



# The VOICE

Your independent news source

Greater Shasta County, CA

Volume XII, Issue X

www.shastavoices.com

March 2019

**Did you know...**

- There were **7** single family home permits issued in the City of Redding (a 29% decrease from the same period of 2018) and **12** Carr Fire single family rebuild permits issued in February 2019. So far in 2019, there have been **21** Carr Fire single family rebuild permits issued. There was **one** permit issued for commercial buildings in February 2019,
- There have been **49** single family permits for Carr Fire rebuilds issued in the unincorporated areas of **Shasta County** to date, with another **42** in the applied status, and **4** ready for issue, for a total of **95** total applications for Carr Fire home rebuilds to date.
- According to the Code Enforcement Division in Redding, here are the local statistics on **cannabis activity** since it became legal in the City of Redding last year, subject to following the State and local regulations: 36 citations issued for violations so far; \$450,000 in fines; 17 applications received; \$100,000 in application and license fees; \$446,000 in license fees pending.

**Inside this issue:**

4 CSO's To Be Added to Redding Police Department	1
Split Council Approves Increases to Park Impact Fees	2
City Will Borrow From REU To Replace Soccer Fields	2
Sprung Structures Offers Shasta County Options For Homeless Navigation Center	3
Updated News and Notes	4
Join Shasta VOICES	4

## 4 CSO's To be Added to Redding's Police Department

The City of Redding conducted a series of four City Council budget workshop meetings from January 31st through March 7th, specifically for the **purpose of identifying and providing additional and redirected resources** primarily to the Police Department, and to offer a broader understanding of the City's general fund and related 10-year plan.

At the final budget workshop meeting, a total of nearly **\$700,000** annually in cost saving measures was identified from the following sources:

- Eliminating a System Analyst/Programming II position (\$30,000 annually)
- Dedicating future cannabis tax (\$200,000 annually)
- Combining Treasurer and Finance Director Position (\$150,000 annually)
- Refund General Fund bond debt (\$300,000 for three years)

Also, during the final workshop on March 7th, Council learned that, with the recent snow and rain events in the City, City Hall had a significant leakage into the interior of the building, which caused a ceiling collapse over an office desk. Due to the immediate need for this and other critical repairs, City Manager Barry Tippin found it difficult to recommend hiring additional staff and incurring long-term expenses prior to addressing the maintenance of City facilities. Therefore, Council chose to take the \$700,000 in identified cost savings and dedicated **1/2 to the Police Department** specifically for hiring Community Service Officers (CSO) and other public safety uses, and **1/2 to begin to deal with City maintenance obligations.**

Police Chief Roger Moore was asked to come back to the next regular Council Meeting with a plan on how his department would allocate about \$350,000 in funding for new positions. He did just that at the **March 19th Council meeting**. It was determined that the best use of the funds towards public safety would be to hire four (4) additional Community Service Officers (CSO) at an annual cost of \$326,560. This will free up other sworn officers time by allowing CSO's to respond to non-emergency incidents where a sworn officer is not needed.

City Council then unanimously approved the addition of **four (4) Community Service Officers (CSO)** to the Redding Police Department, to be funded through these identified cost saving measures. Two of the CSO's will be hired as soon as May, and the remaining two will be hired after the start of fiscal year 2019-20, which begins July 1st.

The cost of the newly added CSO positions for the remainder of the current fiscal year will be about \$41,000 and will be paid out of accumulated salary savings. To date, there is about \$275,000 in salary savings. Additionally, \$100,000 of the net revenue from Red Light Camera Enforcement to date (about \$200,000 total), will be used to pay for the purchase of three (3) trucks and needed equipment to support the new CSO's.

Still pending is the modification of City programs that could be modified to **find the \$800,000 per year** that would be needed to maintain three firefighter positions and four police officer positions that could otherwise be eliminated July 1, 2019. The largest potential "modified" funding source is from an **increase in building fees**. On January 15th, Council voted to have staff provide more data and community/stakeholder input through public meetings, and moved the conceptual plan forward. Those community and stakeholder meetings will be scheduled "very soon" according to Mr. Tippin.

## *Split Council Approves Increases To Park Development Impact Fees*

On March 5th, a split Redding City Council voted 3-2, with members Julie Winter, Erin Resner, and Kristen Schreder in favor of both **increases** to the Park Development Impact Fees for residential development and **adding a new fee** category for non-residential fees. Council members Adam McElvain and Mike Dacquistto voted against the increases.

It should be noted that a five-page letter from local attorney Walt McNeill, who successfully sued the City and forced them to **rescind the Council approved Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan** (PTOSMP) on November 6, 2018, was distributed to City Staff and Council on March 4th (the day before the Council meeting). In this letter, Mr. McNeill reminds the City that that they were “sued because your initial approval of the proposed inventory of open space and facilities was not based on informed decision-making; you rescinded the PTOSMP because you couldn’t defend your approval of that inventory of open space and facilities and the PTOSMP. Yet City Staff suggests to you that even though you rescinded the PTOSMP, you should rely on the data and inventory in the discredited Plan as a basis for passing increased/new Parks Fees.” He also reminds the City and Council, among other things, that “The Carr Fire brought to light the dangers and damage of wildfire in the City’s open spaces and parks/recreational facilities, dramatically altering the baseline assessment of how to create and manage these open spaces and facilities, the feasibility of facilities, the cost of different endeavors, the elimination of usable spaces and facilities destroyed by fire, and the priorities for future facilities/inventory based on the impact and knowledge gained from the Carr Fire.”

Nonetheless, three Councilors ignored and downplayed the warning letter, and voted to approve the increased and new park fees. It’s entirely possible that this is not the last we have heard about this particular approval.

In the meantime, here are the increased fee schedules, as well as the approved reduction for Park In-lieu Fees:

<u>Fee Schedule Options</u>	<u>Development Type</u>	<u>Occupancy</u>	<u>Approved Fee</u>	<u>Current Fee</u>
Residential	Single-Family	2.50	\$ <b>5,200.00</b>	\$ 4,331.15
	Multi-Family	1.89	\$ <b>3,935.00</b>	\$ 3,376.34
Non-Residential	Commercial	2.5 emp/ksf	\$ <b>494.00</b> per 1,000 SF	none
	Office	3.7 emp/ksf	\$ <b>731.12</b> per 1,000 SF	none
	Industrial	2 emp/ksf	\$ <b>395.20</b> per 1,000 SF	none

The amount of the Park In-lieu fee is based upon the fair market value of the amount of land which would otherwise be required for dedication, plus 20% for off-site improvements. The current fee charged to developers is \$1,936 per unit. Using property valuation data provided by Shasta County Assessor’s Office for the fair market value, the updated **in-lieu fee will be reduced to \$1,928 per unit.**

The newly approved fees are scheduled at this time to become effective on April 19, 2019.

## *City Will Borrow From REU to Replace Soccer Park Fields*

On March 5th, Redding City Council voted 4-1 (Adam McElvain dissenting) to approve a funding plan totaling **\$5.15 million** to replace four synthetic soccer turf fields at the City’s California Soccer Park, which is located on Viking Way, next to the Big League Dreams softball fields. The Council Chambers had standing room only due to the attendance of perhaps every youth soccer team in the area (and their parents), many of whom pleaded at the podium to save their soccer park, which opened in 2007.

The Shasta Regional Soccer Association (SRSA), a non-profit organization that has been operating this Soccer Park for the past 12 years, had asked the City of Redding to renegotiate the terms of their lease, to become effective on July 1, 2019, and to make the City of Redding financially responsible for replacing the fields. They have proposed paying monthly rent of \$6,000 over 10 years (\$620,000) to help fund the replacement of the fields. A new lease will now be re-negotiated with the City.

The much-needed renovations were submitted for grants from the National Park Service and other available State grants, but the City was unable to secure any grants for what are considered “maintenance” items, rather than new construction. The City was successful, however, in winning a \$500,000 settlement last year from a lawsuit against the turf installer.

Other funding sources to replace the fields include a \$1 million donation from the McConnell Foundation and \$30,000 that has been contributed to a turf replacement fund by the SRSA over the past twelve years. That leaves a balance of \$3 million.

City Council approved a funding plan for the turf field replacement that includes a **\$3 million loan from Redding Electric Utility**, with loan repayments made “as the General Fund can afford.” The replacement of the fields is considered a maintenance effort, and, therefore, a General Fund responsibility. The tentative schedule for replacing the fields is to advertise a Request for Proposal (RFP) for design services by May 1st, award the contract by August 6th, approve a completed design by January 1, 2020, advertise and award the construction contract by March, 2020, and begin construction in May, 2020.

## *Sprung Structures Offer Shasta County Options for Creation of Homeless Navigation Center*

On February 26th, the Shasta County Board of Supervisors received a presentation from Donnell Ewart, Director of Health and Human Services (HHSA), regarding the creation of a “Homeless Navigation Center” to serve hard-to-reach unsheltered adults.

Mr. Ewart said that currently, available shelters are not utilized by some unsheltered adults due to personal choice or exclusionary policies, with 322 people in Shasta County deemed to be unsheltered. In addition to health problems suffered by unsheltered people, there are also increased costs for law enforcement, environmental clean-up, fire response, hospitalization and more. One potential solution, he said, would be the creation of a Homeless Navigation Center, a low-barrier, secular shelter.

In December, 2018, the County’s Community Action Agency (CAA) applied for and was awarded Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) funding, requesting **\$1,685,155** toward capital development for this Center. The suggested occupancy for this Center is 92 individuals in three categories: (1) general shelter; (2) medical respite; (3) sobering center. Shelter staff would navigate individuals toward appropriate services during their flexible length of stay. The average length of recovery for individuals receiving medical respite services is about 6-8 weeks. Prior to discharge, shelter staff would coordinate case management services, similar to services provided to other individuals within the general shelter. The sobering center would be designed to provide exclusive space for non-violent individuals to recover from public intoxication.

After much discussion, the Board of Supervisors voted to direct staff to **accept** and utilize the \$1,685,155 from the HEAP awarded funds towards capital development costs to the Center. But they stopped short of approving anything else, having many questions and concerns about holding shelter residents accountable, the projected costs far above the HEAP funding to build the Center, and the ongoing operational costs of such a shelter. They wanted more information from Mr. Ewart first, including a scaled-down version of the Center.

Then on March 12th, Supervisor Leonard Moty, who missed both February 26th and March 5th Board meetings, brought the item back for discussion, saying he was unclear as to whether or not the Supervisors were actually “on-board” with the concept of such a Center. The Board voted 3-1 (Morgan absent, Baugh dissenting) not to put the item on future agendas for presentations from other community members until it can gauge support for this project from the cities of Redding, Anderson and Shasta Lake, with the County taking the lead on the project. The hope is that Mr. Ewart will come back to the Board with a scaled-down version of the concept, starting with a very basic facility, as the next step in the process.

With that in mind, on March 18th, a well established company called **Sprung Structures**, in business for over 120 years, did a presentation hosted by the Shasta Builders Exchange, which was attended by about 40 appropriate city and county officials (and other interested parties), to offer a potentially better way to build and operate such projects. This company designs and builds high performance tensioned membrane structures which allow for rapid construction, total design flexibility, and lower overall project costs. The pre-manufactured structure materials take about 3-4 weeks to arrive, and it takes about 4 more weeks to put up the structures. There are both lease and purchase options available. There is **flexibility** in design—you can easily reconfigure, disassemble, or relocate the structures. Aluminum substructure and a patented tensioning system are engineered to outperform and outlast other types of construction.

A Sprung **Navigation Center** is a **homeless community resource center** designed by planners across North America. Such a center can become a vital bridge between life on the streets and an affordable housing unit. Delivered and erected in as little as 8 weeks, the Center allows cities to provide safe and secure accommodations as well as basic life services: bathrooms, showers, laundry, counseling, and medical care. People experiencing homelessness can now be placed into the system and given the help they need while preparing them for their transition to longer term affordable housing.

Sprung Structures offer a solution for homeless shelters due to low construction costs, limited foundation requirements, and the ability to deliver and build quicker than any conventional homeless building type.

To the right is a picture of the Division Circle Navigation Center in San Francisco, a Sprung homeless shelter constructed in response to a drastic increase in tent encampments. It serves those who have been unable to access services like intensive case management, health care and drug treatment programs that are not available at traditional shelters. It provides 126 beds and is operated by St. Vincent de Paul Society of San Francisco and the City of San Francisco Public Works Department.

The City of San Diego also constructed a Sprung Homeless Shelter. In 2017, they had 5,600 people sleeping on the streets and in hand-built encampments lined along city blocks. Unsanitary conditions were blamed for an outbreak of Hepatitis A, killing 20 people and sickening over 500 others. San Diego needed an immediate interim housing solution. Within a few weeks, three engineered Sprung Structures were completed to immediately address the problems. The shelter, with 350 beds, is operated by the non-profit Alpha Project.



Mr. Ewart is scheduled to come back to the Board of Supervisors on March 26th with a scaled-down version of his original concept, perhaps offering a Sprung Structure option as well as more information on plans for operation of his concept for such a center. Stay tuned!

## *Updated News and Notes*

Shasta VOICES is continuing to monitor and follow many issues of interest to our supporters and the community. As part of our efforts to keep you updated and informed, here is a brief update of some of these issues.

**Another Sales Tax Measure?** At the March 12th Shasta County Board of Supervisors meeting, the Supervisors voted to establish a temporary ad hoc advisory committee composed of two members of the Board, Joe Chimenti and Leonard Moty, “for the purpose of advising the Board concerning options for a possible transaction and use tax (sales tax) sharing agreement, after gathering input from the cities of Anderson, Redding, and Shasta Lake.” This followed notification received on March 5th at the 11th hour prior to the Board of Supervisors meeting that day, from Redding’s Mayor, Julie Winter, that there was already a community group (who remains unnamed) working to put a **one percent general sales tax increase** measure in the city of **Redding** on the ballot in 2019.

The Supervisors had discussed putting a one-half percent **specific countywide** sales tax measure together for the 2020 election ballot, dedicated to public safety, before learning about the other effort. A one percent general sales tax, which could be used for any and all general fund purposes in the City of Redding, could generate as much as \$24 million of additional revenue each year...and Shasta County wants to be included in that expenditure with a tax-sharing agreement.

This would be a third attempt to get Redding voters to pass a sales tax hike — and each time, the proposed increase gets larger. In 2014, voters were asked to approve a quarter-cent **specific** tax increase requiring a 2/3 majority vote, (which failed by a 56% to 44% vote) and in 2016, a half-cent **general** tax increase requiring a simple majority vote (which failed by a 62% to 38% vote). This time, the community group spearheading the effort will need to obtain at least 5,000 signatures from registered voters in the city of Redding to have the proposed measure put on a special ballot in 2019. In the meantime, there is sure to be much discussion between County and City officials on how each would like to spend any such new tax revenues. It remains to be seen if any of these discussions will be in a public forum. Once again, stay tuned!

**Redding Short-Term Rental Ordinance Amended**—On March 5th, Redding City Council approved four amendments to the City’s Short-Term Rental Ordinance: (1) Section 18.43.180.C.2—Annual renewal of permits is now required (changed from a one time permit); (2) Section 18.43.180.E.7—Establishing specific outdoor quiet hours between 10:00 pm and 7:00 am to minimize disturbance to neighboring residences. Outdoor activities are prohibited during quiet hours.; (3) Section 18.43.180.F.2—The name and local contact information of the rental unit must be made available to the public; and (4) Section 18.43.180.F.2—The number of adult guests permitted at any given time is limited to the number of bedrooms multiplied by two. These changes were made in response to multiple successful neighborhood appeals to short-term vacation rental permit requests in their area, based on negative experiences from existing vacation rentals.

**Redding Cannabis Ordinance Amended**—Six cannabis retailers received pre-approval from the City of Redding to operate last year. But only one retailer, Synergy, has completed its application and is operating in Redding. Complacency on the part of applicants who are “pre-approved” is not furthering the goals of timely establishment of retail cannabis businesses so that their presence may negatively impact black market sales of cannabis.

Therefore, one of the amendments to the Cannabis Ordinance adopted by Council on March 19th is to keep such applications from languishing. Section 6.12.400.B.1 has been added: “Any cannabis retailer applicant selected by the city manager who fails to satisfy all licensure requirements and receive a license from the director within ninety (90) calendar days of selection by the city manager forfeits further consideration of the application. Applicants denied licensure on this basis shall be permitted to reapply if a competitive selection process is later initiated by the city manager.”

Other Ordinance changes include changing the use permit requirement for commercial cultivation to a requirement for a site development permit, eliminating the requirement for an applicant **DOJ finger-print** background check while keeping the required background check, eliminating the requirement for background checks on all employees, allows Director exceptions to the requirement that each cannabis business be located in a stand-alone structure, the establishment of regulations for micro-businesses, and a clarification that the penalties for **every cannabis plant** cultivated in violation of the outdoor grow or indoor grow regulations shall constitute a separate violation.

***Join Shasta VOICES today.***

**We depend on membership and other contributions.**

If you are viewing this issue of “**THE VOICE**” on our website, click on the **membership tab** for information and to download a membership application or contributor form. Or, you can obtain more information by going to our website, **www.shastavoices.com**, or calling **(530) 222-5251**.

Mary B. Machado, Executive Director