



PLANNING COMMISSION

AGENDA

Regular Meeting

7:00 P.M. on Tuesday, June 26, 2018

Hoyer Hall, Clayton Community Library, 6125 Clayton Road, Clayton, California

- 1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE TO THE FLAG**
- 2. ADMINISTRATIVE**
 - 2.a. Review of agenda items.
 - 2.b. Declaration of Conflict of Interest.
 - 2.c. Commissioner A.J. Chippero to report at the City Council meeting of July 17, 2018 (alternate Vice Chair Bassam Altwal).
- 3. PUBLIC COMMENT**
- 4. MINUTES**
 - 4.a. Approval of the minutes for the May 22, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.
- 5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None.
- 6. OLD BUSINESS**

None.
- 7. NEW BUSINESS**
 - 7.a. **GPA-01-17, City of Clayton.** Review of the Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Capital Improvement Program Projects for Conformity with the Clayton General Plan.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Planning Commission find the City's Capital Improvement Program Projects for the Fiscal Year 2018-2019 are in conformity with the Clayton General Plan and there is no possibility this finding may have a significant effect on the environment.

8. COMMUNICATIONS

- 8.a. Staff.
- 8.b. Commission.

9. ADJOURNMENT

- 9.a. The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for **Tuesday, July 10, 2018.**

Most Planning Commission decisions are appealable to the City Council within ten (10) calendar days of the decision. Please contact Community Development Department staff for further information immediately following the decision. If the decision is appealed, the City Council will hold a public hearing and make a final decision. If you challenge a final decision of the City in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing(s), either in oral testimony at the hearing(s) or in written correspondence delivered to the Community Development Department at or prior to the public hearing(s). Further, any court challenge must be made within 90 days of the final decision on the noticed matter. If you have a physical impairment that requires special accommodations to participate, please contact the Community Development Department at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting at 925-673-7340. An affirmative vote of the Planning Commission is required for approval. A tie vote (e.g., 2-2) is considered a denial. Therefore, applicants may wish to request a continuance to a later Commission meeting if only four Planning Commissioners are present.

Any writing or documents provided to the majority of the Planning Commission after distribution of the agenda packet regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Community Development Department located at 6000 Heritage Trail during normal business hours.

Minutes
Clayton Planning Commission Meeting
Tuesday, May 22, 2018

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

Chair Carl Wolfe called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at Hoyer Hall, 6125 Clayton Road, Clayton, California.

Present: Chair Carl Wolfe
Vice Chair Bassam Altwal
Commissioner Peter Cloven
Commissioner William Gall

Absent: Commissioner A. J. Chippero

Staff: Community Development Director Mindy Gentry
Assistant Planner Milan Sikela, Jr.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE

- 2.a. Review of agenda items.
- 2.b. Declaration of Conflict of Interest.
- 2.c. Chair Carl Wolfe to report at the City Council meeting of June 5, 2018.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

4. MINUTES

- 4.a. Approval of the minutes for the April 24, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Gall moved and Commissioner Cloven seconded a motion to approve the minutes, as submitted. The motion passed 4-0.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 5.a. **ZOA-02-18, Municipal Code Amendment, City of Clayton.** A request by the City for the Planning Commission to consider and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding amendments to the Clayton Municipal Code Section 17.92 (Inclusionary Housing Requirements) to incorporate rental housing projects.

Director Gentry presented the staff report.

Vice Chair Altwal inquired what is the in-lieu contribution?

Director Gentry responded that the adopted Clayton General Plan Housing Element requires that projects with 10 or more units shall provide 10% of those units as affordable housing units. The City Council will be reviewing and taking formal action on a resolution in order to address the ratio of what percentage of those units would be low income units and what percentage would be very low income units.

Commissioner Cloven inquired if a developer decides to pay the affordable housing in-lieu fee instead of providing the units, how is the in-lieu fee managed?

Director Gentry responded that it would be up to the discretion of the City Council to accept the payment of an in-lieu fee rather than requiring the provision of units on-site or some other alternative mechanism. The way that the affordable housing requirements are currently written, the in-lieu fee would go into a fund specifically established for the provision of affordable housing.

Commissioner Cloven inquired about how many affordable housing units were provided toward our Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) as part of the Diamond Terrace project?

Director Gentry responded that the Diamond Terrace project was constructed so long ago, it is unclear whether RHNA numbers were counted back then. The RHNA numbers we use today are only applicable to current development.

Commissioner Cloven inquired if the same controls apply to rental projects as would apply to homeownership units such as a condominium or townhouse?

Director Gentry responded that a deed restriction would be in place requiring those units to be set aside for a certain area median income level.

The public hearing was opened.

Jason Reyes, representative of the Grand Oak project, requested that the Planning Commission exempt Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly (RCFE) from the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 1505.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Cloven indicated the following:

- The RHNA requirements are quite clear on how the City needs to comply with State housing requirements.
- We would be hurting ourselves by not recommending approval of the Ordinance to include rental units in order for the City to be compliant with the RHNA and State housing requirements.
- Low income housing does not necessarily mean Section 8; it means teachers who teach at local schools but cannot afford to live in Clayton.

Commissioner Gall concurred with Commissioner Cloven's comments.

Vice Chair Altwal concurred with Commissioner Cloven's comments and inquired if the Planning Commission could require a certain percentage of the units of the Grand Oak project be as affordable as low income households?

Director Gentry responded that the issue arises when you could have the base rent be affordable but, as needed services incrementally increased such as medication administration, bathing, and incontinent care, it creates a difficult scenario where a tenant would be forced out because the tenant cannot afford the services as a result of needing a higher level of care. That is the operational dilemma that Mr. Reyes, representative of the Grand Oaks project, is concerned about.

Vice Chair Altwal indicated that, since it is a State and RHNA requirement, he agrees that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Ordinance.

Commissioner Cloven indicated that Mr. Reyes asked for an exemption for RCFEs; has there been this type of exemption granted for RCFEs in other jurisdictions.

Director Gentry responded that AB 1505 is so new that there is no information available on how this issue has been handled in other jurisdictions. As the Commissioners are aware, the Planning Commission is only making a recommendation to the City Council with the City Council ultimately making the final decision.

Commissioner Cloven indicated that he supports recommending City Council approval of the Ordinance as written.

The public hearing was re-opened.

Marci Longchamps inquired why does Clayton have to be the first jurisdiction to implement these requirements?

Director Gentry responded that, in 2016, the City Council directed staff to draft inclusionary housing requirements in order to be compliant with the City's Housing Element. The City's Housing Element has to be certified and adopted by the State which, as part of the State's certification and adoption, the State mandates certain requirements and legislative measures that the City has to comply with, including inclusionary housing requirements. If the City fails to meet the inclusionary housing requirements that are outlined in the goals and implementation measures within the City's Housing Element, the State could rescind the certification and adoption. Without a certified and adopted Housing Element, it could result in a multitude of different lawsuits against the City.

Ms. Longchamps inquired how many cities in Contra Costa County are passing these types of regulations that are similar to this Ordinance?

Director Gentry indicated that, numerous cities throughout California have inclusionary housing ordinances and each jurisdiction will be choosing to update their regulations as they see fit in compliance with AB 1505.

James Gamble indicated the following:

- This ordinance is part of Agenda 21.
- Look at other communities in the area where high density housing is being developed around heavy transit areas.

James Jacques indicated that he disagreed with the representative of the Grand Oaks project asking for RCFEs to be exempt from the requirements of AB 1505.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Cloven moved and Vice Chair Altwal seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 02-18, recommending City Council approval of an Ordinance amending the City's Inclusionary Housing Requirements. The motion passed 4-0.

- 5.b. ZOA-08-16, Municipal Code Amendment, City of Clayton.** A request by the City for the Planning Commission to consider and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding amendments to the Clayton Municipal Code to conditionally allow parolee homes in the following General Plan land use designations: Multifamily Low Density, Multifamily Medium Density, and Multifamily High Density.

Director Gentry presented the staff report.

Commissioner Gall inquired what would happen after the City's parolee home moratorium expires on October 3, 2018?

Director Gentry responded that, after the parolee home moratorium expires on October 3, 2018, there would be no codified requirements established in the City's Municipal Code to regulate parolee homes which would allow parolee homes to potentially be located anywhere in Clayton.

Commissioner Cloven had the following questions:

- So the City could possibly be in legal jeopardy if we established a ban on parolee homes? Director Gentry responded "yes."
- So it is in our best interest to establish codified provisions which regulate parolee homes? Director Gentry responded "yes" and added that the City cannot establish regulations that are so prohibitive that, by default, it prevents these types of uses from locating Clayton.
- Is my understanding correct that the parolee homes would still have to be reviewed individually before the Planning Commission on a case-by-case basis under the guise of a use permit? Director Gentry responded "yes."
- In the instance that we were to review a use permit for a parolee home, what latitude do we have to require certain thing like a management plan? A management plan is one of the requirements in the draft Ordinance.
- Could we require that there be a person living at the parolee home for supervisory purposes who is not a parolee? That is one possibility that could be considered on a case-by-case basis and included as a condition of approval.

- Are there a maximum number of parolees that can live in a parolee home based on the number bedrooms in that home? Due to a court case out of Southern California, the number of parolees would be dictated by the California Building Code which may include, but not be limited to, such calculations as number of occupants per bedroom and number of occupants on a square footage basis in the rest of the home.
- According to the provisions of the draft Ordinance, in a three-bedroom townhouse theoretically six parolees could live there? Director Gentry responded that was correct.
- If a use permit were conditionally approved for a parolee home, is there a way the City could review the parolee home on an annual basis? Director Gentry responded that could be included as a condition of approval.
- Is there a fee the City could charge to cover the cost of policing and annual reviews? Director Gentry responded that, beyond costs for staff time in the processing of the use permit and follow-up annual inspections as directed by the use permit conditions of approval, the City would not be able to charge for additional calls for service or strain on the police department because those types of things are already assumed in the property taxes.
- What are single housekeeping units? Director Gentry responded that an example of single housekeeping units would be where a parolee owns a living unit and invites a friend who is a parolee to live in the home. The regulation of these types of households could tread into questionable legal territory in regards to what defines a housing unit and how the government wants to define family.
- So, theoretically, a single family dwelling unit could be considered as a single housekeeping unit? Director Gentry indicated that was correct and, in addition, a multifamily dwelling unit could also be considered as a single housekeeping unit.
- Of the rules and criteria related to parolee housing, one item was that membership is determined by the residents of the parolee home and not by a management company so, if the residents were all parolees, they could choose which parolee could live with them in the parolee home, correct? Director Gentry responded that was correct.

Vice Chair Altwal had the following questions:

- Is the City being required by the State to pass this Ordinance? Director Gentry responded that the City is not being required by the State to pass this Ordinance. Rather, this is a preemptive recommendation of staff and in response to AB 109 in order to prevent parolee homes from locating anywhere in Clayton and to allow the City some control over where they are located.
- If the City does not pass this Ordinance, the parolee home could locate anywhere in the Clayton that they want to and we would not have any control over the parolee home? Director Gentry indicated that was correct as the parolee home would then be considered as a typical residential unit and the parolee home could locate anywhere in Clayton without any regulations and without any public hearings process, resulting in the City relinquishing all control over parolee homes.

- Only federal crime parolees can live in the parolee home? Director Gentry responded that all parolees would be allowed to live in the parolee home, based on the definition of a parolee as contained in the draft Ordinance that has a large umbrella definition that encompasses essentially anyone that is on parole.
- Can the City limit the type of parolees living in the parolee home, for instance prohibiting sex offender parolees as opposed to petty theft parolees? Director Gentry responded that she would defer to legal counsel, Heather Lee, a representative from the City Attorney's Office.

Ms. Lee responded that the City prohibiting a particular class of people would run the risk of legal challenge and could result in the ensuing court case being a test case for this issue.

Director Gentry indicated that this draft Ordinance is an attempt by staff to be proactive as a result of the City receiving an inquiry regarding this issue. So, rather than allowing parolee homes to locate within Clayton without the community's consideration, the intent of the draft Ordinance is that, in the instance that there is a County program seeking to locate a parole home in Clayton, then at least the City would have a say in where the parolee home is located, how the parolee home can operate, and ensuring that the parolee home is subject to a public hearing process. Staff is hoping that the draft Ordinance will be preemptive and will enable the City to have control over where parolees get housed and how they get housed.

Vice Chair Altwal had the following questions:

- How would this Ordinance stop a parolee home from being located anywhere in Clayton? Director Gentry responded that the Ordinance would prevent a County re-entry program contractor from renting a home without a public hearing and without being subject to location controls; however, the Ordinance would not prevent a situation where someone owns a home and invites family members or friends who are parolees to move into the home.
- Regarding the radius area around a parolee home, can we increase the unit of radius area measurement from a foot to a yard? Director Gentry indicated that, increasing the buffer area from feet to yards would raise the legal questionability of the Ordinance as this would affect the numbers of possible parolee home locations available in Clayton. Legal counsel has indicated a minimum of three to four available locations would be legally defensible and increasing the unit of measurement would reduce the number of locations available and would, by exclusion, essentially be a Citywide ban of parolee homes.
- So a ban on parolee homes constitutes discrimination? Director Gentry said that was correct.

Chair Wolfe inquired what would happen if the City established a ban on parolee homes? Director Gentry responded that, if the City banned parolee homes, it would open the City up to discrimination lawsuits.

Commissioner Gall inquired that, if a parolee has family living in Clayton, could they just move into the family home? Director Gentry explained that this Ordinance would address parolee homes that would be established as part of the County's re-entry program.

The public hearing was opened.

Mike Clifton indicated the following:

- Clayton is too small to manage parolee homes.
- Catering to parolees is not in the City's best interest.
- Allowing them to use multifamily units, which, are more affordable, make Clayton more attractive to parolees.
- We should only allow them to use single-family residential housing units, which are more expensive, and may be a way to discourage parolee homes from locating within Clayton.
- This Ordinance makes it appear to the County that we are inviting parolees to move to Clayton.

Chair Wolfe had the following comment and question:

- It would appear that if the City does not pass some sort of regulations, we would be in a difficult situation.
- What do we know about the number of parolees in Clayton? Director Gentry indicated that, according to County statistics which take into consideration the entire zip code of 94517 which is a much larger area than the City of Clayton, there are 20 parolees who consist of 9 adults and 11 juveniles.

Sarah Riley indicated the following:

- I have been a police officer in Oakland for 16 years.
- I moved out to Brentwood to avoid running into parolees who were people I arrested in a grocery store.
- I then moved to Clayton to get out of Brentwood and after Brentwood allowed parolees to move in, then my home was burglarized.
- These parolees are arrested for violent offenses and then, when they moved into parolee homes, their offenses are represented as something more benign than they actually area.

James Jacques indicated the following:

- I am also a police officer.
- Clayton is very attractive since it is a safe community.
- Children in Clayton commonly walk home from school. As a result, the 300-foot radius is not a large enough distance to provide safety for our children.
- We should not only be concerned with one parolee, but instead we should be concerned with a whole group of parolees living together. Birds of a feather flock together, so we want to avoid inviting a criminal element into Clayton where whole groups of parolees are living together.
- The City should do nothing right now, and wait for the lawsuit to come.

Vice Chair Altwal confirmed that, if the City does nothing, it is not the lawsuit that concerns us but rather the fact that parolee homes could be potentially located anywhere in Clayton, correct? Director Gentry indicated that was correct.

Colleen Van Outrive indicated the following:

- What has stopped parolee homes from coming into Clayton thus far?
- Clayton is only 5 square miles in area. Allowing 6 parolee homes in Clayton would be an average of more than one parolee home per square mile.
- I ask that the Planning Commission make it as difficult as possible for parolee homes to move into Clayton.

Chair Wolfe inquired if the email the City received regarding parolee homes was sent just to the City of Clayton. Director Gentry responded that the email was sent out to many more jurisdictions than just Clayton. As a result of the email, staff thought it prudent to establish some sort of regulations in order to make it more restrictive for parolee homes to locate within Clayton. This arose from the County re-entry program, which was established by the County in October 2011 due to the United States Supreme Court upholding the State of California Court ruling mandating that California reduce its prison population.

Chair Altwal inquired if the City can extend the moratorium beyond the expiration date in October 2018? Director Gentry responded that, no the City cannot extend the moratorium more than three times, and the City's third extension will expire in October 2018.

Commissioner Cloven asked if any other cities in the County have parolee home regulations? Director Gentry responded that Pleasant Hill, Antioch, and Oakley have established regulations for parolee homes.

Chair Wolfe inquired if there is a legal notification system for a parolee being released into our community? Director Gentry responded that there currently is no legal notification system.

Kathy Bengel indicated the following:

- She is opposed to the draft Ordinance.
- Her neighbor could not make it to the meeting tonight and her neighbor wanted to pass along her concerns related to an increase in crime that may occur as a result of parolee homes being established in Clayton.
- Could we locate a parolee home out on Marsh Creek Road?

Director Gentry indicated that the Marsh Creek Road area is located in the unincorporated Contra Costa County area, outside of Clayton, and would be under the County's jurisdiction.

Matt Foley indicated the following:

- Been in law enforcement for 15 years.
- To respond to Commissioner Cloven's comment about school teachers living in affordable housing units, I have met many occupants of Section 8 houses and, not once, have I met a school teacher living in them.
- The City is not being exclusionary since parolees can already locate within the City.

- Governor Jerry Brown has a parolee release rate of 87% for parolees that have committed serious crimes, in some case these parolees are lifers. In the past these criminals would not have been released. To compare, former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger only had a parolee release rate of 27%.
- These parolee are cloaked are lesser offenders when in fact they are animals that have committed serious crimes.
- The City should establish another level of approval so the County cannot so easily establish these types of homes within Clayton.
- Would a business license be required for a parolee homes.

Director Gentry responded with the following comments:

- The radius distances for buffering purposes were proposed by City staff to prevent parolee homes from establishing near schools, parks, and other sensitive-use areas.
- The purpose of this Ordinance is to establish another level of approval that would give the community the opportunity to review parolee homes and provide feedback to the Planning Commission regarding whether or not the use is acceptable in the location it is proposed.
- Yes, the parolee home would be required to obtain a City business license.

Chair Wolfe asked what the City Attorney's office thinks of possible legal challenges staff's proposed buffer zones? Ms. Lee responded that staff has worked with legal counsel to develop a defensible way of identifying buffers and an appropriate number of locations to provide a reasonable set of regulations that could be legally defensible.

Maria Arvizu indicated the following:

- This is our community and we should be able to dictate what does and does not happen here.
- We should establish something like Megan's Law.
- We should be able to list parolees in a database who are moving to Clayton and have their pictures and the crimes they committed.
- Parolee homes should not be located in Clayton.
- A curfew should be placed on parolees living in Clayton.

Vice Chair Altwal inquired if there is a way to establish a curfew for parolees living in Clayton? Ms. Lee responded that, as with any land use regulation, we have to have a rational, legal basis for establishing a curfew which we may not have the authority to do given the State's laws superseding our own. We are talking about land use regulations and restrictions on property use. Some of these parolee home-related concerns are a police matter and do not fall under the purview of the Planning Commission.

Brain Fitzgerald indicated that the City should have each parolee home apply on a case-by-case basis which would allow us to deny the parolee home.

Commissioner Cloven inquired what are the Planning Commission's options regarding the requirements of a land use permit? Director Gentry responded that the Planning Commission would review any possible impacts to the surrounding community as it pertains to public health and safety and, based on that analysis, the Planning Commission would have make certain findings in order to deny a use permit. The Planning Commission would, as part of the use permit process, have the ability to regulate hours of operation, parking, traffic, and other such typical land use consideration that would be associated with a proposed development.

Commissioner Cloven indicated that is it incumbent upon us to be as restrictive as possible in order to protect the safety of our community.

Director Gentry indicated that staff's discussion with legal counsel included creating a set of regulations in the Municipal Code that would be as restrictive as possible but still be within the confines of the law.

Fiona Hughes indicated the following:

- Since the email was sent to other jurisdictions, it would seem like the sender of the email is fishing for easy communities to establish parolee homes in.
- We should respond to the sender of the email that Clayton is not a viable location for parolee homes.
- We do not want to end up flagging our City as a parolee destination.

Director Gentry indicated that the sender of the email has not expressed further interest in locating parolee homes in Clayton.

Vice Chair Altwal inquired if the City's business license process would be another way to regulate parolee homes? Director Gentry indicated that the City's business license process is merely a taxation mechanism and would not be an option for regulating parolee homes.

Kristin Moore indicated the following:

- Only three communities in Contra Costa County have mandated zones for parolees.
- All the other communities in Contra Costa County have not taken a stance on parolee homes, so why should we?
- There are four locations identified for parolee homes in Clayton that are in close proximity to our schools.
- It is as if we are putting a target on our back and our children's backs to invite parolees into town.
- It is mind boggling that we are even considering this.

David Thys indicated the following:

- I have spent a career in law enforcement.
- I understand where the City is coming from regarding legal challenges.
- I think the citizens of Clayton would welcome a challenge.

Chair Wolfe asked what the City of Antioch has established as a buffer zone for parolee homes? Director Gentry responded that the City of Antioch would not be applicable in this case since they have required that parolee homes be located in industrial districts and there are no industrial districts in Clayton.

Paul Henshaw expressed concerns that the buffer zone around a parolee home could prohibit the establishment of a pre-school.

Catherine Harrell indicated the following:

- Part of why we live in Clayton is because we have a safe community.
- I disagree with parolee homes being located within 300 feet of schools. We should increase the buffer distance.
- We should not put parolee rights above the safety of our children. Our children should come first.

Marci Longchamps indicated that we should not be one of the first cities to participate in this program.

John Kranci indicated the following:

- I am a retired police officer.
- I support increasing the buffer distance.

Chair Wolfe inquired what would a legal challenge cost the City? Director Gentry said, depending on the nature of the lawsuit, the fiscal impact could range from the tens of thousands to the hundreds of thousands.

James Gamble indicated the following:

- This item should not be on the agenda.
- What is attractive about establishing parolee homes in Clayton when Concord has many other zoning options such as industrial districts.
- This is a social justice entity pushing for parolee homes.

Wendy Laughlin indicated the following:

- Parolee homes would impact in-home day cares which are needed.
- It is a privilege to live in Clayton.
- It is not fair that parents have to work hard to afford their homes in Clayton while parolees can just move in easily.

Alisa Bowron indicated that she is in opposition to the draft Ordinance since the City Council will not have a level of control over parolee homes.

Director Gentry indicated that, without the establishment of an Ordinance, parolee homes could potentially locate anywhere whereas, with the establishment of an Ordinance, the City would have control over the location of parolee homes, have the ability to regulate them, and subject them to a public hearing process.

Maria Arvizu, representing her husband Victor Arvizu, indicated that parolees moving to Clayton should be subject to some sort of registration process.

Director Gentry indicated that, currently, an individual who is a parolee could theoretically be located anywhere in Clayton. Alternatively, the Ordinance would specifically address the County's re-entry program.

Chuck Blazer indicated the following:

- Staff is way off base with this Ordinance.
- I have seen parolee homes destroy neighborhoods.
- I have concerns with parolee homes contributing to prostitution, drugs, theft, and other crimes.
- We do not want parolees looking at Clayton as an option for moving into.
- Parolee homes increase violence, blight, and crime in general.
- You have heard from your citizens tonight and you should not be making a decision tonight.

Tom Finnegan indicated the following:

- I think the City should not reply to the email.
- I am in favor of an Ordinance that would double or triple the buffer zone distances and make it next to impossible for parolee homes to move to Clayton.
- We should analyze the impacts parolee homes have as a public nuisance that could lower property values and make them build-only proposals.

Vice Chair Altwal inquired about requiring parolee homes being allowed as build-only projects? Director Gentry responded that requiring parolee homes to be build-only projects would make the parolee homes so cost prohibitive that the City would legally default to being too restrictive.

Frank Gavidia indicated the following:

- We live in a State that ignores the Federal government; why should we cater to the State?
- I do not understand how one email triggered all this staff time and work in preparing the draft Ordinance.
- We should have input from our Police Department.

Ryan (no last name given) indicated the following:

- I love this community.
- I am a police officer and have seen parolee homes destroy communities.
- I would like to know who sent the email.
- We should table this item until we have more information.

Director Gentry indicated that the email is public record and was sent from a program manager representing a transitional housing/stable living environment for persons previously incarcerated and the program manager was looking for jurisdictions to locate in that did not have a use permit process already established.

The public hearing was closed.

Vice Chair Altwal indicated the following:

- I want to thank staff for all their hard work and bringing this item to our attention.
- My home in Clayton was burglarized 6 years ago.

- We should not make a decision tonight.
- We should not regulate it until a parolee home attempts to move into Clayton and then we are forced to regulate it.

Commissioner Gall indicated the following:

- I want to thank everyone for being here this evening and would like to express to the audience that their concerns are Planning Commission concerns as we are also members of this community and we have children and grandchildren.
- We have an obligation to the City Council to make a recommendation.
- We have some time so we should take a closer look at this issue.
- I do not think we should recommend approval right now.

Commissioner Cloven indicated the following:

- I see a need to do something.
- I would not want a parolee home locating next door to my residence and not be able to do anything about it.
- I think it would be good for the City to be able to review a land use permit for a parolee home and have codified regulations that would require the submittal of plans and a management plan.
- I am concerned that we are inviting parolee homes to Clayton but I am also concerned that, without regulations, parolee homes can locate anywhere in our community.
- I think the draft Ordinance needs to be refined and we should take more time to review this issue.

Chair Carl Wolfe indicated the following:

- My concern is that, if we do not do something today or not do something today, we open the City up to legal challenges.
- I can see there is a definite level of discomfort from the community regarding the draft Ordinance.
- I am not sure we have enough information to make an educated decision on the draft Ordinance.

Vice Chair Altwal moved and Commissioner Cloven seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 03-18, recommending City Council denial of an Ordinance amending the Clayton Municipal Code to conditionally allow parolee homes in the following General Plan land use designations: Multifamily Low Density, Multifamily Medium Density, and Multifamily High Density. The motion passed 4-0.

6. OLD BUSINESS

None.

7. NEW BUSINESS

None.

8. COMMUNICATIONS

8.a. Staff

None.

8.b. Commission

None.

9. ADJOURNMENT

9.a. The meeting was adjourned at 9:36 p.m. to the regularly-scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission on June 12, 2018.

Submitted by
Mindy Gentry
Community Development Director

Approved by
Carl Wolfe
Chair

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: June 26, 2018

Item Number: 7.a

From: Mindy Gentry *MG*
Community Development Director

Subject: Review of the FY 2018/19 Capital Improvement Program Projects for Conformity with the Clayton General Plan (GPA-01-18)

Applicant: City of Clayton

DISCUSSION

Section 65401 of the California Government Code requires the Planning Commission to determine if projects proposed in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for the upcoming fiscal year are in conformity with the General Plan. Projects in the City's 2018/19-2022/23 CIP that may be undertaken during the Fiscal Year 2018-2019 are listed below. Additionally, citations from the Clayton General Plan are provided related to the particular project's conformity with the General Plan.

1. Pine Hollow Road Upgrades (CIP No.10379)

Included in the past several CIP budgets but listed as "unfunded", the scope of this project is to widen the north side of Pine Hollow Road with the addition of new curb, gutter, and sidewalk between Pine Hollow Estates and the westerly city limit. Project work will require the acquisition of right-of-way for new improvements with conform paving crossing the city limit line into Concord. Furthermore, the project entails the installation of a city entryway sign on the southern city limit of Pine Hollow Road. The total estimated cost for this project is \$872,883.

It is anticipated this project will complete the engineering, planning, and design phase with a complete set of bid specifications by the close of next fiscal year (FY 2018-19). As noted previously, it is not expected this project will enter into the construction phase until FY 2019-20, when additional funding is expected to become available.

The maintenance of Clayton streets conforms to the General Plan by supporting Policy 9c of the Circulation Element to "Provide systematic upgrades of streets and roads to applicable standards."

2. ADA Compliance Program (CIP No. 10394A)

Each fiscal year the City sets aside \$6,000 of its annual Gas Tax revenues to build up sufficient funds to perform handicap ramp corner curb cuts on public sidewalks. In addition to installing these ADA ramps where none exist, federal standards as to ramp specifications were modified in July 2008 requiring revamping of existing ramps when street or sidewalk projects are installed in the adjacent area. These monies may also be used to repaint and remark existing ADA public parking spaces to current standards. This particular project fund is utilized by the City to annually accumulate income and to build reserves for projected future costs. It is not anticipated that FY 2018-19 funds or prior years' unspent funds will be allocated to a specific project or projects during FY 2018-19; therefore, it is projected that the project account will have a balance of approximately \$15,052 on June 30, 2019.

The maintenance of Clayton streets conforms to the General Plan by supporting Policy 9c of the Circulation Element to “Provide systematic upgrades of streets and roads to applicable standards.”

3. Utility Undergrounding (CIP No. 10397)

Each year, PG&E is required by the Public Utilities Commission to set aside funds for the undergrounding of overhead utility lines. The money set aside is distributed by PG&E to local agencies on a proportional basis. Since the cost of undergrounding is so high (minimum of \$1,000,000 for approximately 300 feet), this project was created to accept and accumulate these funds until enough is available to undertake a project. In FY 2018-19, the City expects to receive approximately \$21,000 in funding from PG&E’s Rule 20A funds, although no project expenditures are planned at this point for FY 2018-19. In addition to the annual allocation, the City is authorized to borrow a 5-year advance, currently estimated to be \$103,660. Including the FY 2018-19 annual allocation estimate total, estimated reserves available for a utility undergrounding project will be approximately \$466,072 as of June 30, 2019.

These program improvements conform to the General Plan by supporting the primary Goal of the Community Facilities Element “To provide for an efficient infrastructure and facility plan and program for improvement of existing infrastructure.” and Policy 1d “Identify private utility plans including program for undergrounding.”

4. El Molino Drive Sanitary Sewer Improvement (CIP No. 10422)

This project was originally established as part of the FY 2011-12 CIP budget to construct modifications to existing deficient sanitary sewer mains to prevent potential sewer overflows in areas adjacent to Mt. Diablo Creek. The project entails pipe enlargement and construction of a bypass line in El Molino Drive. Total revised estimated project costs of \$560,000 are expected to be funded by a reimbursement agreement with the City of Concord from its joint sewer enterprise fund wherein property owner parcel assessments in Clayton are deposited. Total project expenditures to-date for engineering, planning, and design are approximately \$63,566, which has been excluded from the overall project cost. The project is expected to transition from the design phase to construction in FY 2018-2019 and be completed by the end of the fiscal year.

These program improvements conform to the General Plan by supporting the primary Goal of the Community Facilities Element “To provide for an efficient infrastructure and facility plan and program for improvement of existing infrastructure.”

5. Collector Street Rehabilitation Project – Keller Ridge (CIP No. 10425)

The scope of this project, which initially began the planning and design phase in FY 2014-15, includes pavement resurfacing and treatment of Keller Ridge Drive from Eagle Peak Avenue to the terminus of Kelok Way. This project is to be partially funded by federal Local Street and Road Shortfall Fund monies (STP monies) totaling \$385,000, which are expected to be received in FY 2018-19. This federal grant requires a minimum local match of 11.5%, which will be achieved through transfers of gas tax monies as well as Measure J local street maintenance “return to source” funds. The federal grant monies can only be used on a collector or arterial street (rather than on a residential local street). Keller Ridge Drive qualifies for this funding because it is a collector street, which is defined as streets that provide a direct connection between arterials and local streets. This project is expected to be completed during next fiscal year (FY 2018-19) at a final estimated total cost of \$1,008,432.

The maintenance of Clayton streets conforms to the General Plan by supporting Policy 9c of the Circulation Element to “Provide systematic upgrades of streets and roads to applicable standards.”

6. 2018 Neighborhood Street Project (CIP No. 10436)

The objective of the 2018 Neighborhood Street Project is to elevate all of the neighborhood streets to a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of 80 or greater, with a PCI score of 100 being equivalent to a brand new street. This project has been designed to accomplish said street maintenance and rehabilitation on streets where State or Federal transportation funds are not currently available. This project will be funded by various sources with proposed funding being derived from gas tax monies, Measure J local streets maintenance “return to source” funds, Measure J Co-op funds, and a Cal Recycle grant for utilizing rubberized paving materials.

The proposed budget assumes a total fully funded project cost of \$994,007 for engineering (planning, design, etc.), construction, inspections, and project acceptance reporting. This project is expected to transition to the construction phase and be completed by the close of next fiscal year (FY 2018-19).

The maintenance of Clayton streets conforms to the General Plan by supporting Policy 9c of the Circulation Element to “Provide systematic upgrades of streets and roads to applicable standards.”

7. Clayton Community Park – Field 1 Rehabilitation Project (CIP No. 10440)

In response to feedback from local soccer and baseball groups and following an on-site assessment of the premises, rehabilitation of the lower baseball/softball field (Field #1) at Clayton Community Park was identified in FY 2016-17 CIP budget. Work to stabilize the subgrade was completed in FY 2016-17 and it is expected the remaining work will be completed in FY 2018-19. The City Engineer estimates the cost to finish the rehabilitation project will be approximately \$100,000, which \$50,000 will be funded by the Garbage Franchise Community Enhancement Fee, which was previously earmarked and the remaining \$50,000 is currently unfunded, but will be determined by the Council in FY 2018-19. The City anticipates this project to complete the remaining work during FY 2018-19.

The maintenance of Clayton’s parks conforms to the General Plan by supporting Policy 2c of the Open Space/Conservation Element to “Review each park/greenbelt area for maintenance needs.”

8. North Valley Park Playground Rehabilitation Project – (CIP No. 10442)

In response to feedback from residents in the community and following an on-site assessment of the premises, rehabilitation of the North Valley Park tot lot and surrounding premises is planned in FY 2018-19. The project consists of the replacement of the resilient play surface, installation of a new playground structure and equipment, and the installation of shade structures. The estimated total cost of the rehabilitation project is \$167,300. The North Valley Playground Rehabilitation project will be funded from two sources; the Open Space In-Lieu fee designated for “active areas” will provide \$142,000, with an additional \$1,500 in accumulated interest earnings, and the remaining \$23,800 from unallocated CIP interest earnings. The City anticipates this project to commence and be completed during FY 2018-19.

The maintenance of Clayton’s parks conforms to the General Plan by supporting Policy 2c of the Open Space/Conservation Element to “Review each park/greenbelt area for maintenance needs.”

9. City Hall ADA Accessibility Project – (CIP No. 10443)

This project was added to the CIP budget after receiving community feedback that the City Hall entry doors are extremely heavy and difficult to open for some, bringing into question their compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Even though City Hall is listed on the California Register of Historic Buildings, it does not exempt the building from being in compliance with the rigorous ADA standards.

The project specifications have been modified due to issues with the previous scope of work. The specifications now include a half circle of glass to be installed at the top of the opening for the doors, which will allow for a regular store front door system be installed, which will result in the doors to be more easily opened. Including engineering design and planning costs, total project costs are estimated to be \$35,000. Due to setbacks encountered by the awarded contractor during the project planning phase in FY 2017-18, this project was temporarily halted and is being rolled forward into the FY 2018-19 proposed CIP budget for completion.

This modification to City Hall is in conformance with the General Plan, based on policy 1c in the Community Design Element, which states, "Ensure renovations of historic buildings and structures retain the building or structures historic character" and policy 1g in the Community Facilities Element, which states, "Identify needs for public facilities including City Hall capacity, library and cultural facilities".

The above proposed CIP projects represent a total projected Capital Related Expenditure in FY 2018-19 of \$2,746,513 in public monies to maintain and improve the infrastructure of this community.

As a result of the above projects and related General Plan review and analysis, staff concludes that the CIP projects that may proceed in Fiscal Year 2018-19 are consistent and in conformity with the Clayton General Plan.

CEQA

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15061(b)(3) it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that finding the Capital Improvement Program in conformance with the General Plan may have a significant effect on the environment, it is therefore not subject to CEQA, and, additionally, since this is a consistency finding, the previous environmental documentation for the General Plan is adequate CEQA documentation.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission find the City's CIP projects for the FY 2018-2019 are in conformity with the Clayton General Plan and there is no possibility this finding may have a significant effect on the environment.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Excerpts from 2018/2019 - 2022/2023 City of Clayton Capital Improvement Program

ATTACHMENT A

CITY OF CLAYTON CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FY 2017/18 to 2022/23

Budget by Funding Source - FY 2018/19

#	Category	Project	Unspent Prior Year Funding	HUTA Fund	RMRA Fund	Federal Grants	State Grants	Concord Sewer Fund	Measure J LSM	Measure J Co-Op	Measure J Grant	Impact Fee Fund	CIP Interest	18/19 Project Totals
		Fund Balance as of 6/30/18		\$ 320,901	\$ 64,855	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 520,000	\$ 564,875	\$ 53,743	-	\$ 531,225	\$ 58,207	
		Estimated Revenue thru FY 18/19		293,004	189,383	385,000	86,553	-	286,000	32,676	330,000	-	-	
		Estimated non-CIP Expenses in FY 18/19		(170,255)	-	-	-	-	(36,639)	-	-	-	-	
		Funds Available for CIP in FY 18/19		443,650	254,238	385,000	86,553	520,000	814,236	86,419	330,000	531,225	58,207	
10337A	Facilities	Keller House Rehabilitation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10343	GHAD	Crow Debris Basin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10347A	GHAD	Eagle Peak Slope Repair	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10348	GHAD	Keller Ridge Drive Area Slope Repair	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10349	GHAD	Community Park Slide Repair	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10370	Creeks	Creek Revitalization	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10375	Parks	Samuel Ct. Park	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10379	Streets	Pine Hollow Road Upgrades	-	-	189,883	-	-	-	-	-	330,000	-	-	519,883
10393	Parks	Skateboard Park	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10394A	Streets	ADA Compliance Program	9,052	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15,052
10395	Streets	Catch Basin Modifications	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10396	Streets	East Marsh Creek Road Signal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10397	Streets	Utility Undergrounding	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10400	Other	Downtown Economic Development	1,322,499	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,322,499
10419	Parks	Community park Lighting, etc.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10420	Other	School Bridge Area Improvements	204,758	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	204,758
10422	Sewers	El Molino Drive Sanitary Sewer Impr.	-	-	-	-	-	520,000	-	-	-	-	-	520,000
10423	Facilities	Library Upgrades	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10425	Streets	Keller Ridge Dr. Collector Street Rehab	-	277,988	-	385,000	25,775	-	241,443	-	-	-	-	930,206
10436	Streets	2018 Neighborhood Street Project	-	159,662	64,355	-	60,778	-	572,793	86,419	-	-	-	944,007
10439	Streets	El Portal Drive restoration Project	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10440	Parks	Clayton Community Park - Field 1 Rehab	50,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50,500
10442	Parks	North Valley Park Playground Rehab.	167,300	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	167,300
10443	Facilities	City Hall ADA Accessibility	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35,000
		Total CIP Funding in FY 18/19		443,650	254,238	385,000	86,553	520,000	814,236	86,419	330,000	-	-	2,920,096
		Fund Balance as of June 30, 2019		\$ 1,789,109	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 531,225	\$ 58,207	

2018/19-2022/23 Capital Improvement Program

Category	Project Number	Project
Streets	10379	Pine Hollow Rd. - Upgrade

DESCRIPTION - LOCATION

Improve City entry on Pine Hollow Rd. with new painting, monument sign, etc.



COMMENTS

ROW controlled by Concord and/or County. Joint Project possible, though not probable.

Estimated Cost	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Planning/Design	\$45,000	\$50,000						\$95,000
Construction/Execution			\$732,883					\$732,883
Monitoring/Inspections			\$35,000					\$35,000
Close-out/Punch List			\$10,000					\$10,000
Other								
TOTAL	\$45,000	\$50,000	\$777,883					\$872,883

Funding (Sources)	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Measure J Grant	\$45,000	\$50,000	\$280,000					\$375,000
Gas Tax (RMRA)			\$189,883					\$189,883
OBAG II (Federal)			\$308,000					\$308,000
TOTAL	\$45,000	\$50,000	\$777,883					\$872,883

2018/19-2022/23 Capital Improvement Program

Category	Project Number	Project
Streets	10394A	ADA Compliance Program

DESCRIPTION - LOCATION

ADA Compliance City-wide.

COMMENTS

Estimated Cost	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Planning/Design								
Construction/ Execution							\$500,000	\$500,000
Monitoring/ Inspections								
Close-out/ Punch List								
Other								
TOTAL							\$500,000	\$500,000

Funding (Sources)	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Gas Tax (HUTA)	\$9,052	\$6,000						\$15,052
Unfunded							\$484,948	\$484,948
TOTAL	\$9,052	\$6,000					\$484,948	\$500,000

2018/19-2022/23 Capital Improvement Program

Category	Project Number	Project
Streets	10397	Utility Undergrounding

DESCRIPTION - LOCATION

Underground overhead utility lines at as
Yet undetermined locations.

COMMENTS

Funds are allocated to the City's Rule 20Aa
account annually but held by PG&E until
project is approved by the City Council and
commences.

Estimated Cost	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Planning/Design								
Construction/ Execution							\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
Monitoring/ Inspections								
Close-out/ Punch List								
Other								
TOTAL							\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000

Funding (Sources)	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
PG&E Rule 20A	\$445,072	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$21,000		\$550,072
Unfunded							\$2,449,928	\$2,449,928
TOTAL	\$445,072	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$21,000	\$2,449,928	\$3,000,000

2018/19-2022/23 Capital Improvement Program

Category	Project Number	Project
Streets	10422	El Molino Drive Sanitary Sewer Improvements

DESCRIPTION - LOCATION

Construct modifications to existing sanitary sewer mains to prevent potential sewer overflows in areas adjacent to Mt. Diablo Creek.



COMMENTS

Includes pipe enlargement and construction of a bypass line in El Molino Drive; funding from CIP 10400, Downtown Economic Development, returned as Concord has agreed to fund the bypass work (including preliminary design work) from annual sewer fees.

Preliminary design costs totaling approximately \$64,000 to date (FY 2004-2009) were tracked in the Development Impact Fees fund (304), temporarily covered by a General Fund loan authorized by City Council in FY 2004-05.

Estimated Cost	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Planning/Design	\$40,000							\$40,000
Construction/Execution		\$500,000						\$500,000
Monitoring/Inspections		\$20,000						\$20,000
Close-out/Punch List								
TOTAL	\$40,000	\$520,000						\$560,000

Funding (Sources)	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Concord Sewer Fund	\$40,000	\$520,000						\$560,000
TOTAL	\$40,000	\$520,000						\$560,000

2018/19-2022/23 Capital Improvement Program

Category	Project Number	Project
Streets	10425	Collector Street Rehabilitation Project - Keller Ridge

DESCRIPTION - LOCATION

Pavement resurfacing and treatment on various collector streets throughout the City.



COMMENTS

Local Streets & Roads Shortfall (LS&RS) funding is federal requiring extensive processing for construction approval. Gas Tax amount covers City share as required by federal funding.

Estimated Cost	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Planning/ Design	\$78,226							\$78,226
Construction/ Execution		\$885,206						\$885,206
Monitoring/ Inspections		\$35,000						\$35,000
Close-out/ Punch List		\$10,000						\$10,000
Other								
TOTAL	\$78,226	\$930,206						\$1,008,432

Funding (Sources)	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Gas Tax (HUTA)	\$78,226	\$315,180						\$393,406
OBAG I (Federal)		\$385,000						\$385,000
Measure J (LSM)		\$241,443						\$241,443
Cal Recycle (Grant)		\$25,775						\$25,775
TOTAL	\$78,226	\$930,206						\$1,008,432

2018/19-2022/23 Capital Improvement Program

Category	Project Number	Project
Streets	10436	2018 Neighborhood Street Project

DESCRIPTION - LOCATION

Pavement resurfacing and treatment on various neighborhood streets throughout the City.



COMMENTS

Estimated Cost	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Planning/Design	\$50,000							\$50,000
Construction/Execution		\$899,007						\$899,007
Monitoring/Inspections		\$35,000						\$35,000
Close-out/Punch List		\$10,000						\$10,000
Other								
TOTAL	\$50,000	\$944,007						\$994,007

Funding (Sources)	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Measure J LSM	\$50,000	\$572,793						\$622,793
Measure J Co-Op		\$86,419						\$86,419
Gas Tax (HUTA)		\$159,662						\$159,662
Gas Tax (RMRA)		\$64,355						\$64,355
Cal Recycle (Grant)		\$60,778						\$60,778
TOTAL	\$50,000	\$944,007						\$994,007

2018/19-2022/23 Capital Improvement Program

Category	Project Number	Project
Parks	10440	Clayton Community Park Field No. 1 Restoration

DESCRIPTION - LOCATION

Rehabilitation of lower baseball/softball field (field No. 1).



COMMENTS

Subgrade stabilization completed in FY 16-17
Remaining work completed in FY 18-19

Estimated Cost	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Planning/Design								
Construction/Execution		\$100,000						\$100,000
Monitoring/Inspections								
Close-out/Punch List								
Other								
TOTAL		\$100,000						\$100,000

Funding (Sources)	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Unfunded		\$50,000						\$50,000
Garbage Franchise Community Enhancement Fee	\$50,000							\$50,000
TOTAL	\$50,000	\$50,000						\$100,000

2018/19-2022/23 Capital Improvement Program

Category	Project Number	Project
Parks	10442	North Valley Park Playground Rehabilitation

DESCRIPTION - LOCATION

Install new playground equipment, shade structures and play surface.



COMMENTS

Estimated Cost	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Planning/Design								
Construction/Execution		\$167,300						\$167,300
Monitoring/Inspections								
Close-out/Punch List								
Other								
TOTAL		\$167,300						\$167,300

Funding (Sources)	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Open Space DIF	\$142,000							\$142,000
CIP Interest earnings	\$23,800							\$23,800
Project Interest	\$1,500							\$1,500
TOTAL	\$167,300							\$167,300

2018/19-2022/23 Capital Improvement Program

Category	Project Number	Project
Facilities	10443	ADA Accessibility - City Hall

DESCRIPTION - LOCATION

Install ADA accessibility improvements to the entry doorways of City Hall.



COMMENTS

Estimated Cost	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Planning/Design								
Construction/Execution		\$35,000						\$35,000
Monitoring/Inspections								
Close-out/Punch List								
Other								
TOTAL		\$35,000						\$35,000

Funding (Sources)	Prior Yrs.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Future	TOTAL
Community Facilities DIF	\$19,000							\$19,000
General Fund Annual Excess	\$16,000							\$16,000
TOTAL	\$35,000							\$35,000