wife bought their property a year ago and that the garage had been built by Jack Schubertth in 1996. He asked that the Council not let them use the roof of the garage as a deck. He also said that if he and his wife cut their trees, or if they were lost in a storm, it would take 5-10 years for new vegetation to grow up which would result in [a period of] no screening from the proposed garage roof deck.

Councilmember Smith asked Mt. Stiles if it was their preference to remove the existing planting in order to let the Schubertths plant screening Mr. Stiles replied that it could be a mutual effort.

Mayor Fredericks asked Mr. Stiles if they were planning to put a fence along the property line adjacent to the Schubertth’s garage. Mr. Stiles said that he and his wife had talked to the Schubertths about a mutual wall or fence.

Vice Mayor Berger asked if the existing landscaping created a view blockage for the Stiles and if not, asked why not just leave the landscaping in place [as screening].

Councilmember Slavitz said he thought that sufficient new landscaping would not be able to be planted in the narrow (foot or foot and a half) area if the existing landscaping was cut down in order [for the Stiles] to build a fence.

Attorney Rifkind said that he understood the conundrum faced by the Council. He said that if a survey had been required by the Town in 1996, the garage would never have been allowed and that a cooperative agreement between the parties at this time was the solution. He said that both parties should provide landscaping and also enter into an agreement that no outdoor use be allowed on the deck by way of a deed restriction. He also stated that the Council had in its purview the ability to impose such restrictions and require landscaping

Applicant Leigh Schuberth said that she and her husband had hoped to work out a compromise on their design after the April 1, 2004 Design Review Board Meeting and that it was not until May 6 that they discovered that a variance was needed for the guard rail on their deck.

Mrs. Schuberth said that access was needed to the deck area in order to clean the windows and gutters on that side of the house and that a sloped roof would not be appropriate.

Mrs. Schuberth showed the Council a powerpoint presentation of photographs depicting the dense screening that existed between the two properties. She said that as a result of the other improvements approved by the Board the deck area would actually decrease by 31 square feet and that it was not “conceivable” to use the area for parties. She added that she and her husband had owned the property for 10 years and had never received any complaints about noise.

Mrs. Schuberth acknowledged that although there was not a “need” for another deck, the addition of the guard rail would create symmetry between the different sides of the home. She said that the use of an existing deck which was even closer to the Stiles’ property line had never caused any problems.

Mrs. Schuberth said that several of the mature, tall trees were actually on their property and that they planned to keep them and maintain them. She said that they had removed a woodshed that encroached onto the Stiles’ property line, and that Mr. and Mrs. Stiles had purchased their property well aware of the property line issues. In fact, Mrs. Schuberth said that a portion of a deck on the Stiles’ property actually encroached into the Schuberth’s property.

Mrs. Schuberth concluded that a) she and her husband had already made significant compromises at the behest of the Board; b) they had redesigned their plans to respect the side yard setback of the Stiles and they had reduced the window space on the west side by 25%.

She said that she and her husband were simply reconfiguring their space and that they would still have access to the roof of the garage [through a window] even if they did not use it as a deck.

Councilmember Gram asked if having “symmetry” or a functioning deck area was most important to the Schubertths. Mrs. Schuberth replied that a “finished appearance” and a guardrail for safety reasons were important.

Mrs. Schuberth also said that their “main deck” [used for entertaining] was the one off of the kitchen and dining room, not the garage deck in question.

In response to further questioning, Mrs. Schuberth stated her belief that being “disallowed” to use the roof area as a deck through a contract or other means would adversely affect their property value.

Mayor Fredericks asked if she would be willing to remove the door onto the deck from the bedroom. Mrs. Schuberth answered affirmatively.

Councilmember Slavitz asked if just keeping the rail in the front would meet Mrs. Schuberth’s aesthetic goals, without the addition of a deck. Mrs. Schuberth replied that they would still like to “improve upon” the tar and gravel materials on the garage roof and that she would appreciate it if such a compromise was granted to them (in exchange for their compromises). She also stated that Mr. and Mrs. Stiles had refused to meet with her and her husband since the April 1 hearing to discuss the vegetation issue.

Mayor Fredericks questioned about whether a rail could be erected on two sides or all sides and whether the front and rear decks adjacent to the Stiles’ property would be connected.

Mrs. Schuberth commented again that she and her husband had been through an arduous process and had complied with all the requests of the Design Review Board.

Vice Mayor Berger asked whether when the garage had been built it had been assumed that the existing fence was on the actual property line. Mrs. Schuberth answered affirmatively and added that in 1996 a civil survey had not been required (in order to grant the variance for the set-back).

Katie Hallal, architect for the Schubertths, said that the guardrail would “complete the design” whose purpose was to “unite the disparate parts” of the home and was needed for reasons of elevation and safety.

Ms. Hallal said that the side of the house in questions was the “bedroom wing” which was quiet and private in nature. She said that homes on hillsides and sloped properties utilized terraces rather than lawns, for instance, and if the area in question were a lawn it probably would not be in dispute. She asked that the Schubertths not be denied the use of this outdoor space on their property.

During the Appellants’ rebuttal, Mr. Rifkind reminded that Council of the “narrow scope” of their

appeal and asked that the Council exercise its authority to deny the use of the garage roof as a deck and to require that landscaping be planted on both sides of the property line to ensure his clients' privacy.

Mayor Fredericks closed the public hearing.

During its deliberations, all of the Councilmembers agreed that the landscaping issue was one that they chose to not act upon.

Councilmember Smith said that both the question of the use of the deck and the landscaping issue were civil matters that could be worked out between the neighbors in a myriad of ways.

Smith further stated that the Design Review Board had grappled with the issues and had made the necessary hardship findings to grant the variance for the garage deck in order to match the back deck to the front, with the addition of a rail, so that the area would not end up as a "playpen," which would be unreasonable.

Councilmember Smith recommended upholding the Board's decision and said that the solutions to the issues presented by the Appellants would be better found by the individual property owners rather than the public.

Councilmember Slavitz disagreed, stating that granting a variance for the deck was not driven by a "practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship" and that it should not be allowed. However, he said that the surface of the garage roof should be allowed to be made more attractive.

Councilmember Berger said that he applauded the changes to the design made by the Applicants, but he said that there were ample aesthetic ways to make the roof "glamorous" without the need for a railing. He said that he agreed (with the Appellants) that the creation of a deck would place an "unfair burden" on the Stiles to screen it.

In response to a question from Mayor Fredericks, Planner Lynch said that a shed roof [on the garage] would also require a variance but that the garage height variance was included in the original application and was not a subject of this appeal.

Councilmember Gram asked if the Board had made the findings to grant this variance and was told by the Associate Planner that they had.

Councilmember Gram said that while the Board had done nothing "wrong" in his mind, he still had not heard from the Applicant that a functioning deck was needed in that location. Gram said he thought that removing the door and placing a rail or leaving a rail in the back might be a solution.

Mayor Fredericks said she agreed with the majority to not act on the landscape portion of the

appeal, noting that it was “not unusual” for a single property owner to provide landscaping when there were narrow setbacks between properties.

However, the Mayor said that she did not think that aesthetics were a sufficient reason to grant a hardship variance and said she would vote to uphold this part of the appeal.

Vice Mayor Berger said he agreed with Councilmember Smith’s comments that a useable deck above the garage was the “best solution” design-wise but also stated that other solutions existed that could be “harmonious.”

Mayor Fredericks suggested that the Council could describe the desired “outcome” (as to the use of the deck) without getting into detail on how to design it.

MOTION: To direct Staff to return to the Council with a resolution of findings partially granting the appeal of the Design Review Board decision pertaining to 5047 Paradise Drive.

Moved: Slavitz, seconded by Berger

Vote: AYES: Berger, Fredericks, Gram, Slavitz

NOES: Smith

7. Recommendation by Advance Planner – General Plan Update: Discussion and Comment on Circulation Element Issues Paper

Advance Planner Bryant reported that the Planning Commission had held a hearing on May 26, 2004 and had received public input about and provided comments on the Circulation Element Issues Paper.

He said that the Council would be asked to give Staff direction on any outstanding issues and to confirm that the goals, policy, and program recommendations contained in the Issues Paper accurately represented the goals and vision of the community.

Planner Bryant highlighted the recommended changes to the Circulation Element:

- Incorporation of Congestion Management Agency standards for Tiburon Boulevard
- Incorporation of the Tiburon Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan
- New policies supportive of ferries, paratransit, and alternative transportation for school children

In addition, Bryant said that the Council would be asked to provide direction on three minor outstanding issues:

1. Gated Communities – the Planning Commission asked for clarification on whether the recommended policy to discourage gated developments would apply to single-family

homes. Staff recommended that the installation of gates at individual homes not be covered by this policy;

2. Bus Shelters – Staff recommended changing the existing policy C-11 (which states that the Town “should provide and maintain” covered seating areas at all bus stops along Tiburon Boulevard) to state that the Town will support such waiting areas and would work with the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District to provide them instead of being a lead agency for such projects. The Planning Commission thought the change might be inconsistent with the existing goal to “promote an integrated transportation system, including the preservation and enhancement of transit.”
3. Tiburon Shuttle – Even though the Town Council had previously given direction that the idea of a jitney or a shuttle should be considered, but not included in the General Plan, the Planning Commission believed it should be re-examined given the reduction of bus service to Tiburon. Staff recommended that the original Council direction on this issue was still appropriate.

Other recommendations and topics covered by the Planning Commission for which direction from the Council was not sought, according to Bryant, were:

- The question of whether roundabouts might be an appropriate alternative to traffic signals, particularly on Tiburon Boulevard;
- The recommendation that stronger language be included to work with the County to lobby for funding for [future maintenance of] Paradise Drive;
- The idea of replacing existing pedestrian traffic signals with numeric “countdown” signals over time;
- The creation of additional parking for bicyclists at the Ferry Plaza.

Council addressed these and other issues, the first being whether new roads should be prohibited on the Tiburon Ridge and possibly prohibited on secondary ridgelines.

Vice Mayor Berger said that roads should be “very restricted” in future development applications but that one should be able to “get across” the Tiburon Ridge.

Mayor Fredericks said that the existing policy was not clear. In particular, she said that whether or not the Martha Property was considered part of the Tiburon Ridge, a secondary ridge, an extension of the Tiburon ridge, or a significant ridge in its own right, it was a ridge that is prominent to the whole area and should be afforded appropriate protection.

Mayor Fredericks also suggested that the General Plan pick up the language used by LAFCO with respect to multi-agency cooperation for the future of Paradise Drive.

Mayor Fredericks opened the public hearing.

Christopher Wand, Reedlands Property Owners’ Association President, concurred with the

Mayor's remarks to include the Martha Property in the area protected from roads on the Tiburon Ridge.

Chris Benediktsson, Mar East Street, expressed his concerns that "non-residents" were not included in the counts of bus usage on the Tiburon Peninsula. He said that it had become more difficult for people who work in Tiburon to get into the community and he said he was in favor of alternate [bus] solutions such as the Tiburon shuttle as well as its inclusion in the General Plan.

Joanna Kemper, Straits View Drive, asked if pedestrian pathways could be identified in the Plan as a component of the existing circulation network. Planner Bryant said that they were identified in the Open Space Element of the General Plan. Mayor Fredericks suggested that referencing them in the Circulation Element would also be useful.

Allan Bortel, Tiburon representative to the Marin Commission on Aging, said that the shuttle would also benefit seniors. He said that it should be marketed and publicized appropriately in order to maintain ridership and that this element should not be left in favor of the "physics of operating a bus system."

Mayor Fredericks closed the public hearing.

Council reviewed the issues listed above:

1. Gated Communities – concurred with the Planning Commission recommendation to exclude single family homes from the prohibition;
2. Bike Ferry Parking – agreed that it did not need to be addressed in the General Plan; Town Engineer Echols said that a recommendation for improvements to the existing bike rail would be forthcoming from the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee;
3. Tiburon Ridge – Mayor Fredericks said that roads should be "strongly discouraged"; Vice Mayor Berger said that houses should be positioned so that you could get to them from existing roads rather than building roads along ridges to get to them after the fact; Councilmember Smith recommended the substitution of the word "viable" for "possible" in existing policy C-7 regarding the positioning of roads away from ridgelines;
4. Roundabouts – recommended no change to existing traffic circulation policy until after timing of signals on Tiburon Boulevard had been implemented;
5. Bus Shelters – concurred with Staff recommendation to assist other agencies in providing them;
6. Tiburon Shuttle – identify the problem/solution rather than state as a policy; encourage continued successful ferry ridership.

Councilmember Smith also suggested that "safe" be added to "convenient in Goal C-B.

In addition, the Mayor asked about the status of improvements to the Reed Ranch Road/Tiburon

Boulevard intersection. She said that she understood that timing the signals along Tiburon Boulevard would improve the turning problem through the “platooning” effect.

Planner Bryant said that another round of study would probably take place before any improvements were made to that intersection; however, he recommended against being too detailed about specific projects in the General Plan. Mayor Fredericks pointed out that it was already mentioned in the Circulation Element.

Chief of Police Odetto added his comments and concurred with the above recommendations. He said that a traffic roundabout might be considered at Mar West and Tiburon Boulevard but not until further studies to see if it was warranted (after the installation of timing signals along Tiburon Boulevard).

REGULAR AGENDA

8. **Recommendation by Director of Community Development** – Marin Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Sphere of Influence Study; Council to Review LAFCO Recommendations

Director of Community Development Anderson said that the Planning Commission had reviewed the report at its May 26 meeting. He said that LAFCO Staff recommended two principal changes to the Town’s Sphere of Influence (SOI) boundaries:

1. Removal of Strawberry (south of Tiburon Boulevard) from the Tiburon SOI;
2. Removal of unincorporated portions of Ring Mountain in public ownership (Ring Mountain Nature Preserve) from the Tiburon SOI due to the fact that they will never require urban services.

Director Anderson said that Town Staff would prefer to leave the Ring Mountain area in Tiburon’s planning area because it was part of Tiburon’s trail network, but agreed that it did not have to be in the Town’s SOI.

Anderson said that the Planning Commission recommended the following action by the Council:

1. Accept the change to the SOI boundary pertaining to Strawberry and Ring Mountain;
2. Favor the “recommended” (as opposed to “alternate”) SOI boundary for the Boardwalk Shopping Center area;
3. Make the Town’s General Plan Planning Area boundary match the LAFCO SOI for Tiburon.

MOTION: To accept the Planning Commission’s recommendations above and to direct Staff to write a letter to LAFCO summarizing the Council’s position on the matter.

Moved: Berger, seconded by Smith
Vote: AYES: Unanimous

COUNCIL, COMMITTEE AND COMMISSION REPORTS

Mayor Fredericks said that County Counsel had commented on the duties of local representatives appointed to regional agencies and commissions such as the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM). He reminded representatives that they should base their decisions on the reports and public comments at the regional meetings, and not solely on local concerns.

Mayor Fredericks also said that there was an “at large” position available in the League of California Cities to represent small cities/regions.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Town Council Weekly Digest – June 4, 2004

Town Council Weekly Digest – June 11, 2004

Town Manager McIntyre noted the commencement of the 2003-04 Street Rehabilitation Project and also pointed out the extended hours of construction at Bel Aire School.

McIntyre invited the Council to attend the upcoming annual League of California Cities Conference in September in Long Beach.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Town Council of the Town of Tiburon, Mayor Fredericks adjourned the meeting at 10:15 p.m., to the next regularly scheduled meeting on Wednesday, July 7, 2004.

ALICE FREDERICKS, MAYOR

ATTEST:

DIANE CRANE IACOPI, TOWN CLERK