CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (RDA)  
CONCURRENT REGULAR MEETING  

AGENDA  

John Beaudet Community Center  
1525 Median Avenue  
Shasta Lake, CA  96019  

Tuesday, March 15, 2011 at 6:00 P.M.  

The Brown Act prohibits the Council from taking action on any item not placed on the Agenda in most cases. The Brown Act requires any non-confidential documents or writings distributed to a majority of the City Council less than 72 hours before a regular meeting to be made available to members of the public at the same time they are distributed.

Should supplemental materials to be evaluated in the decision making process be made available to the members of the legislative body at the meeting, seven (7) copies must be provided to the City Clerk who will distribute them.

Agenda packets are available for public review at City Hall, 1650 Stanton Drive, Shasta Lake, CA during normal business hours of 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. weekdays, excluding holidays.

Parties with a disability as provided by the American Disabilities Act who require special accommodations in order to participate in the public meeting should make a request to the City Clerk at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

1.0 CITY COUNCIL/RDA MEETING – CALL TO ORDER – 6:00 PM

Call to order (please place cell phones and pagers on silent.
Statement for the record of Council/Board members present
Pledge of Allegiance
Invocation

2.0 AWARDS/RECOGNITIONS

CC a) Resolution commending the Central Valley High School Varsity Basketball Team for their successful season of accomplishments and teamwork – to be read by Councilmember Watkins.

CC b) Resolution honoring our local Law Enforcement Officers for their dedication in serving our community - to be read by Councilmember Farr.

CC c) Resolution honoring the Shasta Lake Citizen’s Patrol for their service to our community - to be read by Councilmember Dixon.

3.0 COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 Presentations:

a) Grand Oaks Elementary Students – report on vandalism
b) Brian Harris from Shasta County Public Health – Presentation on upcoming Skate and Art Show.

c) Outside Agency Funding Reports:
Gateway Unified School District – Multi-Cultural Program
Shasta Lake Heritage and Historical Society

3.2 Public Comment Period:
This time is set aside for citizens to address the City Council/RDA Board on matters listed on the Consent Agenda as well as other items not included on the regular agenda. If your comments concern an item noted on the regular agenda, please address the Council after that item is open for public comment. Each speaker is allocated three (3) minutes to speak. Speakers may not cede their time. Comments should be limited to matters within the jurisdiction of the City. Persons wishing to address the Council/RDA should fill out a Speaker Request Form prior to the beginning of the meeting and submit it to the City Clerk. Forms are available from the City Clerk, 1650 Stanton Drive, Shasta Lake, on the City’s website, or at the back of the meeting hall. If you have documents to present to members of the Council to review, please provide a minimum of seven copies.

3.3 Commission/Committee Reports

3.4 Staff Comments/Reports
a) Development Services Director Carla Thompson – report on Mayor’s appointment of Planning Commissioners Kirkland and van Wyhe to the Grading, Erosion and Hillside Development Ordinance Ad Hoc Committee.

3.5 City Council/RDA Board Comments/Reports
Brief reports by members of the Council regarding correspondence, events and or/meetings attended. Announcements of upcoming events or meetings. In compliance with Assembly Bill 1234, Council will report on attendance at conferences/meetings/events reimbursed at City expense.

Announcement: Damboree Community Awards Banquet.

4.0 CONSENT AGENDA

NOTICE: The items listed under the Consent Agenda are considered routine business and will be voted on together by one motion unless a Council Member requests a specific item to be removed and discussed separately.

CC/RDA 4.1 Approval of the regular CC/RDA meeting minutes for March 1, 2011.

CC 4.2 Resolution approving an agreement with the City of Redding for Summer Fun Camp 2011.

CC 4.3 Resolution authorizing the City to accept donations and disburse funds for school band uniforms.

Three Minute Break.
5.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS

CC 5.1 Public Hearing and possible action on Resolution authorizing submittal of an application to the State Community development Block Gant Program, Economic Development Allocation, for Microenterprise training and technical assistance activities, and authorizing the City Manager or Designee to execute all documents and amendments pertaining to the application and award. Page 22

RDA 5.2 Public Hearing and possible action to approve the use of Redevelopment Agency funds to rehabilitate the John Beaudet Community Center. Page 27

RDA 5.3 Public Hearing and possible action to approve the use of Redevelopment Agency funds for upgrade of Lift Station #4. Page 32

RDA 5.4 Public Hearing and possible action to approve the use of Redevelopment Agency funds in the amount of $41,000 for upgrades to Park Lighting within Clair Engle Park. Page 38

RDA 5.5 Public Hearing and possible action to approve the use of Redevelopment Agency funds for design of a new reclaimed water line to serve the Tierra Oaks Golf Course. Page 43

Three Minute Break.

6.0 REGULAR AGENDA

CC 6.1 Discussion and possible action to conduct the second reading of an Ordinance establishing an electric utility rate increase. Page 49

CC 6.2 Discussion and possible action to adopt a Resolution approving a waiver of building permit fees for the Wynne Price Park Scoreboard. Page 51

CC 6.3 Discussion and possible action approving the Housing Element Annual Report. Page 57

CC 6.4 Discussion and possible action authorizing the City Attorney to cooperate with the League of California Cities, California Redevelopment Association, and other cities and counties in litigation challenging the constitutionality of the elimination of Redevelopment Agencies. Page 69

CC 6.5 Discussion and possible action to accept the City’s FY 2009/2010 Audited Financial Statements. Page 73

7.0 COUNCIL/STAFF REPORTS/COMMENTS

7.1 Staff Comments/Reports

7.2 City Council./RDA Board Comments/Reports

8.0 ADJOURNMENT
Committee and Commission Meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Council/ Redevelopment Agency</td>
<td>1st and 3rd Tuesday at 6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>3rd Thursday at 6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Advisory</td>
<td>4th Wednesday at 6:00 p.m. in January, March,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>May, July, September, and November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City Council Meetings are televised on Channel 11 the following Wednesday at 8:30 p.m. and Friday at 2:00 p.m.

“This is an equal opportunity institution”
RESOLUTION CC 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE COMMENDING THE CENTRAL VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL VARSITY BASKETBALL TEAM FOR THEIR SUCCESSFUL SEASON OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND TEAMWORK.

WHEREAS, Central Valley High School Varsity Basketball Team are the 2011 Northern Section CIF Division IV Basketball Champions; and

WHEREAS, their 52-49 point win against the Orland Trojans in the championship game secured them this title; and

WHEREAS, this is the third Section Title win since 1984.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Shasta Lake City Council commends and honors the 2011 Central Valley High School Varsity Basketball Team for their successful season of accomplishments and teamwork.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED this 15th day of March, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

____________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

____________________________
TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
RESOLUTION CC 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE
HONORING OUR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS FOR THEIR
DEDICATION IN SERVING OUR COMMUNITY

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake contracts with the Shasta County Sheriff’s Office for
law enforcement services; and

WHEREAS, the Officers serving our community protect our neighborhoods, our
business, our homes, and our loved ones; and

WHEREAS, these dedicated men and women are professionals whose careers are
among the most challenging, dangerous and stressful; and

WHEREAS, the law enforcement professionals serving our community deserve our
support and thankful recognition.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Shasta Lake City Council hereby
commends and honors our local law enforcement officers for their dedication in serving
our community.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED this 15th day of March, 2011, by the following
vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

____________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

____________________________
TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
RESOLUTION CC 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE
HONORING THE SHASTA LAKE CITIZENS PATROL FOR THEIR SERVICE
TO OUR COMMUNITY

WHEREAS, citizens of Shasta Lake established a community-wide organization, the Shasta Lake Citizen’s Patrol, to assist law enforcement within the community in the protection of our neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, over the years, a large number of citizens have volunteered to provide patrol service to the community in an effort to prevent criminal activity, as well as to report instances of activity that are suspicious; and

WHEREAS, the City Council appreciates those who volunteer to serve our community in this important capacity.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Shasta Lake City Council commends and honors our Citizen’s Patrol and all of those who have volunteered over the years in service to the community.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED this 15th day of March, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

____________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

____________________________
TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
AGENDA ITEM
City Council Meeting

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Jessaca Lugo, Program Manager
DATE: February 22, 2011
SUBJECT: Outside Agency Donation Reports

RECOMMENDATION:

Presentations By:

Gateway Unified School – Multi Cultural Program  Beth Huebner, English Teacher
Shasta Lake Heritage and Historical Society   Barbara Cross, President

BACKGROUND

The City of Shasta Lake provides annual donations to various outside agencies for services that will be utilized towards the benefit of our community. Council has requested periodically to receive written/verbal reports on the expenditure status of the donated funds. Staff notified various agencies of the schedule council meeting, these agencies will have a member report on the status of funding expenditures.

FISCAL IMPACTS:

None

ATTACHMENTS:

None

DISTRIBUTION:

City Council
Assistant City Manager
TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Carla L. Thompson, AICP, Development Services Director
DATE: March 8, 2011
SUBJECT: Grading, Erosion Control and Hillside Development Ordinance Review Committee – Appointment of Planning Commissioners
FILE NO.: P-110-522-185

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends Mayor Lindsay appoint Planning Commissioners Cherrel Kirkland and Richard van Wyhe to the Grading, Erosion Control and Hillside Development Ordinance Review Committee.

BACKGROUND:

At the February 15, 2011, City Council meeting, Mayor Lindsay appointed Councilmembers Farr and Watkins to the Grading, Erosion Control and Hillside Development Ordinance Ad Hoc Review Committee. At the February 17, 2011, Planning Commission meeting, I relayed this information and the Commission expressed their desire to be represented on the Committee. Planning Commissioners Kirkland and van Wyhe stated they would like to serve on the Committee.

The first Review Committee meeting was held on March 2, 2011. In attendance were Councilmembers Farr and Watkins, Carol Martin, Carla Thompson, and two members of the community.

I presented an historical overview of development and subsequent review of the ordinance, commencing with adoption of the original ordinance on February 6, 2007 (see attached table).

The Committee discussed the possibility of including a universal statement in the Ordinance allowing the Development Services Director or Planning Commission to grant an exception for any design standard included in the Ordinance if the exception is supported by substantial evidence demonstrating that the exception would not result in an adverse environmental impact.

For example, under Section 15.08.270 (Design Standards for Hillside Development), the following statement is included:

5
The Planning Commission may approve modifications to these requirements upon demonstration that any such proposed modifications represent a desirable integration of both site and unit design.

Although individual design criteria under Section 15.08.210 (Design Criteria for All Projects) and Section 15.08.280 (Design Standards for Skyline and Ridgeline Development) include allowable exceptions for some of the standards, the current language does not allow an exception to be granted for all of the criteria. This is one amendment that could be considered.

During the Committee meeting, Councilmember Watkins suggested that no visual impact analysis should be required for lots over two acres. He shared a PowerPoint presentation that included a visual impact analysis for Bob Meissner’s property off Shasta Park Drive. The visual impact analysis showed houses constructed along ridgelines.

I again reiterated that my main concern with hillside development in terms of visual impact is not the house but rather the access road/driveway and grading required to extend utilities to the building site.

During the Committee meeting, I discussed staff’s current workload and other projects currently under review by the Development Services Department. I explained these are projects for which applicants have paid a permit fee in order for staff to process their applications. The list of projects is included in the monthly report distributed to City Council by Fred Castagna and is also included in the Planning Commission’s monthly status report that is provided to City Council.

Councilmember Watkins discussed revising his list of 18 points, which may reduce the fee for hiring an outside consultant to complete the environmental review for the Ordinance revisions. Councilmember Watkins indicated that I would need to do some of the work to identify what needs to be done.

During the Committee meeting, we also discussed the Planning Commissions’ interest in having representation on the Review Committee. Commissioners Kirkland and van Wyhe, who were both on the Planning Commission during development of the original ordinance, both expressed interest in serving on the Committee. It is staff’s opinion that Commissioners Kirkland and van Wyhe would provide an historical perspective that would be beneficial during initial discussions of the proposed amendments. The Ad Hoc meetings are open to the public and legal notice of the meeting is provided by the City Clerk. Any proposed amendments would be referred to the Planning Commission and public hearings would be conducted by both the Planning Commission and City Council.

**FISCAL IMPACTS:**

No fiscal impacts would result from the action.

**DISTRIBUTION:**

City Council

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Historical Overview of Ordinance Development and Proposed Revisions
## History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-06-2007</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Adoption of Original Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-12-2010</td>
<td>Joint City Council Planning Commission Workshop</td>
<td>Discussed possible revisions to the Tree Conservation Ordinance and Grading Ordinance. Following numerous public comments on both issues, Mayor Watkins announced he did not hear any great need to change the Ordinances at that time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-18-2010</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Councilwoman Lucero requested an agenda item to consider changing the section related to housing orientation. Council voted 3-2 to refer the matter to the Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-24-2010</td>
<td>Carol Martin, Carla Thompson, Councilmember Greg Watkins, Planning Commissioner Cherrel Kirkland</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss additional items that should be considered for amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-17-2010</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Planning Commission considered the following revisions:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            |                                        | 1. Density transfer provisions for hillside development  
2. Establishing exceptions for larger parcels.  
3. Requirements for orientation of rooflines  
4. Exempting the visual impact analysis for development of a single-family residence on a larger parcel.  
5. Requiring a minimum parcel size of two acres in ridgeline and skyline areas.  
6. Requiring no specific setback for skyline ridges.  
7. Requirements for cut slopes being no steeper than 2:1|
<p>|            |                                        | The Commission voted to schedule a special meeting to discuss the issues.                                                                                                                                                   |
| 07-29-2010 | Planning Commission Special Meeting    | The Commission directed staff to schedule a public hearing to consider amending Section 15.08.270(F) to allow the Planning Commission to grant exceptions to the orientation of rooflines in ridgeline and skyline areas.                     |
| 08-06-2010 | Carol Martin, Carla Thompson, Councilmember Greg Watkins | Discussed options to rescind Ordinance, Modify Ordinance or exempt larger parcels (2 acres) from only the hillside portion of the Ordinance.                                                                                     |
| 08-19-2010 | Planning Commission                    | Conducted public hearing and recommended to City Council an amendment to Section 15.08.280(F).                                                                                                                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Council Members</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-07-2010</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Continued action on the proposed Ordinance to allow time to determine whether Mayor Watkins had a conflict of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-21-2010</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Conducted a public hearing and passed first reading of an Ordinance amending Section 15.08.280(F). Mayor Watkins presented his “18 points” and requested staff review and analyze per CEQA guidelines. City Council voted 3-2 to refer the 18 items to the Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16-2010</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Staff report to inform City Council of status of the proposed amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-01-2010</td>
<td>Carol Martin, Carla Thompson, John Kenny, Councilmember Greg Watkins</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss visual impacts for larger lots. Discussed hiring a consultant to prepare the CEQA Initial Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-01-2011</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Council considered supplemental appropriation of $14,050 for PMC to prepare the Initial Study, including visual impact analysis, consultation with outside agencies and attendance at Planning Commission and City Council meetings. Council voted to deny the request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-15-2011</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Mayor Lindsay appointed Councilmembers Farr and Watkins to a Grading, Erosion Control and Hillside Development Ordinance Ad Hoc Review Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-02-2011</td>
<td>Councilmembers Farr and Watkins, Carol Martin, Carla Thompson</td>
<td>First meeting of the Ad Hoc Review Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF SHASTA LAKE
CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
CONCURRENT MEETING MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR CONCURRENT MEETING
HELD TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2011, AT THE
JOHN BEAUDET COMMUNITY CENTER, 1525 MEDIAN AVENUE, SHASTA LAKE, CALIFORNIA.

1.0 CITY COUNCIL/RDA MEETING - 6:05 p.m.
Council/Board members present: Dixon, Farr, Lindsay, Watkins
Council/Board members absent: Lucero
Pledge of Allegiance
Invocation

2.0 AWARDS/RECOGNITIONS
2.1 Proclamation supporting openness in government and recognizing march 13th through March 19th, 2011 as “Sunshine Week” was read into the record by Councilmember Dixon.

2.2 Proclamation designating the month of March 2011 as Women’s History Month, themed “Our History is Our Strength” was read into the record by Mayor Lindsay.

3.0 COMMUNICATIONS:
3.1 Presentations
a) Outside Agency Funding Reports were given by the following:
   Brandi King – Central Valley High Sober Graduation
   Neva Wacker – Shasta Gateway Library
   Chris Kobe – Shasta Lake Chamber of Commerce

3.2 PUBLIC COMMENT:
Gracious Palmer of Shasta Lake spoke about transparency in government and her opinion that having a local Sunshine Ordinance is important.

Oly Olsen of Shasta Lake expressed disappointment that Councilmember Lucero was absent and stated that he would be coming to future meetings to voice his opinions/complaints.

Brad Dupre of Shasta Lake spoke about poor service being provided by Channel 11.
Chris Lara of Shasta Lake spoke about safety concerns with the crosswalk on Shasta Dam Blvd at Shasta Street.

Brandi King of Shasta Lake gave additional information on Sober Grad activities.

3.3 Commission/Committee Reports

3.4 Staff Comments/Reports:

City Attorney John Kenny spoke about the proposed bill to abolish Redevelopment Agencies.

Development Services Director Carla Thompson gave Council an update on the 3M Moody Flats Quarry Project in Shasta County.

3.5 City Council/RDA Board Reports/Comments/Correspondence

Miscellaneous comments

4.0 CONSENT AGENDA:

4.1 Approval of the regular CC/RDA meeting minutes of February 15, 2011.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Watkins/Dixon), and carried, the consent calendar was approved.

5.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS

6.0 REGULAR AGENDA

6.1 Discussion and possible action to conduct the second reading and adoption of an Ordinance amending the zoning map designation from Single-family Residential (R-1) to Multi-family Residential – office (R-4) for Assessor’s Parcel Number 075-140-011, located generally on the south side of Trinity Street west of Cascade Blvd and east of West Street in the City of Shasta Lake.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Watkins/Farr), and carried, Ordinance 11-218 was approved.

6.2 Discussion and possible action to conduct the first reading of an amended Ordinance establishing an electric utility rate increase.

Public Comment:

Richard Kern of Shasta Lake spoke about the need to keep the Electric Rate Ad Hoc Committee going and to look for other ways to avoid additional rate increases.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Watkins/Dixon), and carried, the Ordinance was read by short title only and moved to the second reading.

6.3 Discussion and possible action to approve the Fiscal Year 2010/2011 Mid-Year Budget.
Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Farr/Dixon), and carried, Resolution CC 11-08 was approved.

6.4 Discussion and possible action to approve the Redevelopment Agency’s Fiscal Year 2010/2011 Mid-Year Budget.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Watkins/Dixon), and carried, Resolution RDA 11-05 was approved.

7.0 COUNCIL/STAFF REPORTS/COMMENTS

7.1 Staff Comments

None

7.2 Council Comments/Reports

None

8.0 ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the City Council/RDA Board, Mayor Lindsay adjourned the meeting at 8:02 pm.

TONI M. COATES, CMC
City Clerk
Redevelopment Agency Secretary
AGENDA ITEM  
City Council Meeting

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Jose Castro, Public Works Supervisor
DATE: March 8, 2011
SUBJECT: Summer Fun Camp 2011
FILE: P-050-668-757

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the City of Shasta Lake enter into an agreement with the City of Redding Parks and Recreation Department to conduct Summer Fun Camp 2011. The Summer Camp Program would run for eight weeks from June 13th through August 5th, 2011. The program would be offered to children ages 6-12 years of age. Each week will revolve around a theme that will include a field trip.

BACKGROUND:
In past years, the City of Shasta Lake has contracted with the City of Redding to provide a Summer Fun Camp for children in Shasta Lake. Attendance has averaged 45 participants per week.

The program cost is $112 per week. The City paid a portion of those fees to keep the cost down. The City’s portion would be $45 per participant which leaves $67 for the parents to pay.

FISCAL IMPACTS
Anticipating up to 50 participants at $45 per week for 8 weeks, the City’s portion of costs would be $18,000. Funds are currently budgeted in the Parks and Recreation fund, 05-12-000-5527.

ATTACHMENTS:
Resolution and Agreement

DISTRIBUTION:
City Council
Parks and Recreation Commission
RESOLUTION CC 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE APPROVING
THE AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY OF REDDING FOR
SUMMER FUN CAMP 2011

WHEREAS, the City of Redding Recreation Department will operate a Summer Fun Camp 2011 in Shasta Lake, and

WHEREAS, the program will run for eight weeks from June 13th through August 5th; and

WHEREAS, the program would be offered to children ages 6-12 years of age; and

WHEREAS, the cost to the City would be $45 per participant, not to exceed the $18,000 currently budgeted.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Shasta Lake hereby authorizes the City Manager to enter into an agreement with the City of Redding for the operation of Summer Fun Camp 2011.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

TONI COATES, CMC, City Clerk
CITY OF REDDING
CONSULTING AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT

THIS CONTRACT is made at Redding, California, by and between the City of Redding ("CITY"), a municipal corporation, and City of Shasta Lake, a municipal corporation for the purpose of providing Summer Camps at Shasta Lake School.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties covenant and agree, for good consideration hereby acknowledged, as follows:

SECTION 1. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this Contract, CITY shall provide to City of Shasta Lake the following services:

(1) Employ personnel to provide recreation services for the City of Shasta Lake. Services will be provided by recreation staff from Monday through Friday, 7:30 am - 5:30 pm for a total of eight weeks.

(2) City shall perform said services as an independent calling and shall not be deemed an employee or officer of the City of Shasta Lake for any purpose.

SECTION 2. COMPENSATION AND REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS

A. City of Shasta Lake shall pay CITY for services rendered pursuant to this Contract, a fee for services upon invoicing based on $45 per participant per week. Said fees will be paid to the CITY within 30 days of receipt of CITY’s invoice and not to exceed eighteen thousand dollars ($18,000). The payments specified herein shall be the only payments to be made to CITY for services rendered pursuant to this Contract.

B. All correct, complete and undisputed invoices sent by CITY to City of Shasta Lake shall be paid within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt.

SECTION 3. TERM AND TERMINATION

A. CITY shall commence work on or about June 13, 2011 and complete said work no later than August 5, 2011 with a target date of completion of August 5, 2011.
B. If City of Shasta Lake fails to pay any undisputed invoice within thirty (30) days, and such failure continues ten (10) days after CITY gives City of Shasta Lake notice of such failure, CITY shall have the right to terminate this contract immediately without liability to City of Shasta Lake. The right to terminate under the terms of this provision shall be in addition to all other legal, equitable or contractual remedies available to CITY.

C. Either Party may terminate this Contract without cause on thirty (30) calendar days’ written notice. Notwithstanding the preceding, if the term set forth in Section 3.A. of this Contract exceeds ninety (90) calendar days in duration, City of Shasta Lake’S sole right to terminate shall be limited to termination for cause.

D. In no event shall the termination or expiration of this Contract be construed as a waiver of any right to seek remedies in law, equity or otherwise for a Party’s failure to perform each obligation required by this Contract.

SECTION 4. MISCELLANEOUS TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT

A. No provision of this Contract is intended to, or shall be for the benefit of, or construed to create rights in, or grant remedies to, any person or entity not a party hereto.

B. No verbal agreement or conversation with any official, officer, agent or employee of City, either before, during or after the execution of this contract, shall affect or modify any of the terms or conditions contained in this agreement, nor shall any such verbal agreement or conversation entitle City of Shasta Lake to any additional payment whatsoever under the terms of this agreement.

SECTION 5. CONTRACT INTERPRETATION, VENUE AND ATTORNEY FEES

A. This Contract shall be deemed to have been entered into in Redding, California. All questions regarding the validity, interpretation or performance of any of its terms or of any rights or obligations of the parties to this Contract shall be governed by California law, and any action brought by either party to enforce any of the terms of this Contract shall be filed in the Shasta County Superior Court. If any claim, at law or otherwise, is made by either party to this Contract, the prevailing party shall be entitled to its costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees.

B. This document, including all exhibits, contains the entire agreement between the parties and supersedes whatever oral or written understanding each may have had prior to the execution of this Contract. This Contract shall not be altered, amended or modified except by a writing signed by City and City of Shasta Lake. No verbal agreement or conversation with any official, officer, agent or employee of City, either before, during or after the execution of this Contract, shall affect or modify any of the
terms or conditions contained in this Contract, nor shall any such verbal agreement or conversation entitle City of Shasta Lake to any additional payment whatsoever under the terms of this Contract.

C. If any portion of this Contract or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be invalid or unenforceable to any extent, the remainder of this Contract shall not be affected thereby and shall be enforced to the greatest extent permitted by law.

D. The headings in this Contract are inserted for convenience only and shall not constitute a part hereof. A waiver of any party of any provision or a breach of this Contract must be provided in writing, and shall not be construed as a waiver of any other provision or any succeeding breach of the same or any other provisions herein.

E. Each Party hereto declares and represents that in entering into this Contract, it has relied and is relying solely upon its own judgment, belief and knowledge of the nature, extent, effect and consequence relating thereto. Each Party further declares and represents that this Contract is made without reliance upon any statement or representation not contained herein of any other Party or any representative, agent or attorney of the other Party. The Parties agree that they are aware that they have the right to be advised by counsel with respect to the negotiations, terms, and conditions of this Contract and that the decision of whether or not to seek the advice of counsel with respect to this Contract is a decision which is the sole responsibility of each of the Parties. Accordingly, no party shall be deemed to have been the drafter hereof, and the principle of law set forth in Civil Code § 1654 that contracts are construed against the drafter shall not apply.

SECTION 6. SURVIVAL


SECTION 7. COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS - NONDISCRIMINATION

A. City of Shasta Lake shall comply with all applicable laws, ordinances and codes of federal, state and local governments.

B. In the performance of this Contract, City of Shasta Lake shall not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, political affiliation, or membership or nonmembership in any organization. City of Shasta Lake shall take affirmative action to ensure applicants are employed and that employees are treated during their employment without regard to their race, color, ancestry, national origin, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, political affiliation, or membership or nonmembership in any organization. Such actions shall
include, but not be limited to, the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer, recruitment or recruitment advertising, layoff or termination, rates of pay or other forms of compensation and selection for training.

SECTION 8. REPRESENTATIVES

A. City's representative for this Contract is Teresa Urricelqui, telephone number (530) 225-4474, fax number (530) 225-4585. All of City of Shasta Lake's questions pertaining to this Contract shall be referred to the above-named person, or to the representative's designee.

B. City of Shasta Lake's representative for this Contract is Jose Castro, telephone number (530) 275-7455, fax number (530) 275-7414. All of City's questions pertaining to this Contract shall be referred to the above-named person.

C. The representatives set forth herein shall have authority to give all notices required herein.

SECTION 9. NOTICES

A. All notices, requests, demands and other communications hereunder shall be deemed given only if in writing signed by an authorized representative of the sender (may be other than the representatives referred to in Section 10 and delivered by facsimile, with a hard copy mailed first class, postage prepaid; or when sent by a courier or an express service guaranteeing overnight delivery to the receiving party, addressed to the respective parties as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To City:</th>
<th>To City of Shasta Lake:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Redding</td>
<td>City of Shasta Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn: Teresa Urricelqui</td>
<td>Attn: Jose Castro, Public Works Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777 Cypess Ave., Redding, CA 96001</td>
<td>1650 Staton Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>Shasta Lake, CA 96019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 496071, Redding, CA 96049-6071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Either party may change its address for the purposes of this paragraph by giving written notice of such change to the other party in the manner provided in this Section.

C. Notice shall be deemed effective upon: 1) personal service; 2) two calendar days after mailing or transmission by facsimile, whichever is earlier.
SECTION 10.  AUTHORITY TO CONTRACT

A. Each of the undersigned signatories hereby represents and warrants that they are authorized to execute this Contract on behalf of the respective parties to this Contract; that they have full right, power and lawful authority to undertake all obligations as provided in this Contract; and that the execution, performance and delivery of this Contract by said signatories has been fully authorized by all requisite actions on the part of the respective parties to this Contract.

B. When the Mayor is signatory to this Contract, the City Manager and/or the Department Director having direct responsibility for managing the services provided herein shall have authority to execute any amendment to this Contract which does not increase the amount of compensation allowable to City of Shasta Lake or otherwise substantially change the nature or scope of the services provided herein.

SECTION 11.  DATE OF CONTRACT

The date of this Contract shall be the date it is signed by City.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, City and City of Shasta Lake have executed this Contract on the days and year set forth below:

CITY OF REDDING,
A Municipal Corporation

Dated: ___________, 2011

By: Kim Niemer, Director,
Community Services

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

RICHARD A. DUVERNAY
City Attorney

__________________________
PAMELA MIZE
City Clerk

__________________________
By:

CITY OF SHASTA LAKE

Dated: ___________, 2011

By:

__________________________
Tax ID No.: ____________________
AGENDA ITEM
City Council Meeting

TO: Mayor and City Councilmembers
FROM: Carol Martin, City Manager
DATE: March 9, 2011
SUBJECT: Authorization to accept donations and pay expenses for School Band Uniforms
FILE:

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends the City Council authorize the City to accept donations and pay expenses related to School Band Uniforms.

BACKGROUND:
Staff was approached by Barbara Cross about coordinating a community effort to provide school band uniforms. As a member of various committees, staff has begun soliciting fund raising ideas and expects to be coordinating them in the near future. Staff has approached the Shasta Lake Coordinating Council and the 2 plus 2 Committee members to assist in this effort.

FISCAL IMPACTS:
None

ATTACHMENTS:
Resolution

DISTRIBUTION:
City Council
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ACCEPT DONATIONS AND EXPEND FUNDS FOR SCHOOL BAND UNIFORMS

WHEREAS, the City Council recognizes the importance of community pride;

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to participate and support a community effort to provide school band uniforms in Shasta Lake; and

WHEREAS, the City Council authorizes city staff to participate in this effort, to accept donations, and expend funds in an effort to provide the school with band uniforms

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Shasta Lake City Council that the City is authorized to accept donations and expend funds for school band uniforms.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March, 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

______________________________
ROD LINDSAY, MAYOR

ATTEST:

______________________________
TONI M. COATES, CITY CLERK
AGENDA ITEM  
City Council Meeting

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Loree Byzick, Program Manager  
        Fred Castagna, Project Manager
DATE: February 28, 2011

SUBJECT: Submittal of Application for Funding - Community Development Block Grant Program, Economic Development Allocation, Microenterprise Training and Technical Assistance

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the City Council hold a public hearing to solicit public input for the 2010/2011 State of California Community Development Block Grant Program, Economic Development Allocation, and approve submittal of an application for funding in the amount of $215,000 for Microenterprise Assistance Activities.

BACKGROUND:

For the past 12 years, microenterprise training and technical assistance has been available to microbusinesses in Shasta County, including the City of Shasta Lake, through a community development block grant awarded to the County of Shasta and implemented by Superior California Economic Development (SCED). This funding expired in December of 2010, and it is unclear as to whether the County will be eligible to apply for funding for the 2010-11 Economic Development Allocation because of the requirement to have an completed and approved housing element prior to the March 28 application deadline.

SCED has proposed submitting an application on behalf of the City of Shasta Lake to provide continuity of service including determining Targeted Income Group (TIG) eligibility, delivering microenterprise training and technical assistance, and facilitating marketing mini-grants.

Recruitment and Eligibility

A microenterprise is defined as a business with five or fewer employees, one of whom is the business owner. All potential participants/businesses must meet microenterprise size and ownership criteria and be screened for TIG eligibility according to HUD/HCD income guidelines.
SCED will document TIG eligibility of potential participants and assess their readiness to enter a business development program.

SCED staff will conduct community outreach to explain microenterprise activities and outline benefits to the community, TIG-owned small businesses, and individuals interested in starting or expanding a microenterprise. Prospective program participants will be recruited through direct mail, press releases, public service announcements, and participation in community events. SCED’s website will be updated with current program information and linked to the jurisdiction’s web site, as well as other local partners such as chambers of commerce.

Training and Technical Assistance

SCED will provide business skills training, technical assistance and coaching for TIG eligible entrepreneurs. Business skills training and coaching are offered in a variety of formats including extended (10-12 week) workshops, independent study, focused workshops on topics of specific interest, one-on-one business and personal development counseling, and site visits. Personalized coaching assistance is critical and is available to participants at every point in the progression through business development. Those program participants meeting underwriting guidelines will be assisted in obtaining access to capital through SCED’s Microloan Program. Entrepreneurs may also be eligible for marketing “mini grants” to help them develop a marketing strategy and develop a toolbox for marketing their business.

Client Tracking and Program Evaluation

A customized database stores income, demographic and programmatic data. Information from the database is the source document used to compile periodic reports for the City and for CDBG. It is also used as a tool to collect data used for program marketing and outreach.

FISCAL IMPACTS:

There is no matching funds requirement and no fiscal impacts would result from this action. Typically, SCED leverages this grant with microloans from their Microloan Program.

ATTACHMENTS:

MDP brochure

DISTRIBUTION:

City Council
RESOLUTION CC 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE AUTHORIZING SUBMITAL OF AN APPLICATION TO THE STATE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ALLOCATION FOR MICROENTERPRISE TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER OR DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS AND AMENDMENTS PERTAINING TO THE APPLICATION AND AWARD.

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake recognizes that it is in the interest of the regional, state, and national economy to stimulate job creation and retention; and

WHEREAS, there is a well-documented need to improve economic opportunity for low- and moderate-income residents of the City of Shasta Lake; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to help small businesses grow and prosper within the community; and

WHEREAS, the City is eligible to apply for funding from the State Community Development Block Grant Program, Economic Development Allocation, for the following activities:

- General Administration: $16,125
- Microenterprise Assistance Activity: $169,044
- Microenterprise Assistance Activity Delivery: $29,831
- Total Application for Funding: $215,000

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Shasta Lake hereby approves submittal of an application for funding in the amount of $215,000 to the State Community Development Block Grant Program, Economic Development Allocation, for Microenterprise Assistance activities, and authorizes the City Manager, or designee, to execute all documents and amendments pertaining to this application and award.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  

______________________________  
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________  
TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
ARE YOU WONDERING?

- Do I have what it takes to own and manage a small business?
- What is a business plan and why do I need one?
- What legal aspects do I need to consider?
- How can I find qualified employees?
- Do I need a computer?
- How do I set up the right record keeping system?
- What does marketing involve?
- Can I operate a business from home?

Contact the Microenterprise Development Program for more information today!
Microenterprise Program May Be the Key to Your Success!

If you...
- Are self-motivated and independent
- Want to be your own boss
- Are not afraid of hard work
- Want to control your own financial resources
- Have a great business idea but just don’t know where to start
- Are interested in finding out what it takes own your own business
- Want to tap the knowledge of others who have business experience

How Can the Microenterprise Program Help You?
The Microenterprise Development Program helps to prepare individuals who are interested in self-employment (entrepreneurs) for the challenge of successfully owning their own business by:
- Helping evaluate interests and abilities
- Developing a business plan
- Exploring the concepts and commitments of self-employment
- Providing materials and coaching during a 12 week workshop covering the important tools needed to run a small or home based business
- Offering one-on-one mentoring to help create a plan for starting and growing a business
- Providing follow-up business counseling for newly created businesses and links to ongoing resources

Superior California Economic Development (SCED) serves a four county region of rural Northern California. District staff, programs and services are committed to helping the communities they serve create stable, long-term employment opportunities.

SCED’s Business Development Loan Program offers loans to qualifying new and established businesses that may not qualify for financing from traditional sources. The Microloan Program was created to provide loan opportunities for qualifying graduates of the Microenterprise Development Program.

SCED staff also assists communities with strategic planning efforts and provides technical assistance in developing grant proposals for economic development projects.

Superior California Economic Development
499 Hemsted Dr., Suite A Redding, CA 96002
(530) 225-2760
Fax (530) 225-2769
AGENDA ITEM
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING

TO: Carol Martin, Executive Officer
FROM: Fred Castagna, Project Manager
DATE: February 18, 2011

SUBJECT: Use of Redevelopment Agency Tax Increment Funds for the rehabilitation of the John Beaudet Community Center.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Redevelopment Agency adopt the attached Resolution approving the use of Redevelopment funds for the rehabilitation of the John Beaudet Community Center.

BACKGROUND:

Providing parks and recreation opportunities and community facilities within the Redevelopment Project Area was first identified in the Redevelopment Plan (Plan) for the Shasta Dam Area Redevelopment Project adopted July 11th, 1989. The Plan was further amended and restated on July 15, 2008. The Plan describes the need for the project as a Plan Goal:

“Provide needed improvements to the community’s recreational, cultural, and other community facilities to better serve the Project Area.”

The project’s estimated costs are $300,000 and include some of the following items:

- Exterior siding rehabilitation
- ADA accessible entrances
- Restroom remodel and ADA upgrades
- Interior flooring replacement
- New dining hall chairs and tables
- HVAC and insulation upgrades
- Energy efficient window and lighting upgrades
FISCAL IMPACTS:

See attached Exhibit A, Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds.

ATTACHMENTS:

Resolution
Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds

DISTRIBUTION:

Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors
RESOLUTION RDA 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY APPROVING THE USE OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF $300,000 TO REHABILITATE THE JOHN BEAUDET COMMUNITY CENTER.

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) adopted a Project Area Redevelopment Plan on July 11, 1989; and

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan provides for the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of property both inside and outside of the Project Area, necessary to carry out the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the John Beaudet Community Center (Community Center) will serve the City of Shasta Lake both inside and outside of the Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Agency desires to contribute tax increment funds received from the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Agency finds, resolves, and orders as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. In connection with the proposed use of Redevelopment funds for rehabilitation of the Community Center within the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area:
   a. The rehabilitation of the Community Center is of benefit to the Project Area;
   b. No other reasonable means of financing the construction are available to the community;
   c. The use of funds for the rehabilitation of the Community Center will assist in the elimination of blight in the Project Area and is consistent with the Project Area’s adopted Implementation Plan; and
   d. The rehabilitation of the Community Center is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

ROD LINDSAY, Chair

ATTEST:

TONI COATES, CMC, Secretary
EXHIBIT A

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED USE OF REDEVELOPMENT FUNDS FOR THE REHABILITATION OF THE JOHN BEAUDET COMMUNITY CENTER

The City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) proposes to provide up to $300,000 in Redevelopment funds to rehabilitate the John Beaudet Community Center.

The project is necessary to help improve community access for Americans with Disabilities to the public facility within the Redevelopment Area and will also help eliminate blight in the project area.

Health and Safety Code Sections 33020, 33021, 33421, 33445, 33678 authorize the Agency to undertake redevelopment activities such as those contemplated herein provided the legislative body determines all of the following findings to be in evidence:

1. That the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are of the primary benefit to the project area from which the funds are derived or to the immediate neighborhood in which the project is located, regardless of whether the improvement is within another project area; and

2. That no other reasonable means of financing the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are available to the community; and

3. That the payment of funds for the acquisition of land or the cost of public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements will assist in elimination of one or more blighting conditions inside the project area and is consistent with an adopted implementation plan; and

4. That the provision of the proposed improvements by the agency is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

Section 33678 of the California Health and Safety Code adds the requirement that if tax increment money is used, the project must meet the definition and purpose of Redevelopment as prescribed in Sections 33020 and 33021 and primarily benefit the project area from which the tax increment money is derived.

These issues are discussed below by topic:

1. **Is the proposed rehabilitation of the John Beaudet Community Center of primary benefit to the project area?**

   Section 33020 defines Redevelopment as the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction, or rehabilitation or any combination of these, of all or part of a survey area and the provision of public, or other structures or spaces as may be appropriate or necessary in the interest of the general welfare. Section 33021 further defines Redevelopment as the alteration, improvement, modernization, reconstruction, or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of existing structures in a project area.

   The rehabilitation of the Community Center is within the Redevelopment Area and will provide expanded access to a community facility by the public and particularly by disabled residents.

2. **Are there any other reasonable means of financing available to the community to finance the project?**
Currently, there are no additional funds within the City’s General Fund to finance this project. Therefore, the only reasonable funding is from the Redevelopment Agency.

3. **Will the proposed activity assist in the elimination of one or more blighting conditions within the Project Area and is it consistent with the Implementation Plan for the Project Area?**

   The proposed activity will assist in the elimination of existing blight conditions in the Project area. Specifically, the John Beaudet Community Center is itself obsolete and in disrepair. Rehabilitation of the building will eliminate blight.

   The proposed project is also consistent with the Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan. The 2005-2009 Amended Implementation Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area was prepared and adopted pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 33490.

   The Implementation Plan specifically describes the Agency’s involvement in the corrections of blight, including defective design and character of physical construction; furthermore it includes the repair of an economic burden that consists of an inadequate public improvement, public facilities, open spaces, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment. The Plan also contains certain goals relative to the elimination of these blighting conditions.

   A. To create new and improved job opportunities by removing those barriers that crime imposes to hamper or impede proper and economic development;
   B. To stimulate private interest in the commercial and industrial sectors; and
   C. To improve the livability of the community in terms of both residential and non-residential districts by providing enhanced safety for residents.

4. **Is the rehabilitation of the John Beaudet Community Center by the Agency necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area?**

   The stated objectives in the Redevelopment plan consist of these major goals:

   1) The elimination of blighting influences and the correction of environmental deficiencies in the Project Area, in particular, structural deterioration, underutilized commercial land, unmanageable parcelization patterns, and inadequate curbs, gutters, paving and sidewalks;

   2) Improved pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the Project Area;

   3) The provision of an environment conducive to social and economic growth, including expansion of job opportunities; and

   4) The expansion and/or improvement of the community’s supply of housing for low- and moderate-income persons.

   The rehabilitation of the Community Center will support all of the above stated objectives both in and out of the project area. Working within the Five Year Implementation Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area, the proposed activity is necessary to support this effort.
RESOLUTION CC 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE
COMMENDING THE CENTRAL VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL VARSITY BASKETBALL
TEAM FOR THEIR SUCCESSFUL SEASON OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND
TEAMWORK.

WHEREAS, Central Valley High School Varsity Basketball Team are the 2011 Northern
Section CIF Division IV Basketball Champions; and

WHEREAS, their 52-49 point win against the Orland Trojans in the championship game
secured them this title; and

WHEREAS, this is the third Section Title win since 1984.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Shasta Lake City Council commends
and honors the 2011 Central Valley High School Varsity Basketball Team for their
successful season of accomplishments and teamwork.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED this 15th day of March, 2011, by the following
vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

____________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

____________________________
TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
RESOLUTION CC 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE
HONORING OUR LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS FOR THEIR
DEDICATION IN SERVING OUR COMMUNITY

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake contracts with the Shasta County Sheriff’s Office for
law enforcement services; and

WHEREAS, the Officers serving our community protect our neighborhoods, our
business, our homes, and our loved ones; and

WHEREAS, these dedicated men and women are professionals whose careers are
among the most challenging, dangerous and stressful; and

WHEREAS, the law enforcement professionals serving our community deserve our
support and thankful recognition.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Shasta Lake City Council hereby
commends and honors our local law enforcement officers for their dedication in serving
our community.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED this 15th day of March, 2011, by the following
vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

____________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

____________________________
TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
RESOLUTION CC 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE
HONORING THE SHASTA LAKE CITIZENS PATROL FOR THEIR SERVICE
TO OUR COMMUNITY

WHEREAS, citizens of Shasta Lake established a community-wide organization, the Shasta Lake Citizen’s Patrol, to assist law enforcement within the community in the protection of our neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, over the years, a large number of citizens have volunteered to provide patrol service to the community in an effort to prevent criminal activity, as well as to report instances of activity that are suspicious; and

WHEREAS, the City Council appreciates those who volunteer to serve our community in this important capacity.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Shasta Lake City Council commends and honors our Citizen’s Patrol and all of those who have volunteered over the years in service to the community.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED this 15th day of March, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

____________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

____________________________
TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
AGENDA ITEM
City Council Meeting

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Jessaca Lugo, Program Manager
DATE: February 22, 2011
SUBJECT: Outside Agency Donation Reports

RECOMMENDATION:

Presentations By:

Gateway Unified School – Multi Cultural Program Beth Huebner, English Teacher
Shasta Lake Heritage and Historical Society Barbara Cross, President

BACKGROUND

The City of Shasta Lake provides annual donations to various outside agencies for services that will be utilized towards the benefit of our community. Council has requested periodically to receive written/verbal reports on the expenditure status of the donated funds. Staff notified various agencies of the schedule council meeting, these agencies will have a member report on the status of funding expenditures.

FISCAL IMPACTS:

None

ATTACHMENTS:

None

DISTRIBUTION:

City Council
Assistant City Manager
AGENDA ITEM
City Council

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Carla L. Thompson, AICP, Development Services Director
DATE: March 8, 2011
SUBJECT: Grading, Erosion Control and Hillside Development Ordinance Review Committee – Appointment of Planning Commissioners
FILE NO.: P-110-522-185

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends Mayor Lindsay appoint Planning Commissioners Cherrel Kirkland and Richard van Wyhe to the Grading, Erosion Control and Hillside Development Ordinance Review Committee.

BACKGROUND:

At the February 15, 2011, City Council meeting, Mayor Lindsay appointed Councilmembers Farr and Watkins to the Grading, Erosion Control and Hillside Development Ordinance Ad Hoc Review Committee. At the February 17, 2011, Planning Commission meeting, I relayed this information and the Commission expressed their desire to be represented on the Committee. Planning Commissioners Kirkland and van Wyhe stated they would like to serve on the Committee.

The first Review Committee meeting was held on March 2, 2011. In attendance were Councilmembers Farr and Watkins, Carol Martin, Carla Thompson, and two members of the community.

I presented an historical overview of development and subsequent review of the ordinance, commencing with adoption of the original ordinance on February 6, 2007 (see attached table).

The Committee discussed the possibility of including a universal statement in the Ordinance allowing the Development Services Director or Planning Commission to grant an exception for any design standard included in the Ordinance if the exception is supported by substantial evidence demonstrating that the exception would not result in an adverse environmental impact.

For example, under Section 15.08.270 (Design Standards for Hillside Development), the following statement is included:
The Planning Commission may approve modifications to these requirements upon demonstration that any such proposed modifications represent a desirable integration of both site and unit design.

Although individual design criteria under Section 15.08.210 (Design Criteria for All Projects) and Section 15.08.280 (Design Standards for Skyline and Ridgeline Development) include allowable exceptions for some of the standards, the current language does not allow an exception to be granted for all of the criteria. This is one amendment that could be considered.

During the Committee meeting, Councilmember Watkins suggested that no visual impact analysis should be required for lots over two acres. He shared a PowerPoint presentation that included a visual impact analysis for Bob Meissner’s property off Shasta Park Drive. The visual impact analysis showed houses constructed along ridgelines.

I again reiterated that my main concern with hillside development in terms of visual impact is not the house but rather the access road/driveway and grading required to extend utilities to the building site.

During the Committee meeting, I discussed staff’s current workload and other projects currently under review by the Development Services Department. I explained these are projects for which applicants have paid a permit fee in order for staff to process their applications. The list of projects is included in the monthly report distributed to City Council by Fred Castagna and is also included in the Planning Commission’s monthly status report that is provided to City Council.

Councilmember Watkins discussed revising his list of 18 points, which may reduce the fee for hiring an outside consultant to complete the environmental review for the Ordinance revisions. Councilmember Watkins indicated that I would need to do some of the work to identify what needs to be done.

During the Committee meeting, we also discussed the Planning Commissions’ interest in having representation on the Review Committee. Commissioners Kirkland and van Wyhe, who were both on the Planning Commission during development of the original ordinance, both expressed interest in serving on the Committee. It is staff’s opinion that Commissioners Kirkland and van Wyhe would provide an historical perspective that would be beneficial during initial discussions of the proposed amendments. The Ad Hoc meetings are open to the public and legal notice of the meeting is provided by the City Clerk. Any proposed amendments would be referred to the Planning Commission and public hearings would be conducted by both the Planning Commission and City Council.

**FISCAL IMPACTS:**

No fiscal impacts would result from the action.

**DISTRIBUTION:**

City Council

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Historical Overview of Ordinance Development and Proposed Revisions
# Grading, Erosion Control and Hillside Development Ordinance

## History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-06-2007</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Adoption of Original Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-12-2010</td>
<td>Joint City Council Planning Commission Workshop</td>
<td>Discussed possible revisions to the Tree Conservation Ordinance and Grading Ordinance. Following numerous public comments on both issues, Mayor Watkins announced he did not hear any great need to change the Ordinances at that time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-18-2010</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Councilwoman Lucero requested an agenda item to consider changing the section related to housing orientation. Council voted 3-2 to refer the matter to the Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-24-2010</td>
<td>Carol Martin, Carla Thompson, Councilmember Greg Watkins, Planning Commissioner Cherrel Kirkland</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss additional items that should be considered for amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-17-2010</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Planning Commission considered the following revisions:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|              |                                                   | 1. Density transfer provisions for hillside development  
|              |                                                   | 2. Establishing exceptions for larger parcels.  
|              |                                                   | 3. Requirements for orientation of rooflines  
|              |                                                   | 4. Exempting the visual impact analysis for development of a single-family residence on a larger parcel.  
|              |                                                   | 5. Requiring a minimum parcel size of two acres in ridgeline and skyline areas.  
|              |                                                   | 6. Requiring no specific setback for skyline ridges.  
|              |                                                   | 7. Requirements for cut slopes being no steeper than 2:1  
<p>|              |                                                   | The Commission voted to schedule a special meeting to discuss the issues.                                                                                                                         |
| 07-29-2010   | Planning Commission Special Meeting               | The Commission directed staff to schedule a public hearing to consider amending Section 15.08.270(F) to allow the Planning Commission to grant exceptions to the orientation of rooflines in ridgeline and skyline areas. |
| 08-06-2010   | Carol Martin, Carla Thompson, Councilmember Greg Watkins | Discussed options to rescind Ordinance, Modify Ordinance or exempt larger parcels (2 acres) from only the hillside portion of the Ordinance.                                                                 |
| 08-19-2010   | Planning Commission                               | Conducted public hearing and recommended to City Council an amendment to Section 15.08.280(F).                                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group/Committee</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-07-2010</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Continued action on the proposed Ordinance to allow time to determine whether Mayor Watkins had a conflict of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-21-2010</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Conducted a public hearing and passed first reading of an Ordinance amending Section 15.08.280(F). Mayor Watkins presented his “18 points” and requested staff review and analyze per CEQA guidelines. City Council voted 3-2 to refer the 18 items to the Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16-2010</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Staff report to inform City Council of status of the proposed amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-01-2010</td>
<td>Carol Martin, Carla Thompson, John Kenny, Councilmember Greg Watkins</td>
<td>Meeting to discuss visual impacts for larger lots. Discussed hiring a consultant to prepare the CEQA Initial Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-01-2011</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Council considered supplemental appropriation of $14,050 for PMC to prepare the Initial Study, including visual impact analysis, consultation with outside agencies and attendance at Planning Commission and City Council meetings. Council voted to deny the request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-15-2011</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Mayor Lindsay appointed Councilmembers Farr and Watkins to a Grading, Erosion Control and Hillside Development Ordinance Ad Hoc Review Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-02-2011</td>
<td>Councilmembers Farr and Watkins, Carol Martin, Carla Thompson</td>
<td>First meeting of the Ad Hoc Review Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 CITY COUNCIL/RDA MEETING - 6:05 p.m.

Council/Board members present: Dixon, Farr, Lindsay, Watkins
Council/Board members absent: Lucero
Pledge of Allegiance
Invocation

2.0 AWARDS/RECOGNITIONS

2.1 Proclamation supporting openness in government and recognizing March 13th through March 19th, 2011 as “Sunshine Week” was read into the record by Councilmember Dixon.

2.2 Proclamation designating the month of March 2011 as Women’s History Month, themed “Our History is Our Strength” was read into the record by Mayor Lindsay.

3.0 COMMUNICATIONS:

3.1 Presentations

a) Outside Agency Funding Reports were given by the following:

   Brandi King – Central Valley High Sober Graduation  
   Neva Wacker – Shasta Gateway Library  
   Chris Kobe – Shasta Lake Chamber of Commerce

3.2 PUBLIC COMMENT:

Gracious Palmer of Shasta Lake spoke about transparency in government and her opinion that having a local Sunshine Ordinance is important.

Oly Olsen of Shasta Lake expressed disappointment that Councilmember Lucero was absent and stated that he would be coming to future meetings to voice his opinions/complaints.

Brad Dupre of Shasta Lake spoke about poor service being provided by Channel 11.
Chris Lara of Shasta Lake spoke about safety concerns with the crosswalk on Shasta Dam Blvd at Shasta Street.

Brandi King of Shasta Lake gave additional information on Sober Grad activities.

3.3 Commission/Committee Reports

3.4 Staff Comments/Reports:

City Attorney John Kenny spoke about the proposed bill to abolish Redevelopment Agencies.

Development Services Director Carla Thompson gave Council an update on the 3M Moody Flats Quarry Project in Shasta County.

3.5 City Council/RDA Board Reports/Comments/Correspondence

Miscellaneous comments

4.0 CONSENT AGENDA:

4.1 Approval of the regular CC/RDA meeting minutes of February 15, 2011.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Watkins/Dixon), and carried, the consent calendar was approved.

5.0 PUBLIC HEARINGS

6.0 REGULAR AGENDA

6.1 Discussion and possible action to conduct the second reading and adoption of an Ordinance amending the zoning map designation from Single-family Residential (R-1) to Multi-family Residential – office (R-4) for Assessor's Parcel Number 075-140-011, located generally on the south side of Trinity Street west of Cascade Blvd and east of West Street in the City of Shasta Lake.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Watkins/Farr), and carried, Ordinance 11-218 was approved.

6.2 Discussion and possible action to conduct the first reading of an amended Ordinance establishing an electric utility rate increase.

Public Comment:

Richard Kern of Shasta Lake spoke about the need to keep the Electric Rate Ad Hoc Committee going and to look for other ways to avoid additional rate increases.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Watkins/Dixon), and carried, the Ordinance was read by short title only and moved to the second reading.

6.3 Discussion and possible action to approve the Fiscal Year 2010/2011 Mid-Year Budget.
Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Farr/Dixon), and carried, Resolution CC 11-08 was approved.

6.4 Discussion and possible action to approve the Redevelopment Agency’s Fiscal Year 2010/2011 Mid-Year Budget.

Motion/Vote

By motion made/seconded (Watkins/Dixon), and carried, Resolution RDA 11-05 was approved.

7.0 COUNCIL/STAFF REPORTS/COMMENTS

7.1 Staff Comments

None

7.2 Council Comments/Reports

None

8.0 ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the City Council/RDA Board, Mayor Lindsay adjourned the meeting at 8:02 pm.

TONI M. COATES, CMC
City Clerk
Redevelopment Agency Secretary
# AGENDA ITEM
City Council Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO:</th>
<th>Carol Martin, City Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FROM:</td>
<td>Jose Castro, Public Works Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE:</td>
<td>March 8, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT:</td>
<td>Summer Fun Camp 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILE:</td>
<td>P-050-668-757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City of Shasta Lake enter into an agreement with the City of Redding Parks and Recreation Department to conduct Summer Fun Camp 2011. The Summer Camp Program would run for eight weeks from June 13th through August 5th, 2011. The program would be offered to children ages 6-12 years of age. Each week will revolve around a theme that will include a field trip.

## BACKGROUND:

In past years, the City of Shasta Lake has contracted with the City of Redding to provide a Summer Fun Camp for children in Shasta Lake. Attendance has averaged 45 participants per week.

The program cost is $112 per week. The City paid a portion of those fees to keep the cost down. The City’s portion would be $45 per participant which leaves $67 for the parents to pay.

## FISCAL IMPACTS

Anticipating up to 50 participants at $45 per week for 8 weeks, the City’s portion of costs would be $18,000. Funds are currently budgeted in the Parks and Recreation fund, 05-12-000-5527.

## ATTACHMENTS:

Resolution and Agreement

## DISTRIBUTION:

City Council
Parks and Recreation Commission
WHEREAS, the City of Redding Recreation Department will operate a Summer Fun Camp 2011 in Shasta Lake, and

WHEREAS, the program will run for eight weeks from June 13th through August 5th; and

WHEREAS, the program would be offered to children ages 6-12 years of age; and

WHEREAS, the cost to the City would be $45 per participant, not to exceed the $18,000 currently budgeted.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Shasta Lake hereby authorizes the City Manager to enter into an agreement with the City of Redding for the operation of Summer Fun Camp 2011.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March 2011 by the following vote:

AYES: 
NOES: 
ABSENT:

_________________________________ 
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

_________________________________ 
TONI COATES, CMC, City Clerk
CITY OF REDDING
CONSULTING AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT

THIS CONTRACT is made at Redding, California, by and between the City of Redding ("CITY"), a municipal corporation, and City of Shasta Lake, a municipal corporation for the purpose of providing Summer Camps at Shasta Lake School.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties covenant and agree, for good consideration hereby acknowledged, as follows:

SECTION 1. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this Contract, CITY shall provide to City of Shasta Lake the following services:

(1) Employ personnel to provide recreation services for the City of Shasta Lake. Services will be provided by recreation staff from Monday through Friday, 7:30 am - 5:30 pm for a total of eight weeks.

(2) City shall perform said services as an independent calling and shall not be deemed an employee or officer of the City of Shasta Lake for any purpose.

SECTION 2. COMPENSATION AND REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS

A. City of Shasta Lake shall pay CITY for services rendered pursuant to this Contract, a fee for services upon invoicing based on $45 per participant per week. Said fees will be paid to the CITY within 30 days of receipt of CITY’s invoice and not to exceed eighteen thousand dollars ($18,000). The payments specified herein shall be the only payments to be made to CITY for services rendered pursuant to this Contract.

B. All correct, complete and undisputed invoices sent by CITY to City of Shasta Lake shall be paid within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt.

SECTION 3. TERM AND TERMINATION

A. CITY shall commence work on or about June 13, 2011 and complete said work no later than August 5, 2011 with a target date of completion of August 5, 2011.
B. If City of Shasta Lake fails to pay any undisputed invoice within thirty (30) days, and such failure continues ten (10) days after CITY gives City of Shasta Lake notice of such failure, CITY shall have the right to terminate this contract immediately without liability to City of Shasta Lake. The right to terminate under the terms of this provision shall be in addition to all other legal, equitable or contractual remedies available to CITY.

C. Either Party may terminate this Contract without cause on thirty (30) calendar days’ written notice. Notwithstanding the preceding, if the term set forth in Section 3.A. of this Contract exceeds ninety (90) calendar days in duration, City of Shasta Lake’s sole right to terminate shall be limited to termination for cause.

D. In no event shall the termination or expiration of this Contract be construed as a waiver of any right to seek remedies in law, equity or otherwise for a Party’s failure to perform each obligation required by this Contract.

SECTION 4. MISCELLANEOUS TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT

A. No provision of this Contract is intended to, or shall be for the benefit of, or construed to create rights in, or grant remedies to, any person or entity not a party hereto.

B. No verbal agreement or conversation with any official, officer, agent or employee of City, either before, during or after the execution of this contract, shall affect or modify any of the terms or conditions contained in this agreement, nor shall any such verbal agreement or conversation entitle City of Shasta Lake to any additional payment whatsoever under the terms of this agreement.

SECTION 5. CONTRACT INTERPRETATION, VENUE AND ATTORNEY FEES

A. This Contract shall be deemed to have been entered into in Redding, California. All questions regarding the validity, interpretation or performance of any of its terms or of any rights or obligations of the parties to this Contract shall be governed by California law, and any action brought by either party to enforce any of the terms of this Contract shall be filed in the Shasta County Superior Court. If any claim, at law or otherwise, is made by either party to this Contract, the prevailing party shall be entitled to its costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees.

B. This document, including all exhibits, contains the entire agreement between the parties and supersedes whatever oral or written understanding each may have had prior to the execution of this Contract. This Contract shall not be altered, amended or modified except by a writing signed by City and City of Shasta Lake. No verbal agreement or conversation with any official, officer, agent or employee of City, either before, during or after the execution of this Contract, shall affect or modify any of the
terms or conditions contained in this Contract, nor shall any such verbal agreement or
conversation entitle City of Shasta Lake to any additional payment whatsoever under
the terms of this Contract.

C. If any portion of this Contract or the application thereof to any person or circumstance
shall be invalid or unenforceable to any extent, the remainder of this Contract shall not
be affected thereby and shall be enforced to the greatest extent permitted by law.

D. The headings in this Contract are inserted for convenience only and shall not constitute
a part hereof. A waiver of any party of any provision or a breach of this Contract must
be provided in writing, and shall not be construed as a waiver of any other provision
or any succeeding breach of the same or any other provisions herein.

E. Each Party hereto declares and represents that in entering into this Contract, it has
relied and is relying solely upon its own judgment, belief and knowledge of the nature,
extent, effect and consequence relating thereto. Each Party further declares and
represents that this Contract is made without reliance upon any statement or
representation not contained herein of any other Party or any representative, agent or
attorney of the other Party. The Parties agree that they are aware that they have the
right to be advised by counsel with respect to the negotiations, terms, and conditions
of this Contract and that the decision of whether or not to seek the advice of counsel
with respect to this Contract is a decision which is the sole responsibility of each of the
Parties. Accordingly, no party shall be deemed to have been the drafter hereof, and the
principle of law set forth in Civil Code § 1654 that contracts are construed against the
drafter shall not apply.

SECTION 6. SURVIVAL

termination of the Contract.

SECTION 7. COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS - NONDISCRIMINATION

A. City of Shasta Lake shall comply with all applicable laws, ordinances and codes of
federal, state and local governments.

B. In the performance of this Contract, City of Shasta Lake shall not discriminate against
any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, ancestry, national
origin, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, political
affiliation, or membership or nonmembership in any organization. City of Shasta Lake
shall take affirmative action to ensure applicants are employed and that employees are
treated during their employment without regard to their race, color, ancestry, national
origin, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, political
affiliation, or membership or nonmembership in any organization. Such actions shall
include, but not be limited to, the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer, recruitment or recruitment advertising, layoff or termination, rates of pay or other forms of compensation and selection for training.

SECTION 8. REPRESENTATIVES

A. City’s representative for this Contract is Teresa Urricelqui, telephone number (530) 225-4474, fax number (530) 225-4585. All of City of Shasta Lake’s questions pertaining to this Contract shall be referred to the above-named person, or to the representative’s designee.

B. City of Shasta Lake’s representative for this Contract is Jose Castro, telephone number (530) 275-7455, fax number (530) 275-7414. All of City’s questions pertaining to this Contract shall be referred to the above-named person.

C. The representatives set forth herein shall have authority to give all notices required herein.

SECTION 9. NOTICES

A. All notices, requests, demands and other communications hereunder shall be deemed given only if in writing signed by an authorized representative of the sender (may be other than the representatives referred to in Section 10 and delivered by facsimile, with a hard copy mailed first class, postage prepaid; or when sent by a courier or an express service guaranteeing overnight delivery to the receiving party, addressed to the respective parties as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To City:</th>
<th>To City of Shasta Lake:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Redding</td>
<td>City of Shasta Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn: Teresa Urricelqui</td>
<td>Attn: Jose Castro, Public Works Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777 Cypress Ave., Redding, CA 96001</td>
<td>1650 Staton Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>Shasta Lake, CA 96019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 496071, Redding, CA 96049-6071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Either party may change its address for the purposes of this paragraph by giving written notice of such change to the other party in the manner provided in this Section.

C. Notice shall be deemed effective upon: 1) personal service; 2) two calendar days after mailing or transmission by facsimile, whichever is earlier.
SECTION 10.  AUTHORITY TO CONTRACT

A. Each of the undersigned signatories hereby represents and warrants that they are authorized to execute this Contract on behalf of the respective parties to this Contract; that they have full right, power and lawful authority to undertake all obligations as provided in this Contract; and that the execution, performance and delivery of this Contract by said signatories has been fully authorized by all requisite actions on the part of the respective parties to this Contract.

B. When the Mayor is signatory to this Contract, the City Manager and/or the Department Director having direct responsibility for managing the services provided herein shall have authority to execute any amendment to this Contract which does not increase the amount of compensation allowable to City of Shasta Lake or otherwise substantially change the nature or scope of the services provided herein.

SECTION 11.  DATE OF CONTRACT

The date of this Contract shall be the date it is signed by City.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, City and City of Shasta Lake have executed this Contract on the days and year set forth below:

CITY OF REDDING,
A Municipal Corporation

Dated: __________, 2011

By: Kim Niemer, Director,
Community Services

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

RICHARD A. DUVERNAY
City Attorney

PAMELA MIZE
City Clerk

Dated: __________, 2011

By:

CITY OF SHASTA LAKE

By:

Tax ID No.: ____________________
AGENDA ITEM
City Council Meeting

TO: Mayor and City Councilmembers
FROM: Carol Martin, City Manager
DATE: March 9, 2011
SUBJECT: Authorization to accept donations and pay expenses for School Band Uniforms
FILE:

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends the City Council authorize the City to accept donations and pay expenses related to School Band Uniforms.

BACKGROUND:
Staff was approached by Barbara Cross about coordinating a community effort to provide school band uniforms. As a member of various committees, staff has begun soliciting fund raising ideas and expects to be coordinating them in the near future. Staff has approached the Shasta Lake Coordinating Council and the 2 plus 2 Committee members to assist in this effort.

FISCAL IMPACTS:
None

ATTACHMENTS:
Resolution

DISTRIBUTION:
City Council
RESOLUTION CC 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ACCEPT DONATIONS AND EXPEND FUNDS FOR SCHOOL BAND UNIFORMS

WHEREAS, the City Council recognizes the importance of community pride;

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to participate and support a community effort to provide school band uniforms in Shasta Lake; and

WHEREAS, the City Council authorizes city staff to participate in this effort, to accept donations, and expend funds in an effort to provide the school with band uniforms

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Shasta Lake City Council that the City is authorized to accept donations and expend funds for school band uniforms.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March, 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:  

____________________________________  
ROD LINDSAY, MAYOR

ATTEST:

______________________________  
TONI M. COATES, CITY CLERK
AGENDA ITEM
City Council Meeting

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Loree Byzick, Program Manager
Fred Castagna, Project Manager
DATE: February 28, 2011
SUBJECT: Submittal of Application for Funding - Community Development Block Grant Program, Economic Development Allocation, Microenterprise Training and Technical Assistance

FILE:

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the City Council hold a public hearing to solicit public input for the 2010/2011 State of California Community Development Block Grant Program, Economic Development Allocation, and approve submittal of an application for funding in the amount of $215,000 for Microenterprise Assistance Activities.

BACKGROUND:

For the past 12 years, microenterprise training and technical assistance has been available to microbusinesses in Shasta County, including the City of Shasta Lake, through a community development block grant awarded to the County of Shasta and implemented by Superior California Economic Development (SCED). This funding expired in December of 2010, and it is unclear as to whether the County will be eligible to apply for funding for the 2010-11 Economic Development Allocation because of the requirement to have an completed and approved housing element prior to the March 28 application deadline.

SCED has proposed submitting an application on behalf of the City of Shasta Lake to provide continuity of service including determining Targeted Income Group (TIG) eligibility, delivering microenterprise training and technical assistance, and facilitating marketing mini-grants.

Recruitment and Eligibility

A microenterprise is defined as a business with five or fewer employees, one of whom is the business owner. All potential participants/businesses must meet microenterprise size and ownership criteria and be screened for TIG eligibility according to HUD/HCD income guidelines.
SCED will document TIG eligibility of potential participants and assess their readiness to enter a business development program.

SCED staff will conduct community outreach to explain microenterprise activities and outline benefits to the community, TIG-owned small businesses, and individuals interested in starting or expanding a microenterprise. Prospective program participants will be recruited through direct mail, press releases, public service announcements, and participation in community events. SCED’s website will be updated with current program information and linked to the jurisdiction’s web site, as well as other local partners such as chambers of commerce.

Training and Technical Assistance

SCED will provide business skills training, technical assistance and coaching for TIG eligible entrepreneurs. Business skills training and coaching are offered in a variety of formats including extended (10-12 week) workshops, independent study, focused workshops on topics of specific interest, one-on-one business and personal development counseling, and site visits. Personalized coaching assistance is critical and is available to participants at every point in the progression through business development. Those program participants meeting underwriting guidelines will be assisted in obtaining access to capital through SCED’s Microloan Program. Entrepreneurs may also be eligible for marketing “mini grants” to help them develop a marketing strategy and develop a toolbox for marketing their business.

Client Tracking and Program Evaluation

A customized database stores income, demographic and programmatic data. Information from the database is the source document used to compile periodic reports for the City and for CDBG. It is also used as a tool to collect data used for program marketing and outreach.

**FISCAL IMPACTS:**

There is no matching funds requirement and no fiscal impacts would result from this action. Typically, SCED leverages this grant with microloans from their Microloan Program.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

MDP brochure

**DISTRIBUTION:**

City Council
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE AUTHORIZING SUBMITAL OF AN APPLICATION TO THE STATE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ALLOCATION FOR MICROENTERPRISE TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER OR DESIGNEE TO EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS AND AMENDMENTS PERTAINING TO THE APPLICATION AND AWARD.

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake recognizes that it is in the interest of the regional, state, and national economy to stimulate job creation and retention; and

WHEREAS, there is a well-documented need to improve economic opportunity for low- and moderate-income residents of the City of Shasta Lake; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to help small businesses grow and prosper within the community; and

WHEREAS, the City is eligible to apply for funding from the State Community Development Block Grant Program, Economic Development Allocation, for the following activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Administration:</td>
<td>$16,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microenterprise Assistance Activity:</td>
<td>$169,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microenterprise Assistance Activity Delivery:</td>
<td>$29,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Application for Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>$215,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Shasta Lake hereby approves submittal of an application for funding in the amount of $215,000 to the State Community Development Block Grant Program, Economic Development Allocation, for Microenterprise Assistance activities, and authorizes the City Manager, or designee, to execute all documents and amendments pertaining to this application and award.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
ARE YOU WONDERING?

- Do I have what it takes to own and manage a small business?
- What is a business plan and why do I need one?
- What legal aspects do I need to consider?
- How can I find qualified employees?
- Do I need a computer?
- How do I set up the right record keeping system?
- What does marketing involve?
- Can I operate a business from home?

Contact the Microenterprise Development Program for more information today!
MICROENTERPRISE PROGRAM MAY BE THE KEY TO YOUR SUCCESS!

IF YOU...

• Are self-motivated and independent
• Want to be your own boss
• Are not afraid of hard work
• Want to control your own financial resources
• Have a great business idea but just don’t know where to start
• Are interested in finding out what it takes own your own business
• Want to tap the knowledge of others who have business experience

HOW CAN THE MICROENTERPRISE PROGRAM HELP YOU?

The Microenterprise Development Program helps to prepare individuals who are interested in self-employment (entrepreneurs) for the challenge of successfully owning their own business by:

• Helping evaluate interests and abilities
• Developing a business plan
• Exploring the concepts and commitments of self-employment
• Providing materials and coaching during a 12 week workshop covering the important tools needed to run a small or home based business
• Offering one-on-one mentoring to help create a plan for starting and growing a business
• Providing follow-up business counseling for newly created businesses and links to ongoing resources

ABOUT SCED...

Superior California Economic Development (SCED) serves a four county region of rural Northern California. District staff, programs and services are committed to helping the communities they serve create stable, long-term employment opportunities.

SCED’s Business Development Loan Program offers loans to qualifying new and established businesses that may not qualify for financing from traditional sources. The Microloan Program was created to provide loan opportunities for qualifying graduates of the Microenterprise Development Program.

SCED staff also assists communities with strategic planning efforts and provides technical assistance in developing grant proposals for economic development projects.

WHY WAIT? CALL TODAY FOR MORE INFORMATION!
(530) 225-2760

499 HEMSTED DR., SUITE A
REDDING, CA 96002
(530) 225-2760
FAX (530) 225-2769
TO: Carol Martin, Executive Officer

FROM: Fred Castagna, Project Manager

DATE: February 18, 2011

SUBJECT: Use of Redevelopment Agency Tax Increment Funds for the rehabilitation of the John Beaudet Community Center.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Redevelopment Agency adopt the attached Resolution approving the use of Redevelopment funds for the rehabilitation of the John Beaudet Community Center.

BACKGROUND:

Providing parks and recreation opportunities and community facilities within the Redevelopment Project Area was first identified in the Redevelopment Plan (Plan) for the Shasta Dam Area Redevelopment Project adopted July 11th, 1989. The Plan was further amended and restated on July 15, 2008. The Plan describes the need for the project as a Plan Goal:

“Provide needed improvements to the community’s recreational, cultural, and other community facilities to better serve the Project Area.”

The project’s estimated costs are $300,000 and include some of the following items:

- Exterior siding rehabilitation
- ADA accessible entrances
- Restroom remodel and ADA upgrades
- Interior flooring replacement
- New dining hall chairs and tables
- HVAC and insulation upgrades
- Energy efficient window and lighting upgrades
FISCAL IMPACTS:

See attached Exhibit A, Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds.

ATTACHMENTS:

Resolution
Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds

DISTRIBUTION:

Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors
RESOLUTION RDA 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY APPROVING THE USE OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF $300,000 TO REHABILITATE THE JOHN BEAUDET COMMUNITY CENTER.

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) adopted a Project Area Redevelopment Plan on July 11, 1989; and

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan provides for the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of property both inside and outside of the Project Area, necessary to carry out the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the John Beaudet Community Center (Community Center) will serve the City of Shasta Lake both inside and outside of the Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Agency desires to contribute tax increment funds received from the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Agency finds, resolves, and orders as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. In connection with the proposed use of Redevelopment funds for rehabilitation of the Community Center within the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area:
   a. The rehabilitation of the Community Center is of benefit to the Project Area;
   b. No other reasonable means of financing the construction are available to the community;
   c. The use of funds for the rehabilitation of the Community Center will assist in the elimination of blight in the Project Area and is consistent with the Project Area’s adopted Implementation Plan; and
   d. The rehabilitation of the Community Center is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March 2011 by the following vote:

AYES: ____________________________
NOES: ____________________________
ABSENT: __________________________

_______________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Chair

ATTEST:

_______________________________
TONI COATES, CMC, Secretary
The City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) proposes to provide up to $300,000 in Redevelopment funds to rehabilitate the John Beaudet Community Center.

The project is necessary to help improve community access for Americans with Disabilities to the public facility within the Redevelopment Area and will also help eliminate blight in the project area.

Health and Safety Code Sections 33020, 33021, 33421, 33445, 33678 authorize the Agency to undertake redevelopment activities such as those contemplated herein provided the legislative body determines all of the following findings to be in evidence:

1. That the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are of the primary benefit to the project area from which the funds are derived or to the immediate neighborhood in which the project is located, regardless of whether the improvement is within another project area; and

2. That no other reasonable means of financing the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are available to the community; and

3. That the payment of funds for the acquisition of land or the cost of public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements will assist in elimination of one or more blighting conditions inside the project area and is consistent with an adopted implementation plan; and

4. That the provision of the proposed improvements by the agency is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

Section 33678 of the California Health and Safety Code adds the requirement that if tax increment money is used, the project must meet the definition and purpose of Redevelopment as prescribed in Sections 33020 and 33021 and primarily benefit the project area from which the tax increment money is derived.

These issues are discussed below by topic:

1. **Is the proposed rehabilitation of the John Beaudet Community Center of primary benefit to the project area?**

   Section 33020 defines Redevelopment as the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction, or rehabilitation or any combination of these, of all or part of a survey area and the provision of public, or other structures or spaces as may be appropriate or necessary in the interest of the general welfare. Section 33021 further defines Redevelopment as the alteration, improvement, modernization, reconstruction, or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of existing structures in a project area.

   The rehabilitation of the Community Center is within the Redevelopment Area and will provide expanded access to a community facility by the public and particularly by disabled residents.

2. **Are there any other reasonable means of financing available to the community to finance the project?**
Currently, there are no additional funds within the City’s General Fund to finance this project. Therefore, the only reasonable funding is from the Redevelopment Agency.

3. **Will the proposed activity assist in the elimination of one or more blighting conditions within the Project Area and is it consistent with the Implementation Plan for the Project Area?**

The proposed activity will assist in the elimination of existing blight conditions in the Project area. Specifically, the John Beaudet Community Center is itself obsolete and in disrepair. Rehabilitation of the building will eliminate blight.

The proposed project is also consistent with the Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan. The 2005-2009 Amended Implementation Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area was prepared and adopted pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 33490.

The Implementation Plan specifically describes the Agency's involvement in the corrections of blight, including defective design and character of physical construction; furthermore it includes the repair of an economic burden that consists of an inadequate public improvement, public facilities, open spaces, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment. The Plan also contains certain goals relative to the elimination of these blighting conditions.

A. To create new and improved job opportunities by removing those barriers that crime imposes to hamper or impede proper and economic development;
B. To stimulate private interest in the commercial and industrial sectors; and
C. To improve the livability of the community in terms of both residential and non-residential districts by providing enhanced safety for residents.

4. **Is the rehabilitation of the John Beaudet Community Center by the Agency necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area?**

The stated objectives in the Redevelopment plan consist of these major goals:

1) The elimination of blighting influences and the correction of environmental deficiencies in the Project Area, in particular, structural deterioration, underutilized commercial land, unmanageable parcelization patterns, and inadequate curbs, gutters, paving and sidewalks;

2) Improved pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the Project Area;

3) The provision of an environment conducive to social and economic growth, including expansion of job opportunities; and

4) The expansion and/or improvement of the community’s supply of housing for low- and moderate-income persons.

The rehabilitation of the Community Center will support all of the above stated objectives both in and out of the project area. Working within the Five Year Implementation Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area, the proposed activity is necessary to support this effort.
TO: Carol Martin, Executive Officer
FROM: Jose Castro, Public Works Supervisor
DATE: March 2, 2011

SUBJECT: Use of Redevelopment Agency Tax Increment Funds in the amount of $70,000 for upgrades to Lift Station #4 of the City’s wastewater collection system.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Redevelopment Agency adopt the attached Resolution approving the use of Redevelopment funds for the Lift Station #4 Project.

BACKGROUND:

Providing wastewater service to all new development activity within the Redevelopment Project Area was first identified in the Redevelopment Plan (Plan) for the Shasta Dam Area Redevelopment Project adopted July 11th, 1989. The Plan was further amended and restated on July 15, 2008. The Plan describes the need of the project as follows as a Plan Goal:

“Eliminate and prevent the spread of blight and deterioration and to conserve, rehabilitate, and redevelop the Project Area in accordance with this Plan and future Annual Work Programs.”

The project’s estimated costs are $70,000 and include upgrade of Lift Station #4 to provide for functionality of the station. This project will benefit areas within the redevelopment project area by maintaining the capacity of the lift station to pump waste water to the City’s wastewater treatment plant.

FISCAL IMPACTS:

See attached Exhibit A, Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds.
ATTACHMENTS:

Resolution
Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds

DISTRIBUTION:

Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors
RESOLUTION RDA 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY APPROVING THE USE OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF $70,000 FOR UPGRADES TO LIFT STATION #4 OF THE CITY’S WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM.

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) adopted a Project Area Redevelopment Plan on July 11, 1989, which was amended and restated on July 15, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan provides for the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of property both inside and outside of the Project Area, necessary to carry out the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the upgraded lift station will serve the City of Shasta Lake both inside and outside of the Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Agency desires to contribute tax increment funds received from the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Agency finds, resolves, and orders as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. In connection with the proposed use of Redevelopment funds for upgrade of lift station #4 within the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area:
   a. The upgraded Lift Station #4 Project is of benefit to the Project Area;
   b. No other reasonable means of financing the construction are available to the community;
   c. The use of funds for the Lift Station #4 Project will assist in the elimination of blight in the Project Area and is consistent with the Project Area’s adopted Implementation Plan; and
   d. The Lift Station #4 Project is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March 2011 by the following vote:

AYES: ____________________________
NOES: ___________________________
ABSENT: _________________________

ROD LINDSAY, Chair

ATTEST:

TONI COATES, CMC, Secretary
EXHIBIT A

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED USE OF REDEVELOPMENT FUNDS FOR THE UPGRADE OF LIFT STATION #4 PROJECT

The City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) proposes to provide up to $70,000 in Redevelopment funds to upgrade Lift Station #4.

The project is necessary to help maintain usable capacity of the lift station within the Redevelopment Area and will also help eliminate blight in the project area.

Health and Safety Code Sections 33020, 33021, 33421, 33445, 33678 authorize the Agency to undertake redevelopment activities such as those contemplated herein provided the legislative body determines all of the following findings to be in evidence:

1. That the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are of the primary benefit to the project area from which the funds are derived or to the immediate neighborhood in which the project is located, regardless of whether the improvement is within another project area; and

2. That no other reasonable means of financing the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are available to the community; and

3. That the payment of funds for the acquisition of land or the cost of public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements will assist in elimination of one or more blighting conditions inside the project area and is consistent with an adopted implementation plan; and

4. That the provision of the proposed improvements by the agency is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

Section 33678 of the California Health and Safety Code adds the requirement that if tax increment money is used, the project must meet the definition and purpose of Redevelopment as prescribed in Sections 33020 and 33021 and *primarily* benefit the project area from which the tax increment money is derived.

These issues are discussed below by topic:

1. **Is the proposed Upgrade of Lift Station #4 Project of primary benefit to the project area?**

   Section 33020 defines Redevelopment as the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction, or rehabilitation or any combination of these, of all or part of a survey area and the provision of public, or other structures or spaces as may be appropriate or necessary in the interest of the general welfare. Section 33021 further defines Redevelopment as the alteration, improvement, modernization, reconstruction, or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of existing structures in a project area.

   The Lift Station #4 project is of primary benefit to the Redevelopment Area and will provide capacity of the lift station to deliver wastewater to the City’s wastewater treatment plant for future development of low income housing, commercial expansion, reuse of blighted areas, and economic development.
2. Are there any other reasonable means of financing available to the community to finance the project?

Currently, there are no additional funds within the City’s General Fund to finance this project. Therefore, the only reasonable funding is from the Redevelopment Agency.

3. Will the proposed activity assist in the elimination of one or more blighting conditions within the Project Area and is it consistent with the Implementation Plan for the Project Area?

The proposed activity will assist in the elimination of existing blight conditions in the Project area. Specifically, portions of the City’s existing wastewater collection system, including Lift Station #4 are reaching the end of functional life. Should the lift station fail or be eliminated, disposal of effluents upstream of the station will be curtailed. This will increase blight, prevent development of low income housing, in-fill housing, and new residential and commercial developments. Upgrade of Lift Station #4 will extend the useful life of the station and therefore both eliminate and prevent creation of blight.

The proposed project is also consistent with the Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan. The 2005-2009 Amended Implementation Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area was prepared and adopted pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 33490.

The Implementation Plan specifically describes the Agency’s involvement in the corrections of blight, including defective design and character of physical construction; furthermore it includes the repair of an economic burden that consists of an inadequate public improvement, public facilities, open spaces, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment. The Plan also contains certain goals relative to the elimination of these blighting conditions.

A. To create new and improved job opportunities by removing those barriers that crime imposed to hamper or impede proper and economic development;

B. To stimulate private interest in the commercial and industrial sectors; and

C. To improve the livability of the community in terms of both residential and non-residential districts by providing enhanced safety for residents.

4. Is the Upgrade of Lift Station #4 Project by the Agency necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area?

The stated objectives in the Redevelopment plan consist of these major goals:

1) The elimination of blighting influences and the correction of environmental deficiencies in the Project Area, in particular, structural deterioration, underutilized commercial land, unmanageable parcelization patterns, and inadequate curbs, gutters, paving and sidewalks;

2) Improved pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the Project Area;

3) The provision of an environment conducive to social and economic growth, including expansion of job opportunities; and
4) The expansion and/or improvement of the community’s supply of housing for low- and moderate-income persons.

The Upgrade of Lift Station #4 Project will support all of the above stated objectives both in and out of the project area. Working within the Five Year Implementation Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area, the proposed activity is necessary to support this effort.
TO: Carol Martin, Executive Officer
FROM: Jose, Castro, Public Works Supervisor
DATE: March 2, 2011
SUBJECT: Use of Redevelopment Agency Tax Increment Funds in the amount of $41,000 for the Park Lighting Project at Clair Engle Park

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the Redevelopment Agency adopt the attached Resolution approving the use of Redevelopment funds for the Park Lighting Project.

BACKGROUND:
Providing parks and recreation opportunities within the Redevelopment Project Area was first identified in the Redevelopment Plan (Plan) for the Shasta Dam Area Redevelopment Project adopted July 11th, 1989. The Plan was further amended and restated on July 15, 2008. The Plan describes the need for the project as a Plan Goal:

“Provide needed improvements to the community’s recreational, cultural, and other community facilities to better serve the Project Area.”

The project’s estimated costs are $41,000 and include upgrade of lighting within the City’s Clair Engle Park. This project will benefit areas within the redevelopment project area by providing enhanced public safety and better visibility within the park at night, thereby eliminating an ongoing vandalism problem which is causing a blighted situation.

FISCAL IMPACTS:
See attached Exhibit A, Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds.

ATTACHMENTS:
Resolution
Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds

**DISTRIBUTION:**

Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY APPROVING THE USE OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF $41,000 FOR UPGRADES TO PARK LIGHTING WITHIN CLAIR ENGLE PARK.

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) adopted a Project Area Redevelopment Plan on July 11, 1989, which was amended and restated on July 15, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan provides for the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of property both inside and outside of the Project Area, necessary to carry out the Plan; and

WHEREAS, upgraded lighted in Clair Engle Park will serve the City of Shasta Lake both inside and outside of the Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Agency desires to contribute tax increment funds received from the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Agency finds, resolves, and orders as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. In connection with the proposed use of Redevelopment funds for the Park Lighting Project within the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area:

   a. The upgraded lighting in Clair Engle Park is of benefit to the Project Area;

   b. No other reasonable means of financing the construction are available to the community;

   c. The use of funds for the Park Lighting Project will assist in the elimination of blight in the Project Area and is consistent with the Project Area's adopted Implementation Plan; and

   d. The Park Lighting Project is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ROD LINDSAY, Chair

ATTEST:

TONI COATES, CMC, Secretary
EXHIBIT A

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED USE OF REDEVELOPMENT FUNDS FOR THE PARK LIGHTING PROJECT

The City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) proposes to provide up to $41,000 in Redevelopment funds to upgrade lighting within the Clair Engle Park.

The project is necessary to provide needed improvements to the community's recreational, cultural, and other community facilities to better serve the Project Area within the project area and will also help eliminate blight in the project area.

Health and Safety Code Sections 33020, 33021, 33421, 33445, 33678 authorize the Agency to undertake redevelopment activities such as those contemplated herein provided the legislative body determines all of the following findings to be in evidence:

1. That the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are of the primary benefit to the project area from which the funds are derived or to the immediate neighborhood in which the project is located, regardless of whether the improvement is within another project area; and

2. That no other reasonable means of financing the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are available to the community; and

3. That the payment of funds for the acquisition of land or the cost of public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements will assist in elimination of one or more blighting conditions inside the project area and is consistent with an adopted implementation plan; and

4. That the provision of the proposed improvements by the agency is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

Section 33678 of the California Health and Safety Code adds the requirement that if tax increment money is used, the project must meet the definition and purpose of Redevelopment as prescribed in Sections 33020 and 33021 and primarily benefit the project area from which the tax increment money is derived.

These issues are discussed below by topic:

1. **Is the proposed Park Lighting Project of primary benefit to the project area?**

   Section 33020 defines Redevelopment as the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction, or rehabilitation or any combination of these, of all or part of a survey area and the provision of public, or other structures or spaces as may be appropriate or necessary in the interest of the general welfare. Section 33021 further defines Redevelopment as the alteration, improvement, modernization, reconstruction, or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of existing structures in a project area.

   The Park Lighting Project is of primary benefit to the Redevelopment Area.

2. **Are there any other reasonable means of financing available to the community to finance the project?**
Currently, there are no additional funds within the City’s General Fund to finance this project. Therefore, the only reasonable funding is from the Redevelopment Agency.

3. **Will the proposed activity assist in the elimination of one or more blighting conditions within the Project Area and is it consistent with the Implementation Plan for the Project Area?**

The proposed activity will assist in the elimination of existing blight conditions in the Project area. Specifically, elimination of unlighted portions of the City’s existing Clair Engle Park will eliminate a blighted situation.

The proposed project is also consistent with the Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan. The 2005-2009 Amended Implementation Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area was prepared and adopted pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 33490.

The Implementation Plan specifically describes the Agency’s involvement in the corrections of blight, including defective design and character of physical construction; furthermore it includes the repair of an economic burden that consists of an inadequate public improvement, public facilities, open spaces, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment. The Plan also contains certain goals relative to the elimination of these blighting conditions.

A. To create new and improved job opportunities by removing those barriers that crime imposes to hamper or impede proper and economic development;
B. To stimulate private interest in the commercial and industrial sectors; and
C. To improve the livability of the community in terms of both residential and non residential districts by providing enhanced safety for residents.

4. **Is the Park Lighting Project by the Agency necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area?**

The stated objectives in the Redevelopment plan consist of these major goals:

1) The elimination of blighting influences and the correction of environmental deficiencies in the Project Area, in particular, structural deterioration, underutilized commercial land, unmanageable parcelization patterns, and inadequate curbs, gutters, paving and sidewalks;

2) Improved pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the Project Area;

3) The provision of an environment conducive to social and economic growth, including expansion of job opportunities; and

4) The expansion and/or improvement of the community’s supply of housing for low- and moderate-income persons.

The Park Lighting Project will support all of the above stated objectives both in and out of the project area. Working within the Five Year Implementation Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area, the proposed activity is necessary to support this effort.
AGENDA ITEM
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING

TO: Carol Martin, Executive Officer
FROM: Tom Chism, Wastewater Treatment Superintendent
DATE: March 2, 2011
SUBJECT: Use of Redevelopment Agency Tax Increment Funds in the amount of $530,000 for design of the Reclaimed Water Main Project to provide for increased capacity at the City’s wastewater treatment facility.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Redevelopment Agency adopt the attached Resolution approving the use of Redevelopment funds for the Reclaimed Water Main Project.

BACKGROUND:

Providing upgrades to infrastructure facilities within the Redevelopment Project Area was first identified in the Redevelopment Plan (Plan) for the Shasta Dam Area Redevelopment Project adopted July 11th, 1989. The Plan was further amended and restated on July 15, 2008. Further, the Project is designated within the Agency’s current Five Year Implementation Plan.

The Plan describes the need of the project as follows:

“Installation of a reclaimed water pipeline to Tierra Oaks Golf Course will allow the City to utilize nearly twice the capacity of the existing treatment plant, thereby allowing additional development within the City. Completion of this project would address public improvements made inadequate by restrictions imposed by regulatory agencies after the initial construction of the improvements.”

The project’s estimated costs are $530,000 and include design of a reclaimed water main to serve the Tierra Oaks Golf Course outside the eastern boundary of the redevelopment project area. Eventual construction of the main will benefit areas within the redevelopment project area by increasing the discharge capacity of the City’s wastewater plant. Increased treatment capacity will serve future redevelopment projects, low income housing, commercial expansion, reuse of blighted areas,
and economic development throughout the City. The reclaimed water will be used by Tierra Oaks Golf Course to replace potable water now used for irrigation purposes.

**FISCAL IMPACTS:**

See attached Exhibit A, Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Resolution
Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds

**DISTRIBUTION:**

Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors
RESOLUTION RDA 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY APPROVING THE USE OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FUNDS FOR DESIGN OF A NEW RECLAIMED WATER LINE TO SERVE THE TIERRA OAKS GOLF COURSE

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) adopted a Project Area Redevelopment Plan on July 11, 1989; and

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan provides for the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of property both inside and outside of the Project Area, necessary to carry out the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the reclaimed water main will serve the City of Shasta Lake both inside and outside of the Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Agency desires to contribute tax increment funds received from the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Agency finds, resolves, and orders as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. In connection with the proposed use of Redevelopment funds for design of the reclaimed water main project both within and outside the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area:
   a. The reclaimed water main project is of benefit to the Project Area;
   b. No other reasonable means of financing the construction are available to the community;
   c. The use of funds for the reclaimed water main project will assist in the elimination of blight in the Project Area and is consistent with the Project Area’s adopted Implementation Plan; and
   d. The reclaimed water main project is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

ROD LINDSAY, Chair

ATTEST:

TONI COATES, CMC, Secretary
The City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) proposes to provide up to $530,000 in Redevelopment funds to design the reclaimed water main project.

The project is necessary to help increase usable capacity in the City’s wastewater treatment plant within the Redevelopment Area and will also help eliminate blight in the project area.

Health and Safety Code Sections 33020, 33021, 33421, 33445, 33678 authorize the Agency to undertake redevelopment activities such as those contemplated herein provided the legislative body determines all of the following findings to be in evidence:

1. That the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are of the primary benefit to the project area from which the funds are derived or to the immediate neighborhood in which the project is located, regardless of whether the improvement is within another project area; and

2. That no other reasonable means of financing the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are available to the community; and

3. That the payment of funds for the acquisition of land or the cost of public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements will assist in elimination of one or more blighting conditions inside the project area and is consistent with an adopted implementation plan; and

4. That the provision of the proposed improvements by the agency is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

Section 33678 of the California Health and Safety Code adds the requirement that if tax increment money is used, the project must meet the definition and purpose of Redevelopment as prescribed in Sections 33020 and 33021 and primarily benefit the project area from which the tax increment money is derived.

These issues are discussed below by topic:

1. **Is the proposed design of the reclaimed water main project of primary benefit to the project area?**

   Section 33020 defines Redevelopment as the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction, or rehabilitation or any combination of these, of all or part of a survey area and the provision of public, or other structures or spaces as may be appropriate or necessary in the interest of the general welfare. Section 33021 further defines Redevelopment as the alteration, improvement, modernization, reconstruction, or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of existing structures in a project area.

   The reclaimed water main project is of primary benefit to the Redevelopment Area and will provide expanded capacity at the City’s wastewater treatment plant for future development of low income housing, commercial expansion, reuse of blighted areas, and economic development.
2. **Are there any other reasonable means of financing available to the community to finance the project?**

Currently, there are no additional funds within the City’s General Fund to finance this project. Therefore, the only reasonable funding is from the Redevelopment Agency.

3. **Will the proposed activity assist in the elimination of one or more blighting conditions within the Project Area and is it consistent with the Implementation Plan for the Project Area?**

The proposed activity will assist in the elimination of existing blight conditions in the Project area. Specifically, the City’s existing wastewater treatment plant has been identified as nearing capacity. Should it reach capacity, all redevelopment activities that include disposal of effluents will be curtailed. This will include blight elimination, low income housing, in-fill housing, and new residential and commercial developments. Development of reclaimed water main project will extend the useful life of the wastewater treatment plant by providing a means of disposing of treated water.

The proposed project is also consistent with the Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan. The 2005-2009 Amended Implementation Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area was prepared and adopted pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 33490.

The Implementation Plan specifically describes the Agency’s involvement in the corrections of blight, including defective design and character of physical construction; furthermore it includes the repair of an economic burden that consists of an inadequate public improvement, public facilities, open spaces, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment. The Plan also contains certain goals relative to the elimination of these blighting conditions.

A. To create new and improved job opportunities by removing those barriers that crime imposes to hamper or impede proper and economic development;
B. To stimulate private interest in the commercial and industrial sectors; and
C. To improve the livability of the community in terms of both residential and non residential districts by providing enhanced safety for residents.

4. **Is the design and eventual development of reclaimed water main project by the Agency necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area?**

The stated objectives in the Redevelopment plan consist of these major goals:

1) The elimination of blighting influences and the correction of environmental deficiencies in the Project Area, in particular, structural deterioration, underutilized commercial land, unmanageable parcelization patterns, and inadequate curbs, gutters, paving and sidewalks;

2) Improved pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the Project Area;

3) The provision of an environment conducive to social and economic growth, including expansion of job opportunities; and
4) The expansion and/or improvement of the community’s supply of housing for low- and moderate-income persons.

The reclaimed water main project will support all of the above stated objectives both in and out of the project area. Working within the Five Year Implementation Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area, the proposed activity is necessary to support this effort.
ORDINANCE CC-11-

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE AMENDING MUNICIPAL CODE
TITLE 13, PUBLIC SERVICES, CHAPTER 13.20, ELECTRICITY SERVICE SYSTEM,
SECTION 13.20.410 ESTABLISHING NEW ELECTRICAL RATES.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS
FOLLOWS:

Section 1:
Title 13, Chapter 13.20, Section 13.20.410 of the City of Shasta Lake Municipal Code is
amended to read as follows:

13.20.410 – Residential, lifeline, social, commercial, large industrial, small industrial,
government and economic development service rates.

Residential Service:
Customer Charge per month $12.50 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.1220 (0 <= 750 kWhs)
$0.1320 (751 <=1700 kWhs)
$0.1460 (>1700 kWhs)

Lifeline Service:
Customer Charge per month $8.00 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.1078 (<=800 kWhs)
$0.14563 (>800 kWhs)

Social Service:
Customer Charge per month $26.00 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.14563 (all kWhs)

Commercial Service:
Customer Charge per month $35.00 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.13322 (all kWhs)

Large Industrial Service:
Customer Charge per month $79.33 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $.0936 (all kWhs)
Demand Rate per kW $8.77 (peak demand kW)

Small Industrial Service:
Customer Charge per month $55.50 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.1072 (all kWhs)
Demand Rate per kW $9.59 (peak demand kW)

Government Service:
Customer Charge per month $43.02 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.1397 (all kWhs)
Economic Development Service:
Customer Charge per month  $79.33 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh   $0.0676 (all kWh)
Demand Rate per kW   $7.92 (peak demand kW)

Note: A public benefit program charge of 2.85% of the electric bill, as required by law, will be effective with the adoption of the ordinance. This provision may be repealed or amended at any time by the California State Legislature.

Section 2:
Severability: If any provision of this ordinance or the applications thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance and the applications of such provision will remain in effect to the extent permitted by law.

Section 3:
Effective Date: This ordinance shall take effect 30 days after the date of its second reading.

Executed this 15th day of March, 2011.

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

______________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
TONI COATES, CMC, City Clerk
AGENDA ITEM
City Council

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Carla L. Thompson, AICP, Development Services Director
DATE: March 3, 2011
SUBJECT: Approval of a Building Permit Fee Waiver for a New Scoreboard at Wynne Price Park
FILE NO.: B-300-200-010 (New)

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends City Council adopt the attached Resolution approving a waiver of building permit fees for a new scoreboard on City-owned property at Wynne Price Park.

BACKGROUND:

The City recently received plans from the Gateway Unified School District for a new scoreboard to replace an existing board at Wynne Price Park, 4240 Vallecito Street. Conceptual drawings and plans for the sign are attached.

Hale Construction is volunteering their time and supplying materials. Bob Anderson, baseball coach from Central Valley High School will also volunteer his time for construction of the sign. The City’s Public Works Department will also assist with construction.

The City is required to complete construction plan check, and a building permit is required. Staff requests the building permit fee be waived. Any additional costs for the scoreboard will be the responsibility of the School District.

FISCAL IMPACTS:

The fee waiver would not exceed $550.00.

DISTRIBUTION: City Council
ATTACHMENTS: Proposed Resolution of Approval
Conceptual design and engineered plans
RESOLUTION CC 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE APPROVING A BUILDING PERMIT FEE WAIVER NOT TO EXCEED $550.00 FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SCOREBOARD ON CITY-OWNED PROPERTY AT WYNNE PRICE PARK,
4240 VALLECITO STREET

WHEREAS, the City received a conceptual drawing and construction plans from the Gateway Unified School District for a new scoreboard to replace an existing board at Wynne Price Park, 4240 Vallecito Street; and

WHEREAS, funding for the sign will be the responsibility of the Gateway Unified School District, with labor and/or materials provided by Hale Construction, Central Valley High School and the City’s Public Works Department; and

WHEREAS, construction plan check and a building permit are required for the new scoreboard; and

WHEREAS, the City supports a waiver of building permit fees.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Shasta Lake hereby approves a building permit fee waiver not to exceed $550.00 for construction of a new scoreboard at Wynne Price Park.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March 2011 by the following vote.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

____________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

____________________________
TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
COLUMNS AND FOOTINGS SHOWN HERE, PROVIDED BY OTHERS, ARE SIZED TO COMPLY WITH IBC 2006 90 MPH EXPOSURE B REQUIREMENTS. THE MANUFACTURED PRODUCT EXCEEDS THE REQUIREMENTS OF IBC 2006 90 MPH EXPOSURE B AS MOUNTED IN THIS DRAWING. SOIL—AVERAGE WITH ALLOWABLE STRESSES OF 2500 psf. DESIGN SHOULD BE ALTERED FOR DIFFERENT SOIL CONDITIONS, CLEARANCE, OR LOCAL CODES. FAIR-PLAY ASSUMES NO RESPONSIBILITIES FOR INSTALLATIONS DONE BY OTHERS.

CONTROL CABLES—SUGGEST 3/4" CONDUIT BE USED FOR BURIED CABLE IN AREAS WHERE IT MAY BE SUBJECT TO MECHANICAL DAMAGE. POWER WIRES SHOULD BE ROUTED IN SEPARATE CONDUIT FROM CONTROL CABLE.

INSTALLATION DRAWING SHOULD BE REVIEWED BY A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER IN YOUR AREA PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

REFERENCE 01-0500-01 FOR INSTALLATION NOTES.

DIMENSIONS BA-7126-2 WITH (2) FDO-2624 & ARCHED TRUSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>COLUMNS</th>
<th>POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13'-0&quot;</td>
<td>6'-6&quot;</td>
<td>1'-9 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>6'-3 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>3'-6&quot;</td>
<td>12'-6&quot;</td>
<td>15'-6&quot;</td>
<td>26'-0&quot;</td>
<td>W12 X 45</td>
<td>01-1591-01-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MA-1591-2

TEAM NAMES CAPABLE OF DISPLAYING 1-LINE OF 11" CHARACTERS.

SIZE: 26'-0"L X 6'-6"H X 10"D

POWER: 120 VAC, 60 Hz., 1-PHASE
10 AMPS. (SCBD + 8 X 48 1.375 AMBER LED CAPTIVE SPORTS TEAM NAMES)
120 VAC AT THE CONTROL LOCATION.

CONTROL CONSOLE: MP-70.
CONTROL CABLE: (1) TWU CONDUCTOR SHIELDED.
(If wireless ordered, cable not req'd.)

LED'S: AMBER LED.

OPTIONS: LIGHTNING DAMAGE REDUCTION UNIT.
WIRELESS MP-70 CONTROL OPERATION.

ESTIMATED WEIGHT: 518 LBS.

* REFERENCE 01-0500-01 FOR INSTALLATION NOTES.

WEB ADDRESS
FAIR-PLAY SCOREBOARDS
FACTORY ADDRESS
PHONE
fair-play.com
P.O. BOX 1847
1700 DELAWARE AVE.
515-265-5305
DES MOINES, IOWA 50305-1847

DES MOINES, IOWA 50317-2999
022610 RMS
01-1591-01-1
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BASE PLATE 1.25 THICK
A325 NUTS / ASTM F436
WASHERS ON TOP AND
BOTTOM OF ALL PLATES
PLATE HOLES ARE 1/8"
LARGER THAN NOMINAL
FASTENER SIZE

HOOP SPACING MAY INCREASE
TO 12" O.C. BELOW PLATE IN
ASCE 7-05 SEISMIC DESIGN
CATEGORIES A & B

ANCHOR PLATE 1.00 THICK
MATL. SCHEDULE AND CONSTRUCTION NOTES
PLATES ARE ASTM A588 STEEL COLUMN
QTY. 58 HOOPS, #7 REBAR ON 4" CENTERS
QTY. 6 VERTICALS, 4# REBAR
QTY. 6 1/2" DIA X 30" LONG UNC THREADED RODS,
ASTM A325 OR A307
BOLTED PLATE HOLES MAY BE BOLT DIA + 1/8"
REINFORCING STEEL - ASTM A615 GRADE 50
VIBRATE CONCRETE THROUGHOUT FULL DEPTH
CONCRETE R 2,000 PSI; QTY. 4.6 YD.
GROUT TO 4,000 PSI (NON-SHRINK)

HOOPS DOUBLED AT
TOP AND BOTTOM

DETAIL A
AGENDA ITEM
City Council

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Debbie Israel, Senior Planner
DATE: March 15, 2011
SUBJECT: 2010 Annual Housing Element Progress Report

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends City Council approve the attached Resolution concerning the 2010 Annual Housing Element Progress Report and its submittal to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR).

BACKGROUND:
The State of California’s Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) certified the City’s Housing Element on July 7, 2010. State Housing Element Law requires that the City provide HCD (and OPR) an annual progress report concerning the Implementation Programs included in the approved Housing Element as well as progress concerning the increase in affordable units as required.

The State has provided a report format approved last year through a State process. Using the State’s format, the Development Services Department has completed that report with assistance from the Redevelopment Agency and Public Works staff. That report is attached.

The report will be required to be submitted every year by April 1 to HCD. At this time there is no response expected from HCD concerning the reports but it is expected that the reports as they accumulate through the five–year planning period will provide HCD an indication not only of progress but of what activities a jurisdiction may be having difficulty implementing.

The Planning Commission reviewed the report at their February 17 meeting and has recommended review by the City Council and transmission to the State. Generally, given the date on which the Housing Element was certified, the City is on track for many of the Implementation Programs with the greater majority of them (with the exception of annual requirements) to be completed in this calendar year. Other ongoing or annual programs will not formally conclude but continue through the five-year planning period.
One notable item is that during the review of the Implementation Programs it was determined that a number of the programs that required revisions of the Zoning portion of the Municipal Code would be better consolidated into a new chapter of the Zoning section.

The new chapter will be identified as the Affordable Housing Chapter and many programs will be housed in that chapter as well as the authority for incentives for affordable development. Keeping those items in one chapter will make it easier for both the public and staff to be aware of and manage information.

After review at this meeting the Report will be sent to HCD and OPR.

Environmental Determination

The California Environmental Quality Act does not apply to this report.

FISCAL IMPACTS:

No fiscal impacts will occur because of the proposed action with the exception of staff time.

ATTACHMENTS:

2010 Annual Housing Element Progress Report

DISTRIBUTION:

City Council
WHEREAS, the Shasta Lake Development Services Department is required by the California Government Code 65400 (a) (2) to prepare an annual report on the Housing Element's implementation programs using the form provided by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) known as the Annual Housing Element Progress Report; and

WHEREAS, the Shasta Lake Planning Commission considered the 2010 Annual Housing Element Progress Report at their public meeting on February 17, 2011 and has recommended to the City Council that they review the Report for submission to the State HCD and OPR; and

WHEREAS, the Shasta Lake City Council is required by the California Government Code 65400(a) (2) to consider the Annual Housing Element Progress Report at a public meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Shasta Lake City Council has considered the 2010 Annual Housing Element Report at a public meeting on March 15, 2011.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the 2010 Annual Housing Element Progress Report has hereby reviewed the 2010 Annual Housing Element Report for submission to HCD and OPR.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this day of March 2011, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

TONI M. COATES, City Clerk
## ANNUAL ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT
### Housing Element Implementation

(CCR Title 25 §6202 )

**Jurisdiction**  
City of Shasta Lake

**Reporting Period**  
01-Jan-10 - 31-Dec-10

### Table A

Annual Building Activity Report Summary - New Construction

**Very Low-, Low-, and Mixed-Income Multifamily Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Development Information</th>
<th>Housing with Financial Assistance and/or Deed Restrictions</th>
<th>Housing without Financial Assistance or Deed Restrictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Identifier</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Affordability by Household Incomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R=Renter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O=Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low-Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate-Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above Moderate-Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3146 West</td>
<td>SF O</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) Total of Moderate and Above Moderate from Table A3  
(10) Total by income Table A/A3  
(11) Total Extremely Low-Income Units*

* Note: These fields are voluntary
ANNUAL ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT  
*Housing Element Implementation*  
(CCR Title 25 §6202 )

Jurisdiction: City of Shasta Lake  
Reporting Period: 01-Jan-10 - 31-Dec-10

Table A2  
Annual Building Activity Report Summary - Units Rehabilitated, Preserved and Acquired pursuant to GC Section 65583.1(c)(1)

Please note: Units may only be credited to the table below when a jurisdiction has included a program in its housing element to rehabilitate, preserve or acquire units to accommodate a portion of its RHNA which meet the specific criteria as outlined in GC Section 65583.1(c)(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Affordability by Household Incomes</th>
<th>(4) The Description should adequately document how each unit complies with subsection (c)(7) of Government Code Section 65583.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Low-Income*</td>
<td>Very Low-Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Rehabilitation Activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Preservation of Units At-Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Acquisition of Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Total Units by Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: This field is voluntary

Table A3  
Annual building Activity Report Summary for Above Moderate-Income Units  
(not including those units reported on Table A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Units Permitted for Moderate</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Units Permitted for Above Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: This field is voluntary
ANNUAL ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT
Housing Element Implementation
(CCR Title 25 §6202 )

Jurisdiction City of Shasta Lake
Reporting Period 01-Jan-10 - 31-Dec-10

Table B
Regional Housing Needs Allocation Progress

Permitted Units Issued by Affordability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>RHNA Allocation by Income Level</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Total Units to Date (all years)</th>
<th>Total Remaining RHNA by Income Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-deed restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-deed restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-deed restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RHNA by COG</td>
<td>Enter allocation number:</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>736</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remaining Need for RHNA Period

Note: units serving extremly low-income households are included in the very low-income permitted units totals.
### Table C

**Program Implementation Status**

Describe progress of all programs including local efforts to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing as identified in the housing element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Timeframe in H.E.</th>
<th>Status of Program Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.1 Vacant Land Inventory to Accommodate Future Needs</td>
<td>20 very low and 30 low-income units during the planning period</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010(^1)</td>
<td>Housing Inventory is complete. Commercial Inventory is underway to assist with HE 4.1. Sites identified for planning period identified and rezoned in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.2 Infill Strategic Report</td>
<td>40 low, and 60 moderate income households</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>Infill Strategic Report will be completed once the total inventory is complete and the City's GIS mapping is updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.3 Density Bonuses and Incentives</td>
<td>20 very low and 30 low-income units during the planning period</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>City is preparing a Draft Affordable Housing Chapter to be included in the Municipal Code. The Planning Commission will consider the Draft Ordinance Amendment in March 2011. Once the Planning Commission meeting has completed their review then the City Council will consider in 2011.(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.4 Non-conforming Structures and Uses</td>
<td>20 very low and 30 low-income units during the planning period</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>Planning Commission will consider revisions to the Municipal Code in April 2011. Once the Planning Commission meeting has completed their review then the City Council will consider in 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.5 Secondary (and Other Accessory) Dwelling Units</td>
<td>5 extremely low, 5 very low and 10 low-income units during the planning period</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>Included in Draft Affordable Housing Chapter referenced above. In the process of being added to the Municipal Code. See Comment Section below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Program</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Timeframe in H.E.</td>
<td>Status of Program Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.6 Pursue State and Federal Funding</td>
<td>20 very low and 50 low-income units during the planning period</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>CalHOME funds were applied for by the City in 2010 but the application was not funded. No other housing grant applications were submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.7 Establish Design Standards - Mixed Use and Multi-Family</td>
<td>Reduced review periods by 2010/11</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>The City’s consultant has submitted draft Design Standards. Staff is reviewing for necessary editing and changes. This program is expected to be implemented during 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.8 Development Agreements</td>
<td>Adopted Code Amendment</td>
<td>FY 2009-2011</td>
<td>No activity on this Implementation Program to date. Activity will start this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.9 Homebuyer Assistance</td>
<td>Annually with Action Plan Report to Redevelopment Agency Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td>RDA Board receives periodic reports concerning the numbers of approved First Time Home Buyer Loans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual review of specific number of homebuyer loans for every income level.</td>
<td></td>
<td>In 2010, four loans were made to very-low income purchasers and seven to low-income purchasers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of strengths and weaknesses in delivery to income levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds included funding from the State of California Housing and Community Development, HOME Program, CalHOME Program and the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Low and Moderate Income fund). Strengths and weaknesses of the program will be reviewed with the RDA Board during 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.10 Collaboration with Affordable Housing Providers</td>
<td>Completed projects with affordable housing partner(s); compilation of a list of potential partners; an assessment of potential projects that can be completed</td>
<td>Initial timeframe for contact with potential partners is September 2010 for partner workshops. Ongoing - Entire Planning Period (this is not a one-time activity)</td>
<td>Development Services and RDA staff have met with a potential affordable housing developer who is working on a Tentative Subdivision Map currently that would provide 8 affordable SFD. Other local non-profit developers have been contacted to consider Shasta Lake for affordable housing. A list will be compiled during 2011 for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Program</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Timeframe in H.E.</td>
<td>Status of Program Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.11 Revision of R-3 and R-4 Districts to Increase Densities</td>
<td>Density increases to a minimum of 20 units per acre for multi-family residential developments and mixed-use developments in R-3 zones, and a change identifying multi-family residential as an allowed use in R-4 and commercial uses where it is part of a mixed-use development together with a change in density for R-4 to 30 units per acre.</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Planning Commission and City Council will consider density revisions during 2011 as part of the Land Use Element review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.12 Rezoning to Address 2003-2008 Housing Element Shortfall</td>
<td>Rezoning of property to either R-3 or R-4 with a minimum density of 20 units per acre.</td>
<td>By August 31, 2010</td>
<td>Completed and effective as of September 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.13 Address Housing Opportunities and Constraints</td>
<td>Revision of Municipal Code to address code constraints for affordable housing</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>Staff has begun a review of the Municipal Code to identify sections of the Municipal Code which are outdated and which may be a constraint for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.14 Annual Report on Housing Element Implementation</td>
<td>Annual review of specific actions taken to implement the Housing Element and report to HCD</td>
<td>Annually in the winter</td>
<td>In Process - City Council to consider and approve in March 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.15 Redevelopment Project Area Goals</td>
<td>Adoption of Redevelopment Agency 5-Year Implementation Plan</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The Redevelopment Agency has adopted a five-year Implementation Plan that reflects the goals of the Redevelopment Plan (December 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Program</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Timeframe in H.E.</td>
<td>Status of Program Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.16 Redevelopment Assistance for Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Completed and adopted policy by the Redevelopment Agency Board with specific funding attached to the Redevelopment Agency budget</td>
<td>By August 31, 2010</td>
<td>RDA approved an RDA Subsidy for a Habitat for Humanity Single Family Home on 10/19/2010 Res. RDA 10-10. Subsidy included NTE $30,000 for impact fees and a Deferred Homebuyer Loan NTE $47,400. Unit is under construction and expected to complete by May 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.17 Water and Sewer Service Priority for Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Development of policies and procedures for granting water and sewer service priority to affordable housing developments.</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Included in Draft Affordable Housing Chapter referenced above. In the process of being added to the Municipal Code. See Comment Section below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 2.1 Housing Rehabilitation (Single-Family)</td>
<td>Annually with Action Plan Report to Redevelopment Agency Board.</td>
<td>3 units of very low, 6 units of low and 10 units of moderate housing rehabilitated</td>
<td>One unit was assisted with a rehabilitation loan (1820 Deer Creek Ave.) during 2010. No additional loans were made. The City applied under the 2010 CalHOME NOFA for Owner Occupied Rehabilitation (OOR), and was not funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 2.2 Housing Rehabilitation (Multi-Family)</td>
<td>Incorporation of rehabilitation of multi-family residential units as part of the Redevelopment Agency 5-year Implementation Plan</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>No activity has occurred on this Implementation Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 2.3 Preservation of Affordable Rental Housing</td>
<td>Agency Plan for preservation of at-risk units</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No activity has occurred on this Implementation Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Program</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Timeframe in H.E.</td>
<td>Status of Program Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 2.4 Preservation of Mobile Home Parks</td>
<td>Plan for conservation of mobile home parks</td>
<td>2009/2011</td>
<td>No activity yet on this Implementation program. Later in 2011, it will be considered as part of the Land Use Element Update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 3.1 Local, State and Federal Funding for Infrastructure</td>
<td>Applications for funding for infrastructure</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>The City applied for the CDBG Program General Allocation in 2010 for $800,000 for sewer replacement but was not funded. RDA funds were used for road rehabilitation in 2010 and are expected to be used in 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 3.2 Wastewater Capacity Improvement</td>
<td>Construction of reclaimed pipeline to the Tierra Oaks Golf Course by 2012; alternatively approval by regulatory agencies for discharging reclaimed water into Churn Creek with limited or no dilution.</td>
<td>2013 (functional pipeline)</td>
<td>The City is coordinating reclaimed water delivery logistics with Tierra Oaks Golf Course and Bella Vista Water District. The Design RFP was issued January 2011. Completion of design is anticipated early 2012. Assuming funding sources can be located by this time, construction of the pipeline should be completed by late 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 4.1 Mixed-Use Development</td>
<td>List of priority commercial sites that could be used for mixed use.</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>The Commercial inventory must be completed first. It is scheduled for consideration in 2011 by the Planning Commission and then the City Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| HE 5.1 Energy Efficiency                 | Program to use Electric utility funds to assist affordable housing residents | 2009/2010         | The City's joint application with the County for weatherization funds was unsuccessful. The City's Electric Department started home energy audits in November 2010. About 25 audits are being completed per month.  

The City has increased rebate amounts for weatherization activities including ceiling/attic and wall insulation, energy efficient replacement windows, Energy Star® window shade screens/window films, duct insulation, blower door guided air sealing, Energy Star roof radiant barrier, and energy efficient roofing(cool roof). Additional rebates are available for energy efficient appliances. |
<p>| HE 5.2 Subdivision Activity              | Revision of Municipal Code to address exemption                          | 2010/11           | No activity has occurred on this Implementation Program.                                                                                                                                                                           |
| HE 6.1 Emergency Shelter                | Zoning Section of the Municipal Code                                     | 2009/10           | Included in Draft Affordable Housing Chapter referenced above. In the process of being added to the Municipal Code. See Comment Section below.                                                                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Timeframe in H.E.</th>
<th>Status of Program Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HE 6.2  Section 8 Rental Assistance</td>
<td>Maintain Contact with the Housing Authority for data and other information. Data made available to developers.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The City has approximately 135 households being assisted with a Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) through Shasta County. Information will be placed on the City’s new website in the coming month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 6.3  Equal Housing Opportunity</td>
<td>Up-to-date information concerning equal opportunity and enforcement available on a routine basis.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The City has included the Equal Housing Opportunity Logo on all its housing material and advertises Equal Housing Opportunity on the Housing Portion of the City’s new Website. Staff is in the process of requesting Spanish and Mien Equal Housing Opportunity posters from HCD to post in City Hall and post on website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 6.4  Accessibility for Persons With Disabilities <em>(Reasonable Accommodation)</em></td>
<td>Revised ordinance adopted</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Included in Draft Affordable Housing Chapter referenced above. In the process of being added to the Municipal Code. See Comment Section below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 6.5  Special Housing Needs</td>
<td>Implementation Plan and revised ordinance adopted</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Included in Draft Affordable Housing Chapter referenced above. In the process of being added to the Municipal Code. See Comment Section below. After Ordinance adoption will be added to the RDA Implementation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 6.6  Transitional and Supportive Housing</td>
<td>Zoning Section of the Municipal Code</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Included in Draft Affordable Housing Chapter referenced above. In the process of being added to the Municipal Code. See Comment Section below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GENERAL COMMENTS:

1. The City’s Housing Element was certified July 7, 2010 by HCD so all 2009/2010 dates will not be met as of 2010 but can be met in 2010/2011.

2. The City decided to incorporate many of the sections listed above into one new section of the Zoning portion of the Municipal Code. That section will be named the Affordable Housing Section. The sections included are noted above in each individual section as being part of the new chapter.

3. The City’s new website went live in January 2011 but portions of the information listed had been placed on the older website as well.
AGENDA ITEM
City Council Meeting

TO: Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: Carol Martin, City Manager
DATE: March 10, 2011
SUBJECT: Resolution Participating in the California Redevelopment Associations Legal Defense Fund to Fight the Elimination of Redevelopment Agencies
FILE: 

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council adopt the following resolution:

A Resolution of the City of Shasta Lake City Council authorizing the City Attorney to Cooperate with the League of California Cities, California Redevelopment Association and other Cities and Counties in litigation challenging the constitutionality of the elimination of Redevelopment Agencies.

BACKGROUND:

As you know, the Governor has proposed elimination of redevelopment agencies in cities and counties in California. While the League of California Cities and the California Redevelopment Association are doing everything possible to defeat his devastating proposal, it is important that consideration for litigation occur at this time. The California Redevelopment Association has had their legal team reviewing the proposed bill and believes that shutting down redevelopment agencies and taking funds for other State purposes is a clear violation of multiple constitutional provisions, including the recently passed Proposition 22 as well as Article XVI, section 16, which requires tax increment to be paid to redevelopment agencies to repay the cost of redevelopment projects. Staff has attached a copy of the summary of violations prepared by Best, Best & Krieger, Attorneys at Law.

The California Redevelopment Association is requesting that all agencies contribute to the legal defense fund for the purpose of preparing for possible litigation. They are asking that we pay it now before any legislation takes effect to ensure that resources are there for legal actions. The proportionate share for the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency is $200.00. If litigation does not occur then the funds will be returned to the City.
FISCAL IMPACTS:
The California Redevelopment Association has calculated that our contribution to a legal defense fund is $200.00.

ATTACHMENTS:
Resolutions
Best, Best & Krieger Summary

DISTRIBUTION:
City Council
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE AUTHORIZING THE CITY ATTORNEY TO COOPERATE WITH THE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES, CALIFORNIA REDEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION AND OTHER CITIES AND COUNTIES IN LITIGATION CHALLENGING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE ELIMINATION OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCIES

WHEREAS, the current economic crisis has placed cities under incredible financial pressure and caused them to make painful budget cuts, including layoffs and furloughs of city workers, decreasing maintenance and operations of public facilities, and reductions in direct services to keep spending in line with declining revenues; and

WHEREAS, since the early 1990s the state government of California has seized over $8.6 billion of city property tax revenues statewide, now amounting to over $900 million each year, to fund the state budget even after deducting public safety program payments made to cities by the state; and

WHEREAS, in his proposed FY 2011-12 budget the Governor has proposed completely eliminating Redevelopment Agencies and transferring $1.7 billion of local tax increment funds to balance the state budget; and

WHEREAS, the loss of all of the redevelopment tax increment will destroy the City’s ability to perform critical traffic related street rehabilitation and reconstruction projects, sewer and improvement projects; and

WHEREAS, the California Redevelopment Association has put together a legal analysis that indicates the taking of our funds for other State purposes is a clear violation of multiple constitutional provisions, including the recently passed Proposition 22 based on existing funding levels available to cities and counties.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE hereby directs the City Attorney to take all necessary steps to cooperate with the League of California Cities, California Redevelopment Association other cities and counties in supporting litigation against the state of California if the legislature enacts and the governor signs into law legislation that unconstitutionally diverts the Redevelopment Agencies share of tax increment funding to fund the state general fund; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Council authorizes the City Manager to pay the Cities proportionate share ($200.00) to the California Redevelopment Association legal defense fund.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15TH day of March, 2011.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

___________________________

ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

___________________________

TONI M. COATES, City Clerk
The above-referenced law firms have reviewed the Governor’s Redevelopment Proposal and have concluded the measure violates multiple provisions of the California Constitution. The Governor’s proposal seeks to disestablish redevelopment agencies, install “successor” agencies to hold redevelopment agency assets, and use redevelopment tax increment funding for Medi-Cal and trial court expenses in the short term—and for other non-redevelopment purposes in the long term.

This proposal violates at least three provisions of the California Constitution:

1) **Proposition 22 - Cal. Const., article XIII, § 25.5(a)(7).** Proposition 22 (2010) was just adopted in November 2010 to prohibit the State from directly or indirectly requiring redevelopment agencies to use redevelopment tax increment for the benefit of the State, any agency of the State, or any jurisdiction. By forcibly eliminating redevelopment agencies and transferring their assets to different accounts under the control of different entities so that redevelopment revenues can be used to fund Medi-Cal and trial courts—both of which are state programs—the Governor’s Redevelopment Proposal indirectly requires redevelopment agencies to transfer their assets for the benefit of the State, in clear violation of Proposition 22. The meaning of Proposition 22 is not ambiguous; and in any event, any conceivable doubts as to its meaning would be resolved by reference to the Attorney General’s title and summary, the Legislative Analyst’s impartial analysis, the ballot arguments in support of and in opposition to Proposition 22, and the measure’s own findings and declarations—which all forcefully declare that Proposition 22 flatly prohibits the State from redirecting redevelopment revenues.

2) **Cal. Const., article XVI, § 16(b) mandates** that redevelopment tax increment funds “shall be allocated to” and when collected “paid into a special fund of the redevelopment agency to pay the principal and interest on...loans, moneys advanced to, or indebtedness...incurred by the redevelopment agency to finance...redevelopment project[s].” The Governor’s Redevelopment Proposal violates Article XVI, § 16 because it does not deposit redevelopment tax increment funds into a special fund of the redevelopment agency, and does not use redevelopment tax increment funding to repay loans, moneys advanced to, or indebtedness incurred for redevelopment projects. The funds are diverted into other accounts for non-redevelopment uses.

3) **Cal. Const., article XIII A, § 1(a) states** that ad valorem real property taxes are “to be collected by the counties and apportioned according to law to the districts within the counties.” The Governor’s proposal seeks to use redevelopment funding for Medi-Cal and trial courts, but the Medi-Cal program and trial courts are not districts within the counties. Therefore, Article XIII A prohibits allocating tax increment funding in this manner. Moreover, Cal. Constitution, article XIII B, § 6(b)(3), as amended by Proposition 1A (2004), prohibits using ad valorem property tax revenue to reimburse a local government for the costs of a new program or a higher level of service. As such, the Governor’s Redevelopment Proposal cannot circumvent Article XIII A by imposing the mandate to fund Medi-Cal and trial courts directly on the counties and then forcing them to allocate redevelopment property tax revenues for those purposes.

---

1 “Districts within the counties” has been interpreted by California courts to mean those local entities within a county that levied a property tax prior to the approval of Proposition 13—which was the measure that added Article XIII A to the Constitution. (City of Rancho Cucamonga v. Mackzum (1991) 228 Cal.App.3d 929.)
AGENDA ITEM  
City Council Meeting

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager  
FROM: John Duckett, Assistant City Manager  
DATE: March 9, 2011  
SUBJECT: Resolution Accepting the Audit for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010  
FILE NO: F-200-

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of a Resolution by the Shasta Lake City Council accepting the Audit for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010 for the City of Shasta Lake.

BACKGROUND:

City Staff and the Finance Committee reviewed the audit on March 9, 2011. The financial report is an accumulation of information relating to the activities directed and approved by the City Council, along with the actions necessary by Management to carry out the desires of the City Council. This year, as in prior years, the staff records these transactions and works diligently to ensure that everything is proceeding within the guidance given by the City Council.

FISCAL IMPACTS:

None

ATTACHMENTS:

- Resolution accepting the Audit for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010
- Audited Financial Statements for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010

DISTRIBUTION:

City of Shasta Lake City Council
RESOLUTION CC 11-

A SHASTA LAKE CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE FINANCIAL AUDIT FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2010.

WHEREAS, the Shasta Lake City Council is required by Government Code to have an Annual Audit, and;

WHEREAS, the audit has been completed by D.H. Scott, Certified Public Accountants, and reviewed by the Finance Committee.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Audit for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2010 is hereby accepted; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Assistant City Manager is hereby authorized and directed to disseminate that Audit Report to the appropriate recipients.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES: NOES: ABSENT:

ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
TO: Carol Martin, Executive Officer
FROM: Jose Castro, Public Works Supervisor
DATE: March 2, 2011
SUBJECT: Use of Redevelopment Agency Tax Increment Funds in the amount of $70,000 for upgrades to Lift Station #4 of the City’s wastewater collection system.

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the Redevelopment Agency adopt the attached Resolution approving the use of Redevelopment funds for the Lift Station #4 Project.

BACKGROUND:
Providing wastewater service to all new development activity within the Redevelopment Project Area was first identified in the Redevelopment Plan (Plan) for the Shasta Dam Area Redevelopment Project adopted July 11th, 1989. The Plan was further amended and restated on July 15, 2008. The Plan describes the need of the project as follows as a Plan Goal:

“Eliminate and prevent the spread of blight and deterioration and to conserve, rehabilitate, and redevelop the Project Area in accordance with this Plan and future Annual Work Programs.”

The project’s estimated costs are $70,000 and include upgrade of Lift Station #4 to provide for functionality of the station. This project will benefit areas within the redevelopment project area by maintaining the capacity of the lift station to pump waste water to the City’s wastewater treatment plant.

FISCAL IMPACTS:
See attached Exhibit A, Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds.
ATTACHMENTS:

Resolution
Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds

DISTRIBUTION:

Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors
RESOLUTION RDA 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY APPROVING THE USE OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF $70,000 FOR UPGRADES TO LIFT STATION #4 OF THE CITY’S WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM.

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) adopted a Project Area Redevelopment Plan on July 11, 1989, which was amended and restated on July 15, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan provides for the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of property both inside and outside of the Project Area, necessary to carry out the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the upgraded lift station will serve the City of Shasta Lake both inside and outside of the Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Agency desires to contribute tax increment funds received from the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Agency finds, resolves, and orders as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. In connection with the proposed use of Redevelopment funds for upgrade of lift station #4 within the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area:

   a. The upgraded Lift Station #4 Project is of benefit to the Project Area;

   b. No other reasonable means of financing the construction are available to the community;

   c. The use of funds for the Lift Station #4 Project will assist in the elimination of blight in the Project Area and is consistent with the Project Area’s adopted Implementation Plan; and

   d. The Lift Station #4 Project is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

ROD LINDSAY, Chair

ATTEST:

TONI COATES, CMC, Secretary
The City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) proposes to provide up to $70,000 in Redevelopment funds to upgrade Lift Station #4.

The project is necessary to help maintain usable capacity of the lift station within the Redevelopment Area and will also help eliminate blight in the project area.

Health and Safety Code Sections 33020, 33021, 33421, 33445, 33678 authorize the Agency to undertake redevelopment activities such as those contemplated herein provided the legislative body determines all of the following findings to be in evidence:

1. That the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are of the primary benefit to the project area from which the funds are derived or to the immediate neighborhood in which the project is located, regardless of whether the improvement is within another project area; and

2. That no other reasonable means of financing the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are available to the community; and

3. That the payment of funds for the acquisition of land or the cost of public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements will assist in elimination of one or more blighting conditions inside the project area and is consistent with an adopted implementation plan; and

4. That the provision of the proposed improvements by the agency is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

Section 33678 of the California Health and Safety Code adds the requirement that if tax increment money is used, the project must meet the definition and purpose of Redevelopment as prescribed in Sections 33020 and 33021 and primarily benefit the project area from which the tax increment money is derived.

These issues are discussed below by topic:

1. **Is the proposed Upgrade of Lift Station #4 Project of primary benefit to the project area?**

   Section 33020 defines Redevelopment as the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction, or rehabilitation or any combination of these, of all or part of a survey area and the provision of public, or other structures or spaces as may be appropriate or necessary in the interest of the general welfare. Section 33021 further defines Redevelopment as the alteration, improvement, modernization, reconstruction, or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of existing structures in a project area.

   The Lift Station #4 project is of primary benefit to the Redevelopment Area and will provide capacity of the lift station to deliver wastewater to the City’s wastewater treatment plant for future development of low income housing, commercial expansion, reuse of blighted areas, and economic development.
2. Are there any other reasonable means of financing available to the community to finance the project?

Currently, there are no additional funds within the City’s General Fund to finance this project. Therefore, the only reasonable funding is from the Redevelopment Agency.

3. Will the proposed activity assist in the elimination of one or more blighting conditions within the Project Area and is it consistent with the Implementation Plan for the Project Area?

The proposed activity will assist in the elimination of existing blight conditions in the Project area. Specifically, portions of the City’s existing wastewater collection system, including Lift Station #4 are reaching the end of functional life. Should the lift station fail or be eliminated, disposal of effluents upstream of the station will be curtailed. This will increase blight, prevent development of low income housing, in-fill housing, and new residential and commercial developments. Upgrade of Lift Station #4 will extend the useful life of the station and therefore both eliminate and prevent creation of blight.

The proposed project is also consistent with the Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan. The 2005-2009 Amended Implementation Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area was prepared and adopted pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 33490.

The Implementation Plan specifically describes the Agency’s involvement in the corrections of blight, including defective design and character of physical construction; furthermore it includes the repair of an economic burden that consists of an inadequate public improvement, public facilities, open spaces, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment. The Plan also contains certain goals relative to the elimination of these blighting conditions.

A. To create new and improved job opportunities by removing those barriers that crime imposed to hamper or impede proper and economic development;

B. To stimulate private interest in the commercial and industrial sectors; and

C. To improve the livability of the community in terms of both residential and non-residential districts by providing enhanced safety for residents.

4. Is the Upgrade of Lift Station #4 Project by the Agency necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area?

The stated objectives in the Redevelopment plan consist of these major goals:

1) The elimination of blighting influences and the correction of environmental deficiencies in the Project Area, in particular, structural deterioration, underutilized commercial land, unmanageable parcelization patterns, and inadequate curbs, gutters, paving and sidewalks;

2) Improved pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the Project Area;

3) The provision of an environment conducive to social and economic growth, including expansion of job opportunities; and
4) The expansion and/or improvement of the community’s supply of housing for low- and moderate-income persons.

The Upgrade of Lift Station #4 Project will support all of the above stated objectives both in and out of the project area. Working within the Five Year Implementation Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area, the proposed activity is necessary to support this effort.
TO: Carol Martin, Executive Officer  
FROM: Jose, Castro, Public Works Supervisor  
DATE: March 2, 2011  
SUBJECT: Use of Redevelopment Agency Tax Increment Funds in the amount of $41,000 for the Park Lighting Project at Clair Engle Park

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Redevelopment Agency adopt the attached Resolution approving the use of Redevelopment funds for the Park Lighting Project.

BACKGROUND:

Providing parks and recreation opportunities within the Redevelopment Project Area was first identified in the Redevelopment Plan (Plan) for the Shasta Dam Area Redevelopment Project adopted July 11th, 1989. The Plan was further amended and restated on July 15, 2008. The Plan describes the need for the project as a Plan Goal:

“Provide needed improvements to the community’s recreational, cultural, and other community facilities to better serve the Project Area.”

The project’s estimated costs are $41,000 and include upgrade of lighting within the City’s Clair Engle Park. This project will benefit areas within the redevelopment project area by providing enhanced public safety and better visibility within the park at night, thereby eliminating an ongoing vandalism problem which is causing a blighted situation.

FISCAL IMPACTS:

See attached Exhibit A, Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds.

ATTACHMENTS:

Resolution
Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds

DISTRIBUTION:

Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors
RESOLUTION RDA 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY APPROVING THE USE OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF $41,000 FOR UPGRADES TO PARK LIGHTING WITHIN CLAIR ENGLE PARK.

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) adopted a Project Area Redevelopment Plan on July 11, 1989, which was amended and restated on July 15, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan provides for the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of property both inside and outside of the Project Area, necessary to carry out the Plan; and

WHEREAS, upgraded lighting in Clair Engle Park will serve the City of Shasta Lake both inside and outside of the Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Agency desires to contribute tax increment funds received from the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Agency finds, resolves, and orders as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. In connection with the proposed use of Redevelopment funds for the Park Lighting Project within the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area:
   a. The upgraded lighting in Clair Engle Park is of benefit to the Project Area;
   b. No other reasonable means of financing the construction are available to the community;
   c. The use of funds for the Park Lighting Project will assist in the elimination of blight in the Project Area and is consistent with the Project Area’s adopted Implementation Plan; and
   d. The Park Lighting Project is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.
   e. 

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March 2011 by the following vote:

AYES: 
NOES: 
ABSENT: 

ROD LINDSAY, Chair 

ATTEST: 

TONI COATES, CMC, Secretary
EXHIBIT A

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED USE OF REDEVELOPMENT FUNDS FOR THE PARK LIGHTING PROJECT

The City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) proposes to provide up to $41,000 in Redevelopment funds to upgrade lighting within the Clair Engle Park.

The project is necessary to provide needed improvements to the community's recreational, cultural, and other community facilities to better serve the Project Area within the project area and will also help eliminate blight in the project area.

Health and Safety Code Sections 33020, 33021, 33421, 33445, 33678 authorize the Agency to undertake redevelopment activities such as those contemplated herein provided the legislative body determines all of the following findings to be in evidence:

1. That the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are of the primary benefit to the project area from which the funds are derived or to the immediate neighborhood in which the project is located, regardless of whether the improvement is within another project area; and

2. That no other reasonable means of financing the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are available to the community; and

3. That the payment of funds for the acquisition of land or the cost of public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements will assist in elimination of one or more blighting conditions inside the project area and is consistent with an adopted implementation plan; and

4. That the provision of the proposed improvements by the agency is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

Section 33678 of the California Health and Safety Code adds the requirement that if tax increment money is used, the project must meet the definition and purpose of Redevelopment as prescribed in Sections 33020 and 33021 and primarily benefit the project area from which the tax increment money is derived.

These issues are discussed below by topic:

1. **Is the proposed Park Lighting Project of primary benefit to the project area?**

   Section 33020 defines Redevelopment as the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction, or rehabilitation or any combination of these, of all or part of a survey area and the provision of public, or other structures or spaces as may be appropriate or necessary in the interest of the general welfare. Section 33021 further defines Redevelopment as the alteration, improvement, modernization, reconstruction, or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of existing structures in a project area.

   The Park Lighting Project is of primary benefit to the Redevelopment Area.

2. **Are there any other reasonable means of financing available to the community to finance the project?**
Currently, there are no additional funds within the City’s General Fund to finance this project. Therefore, the only reasonable funding is from the Redevelopment Agency.

3. **Will the proposed activity assist in the elimination of one or more blighting conditions within the Project Area and is it consistent with the Implementation Plan for the Project Area?**

The proposed activity will assist in the elimination of existing blight conditions in the Project area. Specifically, elimination of unlighted portions of the City’s existing Clair Engle Park will eliminate a blighted situation.

The proposed project is also consistent with the Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan. The 2005-2009 Amended Implementation Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area was prepared and adopted pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 33490.

The Implementation Plan specifically describes the Agency’s involvement in the corrections of blight, including defective design and character of physical construction; furthermore it includes the repair of an economic burden that consists of an inadequate public improvement, public facilities, open spaces, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment. The Plan also contains certain goals relative to the elimination of these blighting conditions.

   A. To create new and improved job opportunities by removing those barriers that crime imposes to hamper or impede proper and economic development;
   B. To stimulate private interest in the commercial and industrial sectors; and
   C. To improve the livability of the community in terms of both residential and non residential districts by providing enhanced safety for residents.

4. **Is the Park Lighting Project by the Agency necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area?**

The stated objectives in the Redevelopment plan consist of these major goals:

1) The elimination of blighting influences and the correction of environmental deficiencies in the Project Area, in particular, structural deterioration, underutilized commercial land, unmanageable parcelization patterns, and inadequate curbs, gutters, paving and sidewalks;

2) Improved pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the Project Area;

3) The provision of an environment conducive to social and economic growth, including expansion of job opportunities; and

4) The expansion and/or improvement of the community’s supply of housing for low- and moderate-income persons.

The Park Lighting Project will support all of the above stated objectives both in and out of the project area. Working within the Five Year Implementation Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area, the proposed activity is necessary to support this effort.
TO: Carol Martin, Executive Officer
FROM: Tom Chism, Wastewater Treatment Superintendent
DATE: March 2, 2011
SUBJECT: Use of Redevelopment Agency Tax Increment Funds in the amount of $530,000 for design of the Reclaimed Water Main Project to provide for increased capacity at the City’s wastewater treatment facility.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Redevelopment Agency adopt the attached Resolution approving the use of Redevelopment funds for the Reclaimed Water Main Project.

BACKGROUND:

Providing upgrades to infrastructure facilities within the Redevelopment Project Area was first identified in the Redevelopment Plan (Plan) for the Shasta Dam Area Redevelopment Project adopted July 11th, 1989. The Plan was further amended and restated on July 15, 2008. Further, the Project is designated within the Agency’s current Five Year Implementation Plan.

The Plan describes the need of the project as follows:

Installation of a reclaimed water pipeline to Tierra Oaks Golf Course will allow the City to utilize nearly twice the capacity of the existing treatment plant, thereby allowing additional development within the Project Area. Completion of this project would help eliminate the blighting condition of inadequate public improvements.

The project’s estimated costs are $530,000 and include design of a reclaimed water main to serve the Tierra Oaks Golf Course outside the eastern boundary of the redevelopment project area. Eventual construction of the main will benefit areas within the redevelopment project area by increasing the discharge capacity of the City’s wastewater plant. Increased treatment capacity will serve future redevelopment projects, low income housing, commercial expansion, reuse of blighted areas,
and economic development throughout the City. The reclaimed water will be used by Tierra Oaks Golf Course to replace potable water now used for irrigation purposes.

**FISCAL IMPACTS:**

See attached Exhibit A, Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Resolution  
Analysis of Proposed Use of Redevelopment Funds

**DISTRIBUTION:**

Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
APPROVING THE USE OF REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FUNDS FOR DESIGN OF A NEW
RECLAIMED WATER LINE TO SERVE THE TIERRA OAKS GOLF COURSE

WHEREAS, the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) adopted a Project Area Redevelopment Plan on July 11, 1989; and

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan provides for the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of property both inside and outside of the Project Area, necessary to carry out the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the reclaimed water main will serve the City of Shasta Lake both inside and outside of the Project Area; and

WHEREAS, the Agency desires to contribute tax increment funds received from the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Agency finds, resolves, and orders as follows:

1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. In connection with the proposed use of Redevelopment funds for design of the reclaimed water main project both within and outside the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Project Area:
   a. The reclaimed water main project is of benefit to the Project Area;
   b. No other reasonable means of financing the construction are available to the community;
   c. The use of funds for the reclaimed water main project will assist in the elimination of blight in the Project Area and is consistent with the Project Area’s adopted Implementation Plan; and
   d. The reclaimed water main project is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

ROD LINDSAY, Chair

ATTEST:

TONI COATES, CMC, Secretary
EXHIBIT A

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED USE OF REDEVELOPMENT FUNDS
FOR DESIGN OF THE RECLAIMED WATER MAIN PROJECT

The City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Agency) proposes to provide up to $530,000 in Redevelopment funds to design the reclaimed water main project.

The project is necessary to help increase usable capacity in the City’s wastewater treatment plant within the Redevelopment Area and will also help eliminate blight in the project area.

Health and Safety Code Sections 33020, 33021, 33421, 33445, 33678 authorize the Agency to undertake redevelopment activities such as those contemplated herein provided the legislative body determines all of the following findings to be in evidence:

1. That the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are of the primary benefit to the project area from which the funds are derived or to the immediate neighborhood in which the project is located, regardless of whether the improvement is within another project area; and

2. That no other reasonable means of financing the public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements are available to the community; and

3. That the payment of funds for the acquisition of land or the cost of public buildings, facilities, structures, or other improvements will assist in elimination of one or more blighting conditions inside the project area and is consistent with an adopted implementation plan; and

4. That the provision of the proposed improvements by the agency is necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area.

Section 33678 of the California Health and Safety Code adds the requirement that if tax increment money is used, the project must meet the definition and purpose of Redevelopment as prescribed in Sections 33020 and 33021 and primarily benefit the project area from which the tax increment money is derived.

These issues are discussed below by topic:

1. **Is the proposed design of the reclaimed water main project of primary benefit to the project area?**

   Section 33020 defines Redevelopment as the planning, development, replanning, redesign, clearance, reconstruction, or rehabilitation or any combination of these, of all or part of a survey area and the provision of public, or other structures or spaces as may be appropriate or necessary in the interest of the general welfare. Section 33021 further defines Redevelopment as the alteration, improvement, modernization, reconstruction, or rehabilitation, or any combination of these, of existing structures in a project area.

   The reclaimed water main project is of primary benefit to the Redevelopment Area in the following ways:
To provide expanded capacity at the City’s Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP): The WWTP when constructed was originally intended to produce recycled water for use at local golf courses. The City has long identified the Golf Club at Tierra Oaks as a potential recycled water customer.

To provide capacity to Summit City for public sewer services: The 2009 Redevelopment Plan amendment, Summit City was added to the project area. Summit City currently is not on public sewer, but on private septic systems. It is in the intent of the redevelopment plan to eventually expand sewer service to Summit City.

Future Development: Provide for future development of low income housing, commercial expansion, reuse of blighted areas, and economic development.

2. Are there any other reasonable means of financing available to the community to finance the project?

Currently, there are no additional funds within the City’s General Fund to finance this project. Therefore, the only reasonable funding is from the Redevelopment Agency.

3. Will the proposed activity assist in the elimination of one or more blighting conditions within the Project Area and is it consistent with the Implementation Plan for the Project Area?

The proposed activity will assist in the elimination of existing blight conditions in the Project area. Specifically, the City’s existing wastewater treatment plant has been identified as nearing capacity. Should it reach capacity, all redevelopment activities that include disposal of effluents will be curtailed. This will include blight elimination, low income housing, in-fill housing, and new residential and commercial developments. Development of reclaimed water main project will extend the useful life of the wastewater treatment plant by providing a means of disposing of treated water.

The proposed project is also consistent with the Project Area’s Amended Five-Year Implementation Plan. The 2005-2009 Amended Implementation Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area was prepared and adopted pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 33490.

The Implementation Plan specifically describes the Agency’s involvement in the corrections of blight, including defective design and character of physical construction; furthermore it includes the repair of an economic burden that consists of an inadequate public improvement, public facilities, open spaces, and utilities which cannot be remedied by private or governmental action without redevelopment. The Plan also contains certain goals relative to the elimination of these blighting conditions.

A. To create new and improved job opportunities by removing those barriers that crime imposes to hamper or impede proper and economic development;
B. To stimulate private interest in the commercial and industrial sectors; and
C. To improve the livability of the community in terms of both residential and non residential districts by providing enhanced safety for residents.

4. Is the design and eventual development of reclaimed water main project by the Agency necessary to effectuate the purpose of the Redevelopment Plan for the Shasta Lake Project Area?

The stated objectives in the Redevelopment plan consist of these major goals:
1) The elimination of blighting influences and the correction of environmental deficiencies in the Project Area, in particular, structural deterioration, underutilized commercial land, unmanageable parcelization patterns, and inadequate curbs, gutters, paving and sidewalks;

2) Improved pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the Project Area;

3) The provision of an environment conducive to social and economic growth, including expansion of job opportunities; and

4) The expansion and/or improvement of the community’s supply of housing for low- and moderate-income persons.

The reclaimed water main project will support some of the above stated objectives both in and out of the project area. Working within the Five Year Implementation Plan for the City of Shasta Lake Project Area, the proposed activity is necessary to support this effort.
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE AMENDING MUNICIPAL CODE
TITLE 13, PUBLIC SERVICES, CHAPTER 13.20, ELECTRICITY SERVICE SYSTEM,
SECTION 13.20.410 ESTABLISHING NEW ELECTRICAL RATES.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS
FOLLOWS:

Section 1:
Title 13, Chapter 13.20, Section 13.20.410 of the City of Shasta Lake Municipal Code is
amended to read as follows:

13.20.410 – Residential, lifeline, social, commercial, large industrial, small industrial,
government and economic development service rates.

**Residential Service:**
Customer Charge per month $12.50 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.1220 (0 <= 750 kWhs)
$0.1320 (751 <=1700 kWhs)
$0.1460 (>1700 kWhs)

**Lifeline Service:**
Customer Charge per month $8.00 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.1078 (<=800 kWhs)
$0.14563 (>800 kWhs)

**Social Service:**
Customer Charge per month $26.00 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.14563 (all kWhs)

**Commercial Service:**
Customer Charge per month $35.00 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.13322 (all kWhs)

**Large Industrial Service:**
Customer Charge per month $79.33 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $.0936 (all kWhs)
Demand Rate per kW $8.77 (peak demand kW)

**Small Industrial Service:**
Customer Charge per month $55.50 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.1072 (all kWhs)
Demand Rate per kW $9.59 (peak demand kW)

**Government Service:**
Customer Charge per month $43.02 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.1397 (all kWhs)
**Economic Development Service:**
Customer Charge per month $79.33 (per meter)
Energy Rate per kWh $0.0676 (all kWh)
Demand Rate per kW $7.92 (peak demand kW)

**Note:** A public benefit program charge of 2.85% of the electric bill, as required by law, will be effective with the adoption of the ordinance. This provision may be repealed or amended at any time by the California State Legislature.

Section 2:
**Severability:** If any provision of this ordinance or the applications thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance and the applications of such provision will remain in effect to the extent permitted by law.

Section 3:
**Effective Date:** This ordinance shall take effect 30 days after the date of its second reading.

Executed this 15th day of March, 2011.

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

______________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
TONI COATES, CMC, City Clerk
AGENDA ITEM
City Council

TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: Carla L. Thompson, AICP, Development Services Director
DATE: March 3, 2011
SUBJECT: Approval of a Building Permit Fee Waiver for a New Scoreboard at Wynne Price Park
FILE NO.: B-300-200-010 (New)

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends City Council adopt the attached Resolution approving a waiver of building permit fees for a new scoreboard on City-owned property at Wynne Price Park.

BACKGROUND:
The City recently received plans from the Gateway Unified School District for a new scoreboard to replace an existing board at Wynne Price Park, 4240 Vallecito Street. Conceptual drawings and plans for the sign are attached.

Hale Construction is volunteering their time and supplying materials. Bob Anderson, baseball coach from Central Valley High School will also volunteer his time for construction of the sign. The City’s Public Works Department will also assist with construction.

The City is required to complete construction plan check, and a building permit is required. Staff requests the building permit fee be waived. Any additional costs for the scoreboard will be the responsibility of the School District.

FISCAL IMPACTS:
The fee waiver would not exceed $550.00.

DISTRIBUTION: City Council
ATTACHMENTS: Proposed Resolution of Approval
Conceptual design and engineered plans
RESOLUTION CC 11-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE APPROVING A BUILDING PERMIT FEE WAIVER NOT TO EXCEED $550.00 FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SCOREBOARD ON CITY-OWNED PROPERTY AT WYNNE PRICE PARK, 4240 VALLECITO STREET

WHEREAS, the City received a conceptual drawing and construction plans from the Gateway Unified School District for a new scoreboard to replace an existing board at Wynne Price Park, 4240 Vallecito Street; and

WHEREAS, funding for the sign will be the responsibility of the Gateway Unified School District, with labor and/or materials provided by Hale Construction, Central Valley High School and the City’s Public Works Department; and

WHEREAS, construction plan check and a building permit are required for the new scoreboard; and

WHEREAS, the City supports a waiver of building permit fees.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Shasta Lake hereby approves a building permit fee waiver not to exceed $550.00 for construction of a new scoreboard at Wynne Price Park.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March 2011 by the following vote.

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

______________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk
COLUMNS AND FOOTINGS SHOWN HERE, PROVIDED BY OTHERS, ARE SIZED TO COMPLY WITH IBC 2006 90 MPH EXPOSURE B REQUIREMENTS. THE MANUFACTURED PRODUCT EXCEEDS THE REQUIREMENTS OF IBC 2006 90 MPH EXPOSURE B AS MOUNTED IN THIS DRAWING. SOIL—AVERAGE WITH ALLOWABLE STRESSES OF 2500 psf. DESIGN SHOULD BE ALTERED FOR DIFFERENT SOIL CONDITIONS, CLEARANCE, OR LOCAL CODES. FAIR-PLAY ASSUMES NO RESPONSIBILITIES FOR INSTALLATIONS DONE BY OTHERS.

CONTROL CABLES—SUGGEST 3/4" CONDUIT BE USED FOR BURIED CABLE IN AREAS WHERE IT MAY BE SUBJECT TO MECHANICAL DAMAGE. POWER WIRES SHOULD BE ROUTED IN SEPARATE CONDUIT FROM CONTROL CABLE.

INSTALLATION DRAWING SHOULD BE REVIEWED BY A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER IN YOUR AREA PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

REFERENCE 01-0500-01 FOR INSTALLATION NOTES.
MA-1591-2

TEAM NAMES CAPABLE OF DISPLAYING 1-LINE OF 11" CHARACTERS.

SIZE: 26'-0"L X 6'-6"H X 10"D

POWER: 120 VAC, 60 HZ, 1-PHASE
10 AMPS. (SCBD + 8 X 48 1.375 AMBER LED CAPTIVE SPORTS TEAM NAMES)
120 VAC AT THE CONTROL LOCATION.

CONTROL CONSOLE: MP-70.
CONTROL CABLE: (1) TWO CONDUCTOR SHIELDED.
(IF WIRELESS ORDERED, CABLE NOT REQ'D.)

LED'S: AMBER LED.

OPTIONS: LIGHTNING DAMAGE REDUCTION UNIT.
WIRELESS MP-70 CONTROL OPERATION.

ESTIMATED WEIGHT: 518 LBS.

* REFERENCE 01-0500-01 FOR INSTALLATION NOTES.

WEB ADDRESS
FAIR-PLAY SCOREBOARDS
FACTORY ADDRESS
PHONE

fair-play.com
P.O. BOX 1847
1700 DELAWARE AVE.
515-265-5305

DES MOINES, IOWA 50305-1847
DES MOINES, IOWA 50317-2999
022610 RMS

01-1591-01-1
TO: Carol Martin, City Manager

FROM: Debbie Israel, Senior Planner

DATE: March 15, 2011

SUBJECT: 2010 Annual Housing Element Progress Report

FILE NO.:  

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends City Council approve the attached Resolution concerning the 2010 Annual Housing Element Progress Report and its submittal to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR).

BACKGROUND:

The State of California’s Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) certified the City’s Housing Element on July 7, 2010. State Housing Element Law requires that the City provide HCD (and OPR) an annual progress report concerning the Implementation Programs included in the approved Housing Element as well as progress concerning the increase in affordable units as required.

The State has provided a report format approved last year through a State process. Using the State’s format, the Development Services Department has completed that report with assistance from the Redevelopment Agency and Public Works staff. That report is attached.

The report will be required to be submitted every year by April 1 to HCD. At this time there is no response expected from HCD concerning the reports but it is expected that the reports as they accumulate through the five–year planning period will provide HCD an indication not only of progress but of what activities a jurisdiction may be having difficulty implementing.

The Planning Commission reviewed the report at their February 17 meeting and has recommended review by the City Council and transmission to the State. Generally, given the date on which the Housing Element was certified, the City is on track for many of the Implementation Programs with the greater majority of them (with the exception of annual requirements) to be completed in this calendar year. Other ongoing or annual programs will not formally conclude but continue through the five-year planning period.
One notable item is that during the review of the Implementation Programs it was determined that a number of the programs that required revisions of the Zoning portion of the Municipal Code would be better consolidated into a new chapter of the Zoning section.

The new chapter will be identified as the Affordable Housing Chapter and many programs will be housed in that chapter as well as the authority for incentives for affordable development. Keeping those items in one chapter will make it easier for both the public and staff to be aware of and manage information.

After review at this meeting the Report will be sent to HCD and OPR.

Environmental Determination

The California Environmental Quality Act does not apply to this report.

FISCAL IMPACTS:

No fiscal impacts will occur because of the proposed action with the exception of staff time.

ATTACHMENTS:

2010 Annual Housing Element Progress Report

DISTRIBUTION:

City Council
A SHASTA LAKE CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION VERIFYING REVIEW OF THE 2010 ANNUAL HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT FOR SUBMISSION TO THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT (HCD) AND THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH (OPR)

WHEREAS, the Shasta Lake Development Services Department is required by the California Government Code 65400 (a) (2) to prepare an annual report on the Housing Element’s implementation programs using the form provided by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) known as the Annual Housing Element Progress Report; and

WHEREAS, the Shasta Lake Planning Commission considered the 2010 Annual Housing Element Progress Report at their public meeting on February 17, 2011 and has recommended to the City Council that they review the Report for submission to the State HCD and OPR; and

WHEREAS, the Shasta Lake City Council is required by the California Government Code 65400(a) (2) to consider the Annual Housing Element Progress Report at a public meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Shasta Lake City Council has considered the 2010 Annual Housing Element Report at a public meeting on March 15, 2011.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the 2010 Annual Housing Element Progress Report has hereby reviewed the 2010 Annual Housing Element Report for submission to HCD and OPR.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this day of March 2011, by the following vote:

AYES: 
NOES: 
ABSENT:

______________________________
ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
TONI M. COATES, City Clerk
ANNUAL ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT
Housing Element Implementation
(CCR Title 25 §6202)

Jurisdiction: City of Shasta Lake
Reporting Period: 01-Jan-10 - 31-Dec-10

Table A
Annual Building Activity Report Summary - New Construction
Very Low-, Low-, and Mixed-Income Multifamily Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Development Information</th>
<th>Housing with Financial Assistance and/or Deed Restrictions</th>
<th>Housing without Financial Assistance or Deed Restrictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Identifier (may be APN No., project name or address)</td>
<td>Unit Category</td>
<td>Tenure (R=Renter O=Owner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3146 West</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Total of Moderate and Above Moderate from Table A3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Total by income Table A/A3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Total Extremely Low-Income Units*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: These fields are voluntary
ANNUAL ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT
Housing Element Implementation
(CCR Title 25 §6202 )

Jurisdiction
City of Shasta Lake

Reporting Period
01-Jan-10 - 31-Dec-10

Table A2
Annual Building Activity Report Summary - Units Rehabilitated, Preserved and Acquired pursuant to GC Section 65583.1(c)(1)

Please note: Units may only be credited to the table below when a jurisdiction has included a program in its housing element to rehabilitate, preserve or acquire units to accommodate a portion of its RHNA which meet the specific criteria as outlined in GC Section 65583.1(c)(1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Affordability by Household Incomes</th>
<th>(4) The Description should adequately document how each unit complies with subsection (c)(7) of Government Code Section 65583.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely Low-Income*</td>
<td>Very Low-Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Rehabilitation Activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Preservation of Units At-Risk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Acquisition of Units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Total Units by Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: This field is voluntary

Table A3
Annual building Activity Report Summary for Above Moderate-Income Units
(not including those units reported on Table A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Single Family</th>
<th>2. 2 - 4 Units</th>
<th>3. 5+ Units</th>
<th>4. Second Unit</th>
<th>5. Mobile Homes</th>
<th>6. Total</th>
<th>7. Number of infill units*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Units Permitted for Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Units Permitted for Above Moderate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: This field is voluntary
# ANNUAL ELEMENT PROGRESS REPORT

## Housing Element Implementation

(CCR Title 25 §6202 )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>City of Shasta Lake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Period</td>
<td>01-Jan-10 - 31-Dec-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table B

### Regional Housing Needs Allocation Progress

#### Permitted Units Issued by Affordability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>RHNA Allocation by Income Level</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Total Units to Date (all years)</th>
<th>Total Remaining RHNA by Income Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-deed restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-deed restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-deed restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RHNA by COG</td>
<td></td>
<td>742</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Need for RHNA Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: units serving extremely low-income households are included in the very low-income permitted units totals.
### Program Implementation Status

Table C

Describe progress of all programs including local efforts to remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing as identified in the housing element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Timeframe in H.E.</th>
<th>Status of Program Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.1 Vacant Land Inventory to Accommodate Future Needs</td>
<td>20 very low and 30 low-income units during the planning period</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>Housing Inventory is complete. Commercial Inventory is underway to assist with HE 4.1. Sites identified for planning period identified and rezoned in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.2 Infill Strategic Report</td>
<td>40 low, and 60 moderate income households</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>Infill Strategic Report will be completed once the total inventory is complete and the City's GIS mapping is updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.3 Density Bonuses and Incentives</td>
<td>20 very low and 30 low-income units during the planning period</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>City is preparing a Draft Affordable Housing Chapter to be included in the Municipal Code. The Planning Commission will consider the Draft Ordinance Amendment in March 2011. Once the Planning Commission meeting has completed their review then the City Council will consider in 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.4 Non-conforming Structures and Uses</td>
<td>20 very low and 30 low-income units during the planning period</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>Planning Commission will consider revisions to the Municipal Code in April 2011. Once the Planning Commission meeting has completed their review then the City Council will consider in 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.5 Secondary (and Other Accessory) Dwelling Units</td>
<td>5 extremely low, 5 very low and 10 low-income units during the planning period</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>Included in Draft Affordable Housing Chapter referenced above. In the process of being added to the Municipal Code. See Comment Section below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Program</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Timeframe in H.E.</td>
<td>Status of Program Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.6 Pursue State and Federal Funding</td>
<td>20 very low and 50 low-income units during the planning period</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>CalHOME funds were applied for by the City in 2010 but the application was not funded. No other housing grant applications were submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.7 Establish Design Standards - Mixed Use and Multi-Family</td>
<td>Reduced review periods by 2010/11</td>
<td>FY 2009/2010</td>
<td>The City's consultant has submitted draft Design Standards. Staff is reviewing for necessary editing and changes. This program is expected to be implemented during 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.8 Development Agreements</td>
<td>Adopted Code Amendment</td>
<td>FY 2009-2011</td>
<td>No activity on this Implementation Program to date. Activity will start this year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| HE 1.9 Homebuyer Assistance                        | Annually with Action Plan Report to Redevelopment Agency Board.           | Annual review of specific number of homebuyer loans for every income level. Analysis of strengths and weaknesses in delivery to income levels. | RDA Board receives periodic reports concerning the numbers of approved First Time Home Buyer Loans.  
In 2010, four loans were made to very-low income purchasers and seven to low-income purchasers.  
Funds included funding from the State of California Housing and Community Development, HOME Program, CalHOME Program and the City of Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency (Low and Moderate Income fund). Strengths and weaknesses of the program will be reviewed with the RDA Board during 2011. |
| HE 1.10 Collaboration with Affordable Housing Providers | Completed projects with affordable housing partner(s); compilation of a list of potential partners; an assessment of potential projects that can be completed | Initial timeframe for contact with potential partners is September 2010 for partner workshops. Ongoing - Entire Planning Period (this is not a one-time activity) | Development Services and RDA staff have met with a potential affordable housing developer who is working on a Tentative Subdivision Map currently that would provide 8 affordable SFD.  
Other local non-profit developers have been contacted to consider Shasta Lake for affordable housing. A list will be compiled during 2011 for implementation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Timeframe in H.E.</th>
<th>Status of Program Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.11 Revision of R-3 and R-4 Districts to Increase Densities</td>
<td>Density increases to a minimum of 20 units per acre for multi-family residential developments and mixed-use developments in R-3 zones, and a change identifying multi-family residential as an allowed use in R-4 and commercial uses where it is part of a mixed-use development together with a change in density for R-4 to 30 units per acre.</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Planning Commission and City Council will consider density revisions during 2011 as part of the Land Use Element review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.12 Rezoning to Address 2003-2008 Housing Element Shortfall</td>
<td>Rezoning of property to either R-3 or R-4 with a minimum density of 20 units per acre.</td>
<td>By August 31, 2010</td>
<td>Completed and effective as of September 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.13 Address Housing Opportunities and Constraints</td>
<td>Revision of Municipal Code to address code constraints for affordable housing</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>Staff has begun a review of the Municipal Code to identify sections of the Municipal Code which are outdated and which may be a constraint for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.14 Annual Report on Housing Element Implementation</td>
<td>Annual review of specific actions taken to implement the Housing Element and report to HCD</td>
<td>Annually in the winter</td>
<td>In Process - City Council to consider and approve in March 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.15 Redevelopment Project Area Goals</td>
<td>Adoption of Redevelopment Agency 5-Year Implementation Plan</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The Redevelopment Agency has adopted a five-year Implementation Plan that reflects the goals of the Redevelopment Plan (December 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Program</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Timeframe in H.E.</td>
<td>Status of Program Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.16 Redevelopment Assistance for Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Completed and adopted policy by the Redevelopment Agency Board with specific funding attached to the Redevelopment Agency budget</td>
<td>By August 31, 2010</td>
<td>RDA approved an RDA Subsidy for a Habitat for Humanity Single Family Home on 10/19/2010 Res. RDA 10-10). Subsidy included NTE $30,000 for impact fees and a Deferred Homebuyer Loan NTE $47,400. Unit is under construction and expected to complete by May 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1.17 Water and Sewer Service Priority for Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Development of policies and procedures for granting water and sewer service priority to affordable housing developments.</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Included in Draft Affordable Housing Chapter referenced above. In the process of being added to the Municipal Code. See Comment Section below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 2.1 Housing Rehabilitation (Single-Family)</td>
<td>Annually with Action Plan Report to Redevelopment Agency Board.</td>
<td>3 units of very low, 6 units of low and 10 units of moderate housing rehabilitated</td>
<td>One unit was assisted with a rehabilitation loan (1820 Deer Creek Ave.) during 2010. No additional loans were made. The City applied under the 2010 CalHOME NOFA for Owner Occupied Rehabilitation (OOR), and was not funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 2.2 Housing Rehabilitation (Multi-Family)</td>
<td>Incorporation of rehabilitation of multi-family residential units as part of the Redevelopment Agency 5-year Implementation Plan</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>No activity has occurred on this Implementation Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 2.3 Preservation of Affordable Rental Housing</td>
<td>Agency Plan for preservation of at-risk units</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>No activity has occurred on this Implementation Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Program</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Timeframe in H.E.</td>
<td>Status of Program Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 2.4 Preservation of Mobile Home Parks</td>
<td>Plan for conservation of mobile home parks</td>
<td>2009/2011</td>
<td>No activity yet on this Implementation program. Later in 2011, it will be considered as part of the Land Use Element Update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 3.1 Local, State and Federal Funding for Infrastructure</td>
<td>Applications for funding for infrastructure</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>The City applied for the CDBG Program General Allocation in 2010 for $800,000 for sewer replacement but was not funded. RDA funds were used for road rehabilitation in 2010 and are expected to be used in 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 3.2 Wastewater Capacity Improvement</td>
<td>Construction of reclaimed pipeline to the Tierra Oaks Golf Course by 2012; alternatively approval by regulatory agencies for discharging reclaimed water into Churn Creek with limited or no dilution.</td>
<td>2013 (functional pipeline)</td>
<td>The City is coordinating reclaimed water delivery logistics with Tierra Oaks Golf Course and Bella Vista Water District. The Design RFP was issued January 2011. Completion of design is anticipated early 2012. Assuming funding sources can be located by this time, construction of the pipeline should be completed by late 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 4.1 Mixed-Use Development</td>
<td>List of priority commercial sites that could be used for mixed use.</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>The Commercial inventory must be completed first. It is scheduled for consideration in 2011 by the Planning Commission and then the City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 5.1 Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>Program to use Electric utility funds to assist affordable housing residents</td>
<td>2009/2010</td>
<td>The City's jt. application with the County for weatherization funds was unsuccessful. The City's Electric Department started home energy audits in November 2010. About 25 audits are being completed per month. The City has increased rebate amounts for weatherization activities including ceiling/attic and wall insulation, energy efficient replacement windows, Energy Star© window shade screens/window films, duct insulation, blower door guided air sealing, Energy Star roof radiant barrier, and energy efficient roofing(cool roof). Additional rebates are available for energy efficient appliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 5.2 Subdivision Activity</td>
<td>Revision of Municipal Code to address exemption</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>No activity has occurred on this Implementation Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 6.1 Emergency Shelter</td>
<td>Zoning Section of the Municipal Code</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Included in Draft Affordable Housing Chapter referenced above. In the process of being added to the Municipal Code. See Comment Section below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Program</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Timeframe in H.E.</td>
<td>Status of Program Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 6.2 Section 8 Rental Assistance</td>
<td>Maintain Contact with the Housing Authority for data and other information. Data made available to developers.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The City has approximately 135 households being assisted with a Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) through Shasta County. Information will be placed on the City’s new website in the coming month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 6.3 Equal Housing Opportunity</td>
<td>Up-to-date information concerning equal opportunity and enforcement available on a routine basis.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>The City has included the Equal Housing Opportunity Logo on all its housing material and advertises Equal Housing Opportunity on the Housing Portion of the City’s new Website. Staff is in the process of requesting Spanish and Mien Equal Housing Opportunity posters from HCD to post in City Hall and post on website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 6.4 Accessibility for Persons With Disabilities (Reasonable Accom.)</td>
<td>Revised ordinance adopted</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Included in Draft Affordable Housing Chapter referenced above. In the process of being added to the Municipal Code. See Comment Section below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 6.5 Special Housing Needs</td>
<td>Implementation Plan and revised ordinance adopted</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Included in Draft Affordable Housing Chapter referenced above. In the process of being added to the Municipal Code. See Comment Section below. After Ordinance adoption will be added to the RDA Implementation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 6.6 Transitional and Supportive Housing</td>
<td>Zoning Section of the Municipal Code</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>Included in Draft Affordable Housing Chapter referenced above. In the process of being added to the Municipal Code. See Comment Section below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

1. The City’s Housing Element was certified July 7, 2010 by HCD so all 2009/2010 dates will not be met as of 2010 but can be met in 2010/2011.

2. The City decided to incorporate many of the sections listed above into one new section of the Zoning portion of the Municipal Code. That section will be named the Affordable Housing Section. The sections included are noted above in each individual section as being part of the new chapter.

3. The City’s new website went live in January 2011 but portions of the information listed had been placed on the older website as well.
AGENDA ITEM  
City Council Meeting

TO: Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: Carol Martin, City Manager  
DATE: March 10, 2011
SUBJECT: Resolution Participating in the California Redevelopment Associations Legal Defense Fund to Fight the Elimination of Redevelopment Agencies

FILE: ____________________

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council adopt the following resolution:

A Resolution of the City of Shasta Lake City Council authorizing the City Attorney to Cooperate with the League of California Cities, California Redevelopment Association and other Cities and Counties in litigation challenging the constitutionality of the elimination of Redevelopment Agencies.

BACKGROUND:

As you know, the Governor has proposed elimination of redevelopment agencies in cities and counties in California. While the League of California Cities and the California Redevelopment Association are doing everything possible to defeat his devastating proposal, it is important that consideration for litigation occur at this time. The California Redevelopment Association has had their legal team reviewing the proposed bill and believes that shutting down redevelopment agencies and taking funds for other State purposes is a clear violation of multiple constitutional provisions, including the recently passed Proposition 22 as well as Article XVI, section 16, which requires tax increment to be paid to redevelopment agencies to repay the cost of redevelopment projects. Staff has attached a copy of the summary of violations prepared by Best, Best & Krieger, Attorneys at Law.

The California Redevelopment Association is requesting that all agencies contribute to the legal defense fund for the purpose of preparing for possible litigation. They are asking that we pay it now before any legislation takes effect to ensure that resources are there for legal actions. The proportionate share for the Shasta Lake Redevelopment Agency is $200.00. If litigation does not occur then the funds will be returned to the City.
FISCAL IMPACTS:
The California Redevelopment Association has calculated that our contribution to a legal defense fund is $200.00.

ATTACHMENTS:
Resolutions
Best, Best & Krieger Summary

DISTRIBUTION:
City Council
WHEREAS, the current economic crisis has placed cities under incredible financial pressure and caused them to make painful budget cuts, including layoffs and furloughs of city workers, decreasing maintenance and operations of public facilities, and reductions in direct services to keep spending in line with declining revenues; and

WHEREAS, since the early 1990s the state government of California has seized over $8.6 billion of city property tax revenues statewide, now amounting to over $900 million each year, to fund the state budget even after deducting public safety program payments made to cities by the state; and

WHEREAS, in his proposed FY 2011-12 budget the Governor has proposed completely eliminating Redevelopment Agencies and transferring $1.7 billion of local tax increment funds to balance the state budget; and

WHEREAS, the loss of all of the redevelopment tax increment will destroy the City’s ability to perform critical traffic related street rehabilitation and reconstruction projects, sewer and improvement projects; and

WHEREAS, the California Redevelopment Association has put together a legal analysis that indicates the taking of our funds for other State purposes is a clear violation of multiple constitutional provisions, including the recently passed Proposition 22 based on existing funding levels available to cities and counties.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHASTA LAKE hereby directs the City Attorney to take all necessary steps to cooperate with the League of California Cities, California Redevelopment Association other cities and counties in supporting litigation against the state of California if the legislature enacts and the governor signs into law legislation that unconstitutionally diverts the Redevelopment Agencies share of tax increment funding to fund the state general fund; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Council authorizes the City Manager to pay the Cities proportionate share ($200.00) to the California Redevelopment Association legal defense fund.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15TH day of March, 2011.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

TONI M. COATES, City Clerk
The above-referenced law firms have reviewed the Governor’s Redevelopment Proposal and have concluded the measure violates multiple provisions of the California Constitution. The Governor’s proposal seeks to disestablish redevelopment agencies, install “successor” agencies to hold redevelopment agency assets, and use redevelopment tax increment funding for Medi-Cal and trial court expenses in the short term—and for other non-redevelopment purposes in the long term.

This proposal violates at least three provisions of the California Constitution:

1) **Proposition 22 - Cal. Const., article XIII, § 25.5(a)(7)**. Proposition 22 (2010) was just adopted in November 2010 to prohibit the State from directly or indirectly requiring redevelopment agencies to use redevelopment tax increment for the benefit of the State, any agency of the State, or any jurisdiction. By forcibly eliminating redevelopment agencies and transferring their assets to different accounts under the control of different entities so that redevelopment revenues can be used to fund Medi-Cal and trial courts—both of which are state programs—the Governor’s Redevelopment Proposal indirectly requires redevelopment agencies to transfer their assets for the benefit of the State, in clear violation of Proposition 22. The meaning of Proposition 22 is not ambiguous; and in any event, any conceivable doubts as to its meaning would be resolved by reference to the Attorney General’s title and summary, the Legislative Analyst’s impartial analysis, the ballot arguments in support of and in opposition to Proposition 22, and the measure’s own findings and declarations—which all forcefully declare that Proposition 22 flatly prohibits the State from redirecting redevelopment revenues.

2) **Cal. Const., article XVI, § 16(b)** mandates that redevelopment tax increment funds “shall be allocated to” and when collected “paid into a special fund of the redevelopment agency to pay the principal and interest on...loans, moneys advanced to, or indebtedness...incurred by the redevelopment agency to finance...redevelopment project[s].” The Governor’s Redevelopment Proposal violates Article XVI, § 16 because it does not deposit redevelopment tax increment funds into a special fund of the redevelopment agency, and does not use redevelopment tax increment funding to repay loans, moneys advanced to, or indebtedness incurred for redevelopment projects. The funds are diverted into other accounts for non-redevelopment uses.

3) **Cal. Const., article XIII A, § 1(a)** states that ad valorem real property taxes are “to be collected by the counties and apportioned according to law to the districts within the counties.” The Governor’s proposal seeks to use redevelopment funding for Medi-Cal and trial courts, but the Medi-Cal program and trial courts are not districts within the counties. Therefore, Article XIII A prohibits allocating tax increment funding in this manner. Moreover, Cal. Constitution, article XIII B, § 6(b)(3), as amended by Proposition 1A (2004), prohibits using ad valorem property tax revenue to reimburse a local government for the costs of a new program or a higher level of service. As such, the Governor’s Redevelopment Proposal cannot circumvent Article XIII A by imposing the mandate to fund Medi-Cal and trial courts directly on the counties and then forcing them to allocate redevelopment property tax revenues for those purposes.

---

1 “Districts within the counties” has been interpreted by California courts to mean those local entities within a county that levied a property tax prior to the approval of Proposition 13—which was the measure that added Article XIII A to the Constitution. (*City of Rancho Cucamonga v. Mackzum* (1991) 228 Cal.App.3d 929.)
TO: Carol Martin, City Manager
FROM: John Duckett, Assistant City Manager
DATE: March 9, 2011
SUBJECT: Resolution Accepting the Audit for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010
FILE NO: F-200-

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends approval of a Resolution by the Shasta Lake City Council accepting the Audit for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010 for the City of Shasta Lake.

BACKGROUND:
City Staff and the Finance Committee reviewed the audit on March 9, 2011. The financial report is an accumulation of information relating to the activities directed and approved by the City Council, along with the actions necessary by Management to carry out the desires of the City Council. This year, as in prior years, the staff records these transactions and works diligently to ensure that everything is proceeding within the guidance given by the City Council.

FISCAL IMPACTS:
None

ATTACHMENTS:
- Resolution accepting the Audit for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010
- Audited Financial Statements for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010

DISTRIBUTION:
City of Shasta Lake City Council
A SHASTA LAKE CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE FINANCIAL AUDIT FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2010.

WHEREAS, the Shasta Lake City Council is required by Government Code to have an Annual Audit, and;

WHEREAS, the audit has been completed by D.H. Scott, Certified Public Accountants, and reviewed by the Finance Committee.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Audit for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2010 is hereby accepted; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Assistant City Manager is hereby authorized and directed to disseminate that Audit Report to the appropriate recipients.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this 15th day of March, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

ROD LINDSAY, Mayor

ATTEST:

TONI M. COATES, CMC, City Clerk