1.1. **CLOSED SESSION** - 5:30 p.m.

1.2. **REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING** - 6:30 p.m.

1.3. Call to Order - 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 421 Main Street

1.4. Flag Salute

1.5. Invocation — Captain Darren Stratton, Corps Officer, The Salvation Army, Chico Corps

1.6. Roll Call

1.7. Closed Session Announcement

1.8. Proclamation — Proclaiming September as Prostate Cancer Awareness Month

1.9. Proclamation — Proclaiming October 2nd as the 50th Anniversary of the Chico Peace Movement

2. **CONSENT AGENDA** – All matters listed under the Consent Agenda are to be considered routine and enacted by one motion.

2.1. **ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO REPEALING CHAPTER 2.64 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE, ENTITLED “HUMAN RESOURCES COMMISSION” - Final Reading and Adoption

   **Adopt** - an ordinance repealing Chapter 2.64 of the Chico Municipal Code entitled Human Resources Commission. This ordinance was introduced by the Council at its meeting of 9/07/10. *The City Clerk recommends adoption of the ordinance by reading of its title only.*

2.2. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN APPLICATION FOR GRANT FUNDS - SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLANNING GRANT AND INCENTIVES PROGRAM**

   **Adopt** - a resolution which approves the filing of an application to the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant and Incentives Program entitled the “Chico Sustainable Development and Design Project,” and authorizes the City Manager to execute all documents necessary to accept and implement an award of funds. *The Planning Director recommends adoption of the resolution.*

   **RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO APPROVING AN APPLICATION FOR GRANT FUNDS FOR THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLANNING GRANT AND INCENTIVES PROGRAM UNDER THE SAFE DRINKING WATER, WATER QUALITY AND SUPPLY, FLOOD CONTROL, RIVER AND COASTAL PROTECTION BOND ACT OF 2006 (PROPOSITION 84)**

2.3. **ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN CITY RECORDS PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 34090**

   **Adopt** - a resolution authorizing destruction of certain records in accordance with the “Local Government Records Management Guidelines,” published by the Secretary of State of California. *The Finance Director and City Manager recommend adoption of the resolution.*

   **RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO AUTHORIZING DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN CITY RECORDS PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 34090**
2.4. APPROVAL OF A MINUTE ORDER AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A GRANT DEED CONVEYING A PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT TO PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (PG&E) FOR UNDERGROUND UTILITY SERVICE TO THE BMX TRACK ACROSS 101 SILVER DOLLAR WAY

Approve - a minute order authorizing the City Manager to execute a grant deed conveying a public utility easement across a City-owned parcel at 101 Silver Dollar Way to PG&E in order to provide electricity to the BMX track. **The Building and Development Services Director recommends approval of the minute order.**

MINUTE ORDER - AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A GRANT DEED CONVEYING A PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT TO PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (PG&E) FOR UNDERGROUND UTILITY SERVICE TO THE BMX TRACK ACROSS 101 SILVER DOLLAR WAY - (APN 005-560-031) - 101 SILVER DOLLAR WAY

2.5. APPROVAL OF FINANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR REVISIONS TO BUDGET POLICIES REGARDING COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION FUNDING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT/TOURISM SERVICES AND EVENTS

Approve - revisions to the City's current adopted budget policies F.1.b and F.2 pertaining to funding the Community Organization Funding Program and Economic Development/Tourism services and events as recommended by the Finance Committee at its meeting of 8/24/10. **The Finance Committee recommends (3-0) revising the currently adopted budget policies F.1.b. and F.2. as detailed in the Exhibit "A" to the Finance Committee report which is attached to the Council report.**

2.6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS

Approve – minutes of the City Council meetings held on 6/22/10, 7/06/10, 7/24/10, 8/03/10, 8/17/10, 8/21/10 and 9/07/10.

ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT - if any

3. NOTICED PUBLIC HEARINGS

3.1. HEARING ON THE 2009-2010 CONSOLIDATED ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT (CAPER) FOR THE FEDERAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM AND THE HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

In order for the City to meet its entitlement community commitments which allow for the receipt of federal funding for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program and the Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME), the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires that a CAPER regarding the use of such funds be prepared at the conclusion of each program year, made available for public comment during a 15-day period, and that the City hold a public hearing on this report at the conclusion of the public comment period. **(Report—Sherry Morgado, Housing & Neighborhood Services Director)**

**Recommendation** — The Housing & Neighborhood Services Director recommends that after holding a public hearing on the 2009-2010 CAPER for the CDBG and HOME programs, that the Council authorize staff to submit the CAPER to HUD.

4. REGULAR AGENDA
4.1. **CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST BY VICE-MAYOR NICKELL ASKING THE CITY COUNCIL TO CONSIDER THE DEFERRAL OF USE PERMIT FEES FOR FOWL**

Vice-Mayor Nickell requests that the City Council discuss agendizing the deferral of use permit fees for Chico citizens owning up to three chickens, based on current health and safety concerns with the commercial egg industry and the promoting of self-sufficiency.

**Council Action Required** - Pursuant to Council Policy AP&P 10-10

A. Vote to hear the request to agendize (yes or no); and
B. If the vote on the request to agendize is yes, determine whether to hear the item at this meeting or a future meeting.

4.2. **ITEMS ADDED AFTER THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA**

5. **BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

Members of the public may address the Council at this time on any matter not already listed on the agenda, with comments being limited to three minutes. The Council cannot take any action at this meeting on requests made under this section of the agenda.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourn to September 28, 2010 at 3:00 p.m., in the City Council Chamber for a joint meeting with the Planning Commission.
CLOSED SESSION
Chico Municipal Center, Conference Room #2, 421 Main Street

1. CALL TO ORDER
   1.1. Roll Call
   1.2. Staff Present
2. CLOSED SESSION MATTERS
   ANNOUNCEMENT OF IDENTIFICATION OF NEGOTIATORS, PROPERTIES AND PARTIES WITH WHOM NEGOTIATORS MAY NEGOTIATE IN REGARD TO A CLOSED SESSION ITEM, CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR

The City Council shall adjourn to closed session to discuss negotiations with the City's real property negotiator regarding the proposed acquisitions affecting the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Assessor's Parcel No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. U.S. Bank of California (US Bank)</td>
<td>256 East 2nd Street</td>
<td>004-091-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Jerry and Laura Douglas</td>
<td>1377 Humboldt Avenue</td>
<td>004-374-032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. William and Karen Bishop</td>
<td>565 East 5th Avenue</td>
<td>003-444-047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Robert and Darlene Fergus</td>
<td>567 East 5th Avenue</td>
<td>003-444-034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Doris Peterson</td>
<td>581 East 5th Avenue</td>
<td>003-444-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Robert Ginno</td>
<td>1465 Mangrove Avenue</td>
<td>003-444-053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City's negotiator is City Manager David Burkland and the parties with whom negotiations are proposed to be conducted are the respective property owners (or such persons designated as their agent for the purpose of negotiations).

2.1. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR
(Gov. Code §54956.8)
   Negotiator: David Burkland, City Manager
   Under Negotiation: Price and terms of payment for proposed acquisitions
   Negotiating Parties: See the names listed above for property owners or designated negotiators

2.2. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR
(Gov. Code Sec. 54957.6.)
   Negotiator: Dave Burkland, City Manager and Teresa Campbell, Director of Human Resources
   Employee Organizations: Management Employees, United Public Employees of California (Confidential), Public Safety Management Employees, Chico Police Officers' Association, Chico Public Safety Association, International Association of Firefighters, Service Employees International Union (Trades and Crafts Unit and Clerical, Technical and Professional Unit).

3. ADJOURNMENT
   Adjourn to a City Council meeting in the Council Chamber.
TO: City Council
FROM: Deborah Presson, City Clerk (896-7251)
RE: FINAL ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE REPEALING CHAPTER 2.64 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE, ENTITLED "HUMAN RESOURCES COMMISSION"

REPORT IN BRIEF:

At its meeting of 9/7/10, the Council introduced an ordinance ("Exhibit A") repealing Chapter 2.64 of the Chico Municipal Code which originally established the purpose and duties of the City's currently seated Human Resources Commission. The effective date of the ordinance coincides with the beginning of the terms of newly appointed commissioners and allows the City Clerk's Office to move forward with the Biennial Recruitment as scheduled in mid-October.

Recommendation: The City Clerk recommends adoption of the ordinance by reading of title only.

ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO REPEALING CHAPTER 2.64 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE, ENTITLED "HUMAN RESOURCES COMMISSION" - final reading and adoption

FISCAL IMPACT:

Publication of the final ordinance is estimated at approximately $100.

PUBLIC CONTACT:

The Human Resources Commission was previously provided with a copy of the 9/7/10 staff report which introduced the ordinance.

Reviewed by: Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk

Approved by: David Burkland, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS:

Exhibit A - Ordinance

DISTRIBUTION:

City Clerk (18)
HR/RM Director

Item #2.1
ORDINANCE NO. ______
(Codified)

ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO REPEALING CHAPTER 2.64 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE, ENTITLED "HUMAN RESOURCES COMMISSION" (Codified)

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Chico as follows:

Chapter 2.64 of the Chico Municipal Code, entitled "Human Resources Commission"
shall be repealed effective January 1, 2011.

The ordinance was adopted by the City Council of the City of Chico at its regular meeting held on __________________ by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

DISQUALIFIED:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:  

APPROVED AS TO FORM 

Deborah R. Presson  
City Clerk

By: Lori J. Barker  
City Attorney
REPORT IN BRIEF

Staff has submitted a grant application, entitled "Chico Sustainable Development and Design Project," to the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant and Incentives Program seeking $174,072. Grant funds would be used to support the Municipal Code update to implement the General Plan's new policy framework, amend the City's Design Guidelines Manual to address design considerations associated with infill, mixed use, and complete streets, and update the Chico Urban Area Bicycle Plan to support the new Land Use Diagram and to enhance bicycle and pedestrian circulation.

A requirement for the grant application submittal is City Council adoption of a resolution approving the filing of the application and authorizing the City Manager to execute all documents necessary to accept and implement an award of funds.

Recommendation:

The Planning Services Director recommends City Council adoption of the resolution (see Council Resolution at Attachment A).

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO APPROVING AN APPLICATION FOR GRANT FUNDS FOR THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLANNING GRANT AND INCENTIVES PROGRAM UNDER THE SAFE DRINKING WATER, WATER QUALITY AND SUPPLY, FLOOD CONTROL, RIVER AND COASTAL PROTECTION BOND ACT OF 2006 (PROPOSITION 84)

FISCAL IMPACT

If the grant is awarded to the City, there would be a need for an approximate $20,000 match of City funds to support the Design Guidelines Manual and the Bike Plan updates. These two efforts have been identified by staff as high priorities for implementation of the Chico 2030 General Plan, and would fall under the Planning Services and Building and Development Services Departments' 2010/2011 work programs. Council has already allotted funding for the Municipal Code Update, and that existing allotment will serve as the cash match for that portion of the grant.
ATTACHMENTS:

A. Grant Application Support Resolution

DISTRIBUTION:
City Council (18)
File
RESOLUTION NO. _____

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO
APPROVING AN APPLICATION FOR GRANT FUNDS FOR
THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLANNING GRANT AND INCENTIVES PROGRAM
UNDER THE SAFE DRINKING WATER, WATER QUALITY AND SUPPLY, FLOOD
CONTROL, RIVER AND COASTAL PROTECTION
BOND ACT OF 2006 (PROPOSITION 84)

WHEREAS, the Legislature and Governor of the State of California have provided funds for
the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant and Incentives Program ("Program"); and

WHEREAS, the Strategic Growth Council has been delegated responsibility for the
administration of this grant program and establishing necessary procedures; and

WHEREAS, the procedures established by the Strategic Growth Council require a resolution
certifying the approval of an application by an applicant’s governing board before submission of the
application to the State:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the Council hereby approves the filing of an application entitled the “Chico Sustainable
Development and Design Project” to the Program;

2. That the City Manager is authorized to submit an application for Program funds and to
execute all documents necessary to accept and implement an award of Program funds.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED at a meeting of the City Council of the
City of Chico held on September 21, 2010 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

DISQUALIFIED:

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DEBORAH R. PRESSON
City Clerk

LORI BARKER
City Attorney
TO: City Council
FROM: Finance Director (879-7301)
RE: ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING DESTRUCTION OF FINANCE RECORDS

REPORT IN BRIEF:

The Finance Director requests permission to destroy historical records maintained by the Finance Department over five years old. A list of records and applicable time periods are set forth in the attached Exhibit "A." The Finance Department maintains its records according to category and destruction date, as published in the "Local Government Records Management Guidelines" by the Secretary of State of California. Each category of records is assigned a retention life and recommended destruction date. All records on the attached Exhibit "A" have destruction dates of 2010 or prior and contain primarily Payroll, Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable and General Ledger Records.

Recommendation: The Finance Director and the City Manager recommend adoption of:

ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN CITY RECORDS PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 34090

FISCAL IMPACT:

The cost to destroy approximately 74 boxes of records is estimated at $100 and is included in the Finance Department Operating Budget.

Reviewed by:
Jennifer Hennessy, Finance Director

Approved by:
David Burkland, City Manager

DISTRIBUTION:
City Clerk (18)

ATTACHMENTS:
Resolution
Exhibit "A" - (Records to be destroyed)
RESOLUTION NO. __________

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO
AUTHORIZING DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN CITY RECORDS
PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 34090

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 34090 of the Government Code, the head of a
city Department, with the written consent of the City Attorney, is authorized to destroy
certain records over two years of age upon approval of a legislative body; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Chico
as follows:

WHEREAS, the Finance Director desires to destroy certain records under her
possession and control, as set forth on the attached Exhibit “A.”

That the Finance Director is hereby authorized to destroy certain records under
the Finance Director’s possession and control and over five years old, as described in
the attached Exhibit “A.”

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED by the City Council of the
City of Chico at its meeting held on the 7th day of September, 2010 by the following
vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
Lori Barker, City Attorney

By: Alicia M. Rock, Assistant City Attorney

Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk

Pursuant to Government Code 34090, I hereby consent to the destruction of the records
as set forth in Exhibit “A.”

Lori Barker, City Attorney
By: Alicia M. Rock, Assistant City Attorney
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOX NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF RECORDS</th>
<th>LATEST DATE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>DESTROY IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PAYROLL VENDOR FILES (1997-98)</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>P/R</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CR POSTINGS JULY 2000 - AUGUST 2000</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CR POSTINGS NOVEMBER 2000 - DECEMBER 2000</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CR POSTINGS JANUARY 2001 - FEBRUARY 2001</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CR POSTINGS MARCH 2001 - APRIL 2001</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>00-01 AR POSTINGS JULY 2000 - JUNE 01</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>00-01 CASH RECEIPTS - REVENUE - TOT</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>00-01 CASH RECEIPTS - REVENUE - UUT</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TIMECARDS PPE 12/14/03 - 1/25/03</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>P/R</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TIMECARDS PPE 2/8/03 - 4/5/03</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>P/R</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>TIMECARDS PPE 4/19/03 - 5/31/03</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>P/R</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>P/R Cancelled Check FY 04-05, Voided Checks</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>P/R</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A/P Cancelled Check FY 04-05, 7/04 - 1/05</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A/P Cancelled Check FY 04-05, 2/05-6/05</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>04-05 Employee Expense Reports, P.O.s, FOCRs, Chrono</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>04-05 AP Check Run 7/1/04 - 9/23/04, Voids</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>04-05 AP Check Run 9/30/04-2/9/04, Encumbrances</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>04-05 AP Check Run 12/16/04-3/24/05</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>04-05 AP Check Run 3/30/05-6/30/05</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 17132-17370</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 17371-17629</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 17630-17979</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 17980-18471</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 18472-18786</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 18787-19167</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 19158-19384</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 19385-19756</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 19760-19989</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 19990-20350</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 20351-20621</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 20622-21019</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 21020-21359</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 21360-21579</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 21580-21989</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 21990-22240</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 22241-22626</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 22627-22849</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 22850-23182</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 23183-23389</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 23392-23753</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 23754-23998</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>04-05 AP Checks 23999-24397</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>04-05 Expense Reports, P.O.'s, FOCR,</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>A/P</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>AR Daily Bank Deposit Worksheets July 04-Nov 04</td>
<td>Nov-04</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>AR Daily Bank Deposit Worksheets Dec 04-May 05</td>
<td>Apr-05</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>AR Revenue, TOTs, UUTs A-D FY 04-05</td>
<td>July-05</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>AR UIUTs E-Z FY 04-05</td>
<td>July-05</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>AR Daily Bank Deposit Worksheets Jun 05 AR/ARO POST 04-05/VOID/Del. Logs</td>
<td>Jun-06</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>FY04-05 Cash Receipts, Postings Reports 3/7/05-6/30/05</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>FY04-05 Cash Receipts 10/18/04-3/8/05</td>
<td>3/8/05</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>FY04-05 Cash Receipts 7/1/04-10/15/04</td>
<td>10/15/04</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>FY05-09 Housing Loans Closed during FY 04-05</td>
<td>6/30/06</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>FY05-10 Paid Invoices, A - B</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2010 Finance Records to be Destroyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOX NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF RECORDS</th>
<th>LATEST DATE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>DESTROY IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56 AR 05-11</td>
<td>04-05 Paid Invoices, C - L</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 AR 05-12</td>
<td>04-05 Paid Invoices, M - W</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 AR 05-13</td>
<td>04-05 Paid DUI, A-Z</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 AR 05-14</td>
<td>04-05 False Alarm billing, Subdivision receipts, Airport Access Card billing, Turbo invoices and other agency payments</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 AR 05-15</td>
<td>04-05 Turbo Data (Deposits, Admin Review, Hearing Schedules &amp; Refunds), ARGL Fund Reconciliations</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 AR 05-16</td>
<td>04-05 Subdivision Billing &amp; Receipts</td>
<td>6/30/05</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 AR Tickets</td>
<td>Old Chico Clipper tickets</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 AR Tickets 2</td>
<td>Old CATS 20 Ride tickets</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 AR Tickets 3</td>
<td>Old Chico Clipper tickets</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 FL-08-11</td>
<td>Central Files (see list for contents)</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 GL-05-06</td>
<td>04-05 Journal Entries #1-315</td>
<td>6/30/06</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 GL-05-07</td>
<td>04-05 Journal Entries #316 - 600</td>
<td>6/30/06</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 GL-05-08</td>
<td>04-05 Journal Entries #601 to adjusting</td>
<td>6/30/06</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 GL-05-09</td>
<td>04-05 Allocation Journal Entries</td>
<td>6/30/06</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 PR 05-13</td>
<td>04-05 Payroll Vendors Assurant - ITT Hartford</td>
<td>06/05</td>
<td>P/R</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 PR 05-14</td>
<td>04-05 Payroll Vendors Legacy - Wage Garnishments</td>
<td>06/05</td>
<td>P/R</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF CHICO
CITY COUNCIL MINUTE ORDER NO. [Blank]

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A GRANT DEED CONVEYING A PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT TO PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (PG&E) FOR UNDERGROUND UTILITY SERVICE TO THE BMX TRACK ACROSS 101 SILVER DOLLAR WAY - (APN 005-560-031) 101 SILVER DOLLAR WAY

EXPLANATION PROVIDED BY: Building & Development Services Director Initials

On May 4, 2001, the City negotiated a lease with Silver Dollar BMX for the use of City property (APN 005-560-032) for a new BMX track. In order for PG&E to provide electricity at the BMX track, a public utility easement across another City-owned parcel located at 101 Silver Dollar Way (APN 005-560-031) is required. This Minute Order authorizes the City to execute a grant deed conveying this public utility easement to PG&E, as depicted on Exhibits “A” and “B”.

RECOMMENDATION: Building & Development Services Director Initials

Authorize the City Manager to execute a grant deed conveying a public utility easement to PG&E for underground utility service to the BMX track across 101 Silver Dollar Way.

CITY MANAGER: Initials

CITY COUNCIL (MEETING OF 09/21/10)

I hereby certify that the City Council took the following action on this Minute Order:

☐ Approved ☐ Other (explain below)

Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the original Minute Order on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk

DISTRIBUTION

Preliminary:
Clerk/Council (18)
BDSD
PG&E
BMX Track File

Final:
PG&E
BMX Track File
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PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT
ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER
005-560-031
“BMX TRACK”

ALL THAT CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY SITUATE IN THE CITY OF CHICO, COUNTY OF BUTTE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

A PORTION OF LOT 1 AS SHOWN ON THAT CERTAIN RECORD OF SURVEY MAP FILED IN BOOK 148 OF MAPS AT PAGE 19 IN THE OFFICE OF THE RECORDER, COUNTY OF BUTTE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 1;

THENCE NORTH 89 DEG. 26' 54" EAST, ALONG THE SOUTHERLY RIGHT OF WAY OF SILVER DOLLAR WAY, A DISTANCE OF 12.00 FEET;

THENCE, LEAVING SAID RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF SILVER DOLLAR WAY, SOUTH 00 DEG. 42' 22" EAST A DISTANCE OF 309.43 FEET;

THENCE SOUTH 89 DEG. 01' 02" WEST A DISTANCE OF 12.00 FEET;

THENCE NORTH 00 DEG. 42' 22" WEST A DISTANCE OF 309.43 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING 0.09 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

THE ABOVE DESCRIBED PARCEL IS A PORTION OF ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER 005-560-031.

EXHIBIT “A”

BY: T. R.
CHECKED: T. R.
APPROVED: ZK
DATE: 8/5/10

SHEET 1 OF 1 SHEETS
LEGEND

AREA OF EASEMENT (3,713.16 S.F. = 0.09 AC)

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER

COURSE DATA

A) N 89 DEG. 26' 54" E - 12.00'
B) S 00 DEG. 42' 22" E - 309.43'
C) S 89 DEG. 01' 02" W - 12.00'
D) N 00 DEG. 42' 22" W - 309.43'

CITY OF CHICO
PLAT TO ACCOMPANY
PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT FOR
PG&E

EXHIBIT
"B"

SHEET 2 OF 2
TO: City Council

FROM: David Burkland, City Manager (896-7201)
Cris Carroll, Community Development Mgr. (879-6307)

RE: Finance Committee Recommendation for Revisions to Budget Policies Regarding Community Organization Funding and Economic Development/Tourism Services and Events

REPORT IN BRIEF:
At its 08/24/10 meeting, the Finance Committee unanimously recommended revisions to the currently adopted budget policies F.1.b. and F.2 pertaining to funding the Community Organization Funding Program and Economic Development/Tourism services and events.

Recommendation:
Approve the Finance Committee recommendation to revise the currently adopted budget policies F.1.b. and F.2. as detailed in the Exhibit "A" to the Finance Committee agenda report which is attached to this report.

FISCAL IMPACT:
There is no fiscal impact to the currently budgeted programs.

If the Council approves the recommended changes, the confirming budget modification changing the language will be included with the Finance Director's 1st Quarter Supplemental budget report presented to Council, and the revised policies will be used in development of the Fiscal Year 2011-12 budget for the two programs which begins in January 2011.

BACKGROUND:
At its 06/15/10 meeting, the City Council accepted the City Manager's recommendation for Finance Committee review of the two budget policies which establish annual available revenue for the Community Organization Funding Program (Annual Budget Policy F.1.b.) and for the Economic Development/Tourism Services and Events program.

DISCUSSION:
The attached Finance Committee report includes detailed background about the development of the budget policies and the practical application of those policies by staff in building budget recommendations. The staff recommendation to revise the policies was crafted so that the practical application of the policy language mirrored actual budget development practices by staff consistent with budget development practices in other City departments.

The Exhibit "A" to that report provides the current adopted budget policy language and the proposed revisions which the Finance Committee unanimously recommended.

PUBLIC CONTACT:
A notice of tonight's meeting has been provided to members of the Arts Commission and all currently funded non-profit organizations, individual artists and economic development/tourism service providers. A copy of the attached Finance Committee report was previously provided to these parties.
RE: Finance Committee Recommendations - Budget Policies
Meeting Date: September 21, 2010
Page 2

Prepared by:
Cris Carroll, Community Development Mgr.
879-6307

REPORT DISTRIBUTION:
City Clerk (original + 18)
City Manager desk
Assistant City Manager
Community Development Manager
Administrative Analyst Kelly
Housing & Neighborhood Services Director
Arts Project Coordinator
Finance Director (budget modification)

NOTICE OF MEETING ONLY:
Community Organization Funding Program -
currently funded orgs/artists
Economic Development/Tourism Program -
currently funded service providers
Arts Commission
North Valley Community Foundation

ATTACHMENT:
8-24-10 Finance Committee report

FILE: D-27-3
TO: Finance Committee
FROM: City Manager (896-7201)
        Community Development Manager (879-6307)
RE: Consideration of Possible Revisions to Budget Policies Regarding Community Organization Funding and Economic Development/Tourism Services and Events.

REPORT IN BRIEF:
At its 06/15/10 meeting, the City Council accepted the City Manager’s recommendation that the Finance Committee review and consider revisions to the City’s current adopted budget policies F.1.b and F.2 pertaining to funding the Community Organization Funding Program and Economic Development/Tourism services and events.

Recommendation:
The City Manager and Community Development Manager recommend revisions to the budget policy language as detailed on the attached Exhibit “A.”

FISCAL IMPACT: There is no fiscal impact to the currently budgeted programs.

If the Finance Committee recommends revision to the current FY 2010-11 Annual Budget policies, a budget modification with the revised language would be presented to the City Council with the recommendation. If approved by the City Council, any revisions to budget policies relating to future funding for the Community Organization Funding Program and the Economic Development/Tourism services program will be used in the development of the FY 2011-12 Annual Budget which begins in January 2011.

BACKGROUND:
In FY 1973-74, the City Council appropriated funds to provide financial assistance to a number of local social service agencies; Federal Revenue Sharing Program funds were the major source of support for these allocations.

When that federal program was terminated on September 30, 1986, the City Council determined that the City would continue to fund community organizations with funding appropriated from a percentage of the General Fund and a percentage of the federal Community Development Block Grant funding. An advisory ballot measure was approved by the voters on November 4, 1986 to “use general fund monies to support local social service agencies and other local organizations which provide services of benefit to the residents of the City of Chico and those businesses which are located within the City of Chico.”

The Community Organization Funding Program grew through subsequent years to include, in addition to the historically funded social service providers, funding categories for tourism/economic development and the arts. As part of the implementation of the Economic Development Strategy, the tourism/economic development category of the Community Organization Funding Program was eliminated and, effective with the FY 09-10 Annual Budget, a separate program was developed to recommend contracting and funding allocations for specific economic development/tourism services and events aligned with the adopted strategy.

A general overview of the development of associated budget policies used to establish available revenue for the programs is attached as Exhibit “B.”
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ATTACHMENT
DISCUSSION:

The primary purpose for the budget policy set-asides for the Community Organization Funding Program (COFP) and the Economic Development/Tourism Program (EDTP) is to provide staff with a Council-authorized available revenue point which is used to develop the annual budget for these programs. Historically, this involved percentage formulas with the resulting available revenue figures presented to the Finance Committee and Arts Commission for use in formulating specific allocation recommendations for each program applicant.

The current policies, revised in FY 2007-08, established specific General Fund baseline amounts to be adjusted annually by fluctuations in the General Fund. In the two years since those baselines were established, and largely in response to addressing budgetary impacts on the General Fund and the structural deficit, the City Manager has recommended reductions to the formula calculations and the recommended reductions have been approved by the City Council as part of the adoption of the City budget.

Budget development in City departments starts with the prior year's allocations as the baseline and adjusts from that point depending on the annual review of the needs of City departments and the City Manager's decisions on how to best continue funding basic municipal services through presentation of a balanced budget to the City Council.

Therefore, staff is recommending a consistent approach in developing budgetary recommendations for the COFP and the EDTP by crafting budget policy language that provides staff a prior-year allocation starting point, adjusted by the General Fund fluctuation, to present to the City Manager as part of the budget recommendations for the programs.

The City Manager would then review those program requests in the context of overall City budget review, and could recommend adjusting that figure up or down depending on annual review of General Fund needs and the projected General Fund revenue. The City Council would be advised of the City Manager's specific revenue recommendations prior to proceeding to Council Committees or the Arts Commission for specific recommended allocations for applicants.

If this recommended policy is approved, staff will use the following prior year allocation starting points, as adjusted, to develop the FY 2011-12 budget information:

**Community Organization Funding Program**
- General/CDBG category: $107,355 (General Fund) plus 15% CDBG annual entitlement (est. $155,098)
- Arts category: $83,951 (General Fund)

**Economic Development/Tourism Services Program:** $166,377 (General Fund)

PUBLIC CONTACT:

Copies of this agenda report are being provided to members of the Arts Commission, all currently funded non-profit organizations and artists in the Community Organization Funding Program, and all currently contracted Economic Development/Tourism service providers.

Reviewed by: 
Cris Carroll, Community Development Manager

Approved by: 
David Burkland, City Manager

S:\CRIS\Comm Org Program\Process Recs\Fin Comm 8-24-10 report.frm
DISTRIBUTION:
City Clerk (17)
Community Organization Funding Program - currently funded orgs/artists
Economic Development/Tourism Program - current service providers
Arts Commission
Housing & Neighborhood Services Director
Arts Project Coordinator
City Manager desk
Assistant City Manager
Administrative Analyst Kelly
Community Development Manager
North Valley Community Foundation
Finance Director (budget policy - possible modification)

ATTACHMENTS:
Exhibit "A" - Current and recommended budget policies
Exhibit "B" - General overview of policy development

FILE: D-27-3
### EXHIBIT “A”
CURRENT AND RECOMMENDED BUDGET POLICIES
FOR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Policy</th>
<th>Current Adopted Budget Policy (FY 2010-11 Annual Budget)</th>
<th>Recommended Budget Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General and Arts Funding Set-Asides (Policy F.1.b.)</td>
<td>Beginning with FY07-08, the total funds available for providing funding assistance to community organizations in the General and Arts categories shall be based on $210,689 and $141,330 respectively and calculated annually by applying the percentage difference between actual General and Park Funds recurring revenue for the prior two years to the current year’s allocation. Provided, however, in the event the percentage difference exceeds the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers - U.S. City Average (CPI-U), the CPI-U for the annual period ending in October shall be applied. Specific appropriations for assistance to such organizations will be subject to the review and approval of the City Council.</td>
<td>For the purposes of budget development, the total funds available for providing funding assistance to community organizations in the General and Arts categories will be calculated annually by using the prior fiscal year total appropriations to community organizations in each category and applying the percentage difference between actual General and Park Funds recurring revenue for the prior two years. Provided, however, in the event the percentage difference exceeds the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers - U.S. City Average (CPI-U), the CPI-U for the annual period ending in October shall be applied. The resulting amount of total available funds for community organizations will be presented with City departmental budget requests to the City Manager, who has authority to recommend adjustments if determined the funding is needed for basic municipal services. Specific appropriations for assistance to such organizations will be subject to the review and approval of the City Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1Recurring General and Park Funds Revenues are the difference between the total General and Park Funds revenue and one-time revenues, refunds, reimbursements, and revenues from sources designated for specific use (i.e. new special taxes or other revenues established by the City Council or voter action for a pre-determined purpose).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Policy</th>
<th>Current Adopted Budget Policy</th>
<th>Recommended Budget Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Services Set-Aside (Policy F.2.)</td>
<td>Beginning with FY09-10, the total funds available for funding economic development services to strengthen the economic base of Chico shall be based on $300,624 and calculated annually by applying the percentage difference between actual General and Park Funds recurring revenue for the prior two years to the current year's allocation. Provided, however, in the event the percentage difference exceeds the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers - U.S. City Average (CPI-U), the CPI-U for the annual period ending in October shall be applied. Specific appropriations to service providers will be subject to the review and approval of the City Council.</td>
<td>For the purposes of budget development, the total funds available for funding economic development/tourism service providers will be calculated annually by using the prior fiscal year total appropriations for economic development/tourism service providers and applying the percentage difference between actual General and Park Funds recurring revenue for the prior two years. Provided, however, in the event the percentage difference exceeds the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers - U.S. City Average (CPI-U), the CPI-U for the annual period ending in October shall be applied. The resulting amount of total available funds for economic development/tourism service providers will be presented with City departmental budget requests to the City Manager, who has authority to recommend adjustments if determined the funding is needed for basic municipal services. Specific appropriations for assistance to such organizations will be subject to the review and approval of the City Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXHIBIT “A”
CURRENT AND RECOMMENDED BUDGET POLICIES
FOR COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Policy</th>
<th>Current Adopted Budget Policy (FY 2010-11 Annual Budget)</th>
<th>Recommended Budget Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program entitlement from the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) will be set aside annually for the purpose of providing funding assistance to community organizations meeting HUD requirements. Specific appropriations for assistance to such organizations will be subject to the review and approval of the City Council.</td>
<td>No change recommended. This federal funding program allows up to 15% of the City’s annual CDBG entitlement funds to be used for public services meeting HUD requirements and is added to the General Fund contribution in the General/CDBG category.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EXHIBIT “B”**  
GENERAL OVERVIEW OF BUDGET POLICY DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>GENERAL/CDBG CATEGORY</th>
<th>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT/TOURISM</th>
<th>ARTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 73-74</td>
<td>Funds appropriated for Social Service providers, largely from Federal Revenue Sharing Program funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1974</td>
<td>Initial meeting of Social Services Commission formed to develop recommendations on funding social service providers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 77-78</td>
<td>Social Services Commission disbanded; Manager recommends hire of Community Development Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-29-86</td>
<td>In anticipation of end of Federal Revenue Sharing Program, City Council authorizes an advisory measure on the ballot concerning the funding of social service agencies and other local organizations. (Res 30 86-87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballot argument indicates that the consensus of current Council is that such funding should not exceed 1% of General Fund budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-30-86</td>
<td>Federal Revenue Sharing Program terminated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-4-86</td>
<td>Voters approved advisory measure (non-binding); results presented and confirming resolution adopted 12-3-86 (Res 130 86-87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General Overview of Budget Policy Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>General/CDBG Category</th>
<th>Economic Development/Tourism</th>
<th>Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating policy of calculating available revenue using 1% of the General Fund estimate and 15% of the CDBG annual federal entitlement for this category develops.</td>
<td>Ordinance 1737 adopted increasing the Transient Occupancy Tax from 6% to 9%. Also added Section 3.52.220 to Municipal Code. “All revenues derived form the taxes imposed by this chapter shall be deposited in the city's general fund and thereafter appropriated by the city council for any municipal purpose; provided, however that the city council shall, in each fiscal year, endeavors to appropriate one-third (emphasis added) of such revenues for the promotion of tourism, economic development, the support of a community center, community art projects, and for any other similar community projects or programs.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-21-88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 89-90</td>
<td>Annual Budget Policy states one-third of the 9% TOT revenue would be allocated as follows: Cultural/arts 20%, Economic Development 20%, Tourism/Community Center 40%, Discretionary Assistance 10%, Reserve Allocation 10%</td>
<td>Annual Budget Policy minor revision: Removes word “cultural” from arts allocation schedule and adds to Tourism/Community Center (including cultural programs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 91-92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 92-93</td>
<td>Annual Budget Policy: Major change in one-third of 9% allocation schedule: Fine Arts Purposes - 30% (less 10% for reserve allocation) Economic Development - 70% (less 10% for reserve allocation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GENERAL OVERVIEW OF BUDGET POLICY DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>GENERAL/CDBG CATEGORY</th>
<th>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT/TOURISM</th>
<th>ARTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-4-94</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ordinance 1985 adopted, increasing the Transient Occupancy Tax rate to 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased the amount the City council would endeavor to appropriate to the promotion of tourism, economic development, support of a community center, community art projects or other similar community projects from 30% to 40% of TOT revenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 94-95</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised: Budget Policy Allocation Schedule</td>
<td>Revised: Budget Policy Allocation Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70% of 40% TOT revenue</td>
<td>Fine Arts Purposes: 30% of 40% TOT revenue less Fine Arts operating expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminated 10% reserve allocation set-aside</td>
<td>Eliminated 10% reserve allocation set-aside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 95-96</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amended Budget Policy to clarify Council’s intention in increasing the set-aside from 30% to 40%. Changed set-aside amount back to 30% (subject to 30/70 allocation split) and applied additional 10% increase as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;In addition, ten percent (10%) of the 10% Transient Occupancy Tax levied by the City is hereby set aside for Economic Development/Tourism purposes. Economic Development staff operating expenses shall be appropriated from this allocation.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This resulted in the formula calculation commonly shown as follows:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arts 30% of 30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Development/Tourism 70% of 30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Development/Tourism - additional 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXHIBIT "B"
GENERAL OVERVIEW OF BUDGET POLICY DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>GENERAL/CDBG CATEGORY</th>
<th>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT/TOURISM</th>
<th>ARTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 00-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget policy amended to add that arts staff and operating expenses shall be appropriated from this allocation (30% of 30%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 05-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>The allocation schedule was revised to add a category for one-time events funding. $10,000 was allocated off the top of the 30% set-aside, and the balance was allocated in the same proportions (eg, Arts 30%/ED 70%). The additional 10% continued to be allocated to Economic Development/Tourism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 6 &amp; April 3, 2007</td>
<td>City Council considered and approved revisions to the Community Organization Funding Program, including approval of staff recommendation that, in consideration of various demands on the General Fund, and to simplify the calculation, available revenue for funding the General, Arts and Economic Development/Tourism categories be tied to actual fluctuations in the General Fund and no longer based on Transient Occupancy Tax revenue. Baselines were established. <strong>The approved recommendations included continued authority for adjustments should the City Manager determine that funding was needed for basic municipal services.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 07-08</td>
<td>Budget policy changed to establish General Fund baseline of $210,689 effective FY 07-08 with adjustments tied to General Fund fluctuations, capped by the CPI-U The other revenue source in this category continued to be the 15% CDBG set-aside for HUD qualified agencies.</td>
<td><strong>Budget policy changed to establish General Fund baseline of $300,624 effective FY 07-08 with adjustments tied to General Fund fluctuations, capped by the CPI-U</strong></td>
<td><strong>Budget policy changed to establish General Fund baseline of $141,330 effective FY 07-08 with adjustments tied to General Fund fluctuations, capped by the CPI-U</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
<td>GENERAL/CDBG CATEGORY</td>
<td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT/TOURISM</td>
<td>ARTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Economic Development/Tourism category was removed from the Community Organization Funding Program and a new program of Requests for Proposals began in order to implement specific elements of the Economic Development Strategy. Budget Policy was amended to segregate the baseline formula from the Community Organization Funding Program set-aside policies, but retained the baseline formula (eg, baseline of $300,624, as adjusted)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADJOURNED REGULAR CHICO CITY COUNCIL MEETING — June 22, 2010
Minutes

1.1. JOINT CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

1.2. Call to Order - Mayor Schwab called the June 22, 2010 - Adjourned Regular Joint Council and Planning Commission to order at 2:00 p.m. In the Council Chamber, 421 Main Street.

1.3. Flag Salute

1.4. Roll Call

Present: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
Absent: None

Planning Commission

Present: Brownell, Luvaas, Merz, Minasian, Sorensen, Kelley
Absent: Barrett

2. REGULAR AGENDA

2.1. CHICO 2030 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE - ELEMENT REVIEW

At this meeting the City Council and Planning Commission reviewed the Introduction, Land Use Element, and Sustainability Element of the draft 2030 General Plan. This is the second in a series of five special joint Council/Commission meetings on the draft 2030 General Plan that has and will continue to take place monthly through the summer and into the fall. Staff provided an overview of key sustainability and land use topics and summarize public feedback received on the two elements. Members of the community had an opportunity to provide input, and the Council and Commission provided direction on suggested modifications or additions. Council direction and public input at this stage will continue to help refine and improve the Plan as it moves toward final adoption in 2011. (Report - Brendan Viega, Principal Planner)

Introduction Chapter Discussion

This study session was held for the continued consideration of the Draft General Plan. Topics included an overview of the: 1) Introduction Chapter; 2) Sustainability Element; and 3) Land Use Element.

It was noted by staff that in the context of a General Plan, when making decisions, goals and policies should be examined comprehensively, not individually. Some policies and actions are mandatory, and other policies and actions are intentionally flexible.

Mayor Schwab opened the floor for public input. Addressing the Council and Planning Commission on the proposed Introduction Chapter of the Draft 2030 General Plan was:

Robin Huffman - opposes to the sphere of influence as defined in the proposed Draft 2030 General Plan.

Following public input, members of the Council and Planning Commission provided staff with suggested changes for the Draft 2030 General Plan Introduction Chapter.
Sustainability Element Discussion

Staff presented an overview of the five proposed changes or requests in the Sustainability Element for the Council and Planning Commission’s consideration. These changes pertained to: 1) a clearer definition of “social equity” with all three components added to the glossary; 2) expansion of the compost facilities and services in the Parks, Public Facilities and Services Element to be discussed on August 21; 3) concern that there was too little emphasis on economy, although staff noted for the record that while there is a separate Economic Development Element, additional cross references will be made between the correlating elements; 4) a request for stronger language in this element; and 5) a Title 19 update could include a change in regulations that would reduce the permitting burden for small animal keeping.

Mayor Schwab opened the floor for public input. Addressing the Council and Planning Commission regarding the Sustainability Element were:

Alec Bingham - appreciates the City’s sustainability efforts, would like to see less restrictions pertaining to the keeping of chickens, and does like the local energy idea;

Jeremy Miller - supports changing the regulations pertaining to the keeping of chickens and supports including stronger language in the General Plan;

Grace Marvin - wants to show her support for Robin Huffman’s recent letter regarding the sustainability element, is concerned that “fresh water” sustainability is missing from the component, and that Chico should know more about what economic sustainability looks like in the Plan because not all economic development is sustainable;

Robin Huffman - believes that “equity” should be kept in the statement, believes that the General Plan should perhaps be extended from 2030 to actually 2100 in order to have a longer term in the Plan, economic development should be cross referenced with the other elements, and that the loss of water should be addressed in this element;

Nancy Browning - would like additional clarification on how Chico defines sustainability;

Bob Kromer - believes that the plan underplays the economic impact of this element, feels that a vibrant economy drives the ability to implement the Plan, and wonders how the City will monitor, measure, or adjust for future changes, and what funding will be used for the implementation;

Bill Brouhard - spoke regarding his letter pertaining to the land use element, sustainability incentives, the idea of large scale planning being processed between a joint meeting between both the Planning Commission and Council which further streamlines the process, encouraged the development of incentives for small wastewater systems, believes additional economic indicators are needed, and that while the Chamber and CEPCO support the current sustainability definition, it should be endorsed by the whole community;

Debbie Villasenor - glad that a sustainability section is going to be included in the General Plan, does support changing the permitting process for chickens and would ask that it also include goats and sheep as well, feels that the General Plan should have more emphasis on transportation which she believes is missing from the Sustainability section, and asks that Neighborhood Plans be included in the General Plan;

Bob Odland - Draft General Plan 2030 Sustainability goals are not user friendly, "social equity"
should be removed from the three legged stool because it is not broad enough, and should integrate the Sustainability Element in with the other elements;

Quentin Colgan - believes a Municipal Power Plant should be pursued by the City and that all new home construction carry a solar installation requirement with only local developers being allowed to build in Chico;

Karen Laslo - believes that home composting programs should be included in the General Plan so that citizens can work towards becoming more self sufficient which would be more helpful for future generations;

Martin Mayer - supports the change in the permitting process for chickens;

Luke Andersen - believes that the conversation shouldn't be about economic development versus sustainability;

Emily Alma - incentives could be developed to encourage onsite solar remodels for existing housing stock;

Jay Gallagher - wants to keep "equity" in the sustainability statement;

Lee Altier - social sustainability needs to be a broader definition and used as a guide for how the City develops;

The Council and Planning Commission recessed at 4:00 p.m. for a 15 minute break. The meeting reconvened and all members were present.

Following the break, members of Council and the Planning Commission provided suggested changes to staff regarding the Sustainability Element. Staff will work with the suggestions to see how to include them in the draft Plan which will be brought back to the Council for final review.

Land Use Element Discussion

Staff indicated that the Land Use Element provides the policy basis for decisions about where and how the City will grow and change over time. At the May 11, 2010 meeting, the project team provided a general overview of the Land Use Element. Based on the comments received by Council and the Planning Commission at that meeting, additional comments from the May 5, 2010 GPAC meeting, and comment letters from the public, staff provided an overview of proposed revisions to five policy areas as follows: 1) Residential Infill; 2) Airport Compatibility; 3) Resource Constraint Overlay; 4) Special Planning Areas; and 5) Norlie Land Use Designation Change Request.

The Council and Planning Commission recessed for a 30-minute break at 5:45 p.m. The meeting reconvened and all members were present.

Mayor Schwab opened the floor for public input. Addressing the Council regarding the Land Use Element were:

Bruce Norlie - encouraged Council to approve his land use designation change request from a medium density residential designation to an office designation which would be compatible with the office uses on the opposite side of Cohasset Road. He believes his request is reasonable and would provide an opportunity for infill;
Grace Marvin - wants Council to require infill to happen prior to ever looking at the expanded planning areas and then only when City services can be easily supplied, believes that Council should direct future growth to the Oroville area which needs additional population, expand agricultural buffers to 300 ft., and include public art as a component of required streetscape policies;

Robin Huffman - has concerns that the City has become dependent on growth and asked Council to consider treating the City as totally built out and constrained now as opposed to using the five additional planning areas in the future which she believes are very special areas;

Bob Kromer - believes Council should adjust the Greenline so it actually serves as a buffer;

Bill Brouhard - would ask that the Council consider the suggested modifications contained in the Chamber letter and matrix;

Debbie Villasenor - opposes the high density planned for the Diamond Match area as well as anything to do with the Otterson Drive Extension, and feels that public transportation needs to be a priority;

Karen Laslo - wants to protect the agricultural land and to make sure that the Greenline stays intact and is opposed to moving the line for the Estes property because that land has great soil for agricultural purposes;

Emily Alma - believes that the proposed Barber Yard project would not be consistent with the older homes in the existing neighborhood and would greatly impact the traffic in this area, and urged Council to allow the existing neighborhood to be part of the decision when this project comes forward;

Elizabeth Devereaux - believes that more housing set aside is needed;

Lee Altier - wants to see the agricultural lands saved and to try to mitigate any further losses in this area;

Caroline Burkett - believes that the emphasis should be on compact urban form and doesn’t believe that the City should expand its sphere of influence;

Randy Abbott - wants to know why a change was made to the overlay zone for Bidwell Park;

Katrina Djberot - wants the Council to protect the Greenline;

Pamela Posey - doesn't support development in the Doe Mill area nor approves of the Schuster project;

Duke Warren - supports moving the Estes property into the special planning area;

Jim Stevens - supports the Estes property being included in the special planning area;

David Gallo - supports moving the Estes property into the special planning area;

Mike Pickering - wants the Council to protect the Greenline;

Quentin Colgan - believes that solar requirements should be mandated by the new General Plan and that a redesign of our railroad system should occur and be paid for by the RDA;
Lucia Pinotti - opposes the proposed move of the Estes property into the special planning area;

Mark Herrera - opposes moving the Greenline;

Ari Frankel - wants the Council to look for ways to encourage sustainability, with low interest loans or incentives that could offset the costs of the upgrades;

Bruce Balgooyen - opposes the Estes property moving to the special planning area resulting in a change in the Greenline;

Pete Peterson - opposes the developing of the Bell Muir area;

Thomas Wahl - is concerned about the 100 ft. setback, with Chico Creek having already been eroded and the City is not taking care of the issue, 5-Mile is not designed well, and that there should not be any development in the Butte Creek area;

Matthew Christopher - wants to keep the Greenline intact;

Jami Byers - wants the Council to develop a Hazard Mitigation Plan for the City;

Larry Jones - asks that the Council hold the Greenline in the Bell Muir area; and

Suzanne Morlock - wants Council to protect the Greenline and feels that if infill is allowed in the Bell Muir area, it will cause traffic, noise, and the need for law enforcement.

*The Council and Planning Commission recessed at 8:10 for a ten minute break. The meeting was reconvened and all members were present.*

Following public input and Council/Commission discussion, the Council and Planning Commission provided staff with ideas for changes which will be incorporated into the Plan and brought back for consideration at a future meeting.

*Noted for the record, Commissioner Merz left the meeting at 10:50 p.m.*

3. **BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

Timothy Brennan addressed the Council regarding his concerns for those suffering because of homelessness and encouraged Council to look at regulations that would allow those individuals to panhandle.

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourned at 11:00 p.m. to July 6, 2010 at 6:00 p.m., in Conference Room 2 if a closed session is scheduled, followed by a regular meeting in the Council Chamber at 6:30 p.m.
ADJOURNED REGULAR CHICO CITY COUNCIL MEETING — July 6, 2010
Minutes

1.1. CLOSED SESSION - 6:00 p.m.

1.2. REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING - 6:30 p.m.

1.3. Call to Order - Mayor Schwab called the July 6, 2010 - Regular City Council meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 421 Main Street

1.4. Flag Salute

1.5. Invocation — Pastor Reg Schultz-Akerson, Faith Lutheran Church

1.6. Roll Call

Present: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
Absent: None

1.7. Closed Session Announcement - None

1.8. Proclamation — Proclaimed July 26th as the 20th anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act

2. CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Walker and seconded by Nickell to approve the Consent Agenda, as read, with it noted that both Councilmember Flynn and Gruendl were disqualified from participating on Item 2.3, due to owning property within 500 feet of the project being discussed.

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
NOES: None

2.1. ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SUBMITTAL OF ANNUAL GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR THE CALRECYCLE USED OIL PAYMENT PROGRAM

Adopted - a resolution authorizing the submittal of annual applications for used oil recycling grants from CalRecycle. This resolution authorized the City Manager to apply for grants and execute the grant agreements each year until the resolution is rescinded by the City Council. Although the City's Budget Policies authorizes the City Manager to file applications for State funding assistance programs, CalRecycle required a City Council resolution. The General Services Director recommended adoption of the resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 31-10 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO AUTHORIZING THE SUBMITTAL OF GRANT APPLICATIONS TO CALRECYCLE FOR THE USED OIL PAYMENT PROGRAM

2.2. ADOPTION OF SEWER IN LIEU RESOLUTION - 11 SANTOS WAY
Adopted - a resolution authorizing sewer assessments to be collected on the tax roll, in lieu of full and immediate payment of the sewer system connection fees. The Building & Development Services Director recommended adoption of the resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 32-10 - A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO LEVYING ASSESSMENT INSTALLMENTS IN LIEU OF THE PAYMENT OF SEWER SYSTEM CONNECTION FEES INCIDENT TO THE CONNECTION OF PREMISES TO THE CITY SEWER SYSTEM - 11 SANTOS WAY / ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO. 006-230-031 (petition from property owners Howard L. and Yee Ying Fong)

2.3. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS REGARDING THE BARONI NEIGHBORHOOD PARK AND OPEN SPACE LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING DISTRICT NO. LLD 001-05 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010/2011

Adopted - resolutions to initiate proceedings and declare the Council's intent to levy and collect the annual assessments for the Baroni Neighborhood Park and Open Space Landscaping and Lighting District No. LLD 001-05 for the 2010/2011 fiscal year, and set a public hearing on 8/03/10 regarding this proposed assessment. The General Services Director recommended adoption of the resolutions.

Councilmember Flynn and Councilmember Gruendl disqualified themselves from this item due to residing within 500 feet of the item being discussion.


2.4. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS REGARDING THE HUSA RANCH/NOB HILL NEIGHBORHOOD PARK LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING DISTRICT NO. LLD 001-08 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010/2011

Adopted - resolutions to initiate proceedings and declare the Council's intent to levy and collect the annual assessments for the Husa Ranch/Nob Hill Neighborhood Park Landscaping and Lighting District No. LLD 001-08 for the 2010/2011 fiscal year, and set a public hearing on 8/03/10 regarding this proposed assessment. The General Services Director recommended adoption of the resolutions.


RESOLUTION NO. 36-10 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO PRELIMINARILY APPROVING THE ANNUAL ENGINEER'S REPORT, AND
2.5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Approved - minutes of the City Council meeting held on 6/15/10.

ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT - None

3. NOTICED PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

4. REGULAR AGENDA

4.1. BUDGET REVIEW - FINAL BUDGET ADOPTION - To consider Item 4.1., the City Council convened as both the City Council and the Chico Redevelopment Agency.

The City Council/Chico Redevelopment Agency was presented with the City Manager/Executive Director’s Final Budget Message, including an overview of recommended budget adjustments to the 2010-11 Proposed Budgets. (Report - Jennifer Hennessy, Finance Director and Dave Burkland, City Manager)

Stephanie Taber and Christine Fixico addressed the Council regarding adoption of the final budget.

A motion was made by Walker and seconded by Gruendl to approve the City of Chico 2010-11 Final Budget and the Chico Redevelopment Agency 2010-11 Final Budget by adoption of the following resolutions:


RESOLUTION NO. 05-10 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CHICO REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY ADOPTING THE 2010-11 FINAL BUDGET FOR THE CHICO REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY - Agency Action

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Walker, Schwab
NOES: Wahl

The Council recessed at 7:35 p.m. for a 15 minute break. The meeting was reconvened and all members were present.

4.2. CONSIDERATION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES AND POLICIES (AP&P) 10-1 AND 10-10

The Council Procedures Committee met on 3/15/10 and 3/29/10 in order to recommend ways to strengthen the Board and Commission Code of Conduct that governs all
appointees to the City's advisory bodies. In addition, the Committee also reviewed a proposed policy regarding usage of the internet by Councilmembers during a Council meeting as well as other general housekeeping items. (Report - Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk)

A motion was made by Flynn and seconded by Holcombe to approve the revisions to AP&P 10-1 and 10-10 as outlined in the staff report, including an additional amendment to strike the "one minute responses made by citizens when responding to Commissioner and Councilmembers questions".

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
NOES: None

A motion was made by Councilmember Wahl to direct that the Airport Commission minutes of 1/28/10 be amended as requested by Airport Commissioner Sanderson. The motion died for a lack of a second.

Councilmember Gruendl indicated that in the past several years, he has either watched or been in attendance at the Airport Commission meetings and that it is clear that one segment of the population is being overly represented at the Airport and that he wanted to remind the Airport Commission that the Airport belongs to the citizens of Chico.

Councilmember Gruendl also noted for the record that the Airport Commission should not be discussing this item again and that Commissioner Sanderson, deserves to hear a message that the Council, as the elected body, serves as the governing body of the City of Chico.

Mayor Schwab stated that she would take Councilmember Gruendl’s comments concerning Commissioner Sanderson as a complaint and will review it according to the newly approved complaint process and bring back a recommendation at a future meeting.

Councilmember Holcombe stated for the record that he also felt that the Airport Commission should not spend any time on a discussion of whether to request the City Council to amend the minutes.

4.3. CONSIDERATION OF INTRODUCTORY READING OF AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTERS 8.28, 9.30, 14.60 AND 14.70 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE (CMC) REGARDING OPERATION OF OUTDOOR CAFES WITHIN THE DOWNTOWN AREA

At its meeting of 5/18/10, the Council reviewed progress made toward developing an ordinance broadening opportunities for outdoor cafe seating. Staff was directed to return with CMC amendments implementing the sidewalk dining concept. (Report - Tom Varga, Capital Project Services Director)

Both Councilmember Wahl and Mayor Schwab disqualified themselves from participating in the discussion and subsequent decision due to Mayor Schwab owning a business and Councilmember Wahl for owning property in the downtown area. After disqualification, they both left the dias and the Chamber.

Addressing the Council regarding this item were:

Deborah Schowalter - opposed to Phase 1 because it only allowed a few businesses to participate which she felt was very discriminating against other businesses.
Cheryl King - in favor of the ordinance but felt that everyone should be able to participate in it not just select businesses.

Denise Bell-Corona - excited about the opportunities that the ordinance provides, if approved. However, she was concerned that all the businesses in the downtown area were not notified by the City when considering this change in regulations.

Staff indicated that they had worked with the DCBA to get the word out.

Ms. Schowalter stated that not all businesses are members of the DCBA and believed that it was the City’s responsibility to notify all those affected of potential regulations or land use changes in zoning.

Mike Trolinder- supported the ordinance but believes that outdoor seating should not be limited to a certain area, otherwise the zoning regulation is arbitrary and not applied equally. He also encouraged Council to include filters that would raise the bar on the dining experience such as a requirement that you must have table service in order to have outdoor seating.

Michael Thomas - urged Council to support the proposed ordinance. He also shared concerns about eliminating a possible “party” aspect to outside cafe seating and supports the City applying filters such as food to alcohol sales and possible hours of operation.

Council member Holcombe stated for the record that he didn’t understand why the City Council couldn’t wait until the completion of the General Plan process and/or the Downtown Element discussion prior to taking action on this item. He stated that moving forward at this stage prior to working out the details on how to implement the regulations is not consistent with how the City has approached other types of planning issues.

A motion was made by Gruendl and seconded by Walker to introduce the following ordinance by reading of its title only:


as amended by: (1) striking B1 and B2 on page 3 of 10; (2) striking lines 13 and 14 on page 3 of 10; (3) inserting “adjacent” on page 3 of 10, line 4 instead of “in front of”; (4) deleting references to “central business district” on lines 4 and 7 on page 8 of 10; (5) inserting “metered” on page 9 of 10, line 27 to further define the removal of parking spaces; and (6) directing staff to develop filters to aid in the application of the ordinance which will not conflict with other regulations currently in place.

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Walker
NOES: None
DISQ: Wahl, Schwab

The Council recessed at 9:35 p.m. for a ten minute break. The meeting was reconvened and all members were present.

4.4. CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS - STATE ROUTE 32 WIDENING PROJECT
The City Council considered the certification of the Environmental Impact Report and
approval of the project for the widening and improvement of approximately 2.6 miles of
State Route 32 between State Route 99 and Yosemite Drive. (Report - Tom Varga, Capital
Project Services Director)

Addressing the Council were Matt Brown, Elizabeth Garcia, Kirk Monfort, and Dick Maxwell.

A motion was made by Walker and seconded by Nickell to adopt the following resolutions: (1)
certification of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR); (2) adoption of a statement of overriding
considerations; (3) adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring program; and approval of the State Route
32 Widening Project.

RESOLUTION NO. 38-10 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
CHICO 1) CERTIFYING THE ADEQUACY OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR
THE STATE ROUTE 32 WIDENING PROJECT; 2) ADOPTING FINDINGS REGARDING
ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS; 3) ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING
CONSIDERATIONS; AND 4) ADOPTING A MITIGATION AND MONITORING PLAN

RESOLUTION NO. 39-10 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
CHICO APPROVING THE STATE ROUTE 32 WIDENING PROJECT, as amended to include in
paragraph "D" that the "Capital Projects Services Director may approve an increased sound wall
height not to exceed a total of 10 feet where elevation of the properties along where the sound
wall is to be placed lower than the average elevation of the neighboring properties."

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
NOES: None

4.5. ITEMS ADDED AFTER THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA - None

5. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Leslie Moore addressed the Council regarding her on-going issues with the Police Department
who she alleges is no longer taking her crime reports and her issues with the District Attorney's
Office as well. She asked Council to intervene on her behalf.

Quentin Colgan addressed the Council regarding the vacancy that will occur when
Councilmember Wahl is sworn in as a Butte County Supervisor.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 10:20 p.m. to July 24, 2010 at 8:30 a.m., in the City Council Chamber for a
joint meeting with the Planning Commission. Please note, the July 20, 2010 City Council
meeting has been cancelled.

Date Approved:

Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk
ADJOURNED REGULAR CHICO CITY COUNCIL MEETING — July 6, 2010
CLOSED SESSION
Chico Municipal Center, Conference Room #2, 421 Main Street

1. CALL TO ORDER

1.1. Roll Call

Present: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
Absent: None

1.2. Staff Present: City Manager Burkland, City Attorney Barker, Assistant City Manager Rucker, City Clerk Presson, Assistant City Attorney Wilson

2. CLOSED SESSION MATTERS

2.1. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL — EXISTING LITIGATION:

The City Attorney reviewed the following: Danford A. Jay and Sandra R. Jay, individually and as trustees of the Jay Family Trust v. City of Chico, et al., Butte County Superior Court Case 145202, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Government Code section 54956.9.

3. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 6:25 p.m. to a City Council meeting in the Council Chamber.

Date Approved:

Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk
ADJOURNED REGULAR CHICO CITY COUNCIL MEETING — July 24, 2010
Minutes

1.1. JOINT CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING - 8:30 a.m.

1.2. Call to Order - Mayor Schwab call the July 24, 2010 - Adjourned Regular Joint Council and Planning Commission meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. in the Council Chamber, 421 Main Street.

1.3. Flag Salute

1.4. Roll Call

Present: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
Absent: None

Planning Commission

Present: Barrett, Luvaas, Merz, Sorensen, Kelley
Absent: Brownell, Minasian

1.5. Proclamation - Congratulating Eri Yoshida for outstanding achievements in professional baseball

The City Council took action on the following item prior to the Joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting:

1.6. CONSENT AGENDA ITEM - ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SUBMITTAL OF APPLICATIONS TO CALRECYCLE FOR THE USED OIL PAYMENT PROGRAM

Adopted - a revised resolution authorizing the City Manager to submit applications to CalRecycle for the Used Oil Payment Program. This resolution was previously approved by the Council on 7/06/10, but CalRecycle required that the title of the resolution be revised to omit the word "Grant" before "Applications." All other language in the resolution remains the same. The General Services Director recommended adoption of the resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 40-10 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO AUTHORIZING THE SUBMITTAL OF APPLICATIONS TO CALRECYCLE FOR THE USED OIL PAYMENT PROGRAM

A motion was made by Walker and seconded by Nickell to approve the Consent Agenda, as read.

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
NOES: None

2. REGULAR AGENDA
2.1. CHICO 2030 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE - ELEMENT REVIEW

At this meeting the City Council and Planning Commission reviewed the Circulation Element of the draft 2030 General Plan. Due to the amount of time spent on the Circulation Element, the Downtown, and Economic Development Elements will be heard at a future meeting. This meeting was the third in a series of five joint Council/Commission meetings on the draft 2030 General Plan.

Staff provided an overview of key Circulation topics and summarized public feedback received on this element. Members of the community were given an opportunity to provide input, and the Council and Commission provided direction on suggested modifications and/or additions. Council direction and public input at this stage continue to help refine and improve the Plan as it moves toward final adoption in 2011. (Report - Brendan Vieg, Principal Planner)

Staff provided an overview of the Circulation Element which described transportation systems in Chico and provides a policy framework to guide development of the City’s circulation system, including roadways, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities and services.

Following the staff presentation and Council/Commission questions, the meeting was recessed at 10:10 for a 15 minute break. The meeting was reconvened and all members were present.

Addressing the Council were:

Donna Cook - questioned street designations, expressed concern about bicycle safety, and asked that speed limits be included in the General Plan.

Maureen Kirk - opposed to the West Park Avenue Extension and encouraged the Council to allow the fencing to come down around Comanche Creek in order for people to enjoy the area.

Sheldon Praizer - opposed to the West Park Avenue Extension especially since true costs associated with the project have not yet been identified.

Emily Alma - opposed to any project happening near Comanche Creek.

Christine Nelson - concerned about Diamond Match and the potential development that could occur. Felt that there should not be any residential in that area due to the contaminants in that area.

Debbie Villasenor - opposed to the West Park Avenue Extension. Encouraged Council to be good stewards and protect the animals in the riparian areas that can’t be here at the meeting to speak for themselves.

Mark Stemen - opposed to the circulation plan because it does not address the greenhouse gases reduction and questioned staff regarding the number of new Class 1 bike lanes.

Quentin Colgan - concerned about the proposed changes to Hicks Lane.

Bill Brouhard - spoke in support of including options in the General plan concerning the West Park Avenue Extension.

Pamela Posey - concerned with sprawl, the overall growth rate of the City, and the fact that all the proposed connectors cross creeks.
Grace Marvin - opposed to the West Park Avenue Extension, asked that the Council require that infill plans, financial considerations, and the Climate Action Plan are all considered prior to approving any new roads being built. She also noted she was opposed to urban sprawl.

Michael Pike - provided the Council and Commission with an overview regarding the Otterson Drive referendum process and expressed his disapproval of now inserting the West Park Avenue Extension into the General Plan when it was clear that the majority of people did not support it when it went to the vote of the people ten years ago. He also questioned staff's traffic count numbers that were used to support the need for the West Park Avenue Extension.

Ken Fleming - informed the Council and Commission that through his research he had found that there were two planning approaches used with the first one having everyone do their homework first and then develop supporting documents to implement. The other way, which is what he believed has been done with our proposed General Plan, is to write a plan that is so vague that it opens up as many discussions as possible at future meetings. He does not support maintaining flexibility in the proposed 2030 General Plan that if approved, will allow standards to be adapted to project needs. He also stated that he is not sure that it is the City of Chico that needs to accommodate future growth in this County.

Matt Galloway - spoke in support of the proposed West Park Avenue Extension and how it would provide assistance with the businesses located in that area and aid in future economic growth. He expressed support for keeping a broad view when looking at the Meyers area and the need for additional circulation. He felt that with the additional circulation, infill projects could be completed.

Jeff Collins - expressed support for the proposed West Park Extension. Doesn't really support staff’s recommendation for the 500 feet at the Midway. He asked that a time line be included in the General Plan for the installation of that extension. He also believed that a Master Plan should be developed for that area so that people can use the area that is currently fenced off.

Brahama D. Sharma - hoped that this 20-year plan would bring about an efficient and improved mass transportation.

Steven Schuman - wanted to share with the Council a quote that said "Do what we can with what we've got." He expressed his thanks to staff and the members of neighborhoods who have assisted with the neighborhood plans. He requested that Council direct the Creekside group to now move forward developing plans for the passive use of the creek in the Otterson Drive area. He also encouraged the Council to bring back the idea of the trolley which he believed would help reduce greenhouse gases and mitigate some of the traffic on Hegan Lane. He also encouraged the Council and Commission to stop treating our soil like dirt and expressed his opposition of a punch through to Ivy Street from the industrial area.

Linda Hamilton - wanted to share with the Council and Commission information about the LEED pilot program which does include some ideas on LEED building. One of the main principals is to not develop on undeveloped lands. It also promotes native plants and resources and encourages alternative transportation. She believed that the new General Plan should keep the door open to the LEED form of building.

Linda Huffman - concerned about the wording pertaining to punching through Ivy Street to the industrial area. If Ivy Street is punched through then it should be included in the normal traffic grid. Don't let the traffic from the Industrial area back up into the residential area.

Richard Harriman - strongly supported the comments from Mark Stemen and Ken Fleming regarding the greenhouse gases issue. He believed that the proposed General Plan needed to
be more focused and that Council should direct staff to trim it down to a 20-year plan versus a 50-year plan which he believed was what staff had presented. The proposed plan looks like a San Jose plan and based on that, he believed that the scope of the environmental review will have to be extensive.

Janet Eilner - stated that she is a current member of the committee dealing with creekside issues and that the committee is not in favor of a bridge being built over Comanche Creek but instead is totally in favor of the area being preserved and enhanced which should include bicycle circulation.

Alan Gair - stated that it is clear that the economy doesn't look good right now and that something different is needed. He indicated that growth in this community is driven by the developers and the propaganda that indicates it is necessary for economical development is inaccurate. He stated that retail business is doing fine in Chico and it is a myth that growth will bring in additional businesses which will help stimulate our economy. He felt that the City should be focusing on the existing businesses already here. He suggested that the Council should dump the proposed General Plan and instead develop priorities that would then help determine a list of projects to be completed.

Robin Huffman - agreed with Mr. Gair's comments. She added that it was time to stop building in and around creeks and was very concerned about the estimated 2% growth rate. She asked that "vacancy" rates be incorporated into the General Plan as well as priorities.

Karen Laslo - asked about the funding source for the proposed West Park Avenue Extension and assumed that it would be public money. She felt that part of the problem in that business area is that the businesses skipped out on the landscaping. She suggested that funds be used to "green" up Hegan Lane landscaping and turn Comanche Creek into a lovely park including a foot bridge. A nice park would increase the value of the businesses out there instead of building a bigger road and bridge. They need to fix up their landscaping in order to attract green companies.

Melinda Vasquez - felt that a bridge and new roadway in the Otterson Drive area does not support the General Plans intent to protect greenways. The City should instead be looking for ways to be better stewards of the creeks and greenways and oppose the West Park Avenue extension.

Bob Linschied - spoke in support of the circulation element as it is needed in order to assist with economic development. He believes equity, environmental concerns and economic concerns should all be treated equally for the common good. He applauded staff and Council on the continuing efforts to address all issues in this plan which he recognized as a tremendous balancing act.

The Council and Commission recessed for a thirty minute lunch at 12:05 p.m. The meeting reconvened and all members of both the City Council and Planning Commission were present.

The Council and Commission discussed the schedule for the remaining items on the agenda pertaining to Economic Development and the Downtown Element.

Addressing the Council in support of taking the public testimony regarding Economic Development and the Downtown Element at this meeting were Richard Harriman, Bill Brouhard, and Mark Stemen.

The Council and Commission agreed to finish the Circulation Element at this meeting and to meet again on Tuesday, August 17, 2010 to discuss the remaining items. It was noted by the
Council that the August 17, 2010 meeting would have a 10:00 p.m. ending time.

The Council and Commission recessed for a two-minute break in order to return order to the meeting.

The Council and Commission members provided staff with general direction, suggestions, and additions regarding the Circulation Element, with specific direction regarding the Eaton Road Extension to State Route (SR) 32, West Park Avenue Extension, and the Southgate Avenue Extension to Midway, as noted by the following straw votes:

A motion was made by Councilmember Walker that a straw vote be taken on including the West Park Avenue Extension in the draft General Plan as a future potential connection to the Hegan Lane Business Park. Councilmember Flynn seconded the motion. The straw vote carried 4-3, with Gruendl, Holcombe and Nickell opposed.

A motion was made by Councilmember Holcombe to retain the Eaton Road Exchange in the 2030 General Plan which he supports as a connectivity route, with benefits to economic development, but with direction that it shouldn’t be growth inducing nor provide any access points beyond the Greenline, with inclusion of mitigations for any residential growth along the roadway. The motion was seconded by Vice Mayor Nickell. The motion carried by a 7-0 vote.

Councilmember Holcombe moved that the Southgate Avenue Extension be included in the draft 2030 General Plan. The motion was seconded by Vice Mayor Nickell and carried with a 7-0 vote.

The Commission and Council also discussed the Hicks Lane 99 Route which staff indicated was being included to reflect the need to address the circulation in that area at some point in the future. Staff also noted that this item is also included in the County’s General Plan as well. Staff recommended that this item be left in as a potential connection but it was noted that it could fall off the list.

Councilmember Gruendl noted that since the plan would be coming back for final discussion with the possibility of this item falling off the list, he suggested that it be left in for now and discussed when the plan comes back. Council concurred.

2.2. ITEMS ADDED AFTER THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA - None

3. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Jane Oliver - thanked the Council for its efforts in developing a comprehensive plan. She gave each Councilmember a copy of a book titled *Climatism* by Steve Goreham that reviews the current climate crisis.

Grace Marvin - asked about the Holly Warner connector route for a bicycle route and encouraged Council to consider that possibility.

Mark Stemen - Stated that he never got an answer on how all these people, all of this growth, all of these roads, and all of this traffic can reduce greenhouse gases.

Chris Nelson - wanted to remind Council that with the West Park Avenue Extension, you are only shaving off an additional couple hundred of feet of roadway with a severe impact to Comanche Creek. She also stated that the Council and City were terrible stewards of that land based on what she had seen when she walked the area.
Michael Pike - concerned about safety issues out at Hegan Lane and asked if a study could be conducted regarding emergency responses.

Michael Jensen - concerned about sustainability and would support a bike factory being located in Chico.

4. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 2:30 p.m. to August 3, 2010 at 6:00 p.m., in Conference Room 2 if a closed session is scheduled, followed by a regular meeting in the Council Chamber at 6:30 p.m.

Date Approved:

Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk
1.1. CLOSED SESSION - 6:00 p.m.

1.2. REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING - 6:30 p.m.

1.3. Call to Order - Mayor Schwab called the August 3, 2010 - Regular Council meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 421 Main Street.

1.4. Flag Salute

1.5. Invocation — Reverend David S. Valtellunga, Trinity United Methodist Church

1.6. Roll Call

Present: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
Absent: Nickell

1.7. Closed Session Announcement - None

2. CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Walker and seconded by Holcombe to approve the Consent Agenda, as read, with it noted that Councilmember Wahl and Mayor Schwab were disqualified on Item 2.2.

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
NOES: None
ABSENT: Nickell

2.1. ORDINANCE NO. 2408 - A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO AMENDING SECTION 3.85.135 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING THE TEMPORARY DEFERRAL OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES - Final Reading and Adoption

Adopted - an ordinance amending Section 3.85.135 of the Chico Municipal Code to add a two-year extension to the timeline and some additional minor changes to the temporary deferral of development impact fees. The Council introduced the ordinance at its meeting of 6/15/10. The Building and Development Services Director recommended adoption of the ordinance by reading of its title only.

2.2. ORDINANCE NO. 2409 - AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO AMENDING CHAPTERS 8.28, 9.30, 14.60 AND 14.70 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING OPERATION OF OUTDOOR CAFÉS - Final Reading and Adoption

Adopted - an ordinance broadening opportunities for outdoor café seating and implementing the sidewalk dining concept. The ordinance was introduced by the Council at its meeting of 7/06/10.

Adopted - a fee schedule resolution to implement the provisions set forth in the
ordinance.

The Capital Project Services Director recommended adoption of the ordinance by reading of its title only and adoption of the resolution.

Councilmember Wahl was disqualified on this item due to owning property within the area being discussed and Mayor Schwab was disqualified due to owning a business in the downtown area.

RESOLUTION NO. 41-10 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO AMENDING THE CITY'S FEE SCHEDULE (AMENDMENT NO. 323 - PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY CAFE LICENSE FEES)

2.3. ACCEPTANCE OF COST REPORT FOR THE 2010 WEEDE ABATEMENT AND LOT CLEARING PROGRAM

Accepted - the cost report for the 2010 Weed Abatement and Lot Clearing program. At its 5/04/10 meeting, the Council adopted Resolution No. 20-10 which required the Housing and Neighborhood Services Department to abate those properties not in compliance with the requirement to abate weeds as of 6/01/10, and to keep an account of the work done by the City contractor to submit to the Council for confirmation. Following the acceptance of the cost report, the owners of the parcels will be given 30 days to pay for the cost of the abatement, otherwise a lien will be placed on their property. The Code Enforcement Supervisor recommended acceptance of the cost report.

2.4. ACCEPTANCE OF ANNUAL REPORT ON THE DISPOSITION OF UNCLAIMED PROPERTY AND BICYCLE DONATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009-10

Accepted - the annual report for Fiscal Year 2009-10 showing the disposition of all lost, stolen or unclaimed property during the preceding fiscal year as required by Section 3.28.130 of the Chico Municipal Code. The Finance Director recommended acceptance of the report.

ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT - None

3. NOTICED PUBLIC HEARINGS

3.1. CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 2.56 AND TITLE 19 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING HISTORIC PRESERVATION

At its meeting of 7/01/10, the Planning Commission voted (6-1, Sorensen opposed) to forward a recommendation to the Council to adopt a historic preservation ordinance. A comprehensive Historic Preservation Program was identified on the Planning Commission's Council adopted 2009/10 Work Plan as a Planning Staff Work Priority. Two primary components of the Program are the adoption of an historic preservation ordinance and the establishment of an historic preservation board. The subject ordinance would accomplish both tasks by amending Chapter 2.56 to create an Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board and by adding Chapter 19.37 Historic Preservation to the Chico Municipal Code. (Report - Bob Summerville, Senior Planner)

Mayor Schwab opened the hearing to the public.
Addressing the Council in support of the proposed ordinance were Richard Macias, John Gallardo, Mike Magliari, John Whitehead, Valene Smith-Posey, Lucy Sperlin, David Wilkinson, Pam Figge, Peter Tichinin, Hilary Herman, Paul Lieberum, Lee Laney, Irv Schiffman, Linda Furr, Mark Stemen, Michael Reilley, and Adam Fedeli.

Speaking in opposition were Richard Bame, Bob Kromer, Evelyn Smith, Gene McFerren, Carl Nelson, Arthur Lemner, Doug Imhoff, W. H. Priel, and Frank Riley.

Mayor Schwab closed the hearing to further public input.

The Council recessed at 8:00 p.m. for a 15 minute break. The meeting was reconvened and all members were present.

A motion was made by Schwab and seconded by Holcombe to introduce an ordinance amending Chapter 2.56 and Title 19 of the Chico Municipal Code regarding historic preservation by reading of the title only:

ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO AMENDING CHAPTER 2.56 AND TITLE 19 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING HISTORIC PRESERVATION - Introductory Reading

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
NOES: Wahl
ABSENT: Nickell

Councilmember Wahl asked for a friendly amendment that would allow all affected property owners to be notified and if desired, opt out of the program. The amendment was not accepted.

3.2. HEARING ORDERING FORMATION OF MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. A05 - MOUNTAIN VISTA/SYCAMORE GLEN SUBDIVISIONS

A condition of approval of the Mountain Vista/Sycamore Glen Subdivisions required the establishment of a means for funding the future replacement, annual operation, and maintenance costs for landscape and irrigation features, bicycle/pedestrian pathways, service accessways, fencing, a treatment basin, and an open space preserve area. (Report - Fritz McKinley, Building & Development Services Director)

Mayor Schwab opened the hearing to the public. No one spoke and the hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Flynn and seconded by Walker to adopt the following resolution:

RESOLUTION NO. 42-10 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO ORDERING FORMATION OF A MAINTENANCE ASSESSMENT DISTRICT AND APPROVING A DECLARATION OF CONDITIONS, COVENANTS, AND RESTRICTIONS RELATING THERE TO - CITY OF CHICO MAINTENANCE ASSESSMENT DISTRICT NO. A05 - MOUNTAIN VISTA/SYCAMORE GLEN SUBDIVISIONS

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
### 3.3. HEARING TO CONSIDER THE FINAL ANNUAL ENGINEER’S REPORT AND THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF THE 2010-11 ASSESSMENTS FOR THE BARONI NEIGHBORHOOD PARK AND OPEN SPACE LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING DISTRICT NO. LLD 001-05

On 7/06/10, the Council adopted resolutions approving the preliminary Annual Engineer's Report (Report) and declaring its intention to levy and collect the annual assessments for the Baroni Neighborhood Park and Open Space Landscape and Lighting District No. LLD 001-05 for the 2010-11 fiscal year. The Council also scheduled a public hearing to consider approval of the final Report and the proposed levy for this meeting. (Report - Ruben Martinez, General Services Director)

Both Councilmember Flynn and Gruendl were disqualified from participating in the discussion and subsequent action due to owning a home within 500 feet of the subject property. After disqualification, they both left the dias and the Chamber.

The Mayor opened the hearing to the public. No one spoke and the hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Walker and seconded by Holcombe to adopt the following resolution:


The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Holcombe, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
NOES: None
ABSENT: Nickell
DISQ: Flynn, Gruendl

### 3.4. HEARING TO CONSIDER THE FINAL ANNUAL ENGINEER’S REPORT AND THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF THE 2010-11 ASSESSMENTS FOR THE HUSA RANCH/NOB HILL NEIGHBORHOOD PARK LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING DISTRICT NO. LLD 001-08

On 7/06/10, the Council adopted resolutions approving the preliminary Annual Engineer's Report (Report) and declaring its intention to levy and collect the annual assessments for the Husa Ranch/Nob Hill Neighborhood Park Landscape and Lighting District No. LLD 001-08 for the 2010-11 fiscal year. The Council also scheduled a public hearing to consider approval of the final Report and the proposed levy for this meeting. (Report - Ruben Martinez, General Services Director)

The Mayor opened the hearing to the public. No one spoke and the hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Walker and seconded by Holcombe to adopt the following resolution:

NEIGHBORHOOD PARK LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING DISTRICT NO. LLD 001-08 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010-11

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
NOES: None
ABSENT: Nickell

4. REGULAR AGENDA

4.1. CONSIDERATION OF THE ANNUAL REVIEW OF PARAGLIDING IN BIDWELL PARK

On 6/02/09, the City Council approved (6-1, Schwab opposed) the Bidwell Park and Playground Commission's recommendation to amend the Chico Municipal Code to allow paragliding in Bidwell Park. Hang-gliding and motorized paragliding are still prohibited in the park. The Council also directed staff to conduct a one-year review of paragliding activities and to report back to the Council as a regular item. (Report - Linda Herman, General Services Administrative Manager)

The Council thanked staff for the report and asked that it be provided one more time in August of 2011.

4.2. ITEMS ADDED AFTER THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA - None

5. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Geoff Kerber addressed his concerns over the short course disc golf plans for Hancock Park. He spoke in opposition to the action of CARD to place a course at this park which was set up for passive use only.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 9:18 p.m. to August 17, 2010 at 6:00 p.m., in the City Council Chamber for a joint meeting with the Planning Commission.

Date Approved:

Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk
1. CALL TO ORDER - Mayor Schwab called the August 3, 2010 - Adjourned Regular Chico City Council meeting to order in the Chico Municipal Center, Conference Room #2, 421 Main Street at 6:00 p.m.

1.1. Roll Call

Present: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
Absent: Nickell

1.2. Staff Present

City Manager Burkland, City Attorney Barker, Assistant City Manager Rucker, Human Resources Director Campbell, City Clerk Presson, Finance Director Hennessey

2. CLOSED SESSION MATTERS

2.1. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR

(Gov. Code Sec. 54957,6.)

Negotiator: Dave Burkland, City Manager and Teresa Campbell, Director of Human Resources

Employee Organizations: Management Employees, Confidential Employees, Public Safety Management Employees, Chico Police Officers' Association, Chico Public Safety Association, International Association of Firefighters, Service Employees International Union (Trades and Crafts Unit and Clerical, Technical and Professional Unit).

3. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 6:25 p.m. to a City Council meeting in the Council Chamber.

Date Approved:

Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk
ADJOINED REGULAR CHICO CITY COUNCIL MEETING — August 17, 2010
Minutes

1.1. JOINT CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING - 6:00 p.m.

1.2. Call to Order - Mayor Schwab called the August 17, 2010 - Adjourned Regular Chico City Council Meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 421 Main Street.

1.3. Flag Salute

1.4. Roll Call

Present: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
Absent: None

Planning Commission

Present: Barrett, Brownell, Luvaas, Merz, Minasian, Sorensen, Kelly
Absent: None

2. REGULAR AGENDA

2.1. CHICO 2030 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE - ELEMENT REVIEW

At this meeting the City Council and Planning Commission reviewed the Downtown, Economic Development, and Community Design Elements of the draft 2030 General Plan. Staff provided an overview of key topics and summarized public feedback received on the three elements. Members of the community were given an opportunity to provide input, and the Council and Commission provided direction on suggested modifications or additions. Council direction and public input at this stage continues to help refine and improve the Plan as it moves toward final adoption in 2011. (Report - Brendan Vieg, Principal Planner)

Downtown Element

Staff provided an overview of the Downtown Element which is a new, optional General Plan element. This element provides goals and policies to guide development and redevelopment of the Downtown area. To support the creation of this element, the City Council established a Downtown Ad Hoc Committee (DAHC). The project team has met with the DAHC eight times and led the group on a tour of two Northern California downtown districts in order to experience and understand the advantages and disadvantages of different development types. In addition, a public workshop was held in March 2008 to clarify the community’s vision for Downtown.

Addressing the Council regarding the Downtown Element were:

Alan Gair - urged Council to stay up to date on the changes happening to the economy and to be conservative with any planning because the economy may not recover as predicted. He also felt that any future efforts should be focused on existing businesses.

Grace Marvin - stated that the Downtown Element provides a wonderful overview of Chico’s Downtown, that she supported a stronger definition in order to cover sustainability issues, and urged Council to ensure that no “big box” retailers will be allowed to build on the fringes of the Downtown area resulting in more blight.
Mike Trolinder - Believed that retail is healthy in the Downtown area with the critical issue being how to get people to this area. Policy makers should be putting something in place to help make that better such as ensuring that street configurations work well, signage regulations are flexible and Title 19 is drafted in such a manner that supports businesses. He noted that these tools can be put into place now and shouldn’t have to wait for the implementation of the new General Plan.

Robin Huffman - felt that the Element excludes skateboarders and long boards which should be referenced in the General Plan as another mode of transportation with enforcement being lifted. She asked why the location of a future parking structure was left off the map and indicated that priorities are important and should be included in the Plan. She also stated that sprawl will have an effect on Redevelopment projects.

Jolene Francis - addressed the Council and Commission regarding 2.1. in the Element and stated that while the Chamber of Commerce and CEPCO are favorable to the overall element, asked that Council keep 'mixed use' in the Downtown area as an "encouraged" use versus a "mandated" use and to ensure that "encourage" doesn’t morph into something else later on.

Stephanie Taber - asked for clarification regarding the allowance of pharmacies or grocery stores with high traffic to be approved without a use permit.

Yvonne Gailey - stated she was encouraged about the Downtown Element but concerned about the overall General Plan policies proposed for the Downtown area, as well as any retail sprawl that might be approved later that could impact the Downtown businesses.

Bob Kromer - stated that multiple surveys have indicated that mixed use is not desired by the people for the Downtown area and in addition may be difficult to finance.

Tom Digiovanni - believed that the City should be cautious with requiring mixed use. He felt that the City should encourage it and not make it mandatory. However, he did take exception to the statement that "mixed use" is not needed because he believes there is a demand for this type of a project.

Members of the Council and Commission provided direction to staff regarding the request for a Downtown Working Group and the Downtown Vision Illustration. Council and Commission direction and public input at this stage will help to refine and improve the Plan as it moves toward final adoption in 2011.

The Council and Planning Commission recessed for a ten minute break at 7:25 p.m. The meeting was reconvened and all members were present.

Community Design Element

Staff provided an overview of the Community Design Element which is an optional element of the General Plan that provides direction on the pattern, form, structure, visual quality and character of the physical elements and spaces that shape Chico. Staff discussed the qualitative language such as "context sensitive," "sense of place," and "timeless architecture" which are common in the design field. To lend further predictability to the review process, the project team will incorporate definitions or clarifications for qualitative language in the Community Design Element. It was noted that this element is intended to identify community values related to design that are defined in more detail in the City Municipal Code and Design Guidelines Manual and implemented through discretionary project review.
Members of the Council and Commission provided staff with their comments which will be incorporated into the final draft which will be brought back for final review and approval.

Addressing the Council and Planning Commission were:

Bill Brouhard - supported the inclusion of police urban or crime prevention design guidelines that should be part of a large project. He believed that this concept should be taken into consideration with all the other factors such as lighting and other safety measures. It makes sense to do but shouldn't become a mandate. He also stated that the "grid" system as referenced in C.2.1 is getting confused with connectivity which is the overall objective. In regards to "viewshed" which he believes is an important issue, he felt that it should be taken into consideration that there will be some bare spots until you have mature landscaping.

Mark Stemen - referenced the picture of the solar panels and encouraged staff to include additional pictures that reflect sustainability efforts such as bio swales. He thought that the Community Design Element should include additional references to sustainability design.

Greg Melton - noted for the Council and Commission members that the qualitative terms and comments mentioned earlier as part of the Design Guidelines are standard terms and with the added definitions on applicability, outside builders will be able to use these guidelines in developing a good project for Chico.

Mike Trolinder - believed that Design Guidelines work has been left undone. The guidelines should be rewritten so that they are right. Title 19 and the Design Guidelines do not support development because the current regulations are not flexible or workable. He urged Council to consider what are Design Guidelines and where they really need to go.

Debbie Villasenor - urged Council to support the inclusion of the neighborhood plans in the General Plan.

Bob Kromer - stated that when you talk about viewshed, you have look at what it is going to look like in 20 years. He also suggested that perhaps the City look at leasing "art pieces" instead of buying them. The leases could be for 24 months and then changed out.

Karen Laslo - spoke in favor of the "Gateway" goal although she didn't understand why South Park Avenue wasn't included. She was also concerned that the trees and shrubs are not being watered in that area.

The Council and Planning Commission took a 10 minute break at 8:40 p.m. The meeting was reconvened and all members were present.

**Economic Development Element**

Staff provided an overview of the Economic Development Element which guides the City's use of resources to protect and improve Chico's economic vitality.

Addressing the Council regarding the Economic Development Element were:

Grace Marvin - agreed with Commissioner Luvaas regarding the lack of sustainability policies in this element. She also stated she was opposed to economic development that would add more sprawl which ultimately impacts sustainability issues.

Robin Huffman - felt that an economic development "sustainability" definition is needed with
Prosperity set as a goal. She also believed that the emphasis should be placed on existing businesses.

Stephanie Taber didn’t understand why the Economic Development Strategy was not included as an attachment to the proposed element. She stated that retail is important and the City can’t ignore the need for Chico to be a retail hub.

Mark Herrera urged the Council to emphasize the need to keep economic development local. Chicoans should be selling to Chicoans.

Mark Stemen stressed that sustainability is supposed to be referenced throughout the entire Draft General Plan and felt that there wasn’t enough representation included.

David Gallo commented that retail growth is supported by demand.

Jolene Francis spoke on Policy 1.1.3 requiring the decision to be measured against the economic development strategy and asked why it isn’t mentioned in the Sustainability Element. The City should create an outreach program and there should be an additional policy statement that states that the City will fast track projects for economical reasons by having the project considered at a joint Planning Commission and Council meeting.

Bob Kromer questioned the implementation of this element with the timing of goals and action plans. He stressed the need to grow a base of economic activities with measured progress. He also believed that details on implementation should be included in the General Plan. He also believed that the vision should be more realistic and include a marketing strategy.

Paul Friedlander encouraged the marketing of "local selling to local" which would ensure that the City focus on our economic developments instead of on the process.

Kirk Monfort isn’t giving up on retail but felt that it shouldn’t be the focus of this element. Growing local businesses shouldn’t be passed over for trying to locate or attract other businesses and jobs.

Mike Trolinder believed that the rents in the Downtown area should be addressed and that lower rents become available from having more retail sales, which make for better businesses. He urged Council to also include the streets and how to access the Downtown area in this element.

The Council and Commission provided input to staff regarding changes for the Economic Development Element. Some of the areas of discussion covered the inclusion of the Economic Development Strategy, a policy statement regarding locally located businesses, retail emphasis, and policies pertaining to the Airport. Staff will incorporate the changes as requested into the final Draft General Plan for final review and approval.

3. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Chris Nelson addressed the Council regarding her concerns about the Estes Triangle and asked when the environmental review will be completed. She wanted to know when the annexation is coming forward so that people can oppose it.

4. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 10:45 p.m. to August 21, 2010 at 8:30 a.m., in the City Council Chamber for a joint meeting with the Planning Commission.
Date Approved:

Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk
ADJOURNED REGULAR CHICO CITY COUNCIL MEETING — August 21, 2010
Minutes

1.1. JOINT CITY COUNCIL/PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING - 8:30 a.m.

1.2. Call to Order - Mayor Schwab called the August 21, 2010 - Adjourned Regular Joint City Council and Planning Commission meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. in the Council Chamber, 421 Main Street.

1.3. Flag Salute

1.4. Roll Call

Present: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
Absent: None

Planning Commission

Present: Barrett, Brownell, Luvaas, Merz, Minasian, Sorensen, Kelly
Absent: None

1.5. Proclamation - Proclaimed September 19, 2010 as "Responsible Dog Ownership Day"

2. REGULAR AGENDA

2.1. CHICO 2030 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE - ELEMENT AND PUBLIC FACILITIES ASSESSMENT REVIEW

At this meeting the City Council and Planning Commission reviewed and discussed the Parks, Public Facilities and Services Element of the draft 2030 General Plan and the draft Public Facilities Assessment (PFA). The PFA describes and assesses the feasibility of financing capital facilities needed to support build-out of the General Plan Land Use Diagram. Staff provided an overview of key topics and summarized public feedback received on the Parks, Public Facilities and Services Element and the draft PFA. Members of the community were provided an opportunity to provide input, and the Council and Commission provided direction on suggested modifications or additions. Council direction and public input at this stage continues to refine and improve the General Plan as it moves forward final adoption in 2011. (Report - Brendan Vieg, Principal Planner)

Staff provided an overview of the staff report pertaining to the Parks, Public Facilities, and Services (PPFS) Element. This element is intended to address the community's needs and interests for its parks of all sizes as well as its public facilities and services, such as infrastructure, schools, sewer and wastewater systems, and community services.

City of Chico/CARD Relationship

The City and the Chico Area Recreation and Park District (CARD) have a new relationship with realigned roles and responsibilities that streamline the provision of parks and recreational services to the City and surrounding community. While CARD’s service area extends well beyond the boundaries of the City, the majority of CARD’s service area population is located in the City. Through the new arrangement, the City will retain ownership and maintenance responsibility for Bidwell Park, the Park Plaza, Children’s Park, creekside greenways and City-
owned preserves, while CARD will assume ownership and operation of the various other
developed parks and recreation systems in the City. It was noted by staff that the draft 2030
General Plan directs the City to use the CARD Master Plan standards for neighborhood and
community parks due to the new partnership between the City and CARD, resulting in a call for
a greater park acreage to resident ratio than the City’s 1994 General Plan standards.

Additional discussion was held regarding the actions in the draft PPFS Element which are listed
below:

**New Park Development Fees in Support of CARD Master Plan** - which would require City
Council adoption of park fees initiated by CARD and is a separate action from the General Plan
adoption.

**CARD Participation in City Projects Review** - engages CARD staff as part of early project review
for Special Planning Areas and larger subdivision proposals in order to integrate parks into
projects at the planning stage.

**Community Partnerships** - City staff will work with CUSD, CSU, Chico, Butte College, and
CARD to coordinate the joint use of school facilities for community parks and recreation.

**Pursuit of Funding Sources** - Pursue local, state, federal, and other funds for the development
of parks and recreation facilities.

Other items discussed included water reuse systems and compost services.

The Council and Commission recessed for a 15 minute break at 9:50 a.m. The meeting was
reconvened and all members were present.

**Public Facilities Assessment (PFA)**

The PFA evaluates the feasibility of the draft General Plan from a municipal facilities
perspective. It projects future demand for parks, streets, sewer and drainage infrastructure, and
other physical improvements needed to support build-out of the Plan’s Land Use Diagram. It
then estimates the costs of these facilities and identifies potential funding sources. The basic
question addressed by the PFA is whether or not it is reasonable to expect that funding for
these various improvements will be available as growth occurs. Staff indicated that the answer
provided by the report indicates “yes.”

Staff noted that the PFA is not a 20-year Capital Improvement Plan nor does it commit the City
to any certain course of action with regard to future City projects or particular funding
mechanisms. The list of facilities will change over time, and the range of funding alternatives
will evolve as the General Plan is implemented. The PFA is an informational document and
does not require adoption or any specific endorsement by the Council. The PFA will, however,
provide background information for the upcoming Nexus Study Update, which will serve as a
basis for adoption of updated impact fees, a major source of funding for capital facilities. The
PFA will also aid in development of future 5-year Capital Improvement Plans because it is
expected that many of the projects identified in the PFA will eventually be incorporated into a
CIP.

**Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA)**

Staff provided an overview and purpose of the Fiscal Impact Analysis which evaluates the
feasibility of the draft General Plan from a municipal cost standpoint as indicated by General
Fund conditions. The FIA estimates revenue from new development which will contribute to the
Mayor Schwab opened up the discussion to the public. Addressing the Council were:

Grace Marvin - asked that the Plan include showing appreciation and encouraging community involvement in improving Chico's future. In regards to water conservation, there is no policy listed under the goal pertaining to citizen conservation efforts. She also felt that there should be a specific mention of protecting the greenline in this plan and a reference to the great gift of Bidwell Park from Annie Bidwell.

Mark Stemen - still waiting for answers on how we build this plan out so that it reduces carbon dioxide. Transit is the key but couldn't find funding in this plan for a transit center. Infill is harder and messier but is key to reducing our greenhouse gases and our increasing demand on ecological services. The General Plan says it promotes infill but he couldn't find it in the PFA.

Elizabeth Devereaux - supported the comments regarding water issues. She felt that water is the most important issue facing us now. She felt that not building on the aquifer is important in our recharge areas. She indicated that the City should be looking at infill if this plan is truly based on sustainability. She also asked the Council to change its vision regarding the West Park Avenue Extension.

Linda Hamilton - wanted to address the West Park Avenue Extension and asked that the priority in the report be lowered to a Tier 3. She stated that building a road and a bridge does not do anything but build a road and a bridge. She believed that every other option should be exhausted before building the road and bridge and encouraged Council to bump up other priorities slated for that area such as installing a bicycle network in that area.

Chris Nelson - addressed her concerns regarding the widening of the Midway and encouraged using signaling to cut down on greenhouse gases. She wanted the Council and Commission to consider the fact that Southwest Chico does not have a park in that area and would ask that the postage stamp piece of property at 16th Street become a passive park and have that land preserved. Storm water management is another concern as it indicates that Comanche Creek is considered a drainage ditch, which it is not. She also felt that the City needed a more comprehensive bicycle plan not like the one currently in place and it should include the Comanche Creek area. She urged Council to take it out of Tier 1 or get rid of it all together. She also addressed her concerns regarding the possible development of Diamond Match and the costs associated with providing infrastructure, safety, schools, and her concern as to what might happen to the Council because of the toxicity of the soil and the lawsuits that will come forward because the City has zoned the land residential. She stated that no one should be building a home on that land. She wanted to encourage looking at waste oil recycling.

Susan Mason - addressed the PFA and why it doesn't include the $100K the Council recently allocated for an animal shelter. She also questioned why Bidwell Park is not mentioned more in this assessment and noted there is no money for the capital projects budget for some of the listed recreational projects.

Jill Ortega - talked about some solid waste programs that have been created by her company that are centered around food waste which she believed have been effective.

Debbie Villasenor - requested that the Southwest Neighborhood Plan be included in the General Plan. She liked the greenway acquisitions policy but thought that it should have more teeth in the guideline. She encouraged the development of incentives to have developers use a
100 ft. creekside setback versus the 25 ft. setback currently required. She also asked Council to please reconsider their vote on the West Park Avenue Extension.

Randy Abbott - addressed his concerns regarding water protection, the aquifer, and adequately preserving Bidwell Park by including the original deed in General Plan.

Janet Ellner - asked the Council to remove the West Park Avenue Extension, as a Tier 1 to a Tier 2 priority. She felt that the City should look at other alternatives and the decision to go forward with this extension should be contingent on the feasibility study of the widening of the Midway.

Mark Herrera - urged Council to support organic recycling efforts and the protecting of our water recharge areas. He also expressed concern over the Neal Road Landfill and the need to continue to find ways to divert the waste being taken there.

Dr. Fred Brooks - provided information regarding how other states implemented aquifer enhancement programs which enhanced those areas. He felt that those programs could be used here in Chico. He encouraged Council to use good planning that will only enhance the quality of life. He suggested looking at Bloomfield, Colorado and how they developed a special events center and it draws people from everywhere. It brings in people for trade shows and is packed every day for all kinds of events. He believed that a special events center in Chico could be used by the City, CARD, and the University.

Karen Laslo - supported the costs spent to date for the development of the proposed General Plan, because it has allowed staff to conduct these meetings which have provided more transparency of the process. She noted that she wanted to see more money for public facilities for the maintenance of the parks, and to restore the rangers hours which have been cut back. She is now picking up trash at the parks because of the cutbacks. She also asked about when the restroom is going to be built on the north side of the pool and encouraged Council to provide more money for schools, roads, and creekside greenways.

Richard Harriman - addressed the three topics that he felt had been covered in this meeting which were (1) using resources efficiently; (2) saving money; and (3) the implicit understanding that new development will pay its own way. Regarding the wastewater issue, he did agree that new packaged sewer plants have been developed that can provide the means for recycling and asked that Council have staff check into these systems.

Council and Commission recessed at 11:50 for a 20 minute lunch break. The meeting was reconvened and all members were present.

The Council and Commission provided staff with detailed suggestions regarding the Parks, Public Facilities, and Services Element and the Fiscal Impact Analysis. Feedback provided at this meeting will be incorporated into the Draft Final Plan and brought back for further discussion and approval.

3. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Debbie Villasenor - questioned how the Fiscal Impact Analysis and Public Facilities Assessment will impact the draft EIR. Staff indicated that all changes to all the Elements will be included in the EIR.

4. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 1:35 p.m. to September 7, 2010 at 6:00 p.m., in Conference Room 2 if a
closed session is scheduled, followed by a regular meeting in the Council Chamber at 6:30 p.m.

Date Approved:

Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk
ADJOURNED REGULAR CHICO CITY COUNCIL MEETING — September 7, 2010
Minutes

1.1. CLOSED SESSION - 6:00 p.m.

1.2. REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING - 6:30 p.m.

1.3. Call to Order - Mayor Schwab called the September 7, 2010 - Regular Chico City Council Meeting 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 421 Main Street at 6:30 p.m.

1.4. Flag Salute

1.5. Invocation - Reverend Duchess Dale, Chico New Thought Center for Spiritual Living

1.6. Roll Call

Present: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
Absent: None

1.7. Closed Session Announcement - None

1.8. Introduction - Welcome California State University, Chico, Associated Students President Amro Jayousi and Vice-President Kristina Barger

1.9. Presentation - Pam Ames, Partnership Specialist, US Census Bureau, presented the City of Chico with a Certificate of Gratitude for its assistance with Census 2010

1.10. Presentation - Mayor’s Commendation Award for bravery and heroism presented to Chico Police Officers Ben Love and Brian Magleby, California Highway Patrol Officer Kurtis Powell and citizen Mike Williams for their selfless acts of courage in an emergency situation

2. CONSENT AGENDA - Items 2.1., 2.5., and 2.6. were removed for further discussion and acted upon separately.

A motion was made by Holcombe and seconded by Walker to approve the Consent Agenda, with Items 2.1., 2.5., and 2.6. removed for further discussion.

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
NOES: None

2.1. ORDINANCE NO. 2410 - AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO AMENDING CHAPTER 2.56 AND TITLE 19 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING HISTORIC PRESERVATION - Final Reading and Adoption

Adopted - an ordinance amending Chapter 2.56 to create an Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board and adding Chapter 19.37 Historic Preservation to the Chico Municipal Code. The ordinance was introduced by the Council at its meeting of 8/03/10.

Adopted - a fee schedule resolution to implement the provisions set forth in the
ordinance. The Interim Planning Services Director recommended adoption of the ordinance by reading of its title only and adoption of the resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 45-10 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO AMENDING THE CITY'S FEE SCHEDULE (AMENDMENT NO. 324 PLANNING FEES)

Councilmember Wahl removed this item from the agenda for further discussion. He addressed his concerns about the implementation of this ordinance which will require participation by all homeowners who happen to be included on the list. Staff confirmed that if a homeowner wished to not participate in the program they would have to petition the Planning Commission for removal from the overlay zone. Councilmember Wahl also expressed concern regarding the added requirements to serve on the Architectural Review Board, which limits citizen participation.

Mike Trolinder stated that he believed there needed to be more discussion regarding this issue in order to determine how the program is going to be paid for or the impact on the homeowners.

Mike Reilley addressed his concerns regarding the Architectural Review Board taking on this additional responsibility. He questioned the ability of the currently structured board to not delay projects as they come forward for review. He felt that the City would be better served if it created a separate board, with experts who have a background and expertise in handling historical issues.

Bob Kromer supports preserving the uniqueness of the City but is concerned that the program is not voluntary and that individuals wishing to not participate in the program will have to go through a petition process, with associated fees, in order to opt out of the program.

Councilmember Wahl made a motion to not approve the ordinance as written but send it back to the Planning Commission to address the concerns expressed at this meeting and instead direct staff to come back with a program that allows citizens to opt out if they do not want to participate. The motion died for a lack of a second.

A motion was made by Holcombe and seconded by Gruendl to adopt the following ordinance, by reading of title only:

ORDINANCE NO. 2410 - AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO AMENDING CHAPTER 2.56 AND TITLE 19 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING HISTORIC PRESERVATION - Final Reading and Adoption

Adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION NO. 45-10 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO AMENDING THE CITY'S FEE SCHEDULE (AMENDMENT NO. 324 PLANNING FEES)

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Walker, Schwab
NOES: Wahl

2.2. ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING UNITED PUBLIC EMPLOYEES OF CALIFORNIA LOCAL 792 AS THE MAJORITY REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYEES
Adopted - a resolution which recognizes United Public Employees of California (UPEC), Local 792 as the majority representative for the Confidential employees of the City. The City Clerk conducted the required secret ballot election and certified that a majority of the Confidential employees voted to recognize UPEC Local 792 as their representative. The Human Resources Director and City Manager recommended adoption of the resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 46-10 - A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO RECOGNIZING UNITED PUBLIC EMPLOYEES OF CALIFORNIA LOCAL 792 AS THE MAJORITY REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYEES

2.3. DETERMINATION OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE OR NECESSITY - WINE TIME (26 LOST DUTCHMAN DRIVE, CHICO, 95973)

Accepted - the Housing and Neighborhood Services recommendation for a determination of public convenience or necessity for Wine Time. The Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control has determined that Wine Time, a proposed wine bar which will be located at 26 Lost Dutchman Drive (APN 006-690-024-000) is in an area with an undue concentration of alcoholic beverage licenses. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code Sections 23958.4, the requested Type 42 license required a City Council determination that public convenience or necessity would be served by its issuance. The Housing and Neighborhood Services Director recommended a determination of public convenience or necessity.

2.4. APPROVAL OF THE 2010-11 BUTTE INTERAGENCY NARCOTICS TASK FORCE (BINTF) GENERAL BUDGET

Approved - the 2010-11 BINTF General Budget as required by the BINTF Memorandum of Understanding between the City and various other law enforcement agencies in Butte County. The BINTF funds have been included in the 2010-11 Police Operating Budget. The Chief of Police recommended approval of the BINTF General Budget.

2.5. AUTHORIZATION FOR MAYOR TO SIGN AND SUBMIT A RESPONSE TO THE 2009-10 FINAL REPORT OF THE BUTTE COUNTY GRAND JURY

Authorized - signature and submittal of the City's response to the 2009-10 Final Report of the Butte County Grand Jury to the Presiding Judge of the Butte County Superior Court. The City Manager, Assistant City Manager and City Attorney recommended such authorization.

Councilmember Wahl removed this item for further discussion. He disagreed with some of the findings listed in the response to the Grand Jury's comments regarding the animal shelter and asked that it be sent back to staff to be re-written.

Assistant City Manager Rucker indicated that the City and Butte Humane Society are working together to see that a new facility is developed and built at the existing site. Councilmember Gruendl acknowledged the team efforts to move forward as the City has a lot of priorities with limited resources.

A motion was made by Flynn and seconded by Holcombe to authorize the Mayor to sign and submit the amended response to the 2009-10 Final Report of the Butte County Grand Jury.

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Walker, Schwab
2.6. CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENTS - PLANNING SERVICES DIRECTOR AND BUILDING OFFICIAL

Confirmed - appointments of Mark Wolfe as Planning Services Director and Nelson George as Building Official effective 9/12/10. The City Manager recommended confirmation of the appointments.

Councilmember Wahl asked that this item be removed from the Consent Agenda for further clarification. He asked staff to identify the funding source for the increase in salaries considering the deficit that the City is currently facing.

It was noted by staff that a supplemental appropriation would be coming forward at a future meeting, with details on funding source(s) as well as an analysis of the costs which are offset by the salary savings realized with the departure of the outgoing staff members who originally held these positions.

Addressing the Council was Stephanie Taber. She asked how the City could move forward with raises before identifying the funding source.

A motion was made by Schwab and seconded by Walker to confirm the appointments of Mark Wolfe as Planning Services Director and Nelson George as Building Official effective 9/12/10.

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Walker, Schwab

NOES: Wahl

ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT - Items 2.1., 2.5., and 2.6. were removed from the Consent Agenda for further discussion.

3. NOTICED PUBLIC HEARINGS

3.1. HEARING ON CITIZENS OPTION FOR PUBLIC SAFETY PROGRAM FUNDING FOR 2010-11

The State of California has appropriated funds for the Citizens Option for Public Safety (COPS) program for the 14th consecutive year. The State Legislature approved continued funding for this program for the 2010-11 fiscal year and this hearing is required by State Law prior to receiving COPS funds. Funds to cover the cost for one police officer position were included in the City of Chico 2010-11 Final Budget, and funding for a Crime Scene Investigation van will be established by budget modification, both subject to this hearing. (Report - Mike Maloney, Chief of Police)

The Mayor opened the hearing to the public. Addressing the Council on this item was Bob Kromer. The hearing was closed to further public input.

A motion was made by Flynn and seconded by Walker to approve the proposed use of the COPS program grant funds for the 2010-11 fiscal year.

The motion carried by the following vote:
AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
NOES: None

The Council recessed at 7:55 for a 15 minute break. The meeting was reconvened and all members were present.

4. REGULAR AGENDA

4.1. CONSIDERATION OF AN UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CLIMATE ACTION PLAN TO REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS (GHG) EMISSIONS

On 9/02/08, the City Council approved the Sustainability Task Force's recommendations to: (1) accept the community and citywide GHG emissions inventory; (2) approve a GHG emissions reduction target of 25% below 2005 emission levels by 2020; and (3) pursue the development of a Climate Action Plan (CAP) outlining potential actions needed to achieve this goal. The Task Force has been working on the CAP and provided a status report on the development progress for Council consideration. (Report - Linda Herman, General Services Administrative Manager)

Addressing the Council on this issue were:

Mark Stemen - urged Council to take action now and spend the money needed to implement the Climate Action Plan.

Francis Farley - spoke in support of the proposed Climate Action Plan and encouraged Council to inform people as to why the City is taking these steps on climate protection.

Bob Kromer - had questions regarding the non-resident factor and the cost to the citizens in the proposed plan and was concerned about moving forward with a plan with unknown costs and unknown funding. He also questioned if upon implementation the costs were proven to be higher, how would the plan then be amended? He would also like to see a commitment from the City that the citizens will not have to subsidize the costs.

Emily Alma - spoke in support of the work that has been done so far, encouraged Council to move quickly in the implementation of the plan, and asked Council to consider an education component for the citizens.

Karen Laslo - spoke in support of the Climate Action Plan and didn't feel that it would be a sacrifice to implement the program.

Kathie Russo - doesn't believe that citizens need additional regulations with the Climate Action Plan, which covers concerns already addressed in the Sustainability Element of the proposed 2030 General Plan. Additional Governmental actions should not be taken to burden the people but instead elected officials should be objective and make good decisions.

Sue Hubbard - expressed her concerns over businesses leaving California due to the over-regulating of businesses not the costs of electricity as stated earlier by Councilmember Gruendl.

Councilmember Gruendl noted for the record that the closest thing to additional regulations for homeowners is the home retrofit requirements which the Council approved using the lowest cost estimates with direction provided to staff to develop incentives to offset the costs.
A motion was made by Gruendl and seconded by Flynn to accept the Sustainability Task Force recommendations that the City Council: (1) conceptually approve the proposed Phase 1 Climate Action Plan (CAP) measures; (2) direct the Task Force to proceed with the development of a draft CAP for Council consideration at a future meeting; and (3) direct staff to prepare a cost analysis on the implementation of the plan similar to a public facilities financing plan and direct staff to include a section pertaining to sustainability impacts (if applicable) in future staff reports.

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Walker, Schwab
NOES: Wahl

The Council recessed at 9:15 p.m. for a 15 minute break. The meeting was reconvened and all members were present.

4.2. CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE REPEALING CHAPTER 2.64 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE, ENTITLED "HUMAN RESOURCES COMMISSION" AND DETERMINE IF THE CREATION OF A NEW COMMISSION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AT THIS TIME

At this meeting, the Council considered the introduction of an ordinance repealing Chapter 2.64 of the Chico Municipal Code which originally established the purpose and duties of the City's currently seated Human Resources Commission. Due to the Council's directive on 10/09/09 to disband the Commission by the end of 2010, staff asked that the Council introduce the ordinance at this meeting. Following introduction, the final reading and adoption of the ordinance will be agendized for the meeting of 9/21/10, with an effective date of 1/01/2011. The January date coincides with the beginning of the terms of newly appointed commissioners. At this meeting, the Council also discussed the role of the recently formed Diversity Action Ad Hoc Committee in conjunction with the possible need to create a new Commission in the future. (Report - Deborah Presson, City Clerk)

Addressing the Council in support of disbanding the Human Resources Commission and recent creation of the Diversity Action Ad Hoc Committee was Ali Sarsour. He also stated that once a diversity action plan was developed, he believed a private organization comprised of interested citizens could be created outside the City structure to assist with the implementation of the plan thereby limiting the need for City resources.

Angela Casler addressed the Council regarding diversity issues faced by more people than just the Associated Students President that recently occurred. She encouraged the Council to move forward in addressing the violence that is erupting in Chico regarding all groups of people.

A motion was made by Walker and seconded by Holcombe to introduce (1) the following ordinance:

ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICO REPEALING CHAPTER 2.64 OF THE CHICO MUNICIPAL CODE, ENTITLED "HUMAN RESOURCES COMMISSION; and

(2) await the Diversity Action Ad Hoc Committees recommendations and implementation plan prior to any discussions regarding the need to create a new commission.

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: Flynn, Gruendl, Holcombe, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
4.3. **ITEMS ADDED AFTER THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA** - None

5. **BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR** - Addressing the Council were the following individuals:

- Burt Levy - concerned about the current regulations and associated costs with the keeping of chickens and urged Council to suspend the regulations as soon as possible.

- Erny Spears - addressed the Council regarding his concerns over the lack of repairs on the roads, the abandoning of buildings currently occurring such as Aero Union, and urged Council to change the City's regulations so that they are less onerous on business owners such as the sign ordinance. He stated that limited government was better for businesses.

- Kathie Russo - addressed her concerns regarding the Council's actions that she believed continue to deny property owners rights such as the Historical Preservation Ordinance that was adopted earlier in the evening.

- Karen Zinniel - addressed the Council regarding the recent temporary bulb-outs that the City installed and then later removed from her neighborhood. Her concern was that only a handful of individuals from CANA made the request to the City which ultimately ended up impacting about 80 of her neighbors. She questioned why the City would install these temporary measures when staff knew that it would fail despite it costing approximately $40,000 for the improvements that were later removed. She also mentioned that the City had paid $35,000 for its own survey which the Council ignores, as well as the survey that was provided by the Concerned Citizens group. She stated that the concerned citizens are not going away until the Council is fairly representing all citizens.

- Sue Hubbard - asked that the Council assist with stopping the propaganda regarding the moving of City elections from November to June. She felt that it was insulting to the students to think that they wouldn't know how to vote by absentee ballots and furthermore, the elections were once held in April. She felt that it should be put to a vote of the people.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourning at 10:12 p.m. to September 21, 2010 at 5:30 p.m., in Conference Room 2 for a closed session, followed by an adjourned regular meeting in the Council Chamber at 6:30 p.m.

Date Approved:

__________________________
Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk
ADJOURNED REGULAR CHICO CITY COUNCIL MEETING - September 7, 2010
CLOSED SESSION
Chico Municipal Center, Conference Room #2, 421 Main Street

1. CALL TO ORDER - Mayor Schwab called the September 7, 2010 - Adjourned Regular Chico City Council Closed Session to order at 6:00 p.m. in Conference Room #2 in the Chico Municipal Center, 421 Main Street.

1.1. Roll Call

Present: Flynn, Gruendl, Nickell, Wahl, Walker, Schwab
Absent: Holcombe (arrived at 6:21 p.m.)

1.2. Staff Present

City Manager Burkland, City Attorney Barker, Assistant City Manager Rucker, City Clerk Presson, Human Resources Director Campbell, and Finance Director Hennessy

2. CLOSED SESSION MATTERS

2.1. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR (Gov. Code Sec. 54957.6.)

Negotiator:
Dave Burkland, City Manager and Teresa Campbell, Director of Human Resources

Employee Organizations:
Management Employees, Confidential Employees, Public Safety Management Employees, Chico Police Officers' Association, Chico Public Safety Association, International Association of Firefighters, Service Employees International Union (Trades and Crafts Unit and Clerical, Technical and Professional Unit).

3. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 6:25 p.m. to a City Council meeting in the Council Chamber.

Date Approved:

______________________________
Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk
REPORT IN BRIEF:
In order for the City to meet its entitlement community commitments which allow for the receipt of federal funding for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program and the Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME), the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires that a Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER) regarding use of these funds be prepared at the conclusion of each program year, made available for public comment during a 15-day period, and that the City hold a public hearing on the report at the conclusion of the public comment period, before it is submitted to HUD. Notice of the availability of the CAPER for public review was published on 9/3/10, advising that the CAPER is available for review. If comments from the public are received, they will be forwarded to Council and be included in the final CAPER submitted to HUD.

Recommendation:
The Housing & Neighborhood Services Director recommends that after holding a public hearing on the 2009-2010 CAPER for the CDBG and HOME programs, the Council authorize staff to submit the final CAPER to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

FISCAL IMPACT:
None. The CAPER is a performance report indicating how funds were expended.

BACKGROUND:
The Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) sets forth the specific uses of, and outcomes attributable to, the CDBG and HOME programs during the period July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

The CAPER discusses the City's progress towards meeting the goals and objectives identified in the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan and the specific activities undertaken in 2009-2010 compared to those described in the 2009-2010 annual Action Plan. The Consolidated Plan identifies the City's housing and community development needs, prioritizes these needs, identifies resources available and sets five-year goals.

DISCUSSION:
The CAPER has two major functions—to report accomplishments and to evaluate the City's performance.

Evaluation and Accomplishments
In general, the City accomplished many of the goals set forth in the 2005-10 Consolidated Plan. In summary, in 2009-2010:

- 6 single-family homeownership homes were built through sweat-equity, 2 transitional housing units were completed, and a 35-bed emergency shelter for victims of domestic violence was constructed.
- 43 first-time home buyers were assisted
- 28 housing rehabilitation and rental housing accessibility projects were completed
- 628 homeless persons were provided emergency shelter
- 33 persons received rental assistance
- 1,290 persons were provided with public services by non-profit agencies
- 882 code enforcement cases were opened in low-income target areas
- 104 low-income small businesses received counseling
During 2009-2010, the City continued to work pro-actively on a variety of affordable housing projects. The Catalyst shelter project was completed, in addition to two transitional housing units at the site, for families continuing to need a supportive housing environment. Community Housing Improvement Program (CHIP) completed the Manzanita Pointe Self-Help Subdivision, consisting of six single family homes for low-income families.

The City has continued to play a leadership role in meeting the needs of the area’s homeless. The City not only assists with sheltering the homeless through funding, but also administratively supports the Greater Chico Homeless Task Force (GCHTF). In 2009-2010, the GCHTF continued to meet, and worked extensively on activities relating to the community “book in common”, “The Soloist”. The goal is to engage the community in a meaningful, pro-active manner to address the root causes of homelessness.

In 2009-2010, City staff completed the 2010-2015 Consolidated Plan. This involved extensive public outreach and data analysis, including a community needs assessment to focus funding to those programs and activities that will address Chico’s most urgent housing and community development needs, pursuant to the CDBG and HOME regulations. The Consolidated Plan was submitted to HUD in May 2010, and we received written approval of the plan in July 2010.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: DNA.

PUBLIC CONTACT:
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I. Introduction
The Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER), which has been prepared for submittal to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), reports on specific federal housing and community development assistance allocated by the City of Chico for the period of July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010. The CAPER provides a summary of progress in carrying out the strategic plan and the action plan components of the Five-Year Consolidated Plan. The Consolidated Plan was submitted to HUD in June 2005 to enable the City of Chico to administer federal funds under the CDBG and HOME programs. The Consolidated Plan planning period is from July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2010. This CAPER, therefore, reports accomplishments for the fifth year of the Consolidated Plan period.

The Consolidated Plan is a 5 year planning document which: 1) identifies housing needs and problems; 2) analyzes market conditions and resources, 3) sets priorities and adopts strategies; 4) allocates resources and 5) contains an annual plan which identifies federal funds expected to be used, indicating the activities on which they will be spent, and sets goals for the number and type of households to be assisted in the applicable federally funded programs.

This CAPER satisfies the reporting requirements for the 2009-2010 Consolidated Plan Program Year. The narrative section of the report contains seven basic elements: 1) an assessment of the five year goals and objectives set forth in the Consolidated Plan, 2) an evaluation on progress in meeting the City’s specific objective of providing affordable housing, 3) a summary of resources and programmatic accomplishments, 4) actions taken to address the needs of homeless persons and special needs persons, 5) narratives regarding the City’s actions indicated in the strategic and action plans, 6) a self-evaluation of progress made during the past year in addressing identified priority needs and objectives and 7) the City’s actions to affirmatively further Fair Housing.

II. Citizen Participation Process
The City published a Public Notice on September 3, 2010 in the Chico Enterprise-Record which notified the public that the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) was available for review. Copies of the CAPER were made available at the City’s Housing & Neighborhood Services Department, and on the City’s website. The public was encouraged to submit written or verbal comments on the CAPER during the 15-day comment period. No comments were received on the report.

III. Assessment of Five-Year Goals and Objectives
The City’s five-year Strategic Plan includes a range of objectives to be accomplished during the planning period. The objectives include the provision of affordable housing opportunities for the elderly, very-low-income families and low-income homeowners. Other objectives in the plan are to assist homeless families with emergency and transitional shelters and provide public services to low-income residents. In addition, the Strategic Plan includes objectives for the improvement of low-income neighborhoods and creation of jobs for low-income persons.

As stated in the Leveraging Resources section of this report, the City has pursued a variety of housing and community development resources to meet the priority needs in the Consolidated Plan. These funding resources include federal CDBG and HOME entitlements, the federal HUD Section 202 and 811 programs, the state Multi-Family Housing and Workforce Housing Reward programs, the state Emergency Housing and Assistance Program for capital development, local Redevelopment Agency low/moderate-income housing set-aside, and the federal Tax Credit Program for affordable housing, as administered by the State Tax Credit and Allocation Committee.
The City provided certifications of consistency for all projects requesting certifications in a fair and impartial manner. The City did not hinder Consolidated Plan implementation by willful action or inaction.

The following table (Table 1) shows the City’s housing and community development programs grouped by priority need areas. The table shows the priority level, the targeted population and where it has been established, the five-year goal in units and/or dollars. Table 1 also shows the units completed and dollars expended for the reporting period and the progress made towards meeting the five-year goals as of the end of the current reporting period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Needs</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Targeting</th>
<th>2005 - 2010 goals</th>
<th>2009-10 completed/expended</th>
<th>Cumulative 5-year completed / expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and program administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General program administration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>265,610 N/A $988,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing rehabilitation program administration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Low and moderate-income households</td>
<td>See housing rehabilitation</td>
<td>See housing rehabilitation</td>
<td>33,091 See housing rehabilitation 206,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Housing Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Housing Workshops</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>General population</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4 workshops</td>
<td>8,000 20 workshops 41,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental housing development</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very-low and low-income households</td>
<td>80 units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,004,341 178 14,934,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership development</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very-low and low-income households</td>
<td>200 units</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>889,602 0 889,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior housing development and preservation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Senior households (62+)</td>
<td>210 units</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0 0 157 9,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-room occupancy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low-income persons</td>
<td>50 units</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership (mortgage subsidy)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low and moderate-income households</td>
<td>75 loans</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,951,316 144 7,071,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied housing rehabilitation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low and moderate-income households</td>
<td>40 households</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>351,549 91 2,198,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-buyer education and credit counseling</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Low and moderate-income households</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>37,000 1172 92,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental housing accessibility</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Disabled renter households</td>
<td>30 households</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29,820 53 167,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant-based rental assistance (homeless)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Households at-risk of homelessness</td>
<td>50 households</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70,343 141 719,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter facilities</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Homeless persons</td>
<td>1 facility</td>
<td>1 complete, 1 renewed</td>
<td>389,750 3 1,369,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter services</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Homeless persons</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>30,295 7,224 154,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-housing community development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for public services providers</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low and moderate-income persons</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>0 0 3 199,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Consolidated Plan Quantified Priority Needs, Goals and Accomplishments
Summary of 2009-10 Accomplishments

Planning and Program Administration
The City has continued to use the allowable amounts of CDBG and HOME funds to plan for the use of federal housing and community development funds and administer CDBG and HOME-funded programs effectively, in accordance with the requirements promulgated through the federal regulations and program guidance from HUD. In 2009-2010, a total of $265,610 was expended from the two funding sources for this purpose.

Equal Housing Opportunity/Fair Housing
The City provided funding to educate the general population regarding fair housing obligations under state and federal law. Public workshops were funded from the administrative portion of CDBG funding. Individual assistance regarding housing rights was provided to low-income persons through a public services grant. A total of $8,000 was expended on this activity during 2009-10.

Housing Services:

Affordable Housing Production
The City of Chico and the Chico Redevelopment Agency continued to both achieve and make significant commitments to housing production in 2009-10.

The projects completed in 2009-10, with City/RDA funding contributions are as follows:

Emergency Shelter:
Catalyst Domestic Violence Shelter, $450,000 CDBG and $1,650,000 RDA

Transitional Housing:
Catalyst Cottages, $204,341 RDA

Single Family Homeownership:
Manzanita Pointe, $734,602 HOME

Projects planned to begin or continue construction in 2010-11:

Multi-Family Rental:
Bidwell Park Apartments, $3.1 million RDA
Parkside Terrace Apartments, $10.1 million RDA

Special Needs Rental:
Villa Serena, $99,000 CDBG and $900,000 RDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Needs</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Targeting</th>
<th>2005 - 2010 goals units/ expenditures</th>
<th>2009-10 completed/expended</th>
<th>Cumulative 5-year completed / expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public infrastructure improvements</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low and moderate-income areas</td>
<td>Not specified --</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Households in low and moderate-income areas</td>
<td>Not specified --</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>127,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services (not including emergency shelter)</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Very-low and low-income persons</td>
<td>Not specified 775,000</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>112,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-enterprise counseling</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Micro-enterprises owned by low and moderate-income persons</td>
<td>Not specified --</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>22,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Single Family Homeownership:
Habitat for Humanity, 16th Street Subdivision (Self-Help), $132,000 HOME, $480,000 RDA
1901 Magnolia, $150,000 RDA
Martha’s Vineyard, $750,000 HOME and $650,000 RDA
Sensible Solar Homes, $120,000 RDA

These efforts continue to place the City well on its way to meeting the five-year goals for housing production for the 2005-2010 Consolidated Planning period, and to jump start our production efforts in our new Consolidated Plan period, 2010-2015.

Homeownership Assistance
The City and Chico Redevelopment Agency operate an active and very popular downpayment assistance program for first-time homebuyers who are income eligible. HOME funds are used to assist low-income households, while RDA funds are used to assist low/median/moderate income households. During this reporting period the City assisted 43 first-time homebuyers with an aggregate assistance of $1,951,316 ($710,610 in HOME funds, and $1,240,706 in RDA funds). Of the households receiving assistance through the HOME program, all thirteen families were low- to median income (≤ 80% AMI). The average loan amount was $54,662. The average sales price of homes purchased with assistance during this reporting period was $187,908.

Housing Rehabilitation
Preserving the City's existing housing stock is an important part of the City’s overall housing strategy. The City’s owner-occupied housing rehabilitation loan program funded fourteen projects during the reporting period, four of which were comprehensive rehabilitation and ten which were minor repairs, under the grant program. The comprehensive rehabilitation projects were funded with the City’s HOME grant and expenditures totaled $228,062. In 2007-08 the City instituted a grant program (up to $15,000) using CDBG funds for minor home repairs. In 2009-10, the grant program expended a total of $106,293, much of it spent for mobile home repairs.

Homebuyer Education and Credit Counseling
The Redevelopment Agency contracts with the Community Housing and Credit Counseling Center (CHCCC) to provide credit and home purchase counseling, with RDA funds directed towards homebuyer education for those households utilizing the downpayment assistance program. The CHCCC also provides counseling to those households facing foreclosure, and credit counseling for households enrolled in a family self-sufficiency program. In 2009-10, 724 individuals received such counseling. This is a substantial increase from previous years' service levels, and can be directly attributable to the national foreclosure crisis.

Rental Housing Accessibility Program
The City is able to provide a valuable service, in partnership with Independent Living Services, to disabled renters who need accessibility accommodations made to their housing unit in order to support and promote their independence. Common improvements include wheelchair ramps, lifts, grab bars and doorway widenings. This program provided 11 grants to disabled renters using CDBG funds.

Homelessness, Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing
The City works actively with local agencies to provide a continuum of services to shelter the homeless, transition the homeless to permanent housing, and to prevent homelessness. The City is a member of the Greater Chico Homeless Taskforce and provides administrative support to the taskforce. The City is also a voting member of the Butte County Continuum of Care Council. CDBG funds are provided through the administrative cap to support the position of the Continuum of Care Coordinator.

The Chico Community Shelter Partnership (CCSP) continues to operate the Torres Community Shelter. Due to the increasing number of families seeking services, the CCSP Board decided to use some of the balance of their outstanding CDBG capital improvements grant from 2004 to complete an interior renovation of the building to provide more rooms for families. This project was completed in 2009-2010. The CCSP also receives an annual allocation of operating funds through the public services component of the CDBG program.
Catalyst Domestic Violence Services completed construction of their new shelter/transitional housing project in January 2010. This project came together with a variety of funding sources, including: $450,000 from the Community Development Block Grant program, $295,000 from the City’s Workforce Housing Reward Program grant from the State of California, $1.15 million from the Chico RDA and a $1 million state EHAP capital development deferred loan. The new shelter will provide 35 shelter beds/transitional housing and space for Catalyst to provide services to the sheltered families. In addition, with assistance from the Chico Redevelopment Agency, Catalyst also completed construction of two transitional housing cottages at the same site. These cottages will be occupied by Catalyst clients who are ready to leave the shelter, but not yet ready to live completely independently in the community, and are in continuing need of support services. Three more cottages will be constructed at this site during 2010-11.

The City’s Tenant-Based Rental Assistance program provides short-term rental assistance (12 to 24 months) to very-low and extremely-low-income ‘hard-to-house’ and special needs families who are at-risk of homelessness, but who are working towards family self-sufficiency with an established social services provider. The City contracts with the Housing Authority of Butte County to administer this program. In program year 2009 the City expended $70,343 in HOME funds to assist 33 very-low-income and extremely-low-income households.

The City also provided $43,120 in CDBG operating grants to the Catalyst Women’s Shelter, the Torres Community Shelter, and Esplanade House. A total of 628 persons were assisted at these facilities during the program year.

Non-Housing Community Development Services:

Facilities for Public Services Providers (non-emergency shelter)
During the 2009-10 year, the City did not provide any capital improvement grants through its CDBG funding to local service providers

Public Services
Public services (not including services to the homeless) provided benefit to 1,290 persons using $112,405 in CDBG funding. Funded services included independent living assistance for the disabled, meal delivery to seniors, childcare services for low-income families, fair housing counseling and operations support for transitional housing.

Code Enforcement
CDBG-funded Code Enforcement is used as a tool in those areas of the City where at least 51% of the persons residing there are low-moderate income and the enforcement, along with other city improvements and services, is expected to arrest the decline of the area. In 2009-2010 $127,137 of CDBG was expended to support code enforcement in low-income areas of Chico. Code Enforcement staff opened 882 cases in low-income target areas during the year. See Attachment 1 for a map which depicts Code Enforcement activity for 2009-10.

Economic Development
One of the goals of the CDBG program is to expand economic opportunities for low-moderate income persons. To support this goal, the City continued its on-going funding for the micro-enterprise counseling effort through the Small Business Development Center at Butte College. One hundred four (104) low-income businesses with five or fewer employees were provided with services and $22,570 was expended.

IV. Affordable Housing
The City strives to meet the diverse housing needs of the community by having an active affordable housing production program and housing programs that meet the needs of low-income households.

Housing Production
As described earlier, the City has continued during the 2009-10 year to make significant strides in the development of affordable housing. In addition to several projects which completed construction, others are slated to begin construction in 2010-11.
The projects completing construction during 2009-10 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Type of project</th>
<th>Total units</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income</th>
<th>Very Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Moderate Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst Shelter</td>
<td>Shelter/Transitional</td>
<td>35 beds</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst Cottages</td>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzanita Pointe</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of the projects continuing or beginning construction in 2010-11 is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Type of project</th>
<th>Total units</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income</th>
<th>Very Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Moderate Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bidwell Park Apts</td>
<td>Family rental</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Terrace Apts</td>
<td>Family rental</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Serena</td>
<td>Special Needs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha’s Vineyard</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901 Magnolia</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensible Solar</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Programs
The City has several programs to meet the needs of low-income households; these include the HOME- and CDBG-funded Housing Rehabilitation, the HOME-funded Tenant-Based Rental Assistance program, the RDA- and HOME-funded Mortgage Subsidy program and the Rental Housing Accessibility program that is funded from the CDBG program.

The Housing Rehabilitation program completed 17 projects in the program year. The total amount of assistance provided was $351,549 (both loans and grants). Included within these totals is the assistance provided to low-income homeowners residing within a Nitrate Compliance Plan Program Area. These homeowners received grants to complete the necessary work to abandon their septic tank and connect to the City’s sewer system.

The Tenant-Based Rental Assistance program assisted 33 very-low and extremely-low-income families in program year 2010 by providing rental deposits and direct rental assistance. The City expended $70,343 in HOME funds in the year.

The Mortgage Subsidy Program provided 43 first-time home buyers with down-payment assistance. The total amount made available for the program (both HOME and RDA) was $1,951,316.

The Rental Housing Accessibility program provided 11 grants to disabled renters for installation of accessibility improvements. These improvements included threshold and entry ramps, roll-in shower stalls and grab bars. A total of $29,820 was expended for an average assistance of $1,615.

Please see ‘Table 2’ that follows for a summary of housing accomplishments in the program year.

---

1 This is a domestic violence shelter, and as such, all persons needing services may receive them, regardless of income level. Per 24 CFR Section 570.208(a)(2)(i)(A), abused children and battered spouses are presumed to be eligible for the CDBG program.
Table 2
Summary of Housing Accomplishments for Program Year 2009
(July 2009 – June 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity listed in Consolidated Plan</th>
<th>Annual Plan</th>
<th>Committed</th>
<th>Non-federal share of committed</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Planned/underway</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY ONE ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Income Rental Households ≤50% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Based Rental Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$309,505</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$70,343</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Housing (Very Low and low Seniors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Housing (Low and Very Low)</td>
<td></td>
<td>204,341</td>
<td>204,341</td>
<td>204,341</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Assistance for New &amp; Existing Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Subsidy Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,951,316</td>
<td>1,240,706</td>
<td>1,951,316</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PRIORITY ONE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,465,162</td>
<td>1,445,047</td>
<td>2,226,000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY TWO ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Owner Households ≤80% AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>650,195</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>351,549</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Housing Accessibility Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>53,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,820</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Persons and Families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
<td>2,650,000</td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>204,341</td>
<td>204,341</td>
<td>204,341</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PRIORITY TWO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,007,920</td>
<td>2,854,341</td>
<td>3,685,710</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households And Persons Assisted With Housing
The City assisted 1,490 households in the City with housing through many avenues of funding and programs. For the purposes of this report an assisted unit is defined as "one which, during the reporting period, received benefits through the investment of Federal funds, either alone or in conjunction with the investment of other public or private funds."

Assisted households include those assisted through the provision or preservation of housing, the provision of shelter, the improvement of housing conditions, direct or indirect purchase assistance, rental subsidy and housing-related services. In the case of the provision, preservation, rehabilitation or purchase assistance, only units completed in the program year are tabulated.

The tables on the following page show assisted households by tenure type and income (for non-homeless) "Table 3" and those same households by race, ethnicity and special needs "Table 4." Please note that the RDA-funded portion of the Mortgage Subsidy Program did not collect race and ethnicity information and more than one sub-recipient reported partial information on beneficiary characteristics.
### Table 3
Total Housing Assistance by Tenure Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Type</th>
<th>Renters</th>
<th>Owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30% of MFI</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 50% of MFI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 80% of MFI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 80% MFI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total renters</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total homeowners</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4
Total Housing Assistance by Race, Ethnicity and Special Needs Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Renters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African-American</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native and White</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and White</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African-American and White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multi-racial</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, not reported</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (all races)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female head of household</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Housing: 740
V. LEVERAGING RESOURCES

The City committed substantial non-entitlement resources to support its housing efforts during the program year. With a number of major projects in the pre-development phase in 2009-10, three projects completed construction during this year, and one continued construction. Total committed funds were $5.5 million with only $1.3 million being entitlement funds. For every entitlement dollar, 4.2 non-entitlement dollars were committed. Of the non-entitlement dollars $2.3 million are local funds (RDA), and $1.2 million are state. The total non-federal share of all funds committed was $4.1 million or 76% of total funds.

The following table demonstrates the use of leveraged funds for projects that began or completed construction in 2009-10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name and sponsor</th>
<th>type of funds</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manzanita Pointe, CHIP</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>734,602</td>
<td>734,602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHIP</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst Shelter relocation, Catalyst</td>
<td>State EHAP</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>1,650,000</td>
<td>1,650,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HCD Workforce</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,395,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>2,945,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst Cottages</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>204,341</td>
<td>204,341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat for Humanity, 16th Street</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHLB AHP</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PG &amp; E Grant</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowe's Grant</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,012,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,500,943</td>
<td>1,316,602</td>
<td>4,184,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. CONTINUUM OF CARE

The Greater Chico Homeless Task Force (GCHTF) was established in 1997. The GCHTF was formed in response to the Salvation Army operated emergency shelter being closed. The Salvation Army was using the National Guard Armory at the local state fairgrounds in the winter. The National Guard left the fairgrounds and the facility was no longer available to the Salvation Army. Over the first 8 years of the GCHTF’s existence a number of housing services were created and linked:

- A local non profit organization was created with the sole mission to provide services to the homeless.
- The GCHTF has met monthly to manage the local continuum of services.
- A community shelter was built that provides emergency shelter for up to 89 persons.
• An outreach program was instituted by the Behavioral Health Department of Butte County.
• The transitional housing facility for families relocated to a new site and expanded from 13 units to 60.
• The City of Chico in conjunction with the Housing Authority of the County of Butte implemented a tenant based rental assistance program.
• The community has received four Super NOFA awards from HUD in the last 5 years.
• The supportive services providers are a very critical element of the continuum and they have coordinated efforts to maximize the services delivered in this era of restricted budgets.

The GCHTF continues to meet on a monthly basis to continue its mission of coordinating services and advocating, at a policy level, for projects and programs which further the goal of providing a wide range of shelter, transitional housing, and permanent affordable housing options.

In 2008, the Butte County Homeless Continuum of Care expanded from the earlier functions of the GCHTF. An oversight Council is made up of members from the cities of Chico, Paradise, Oroville and Gridley, the Butte County Housing Authority, as well as representatives from Butte County Behavioral Health, geographic homeless taskforces within the County and non-profit providers such as Community Action Agency, Caminar, Northern Valley Catholic Social Services, and the Torres Community Shelter. This Council meets on a quarterly basis. The council representatives also all contribute to the funding of a part-time Continuum of Care Coordinator, whose job is to oversee such functions as the annual HUD application for homeless housing services, the Point-in-Time Count, HMIS, other homeless service grant opportunities and coordination among service providers. The larger Continuum of Care meets on a quarterly basis, and the Continuum has a number of specialized subcommittees, such as the Runaway and Homeless Youth Taskforce, the Point-in-Time Census Committee, HMIS Workgroup, Voices Focus Group (which includes homeless individuals), Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Committee, and the 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness subcommittee.

VII. CAPER NARRATIVES

a) Anti-Poverty Strategy
The City’s anti-poverty strategy consists of micro-enterprise counseling, tenant-based rental assistance, subsidized childcare and the funding for transitional housing programs which provide a safety net for very-low income families.

• The micro-enterprise counseling program assisted 104 small businesses in 2009-10 by training them in basic business skills such as book-keeping and accounting, marketing and sales, record-keeping, research and development and business planning.

• The City provides funding for affordable child care with CDBG public services grants and general funds. In 2009-10 115 families received subsidized childcare.

• The City provides temporary housing assistance to CalWORKS participants with the HOME Tenant Based Rental Assistance program. Thirty-three households received assistance in 2009-10.

• The City provides funding for transitional housing services provided by Community Action Agency/Esplanade House and Catalyst Women’s Domestic Violence Services. These transitional housing services provide a safety net for very-low income families who are in crisis and have recently experienced homelessness. These services allow them to stabilize their lives and their income by providing them with low-cost subsidized housing until they can regain their independence.

b) Public Housing
The Housing Authority of the County of Butte (HACB) continued to implement the priorities of the Comprehensive Grant Program during this period. HACB has continued to work with residents to provide an environment in which they are able to accumulate adequate resources in order to encourage them to move into homeownership.

c) Lead Based Paint
Participants in HOME and CDBG-funded housing programs are provided with information on lead hazards. All housing units built before 1978 to be rehabilitated with CDBG or HOME funds are tested for lead hazards. The City has implemented a lead-based paint hazard reduction program pursuant to 24 CFR Part 35. The City has contracted
with a consulting firm to conduct risk assessments, supervise construction activity and perform clearance testing. The City requires contractors performing lead-hazard reduction work or disturbing lead-based paint to have the appropriate certifications.

d) HOME Unit Inspections
The one federal HOME-funded rental project completed during this reporting period was Avenida Apartments, and this project has been subject to one on-site monitoring and review. The City has an annual inspection program for state HOME-funded units which include Walker Commons, Campbell Commons, Cameo Court and the Esplanade House.

The inspections and monitoring visits conducted in 2009-10 found no material concerns.

e) Private Sector Leveraging
The City encouraged Private Sector participation in all 2009-2010 HOME-funded activities. All construction contracts for the HOME-funded housing rehabilitation program are made available to private sector contractors. The Mortgage Subsidy Program utilizes private mortgage lenders and owner participation in the acquisition of single family homes.

The Tenant-Based Rental Assistance Program provided assistance and security deposit grants for “at risk” tenants. The success of the program depends very much on the participation of private sector landlords. The City works in cooperation with private non-profit service providers to implement the program.

f) Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO)
Currently, there are two eligible CHDOs in the Chico area. The City has designated Community Housing Improvement Program (CHIP) and the Community Action Agency of Butte County as eligible CHDOs for participation in the HOME program.

g) Affirmative Marketing
During this reporting period the City continued to follow Affirmative Marketing Strategies for all housing projects. All projects and programs are available to all citizens. Information is made available through public meetings, newspapers, brochures, television and radio.

Pursuant to 24. CFR 92.351 affirmative marketing procedures are required for HOME-assisted housing projects containing 5 or more housing units. The Avenida Apartments project complied with these requirements and is fully leased-up.

The City has an active Fair Housing Program to inform the public, owners, and tenants about Fair Housing Law. HOME and CDBG funded projects and programs are marketed through the commercial media with the use of the Equal Housing Opportunity logo.

h) Minority Outreach
The City has made an effort to procure construction bids from minority and women owned businesses for public improvement projects and housing rehabilitation projects. All bids are procured through the regional contractors exchange which includes minority and women owned businesses. The Mortgage Subsidy Program is marketed to all sectors of the population.

i) Displacement
The City has not displaced any tenants as a result of any projects assisted under the HOME program.

j) Economic Development/Rehab Loans
No economic development loans were made in the program year.

Information on Housing Rehabilitation loans is available in the previous section and in the appended IDIS reports.

k) Other Actions
During the 2009-2010 program year the City took the following actions to meet the community's needs:

- **Coordination - Public Housing** The City continued to work with the Housing Authority of the County of Butte (HACB) and other private housing and social service agencies in order to foster public housing improvements and resident initiatives. The Housing Authority continued to work with a local architectural firm to re-evaluate the buildings discussed in their Comprehensive Plan. The Housing Authority continued to renovate buildings as part of their Plan during the year.

- **Serving Underserved Needs** The City is an active participant in the Greater Chico Homeless Task Force to plan for the needs of homeless families and individuals and those at risk of homelessness. The City also undertook a major outreach effort to the community with the update of the City’s Housing Element. This included 2 stakeholder’s meetings in which the community was invited to come and share their thoughts and personal experiences regarding gaps in housing availability and services, and the most effective programs to meet those needs. There was also a series of four educational symposia on affordable housing strategies, including a local housing trust fund, inclusionary zoning, land trusts, and employer-assisted housing. A special workshop was conducted with tenants currently living in affordable housing units. The information gathered was used to formulate strategies, policies and programs in the updated Housing Element, which was adopted by the City Council in August 2009.

- **Barriers to Affordable Housing** The City continued to implement the Housing Element of its General Plan and completed the 2009 Housing Element update in August 2009, with its final adoption by Council. With the updated Housing Element, a number of new strategies will be implemented to address a number of on-going barriers, such as inadequate funding to meet affordable housing needs (Housing Trust Fund), and ways to more fully integrate affordable housing throughout the community (Inclusionary Ordinance).

- **Foster and Maintain Affordable Housing** The City continued to operate the Tenant-Based Rental Assistance program with a consortium of housing and social service providers. The Program provides rental assistance to very low-income families that are participating in self-sufficiency programs. As described earlier the City has an active housing production program which includes regulatory agreements and on-going monitoring for continued affordability. The City monitors the status of units at risk of conversion to market rate and works with local housing developers to plan for acquisition and rehabilitation of such projects. One of the potential strategies considered in the Housing Element update was the establishment of Community Land Trusts to maintain long-term affordability. While this strategy did not garner a large amount of interest or support, the City will work with any group interested in forming such a land trust in the future.

- **Overcoming Gaps In Institutional Structure** The City continues to work with non-profit groups to improve the organizational capacity of housing and service organizations. The City is interested in developing more Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs), and is also interested in pursuing designation of Community Based Development Organizations (CBDOS) to assist the City with neighborhood revitalization and other appropriate and eligible projects. Chico is somewhat limited due to its geographic isolation, but we believe that we can develop more capacity in the coming years to address any unprovided or underserved needs.

- **Compliance and Monitoring** The City's Housing & Neighborhood Services Department is responsible for monitoring the continued affordability of projects assisted by the City and/or the Redevelopment Agency. Assisted projects submit annual reports and certifications of occupancy which document household size and annual income. The affordability restrictions are a minimum of 30 years for HOME-funded projects and in most cases the period has been 55 years, due to the involvement of RDA funds and/or tax credits.

  Home ownership assistance is monitored annually for occupancy by the assisted family. Home ownership assistance is re-captured in the event of sale, transfer or rental of the property.

The City is required to submit an annual Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report to HUD for its CDBG and HOME grant. In addition, the City is required by HUD to submit a five-year Consolidated Plan and an Annual Plan for all proposed activities.
The Redevelopment Agency must submit an annual housing assistance report to the State Department of Housing and Community Development and it must comply with an Affordable Housing Plan which has ten year goals and objectives for the Agency to maintain compliance with its housing production requirements.

VIII. SELF-EVALUATION

As summarized in “Section I” the City made significant progress towards meeting the goals of the Consolidated Plan. An evaluation of the City's actions by need area follows.

Planning and Program Administration
The City has continued to adequately provide for the general administration, planning and oversight of CDBG and HOME-funded activities. No specific goals were set in the annual plan.

The City completed its planning effort for the next Consolidated Plan in the 2009-10 program year. The City of Chico undertook a significant public outreach process in order to encourage citizen participation in the development of the Consolidated Plan. This outreach effort included: four workshops, focus group meetings with low-income and special needs populations, a community needs survey published in English, Spanish and Hmong, and the required public hearings at the City's Finance Committee and City Council. The City submitted its Consolidated Plan to HUD in May 2010 and was notified in July 2010 that the Plan had been approved by HUD.

Equal Housing Opportunity
The City has continued to fund both general education regarding fair housing as well as targeted assistance to low-income persons.

Housing
In its fifth year of its five-year Consolidated Plan the City’s housing production is well on-target to meet most of its five-year goals. The noticeable exceptions are home ownership development and single-room-occupancy housing. The rapid appreciation in land values in recent years has led the City and non-profit developers to wait on single-family affordable development until prices stabilize. However, one single family project was completed during the year, a 6-unit self-help project sponsored by Community Housing Improvement Program (CHIP), known as Manzanita Place. Habitat for Humanity has also begun construction on an 8-unit ownership project, and CHIP plans to sponsor another 13-unit project. We also plan to work with a private-developer on a two-house infill project targeting moderate income homeowners, as well as a similar project which incorporates solar energy. Single-room occupancy housing projects have also fallen prey to rapid appreciation in land values, the lack of appropriate sites for such housing, and most of all, appropriate funding which can address the difficulties of long-term operational stability for such projects which have little net income, due to the extremely low rents. Working on this area is also a focus of the Housing Element update.

The first-time home buyer program continued its increased activity in 2009-10. The City/RDA provided 43 households with downpayment assistance loans in 2009-10, compared to 36 loans in 2008-09, 44 loans in 2007-08 and only 9 loans in 2006-07. The program is clearly contributing to the City’s goal of increasing home ownership opportunities for low-moderate income households.

The City expects our Housing Rehabilitation program to become a larger part of our overall housing strategy. With the City’s aging and deteriorating housing stock, and high percentage of rentals (due to the student population), it is likely that increasing resources will be directed to this area. The City may also explore focusing housing rehabilitation to geographic target areas, perhaps in conjunction with a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area(s).

The credit and home purchase counseling program helps families and individuals to effectively manage their credit and prepare to purchase a home. This program is part of the City’s effort to prevent default within its Mortgage Subsidy Program as well as to generally assist low and moderate income households to maintain their credit and avoid default on home loans. It has proven to be effective.
The Rental Housing Accessibility Program provides essential modifications to the homes rented by disabled persons. This program meets a need that the Housing Rehabilitation Program (HRP) cannot. The HRP is structured to provide assistance to owner-occupants and is intended to handle much more significant repairs.

Homelessness
The City’s multi-faceted collaborative approach has dramatically increased the City’s (and the county’s) capacity to meet the needs of the homeless. The City has also made adequate progress towards achieving the Consolidated Plan’s five-year goals for homelessness. Two exciting developments are the successful funding and hiring of a part-time Continuum of Care Coordinator and the successful development of a drop-in day center, to be operated by Club Stairways, for persons experiencing mental illness.

The Tenant-Based Rental Assistance program assisted 33 households. The collaboration with the Housing Authority of the County of Butte has proven to be highly effective, and the City is continuing to work with them to improve the program and target families enrolled in self-sufficiency programs.

The Torres Shelter has been in operation for 5 years. With a new project in 2009-10, the Torres Shelter increased its capacity to shelter families and be able to provide health examinations and private counseling among other services.

The City has worked with Caminar to create a special needs housing facility (Avenida Apartments) for persons who previously were homeless, and is continuing to work with Catalyst Women’s Services to construct a new shelter for victims of domestic violence. This project began construction in May 2009 and was completed in January 2010.

The Greater Chico Homeless Task Force has continued to develop and increase its capacity. It has implemented an HMIS system and during the program year, secured a record amount of funding for the homeless of our community. The Task Force has continued to broaden its membership and diversify its efforts and helped to launch the newly re-organized Countywide Continuum of Care.

Non-housing Community Development
Public services funded a broad range of services that benefited low-income persons and special needs populations. Through the 5-year Consolidated Plan period, the City has allocated the maximum allowable 15% for public services from each year’s CDBG grant. This funding has helped to leverage thousands of non-entitlement dollars for the benefit of our community. The only lack or shortfall in this program has to do with the necessary funding to meet the breadth of needs in the community. When you consider that the non-homeless providers have served over 9,000 individuals over the last 5 years, and with over 7,000 homeless individuals served, it is obvious that this program has provided a tremendous community benefit through the provision of safety-net, social services for those citizens who are most at-risk and vulnerable.

Many areas of the city are under a State of California order to hook up to City sewer, due to nitrate contamination of groundwater caused by septic tanks. One program that was instituted this year which bridges the gap between housing and public infrastructure was the Sewer Lateral Program. This provided low-income homeowners residing in Nitrate Compliance Areas with grant assistance to enable them to abandon their septic tanks and hook up to the City’s sewer system. Without this program, many would not have the financial means to complete these important connections.

Economic Development
Over the past few years the City has reduced the role of CDBG in supporting economic development activities. A greater reliance has been placed on local tourism tax and redevelopment revenues, especially in light of the CDBG limitations when considering economic development activities.
IX. AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING

The City of Chico's Analysis of Impediments (AI) included five recommendations summarized as follows:

a) promote education on Fair Housing;

b) continue to fund Legal Services of Northern California;

c) educate members of North Valley Property Owners' Association and Chico Board of Realtors on Fair Housing issues;

d) update the Fair Housing pamphlet and;

e) continue to gather data on Fair Housing issues and monitor Fair Housing issues in Chico.

The City has pro-actively funded Fair Housing education for community members and housing professionals. City staff has provided many referrals on Fair Housing and tenants' rights to the appropriate agencies. In addition, the City has monitored Fair Housing practices in City and Redevelopment Agency-funded housing projects.

In accordance with the recommendations in the City's Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice the City continues to provide referrals and education on Fair Housing through non-profit agencies. During this reporting period the City sponsored four educational seminars on Fair Housing for landlords and tenants. The workshops have been well attended. The attendees are provided with updated brochures on Fair Housing and tenants' rights. The City has contracted with two organizations to conduct Fair Housing Seminars, Legal Services of Northern California and North Valley Property Owner’s Association:

Legal Services of Northern California (LSNC)

Legal Services has a branch office in Chico where they provide advice, referral and direct legal representation to low-income City residents and groups in non-fee generating civil cases. The Chico office has three attorneys, three paralegals and four support staff members. Legal Services also provides a large amount of community education. The City of Chico cooperates with Legal Services by providing public services funding for direct client assistance and funding for their Fair Housing educational programs. The focus of the educational programs is on tenants. Legal Services and City staff market the Fair Housing Seminars extensively through direct mailing to community groups, tenant groups, government organizations and newspaper advertisements.

The seminars are usually conducted in either neighborhood centers or at City Hall in the early evening in an informal setting. Landlords are welcome to attend the seminars to learn about Fair Housing Laws from the perspective of the tenant. The seminars are usually two hours long with ample time for one on one questions with the Legal Services attorneys. Legal Services attempts to highlight a different Fair Housing issue during each seminar such as the Americans with Disabilities Act and addressing housing problems within the Hmong community. Interpreters are provided for non-English speaking persons. Housing & Neighborhood Services staff attends all of the seminars to provide information on City services and City regulations. Legal Services also provides Fair Housing training to non-profit agencies that are operating housing programs.

North Valley Property Owners Association (NVPOA)

NVPOA is a member of the California Housing Providers Coalition. NVPOA represents 13,000 rental units in the North Valley, most of which are located in the Chico Urban area. NVPOA represents owners of over 60% of the apartments in Chico. NVPOA has an ongoing educational program to provide landlords with updated information on the changes in laws that affect the rental industry. The City provides funding each year for educational programs that focus on Fair Housing Law and Landlord Tenant relationships. Many property owners require their resident managers to attend the seminars in order to keep them current on changes in the laws. The seminars are usually held at the City Council Chamber in the early evening. The subject matter of the seminars varies for each meeting. Housing & Neighborhood Services staff communicates with NVPOA throughout the year regarding tenant/landlord and Fair Housing issues.
2009 - 2010 Fiscal Year Code Enforcement Activities - 1633 Cases
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- Outside Low \ Moderate Income Areas - 46%
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- 1000 - 2, 4, 5-6
- 1100 - 1-5
- 1200 - 1-4
- 1300 - 1-4
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Hi Lynda, Thanks for reminding me about that. I want to request that we put on the next City Council agenda to discuss the owning of chickens (no more than 3), and defer the cost of the use permit based upon citizen emails, concerns over the health and safety issues currently with the commercial egg industry, and to promote the growing ones own food. TPN