



City of Lemon Grove
City Council Regular Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, February 4, 2020, 6:00 p.m.

Lemon Grove Community Center
3146 School Lane, Lemon Grove, CA

The City Council also sits as the Lemon Grove Housing Authority, Lemon Grove Sanitation District Board, Lemon Grove Roadway Lighting District Board, and Lemon Grove Successor Agency

Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance:

Changes to the Agenda:

Public Comment:

(Note: In accordance with State Law, the general public may bring forward an item not scheduled on the agenda; however, the City Council may not take any action at this meeting. If appropriate, the item will be referred to staff or placed on a future agenda.)

City Council Oral Comments and Reports on Meetings Attended at the Expense of the City.
(GC 53232.3 (d)) (53232.3.(d) states that members of a legislative body shall provide brief reports on meetings attended at the expense of the local agency at the next regular meeting of the legislative body.)

1. Consent Calendar:

(Note: The items listed on the Consent Calendar will be enacted in one motion unless removed from the Consent Calendar by Council, staff, or the public.)

A. Waive Full Text Reading of All Ordinances on the Agenda

Reference: Kristen Steinke, City Attorney

Recommendation: Waive the full text reading of all ordinances included in this agenda; Ordinances shall be introduced and adopted by title only.

B. City of Lemon Grove Payment Demands

Reference: Rod Greek, Interim Finance Manager

Recommendation: Ratify Demands

C. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Regular Meeting

January 21, 2020

Reference: Shelley Chapel, City Clerk

Recommendation: Approve Minutes

- D. Adoption of Resolution Authorizing the Submittal of a CalRecycle Local Government Waste Tire Enforcement Grant Application in Partnership with the City of San Diego – Solid Waste Local Enforcement Agency and Authorizing the City of San Diego to Act on Behalf of the City of Lemon Grove to Execute All Necessary Grant Documents.

Reference: Christian Olivas, Management Analyst
Recommendation: Adopt Resolution.

- E. Rejection of Claim – Edward Dominick

Reference: Mike James, Assistant City Manager / Public Works Director
Recommendation: Reject Claim

- F. Rejection of Claim – Diane Ravelle

Reference: Mike James, Assistant City Manager / Public Works Director
Recommendation: Reject Claim

- G. Rejection of Claim – Edward Wong

Reference: Mike James, Assistant City Manager / Public Works Director
Recommendation: Reject Claim

Reports to Council:

2. Adopt Resolution Approving the Renaming Civic Center Park to Treganza Heritage Park.

Reference: Mike James, Assistant City Manager / Public Works Director
Recommendation: Adopt Resolution entitled, "A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Lemon Grove, California, Changing the Name of Civic Center Park to Treganza Heritage Park."

3. State of California Senate Bill 50

Reference: Noah Alvey, Community Development Manager
Recommendation: Receive and File.

Closed Session:

1. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION

Government Code Section 54956.9b
Number of potential cases: 1

Adjournment

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the City of Lemon Grove will provide special accommodations for persons who require assistance to access, attend and/or participate in meetings of the City Council. If you require such assistance, please contact the City Clerk at (619) 825-3800 or email schapel@lemongrove.ca.gov. A full agenda packet is available for public review at City Hall.

AFFIDAVIT OF NOTIFICATION AND POSTING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO) SS
CITY OF LEMON GROVE)

I, Shelley Chapel, MMC, City Clerk of the City of Lemon Grove, hereby declare under penalty of perjury that a copy of the above Agenda of the Regular Meeting of the City Council of the City of Lemon Grove, California, was delivered and/or notice by email not less than 72 hours before the hour of 6:30 p.m. on January 30, 2020, to the members of the governing agency, and caused the agenda to be posted on the City's website at www.lemongrove.ca.gov and at Lemon Grove City Hall, 3232 Main Street Lemon Grove, CA 91945.

/s/: Shelley Chapel
Shelley Chapel, MMC, City Clerk



CITY OF LEMON GROVE

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

Item No. 1.A

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020
Submitted to: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
Department: City Manager's Office
Staff Contact: Kristen Steinke, City Attorney
Item Title: **Waive the Full Text Reading of all Ordinances**

Summary: Waive the full text reading of all ordinances included in this agenda. Ordinances shall be introduced and adopted by title only.

Environmental Review:

- Not subject to review Negative Declaration
 Categorical Exemption, Section | Mitigated Negative Declaration

Fiscal Impact: None.

Public Notification: None.



CITY OF LEMON GROVE

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

Item No. 1.B

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020
Submitted to: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
Department: City Manager's Office
Staff Contact: Rod Greek, Interim Finance Manager
Item Title: **City of Lemon Grove Payment Demands**

Recommended Action: Ratify Demands.

Environmental Review:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not subject to review | <input type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exemption, Section | <input type="checkbox"/> Mitigated Negative Declaration |

Fiscal Impact: None.

Public Notification: None.

City of Lemon Grove Demands Summary

Approved as Submitted:

Rod Greek, Interim Administrative Services Director
For Council Meeting: 02/04/20

ACH/AP Checks 01/13/20-01/22/20 1,333,646.86
Payroll - 01/14/20 150,517.70

Total Demands 1,484,164.56

CHECK NO	INVOICE NO	VENDOR NAME	CHECK DATE	Description	INVOICE AMOUNT	CHECK AMOUNT
ACH	Dec19	Wells Fargo	01/13/2020	Bank Service Charge - Dec'19	464.47	1,065.94
ACH	Dec19-CC			Credit Card Processing-Mo.Svc - Dec'19	9.95	
	Dec19-CC			Credit Card Transaction Fees- Dec'19	591.52	
ACH	Refill 1/13/20	Pitney Bowes Global Financial Services LLC	01/13/2020	Postage Usage 1/13/20	250.00	250.00
ACH	Dec19	Home Depot Credit Services	01/14/2020	Home Depot Charges - Dec'19	3,320.43	3,320.43
ACH	Dec4-Dec31 19	California Public Empl Retirement System	01/15/2020	Pers Retirement 12/4/19-12/31/19	64,861.23	64,861.23
ACH	Jan14 20	Employment Development Department	01/16/2020	State Taxes 1/14/20	11,006.40	11,006.40
ACH	Jan1-Jan14 20	Calpers Supplemental Income 457 Plan	01/16/2020	457 Plan 1/1/20-1/14/20	8,355.63	8,355.63
ACH	8034	Aflac	01/16/2020	AFLAC Insurance 1/15/20	757.02	757.02
ACH	Jul-Sep19	Employment Development Department	01/16/2020	Unemployment Insurance - Jul-Sep'19	346.85	346.85
ACH	1523103 1532346/47	US Bank- Corporate Trust Services	01/21/2020	2014 Bond Debt Service - Interest 2019 Bond Debt Service - Interest	101,543.13 382,014.87	483,558.00
ACH	Jan14 20	US Treasury	01/21/2020	Federal Taxes 1/14/20	35,993.64	35,993.64
ACH	Nov19	San Diego County Sheriff's Department	01/22/2020	Law Enforcement Services - Nov'19	512,782.06	512,782.06
12467	0692 39802	A Aaron Lock & Key	01/15/2020	Keys Repair - Install Push Bar & Trim/Back Door - Sr Ctr	22.13 536.18	558.31
12468	14029882	AT&T	01/15/2020	Phone Service- 11/13/19-12/12/19	85.52	85.52
12469	5656981671	AutoZone, Inc.	01/15/2020	Transmission Fluid - LGPW#01 '12 Dump Truck	56.01	56.01
12470	17849L-IN 17849L-IN	Aztec Landscaping Inc.	01/15/2020	Repair Irrigation/Various Locations Landscaping Labor - Irrigation Repairs - Various Locations	383.71 960.00	1,343.71
12471	Jan-20 Jan-20	BCC	01/15/2020	LTD Insurance - Jan'20 Life Insurance - Jan20	77.28 711.46	788.74
12472	4950620	Bearcom	01/15/2020	Portable Radios Monthly Contract 12/22/19-1/21/20	150.00	150.00
12473	866660	Best, Best & Krieger LLP	01/15/2020	Legal Svcs: thru Dec'19	2,428.32	2,428.32
12474	990927-9	BJ's Rentals	01/15/2020	Boom Knuckle Rental - Holiday Banners/Decor 1/6/20	449.06	449.06
12475	1/14/20	California State Disbursement Unit	01/15/2020	Wage Withholding Pay Period Ending 1/14/20	161.53	161.53
12476	CitywideConst	Citywide Construction Inc.	01/15/2020	Refund/Citywide Const/Diversion Deposit CD1-900-0068	500.00	500.00
12477	2212 2258	Clark Telecom & Electric Inc.	01/15/2020	Street Light Repairs - Oct'19 Street Light Dig-Alert Markouts - Oct'19	1,128.13 1,111.56	2,239.69
12478	Nov19 Dec19	Colonial Life	01/15/2020	Colonial Optional Insurance -Nov19 Colonial Optional Insurance -Dec19	446.80 446.80	893.60
12479	20CTOFLGN06	County of San Diego- RCS	01/15/2020	800 MHZ Network - Dec '19	2,878.50	2,878.50
12480	15806 15815 15828	Custom Auto Wrap Inc.	01/15/2020	Banner - Daycamp Daycamp Banner/Double Sided Reflective Striping - LGPW#35 '04 Ford Expedition	134.69 676.11 996.31	1,807.11
12481	5352 5360 5361 5362	D- Max Engineering Inc.	01/15/2020	1963 Berry St SWQMP Review 7/20/19-11/30/19 1993 Dain Dr Stormwater Inspection 11/1/19-11/30/19 6800 Mallard Ct Stormwater Inspection 11/1/19-11/30/19 Golden Doors Stormwater Inspection 11/1/19-11/30/19	67.00 368.30 368.30 30.30	833.90
12482	52961	Daley & Heft LLP	01/15/2020	Legal Svcs: GHC0025482- Svcs thru 9/17/19	667.70	667.70
12483	01052020560	DAR Contractors	01/15/2020	Animal Disposal- Dec'19	174.00	174.00
12484	18dsbfe6988	Dig Safe Board	01/15/2020	State Fee/Regulatory Monthly Costs/Dig Alert 2018	42.80	42.80
12485	0082572-IN	Doggie Walk Bags Inc.	01/15/2020	17,080 Doggie Walk Dispenser Bags w/Pouch	1,136.25	1,136.25
12486	Jan-20	Fidelity Security Life Insurance Company	01/15/2020	Vision Insurance -Jan20	259.12	259.12

12487	INV1016780 INV1016868	George Hills Company	01/15/2020	TPA Claims- Adjusting/Other Services - Nov 19 30% Subro Recovery Fee/GHC0024631	741.20 1,500.00	2,241.20
12488	C57088	Haaker Equipment Company	01/15/2020	LGPW#32- 3/4" x 800 Cleaning Hose/Sanitation	2,301.54	2,301.54
12489	Jan14 19	ICMA	01/15/2020	ICMA Deferred Compensation Pay Period Ending 1/14/20	780.77	780.77
12490	081775	Inventus, LLC	01/15/2020	Legal Svcs: GHC0019886	3,586.80	3,586.80
12491	137579 137481 137482	Knott's Pest Control, Inc.	01/15/2020	On Call Pest Control - Fire Stn Monthly Bait Stations- Civic Ctr - Jan20 Monthly Bait Stations- Sheriff -Jan20	125.00 60.00 45.00	230.00
12492	201912 201912 201912 201912	Lemon Grove Car Wash, Inc.	01/15/2020	Smog Test - LGPW#22 '03 GMC 2500 - 12/16/19 Smog Test - LGPW#17 '99 Ford F350 - 12/17/19 Smog Test - LGPW#28 '08 Chevy Colorado - 12/17/19 Smog Test - LGPW#14 '98 Ford Ranger - 12/19/19	68.00 100.00 68.00 100.00	336.00
12493	4760668 4760675	Mallory Safety and Supply, LLC	01/15/2020	Nitrile Gloves/Disposable Respirators Rainsuit	300.51 42.58	343.09
12494	819352	Miracle Recreation Equipment Co.	01/15/2020	Slide Replacement- Berry St Pk	821.66	821.66
12495	Jan2020	Preferred Benefit Insurance Administrators	01/15/2020	Dental Insurance- PPO -Jan'20	3,715.50	3,715.50
12496	31890088 31896395 31896396 31898703	RCP Block & Brick, Inc.	01/15/2020	10 x 10 Steel Tamper Bulk Concrete Sand - Fire Station Bulk Concrete Sand - Fire Station Bulk Concrete Sand - Fire Station	54.95 112.39 112.39 112.39	392.12
12497	0071763 0071852	Rick Engineering Company	01/15/2020	Prof Svc: 20A UG Dis Project 10/26/19-11/29/19 Prof Svc: City Engineer 10/26/19-11/29/19	575.00 49,436.86	50,011.86
12498	12/18/2019 12/20/2019 12/20/2019 Dec19	SDG&E	01/15/2020	3225 Olive- 11/18/19-12/18/19 3500 1/2 Main- 11/18/19-12/18/19 3601 1/2 LGA-11/18/19-12/18/19 Gas & Electric 11/21/19-12/23/19	127.18 150.29 32.90 21,563.56	21,873.93
12499	80199 80200 80201	Southwest Signal Service	01/15/2020	Markout Reports - Underground Service Alert - Dec'19 Bi-Monthly Traffic Signal Maint/PM Inspections - Dec'19 Traffic Signal Service Calls - Dec'19	120.00 845.00 1,091.47	2,056.47
12500	00091882 00091918	The East County Californian	01/15/2020	Notice of Public Hearing - CUP-190-0002 1/9/20 Notice of Public Hearing - PDP-170-0003 1/9/20	210.00 196.00	406.00
12501	55417	Tyson & Mendes, LLP	01/15/2020	Legal Svcs: GHC0019886 thru 12/1/19	53,050.22	53,050.22
12502	122019379	Underground Service Alert of Southern Ca.	01/15/2020	32 New Ticket Charges - Dec'19	62.80	62.80
12503	72438474 72438475	Vulcan Materials Company	01/15/2020	Asphalt Asphalt/SS1H 4.5 Gallon Bucket	150.85 198.37	349.22
12504	Williams	Williams, Chris	01/21/2020	Refund/Williams, Chris/Planning Permit AA2-000-0001	150.00	150.00
12505	12990	AdminSure	01/21/2020	Workers' Compensation Claims Administration - Feb'20	453.34	453.34
12506	Feb 2020	California Dental Network Inc.	01/21/2020	California Dental Insurance -Feb20	311.74	311.74
12507	20977413	Canon Financial Services Inc.	01/21/2020	Canon Copier Contract Charge 1/20/20-2/19/20	81.35	81.35
12508	Reimb 1/13/20	Chapel, Shelley	01/21/2020	Reimb: Mileage/New Law & Elec Conf/Gdn Grove/Chapel 12/11-13/19	197.80	197.80
12509	21687 21687 21687 21687 21687	City of La Mesa	01/21/2020	Overtime Reimbursement - Lima 12/7/19 Overtime Reimbursement - Doig 12/8/19 Overtime Reimbursement - Wright 12/11/19 Overtime Reimbursement - Sergeant 12/14/19 Overtime Reimbursement - Kleist 12/15/19	1,310.41 1,478.17 1,039.12 1,310.41 1,478.17	6,616.28
12510	15773	Custom Auto Wrap Inc.	01/21/2020	Sponsor Banners	510.85	510.85
12511	0107202305	Domestic Linen- California Inc.	01/21/2020	Shop Towels & Safety Mats 1/7/20	92.70	92.70
12512	20197927 20197928	Dudek	01/21/2020	Prof Svcs: Inspection Support Svc/Grove Hill Proj 9/28-10/25/19 Prof Svcs: Inspection Support Svc/Sewer CIP Proj 9/28-10/25/19	2,187.50 2,025.00	4,212.50
12513	27111	Excell Security, Inc.	01/21/2020	Senior Center Security Guard - 12/5/19, 12/8/19	648.70	648.70
12514	1597	Janazz, LLC SD	01/21/2020	IT Services- City Hall- 24 & 48 Port Switches/Workstation- PW Yd	1,293.00	1,293.00
12515	Dec 19 Dec 19 Dec 19 Dec 19 Dec 19	Lounsbery Ferguson Altona & Peak LLP	01/21/2020	General 03529-00001 Dec'19 Code Enforcemnt 03529-00002 Dec'19 General 03529-00014 Dec'19 General 03529-00015 Dec'19 General 03529-00016 Dec'19	14,445.80 88.50 516.45 2,672.02 66.40	17,789.17
12516	Reimb 1/15/20	Mendoza, Jennifer	01/21/2020	LCC Leadership Mtg/Sacra/Mendoza, J 12/4/19-12/6/19	154.96	154.96
12517	234382 234383	Ninyo & Moore	01/21/2020	6800 Mallard Ct Inspection Svcs thru 11/29/19 1963 Berry St Inspection Svcs thru 11/29/19	4,836.50 1,400.00	6,236.50
12518	66752171	Occupational Health Centers of CA, A Medical	01/21/2020	Annual DMV Medical Exam - 1/13/20, 1/14/20	557.00	557.00

12519	Rose	Rose, Sophia	01/21/2020	Refund/Rose, Sophia/Business License Fees	70.00	70.00
12520	8057001797	Staples Advantage	01/21/2020	Office Supplies & Copy Paper - City Hall	454.61	454.61
12521	STMT 12/23/2019	US Bank Corporate Payment Systems	01/21/2020	Supplies/Cable for EMS iPad - E10	21.64	9,006.11
				PW Staff Mtg/Lunch 12/6/19	58.98	
				Credential Mgr Application - James	50.00	
				Lodging/LA/Natl Brownfields Trng Conference James 12/12/19	281.23	
				Airfare/Phx/EPIC-N Board of Directors Mtg James 1/10/20	219.96	
				Maintenance/PW Refrigerator/Parts	86.95	
				LGPW#35 '04 Ford Expedition/Repairs/Ignition Coil/Spark Plugs/Tune	691.52	
				Bonfire Supplies 12/6/19	940.28	
				Daycamp Supplies	183.20	
				APA Membership - Alvey	579.00	
				LGPW#19 '99 Ford F350/Brakes/Repairs	1,494.41	
				Cardiac Science AED - Fire Admin Ofc	309.85	
				Diesel Exhaust Fluid - E210	68.92	
				LCC/New Mayor & CM Academy/Sacramento Romero 1/22-24/20	625.00	
				LCC/New Mayor & CM Academy/Sacramento Altamirano 1/22-24/20	625.00	
				Airfare/LCC/New CM Academy/Sacramento/Altamirano 1/21/20	122.96	
				Cashbox - Frontdesk Register	13.98	
				NameplateS - Planning Commissioner/Council	51.72	
				Notice of Election Translation: Chinese, Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese	640.00	
				Notice of Election/EI Latino Newspaper	385.00	
				Lodging/City Clerks New Law & Elections Mtg/Chapel 12/11/19	438.36	
				Transp & Lodging/Calpelra Conference/Hidalgo 11/19/19-11/22/19	852.23	
				MMASC Membership - Hidalgo	85.00	
				Bonfire Supplies 12/6/19	145.92	
				LGPW#31 '14 Ford Escape/Turn Signal Light	35.00	
12522	1/14/20	Van Lant & Fankhanel, LLP	01/22/2020	FY2019 Audit & Related Reports- Final Billing	2,500.00	2,500.00
					1,333,646.86	1,333,646.86



CITY OF LEMON GROVE

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

Item No. 1.C

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020

Submitted to: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

Department: City Manager's Office

Staff Contact: Shelley Chapel, City Clerk

Schapel@lemongrove.ca.gov

Item Title: **Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes**

Recommended Action: Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes.

Environmental Review:

- Not subject to review Negative Declaration
 Categorical Exemption, Section | Mitigated Negative Declaration

Fiscal Impact: None.

Public Notification: None.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE LEMON GROVE CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2020**

*The City Council also sits as the Lemon Grove Housing Authority,
Lemon Grove Sanitation District Board, Lemon Grove Roadway Lighting District Board, and
Lemon Grove Successor Agency.*

Call To Order:

Mayor Vasquez called the Regular Meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

Present: Mayor Racquel Vasquez, Mayor Pro Tem Jennifer Mendoza, Councilmember Yadira Altamirano, Councilmember David Arambula, Councilmember Jerry Jones

Absent: None.

Staff Members Present:

Lydia Romero, City Manager, Kristen Steinke, City Attorney, Mike James, Assistant City Manager/Public Works Director, Noah Alvey, Community Development Manager, Shelley Chapel, City Clerk, Steven Swaney, Fire Chief, Lieutenant Stranger, San Diego County Sheriff's Office - Lemon Grove Substation, Roberto Hidalgo, Human Resources Manager, and Mike Viglione, Assistant Planner, and Arturo Ortuño, Assistant Planner.

Pledge of Allegiance:

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was led by San Diego Girl Scouts.

Presentation:

Mayor Vasquez invited the San Diego Girls Scouts to the Podium to receive a Proclamation Recognizing the Girl Scouts – 2020 Cookie Kick-Off and Declaration that “Lemon-Ups” are the Official Girl Scout Cookie for the City of Lemon Grove for 2020.

Public Comments:

Appeared to comment were: Teresa Rosiak-Proffit, Kayoko Swayne, John L. Wood, Joseph Sorensen, Tanya Harris, Chris Williams, Arthur Cranor, and Liana LeBaron.

City Council Oral Comments & Reports on Meetings Attended At City Expense: (G.C. 53232.3(d))

Councilmember Jones attended the following meetings and events:

- East County Economic Development Council (ECEDC) Meeting along with Councilmember Altamirano
- East County Chamber of Commerce Meeting along with Councilmember Altamirano

Councilmember Altamirano attended the following meetings and events:

- East County Economic Development Council (ECEDC) Meeting along with Councilmember Jones
- East County Chamber of Commerce Meeting along with Councilmember Jones
- Heal Zone Resident Academy Graduation
- East County Chamber of Commerce Breakfast
- Helix Water District Board Meeting

Mayor Pro Tem Mendoza attended the following meetings and events:

- Christmas on Promenade
- Lemon Grove Clergy Meeting
- SANDAG Board Meeting as Alternate with Mayor Vasquez
- League of California Cities Monthly Meeting
- SANDAG Transportation and Planning Committee Meeting with Mayor Vasquez

Would like to see an item regarding bathrooms at Promenade Park added to a future agenda.

Mayor Vasquez attended the following meetings and events:

- SANDAG Board Meeting with Mayor Pro Tem Mendoza
- SANDAG Transportation and Planning Committee Meeting with Mayor Pro Tem Mendoza
- San Diego Youth Nutcracker Ballet
- SANDAG Director's Policy and Business Meeting
- Martin Luther King Event on the USS Midway
- 35th Annual Martin Luther King Breakfast hosted by Jackie Robinson YMCA
- Grand Marshall 40th Annual Martin Luther King Parade
- Attended UAMS 25th Annual Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Breakfast including the All People's Celebration

Consent Calendar:

- A. Waive Full Text Reading of All Ordinances on the Agenda.
- B. Ratification of Payment of Demands
- C. City Council Meeting Minutes for Regular Meeting of December 17, 2019.
- D. Adopted Resolution No. 2020-3700, Approving the Application for Grant Funds for the Green Infrastructure Grant Program.
Appeared to comment was: John L. Wood (Item D)

Action: Motion by Councilmember Jones, seconded by Councilmember Altamirano, to approve Consent Calendar Items A-D

The motion passed by the following vote:

Ayes: Vasquez, Mendoza, Altamirano, Arambula, Jones

Noes: None.

Absent: None.

Public Hearings:

2. Public Hearing to Consider a Conditional Use Permit Application CUP-190-0002, A Request to Establish a Medical Marijuana Dispensary at 3515-3521 Harris Street in Special Treatment Area III, Regional Commercial.

Mayor Vasquez introduced the Attorney for the Applicant Gina Austin. Kristen Steinke, City Attorney spoke to that point and introduced Ms. Austin. The Applicant is requesting for a continuance for a date certain of February 18, 2020 which follows the court injunction.

City Attorney Steinke stated that the City Council can grant the continuance pursuant to the request and it can grant the continuance with the direction that no new sensitive uses would prejudice the applicant from moving forward in the future dependent upon the courts determination on the pending litigation that has been brought by Citrus Street Partners. A Temporary Restraining Order was granted on January 16, 2020, which precludes the City Council from making a final determination on the application that is before you tonight as well as restricting any final building permits or certificates of occupancy being issued to the Citrus Street Daycare that was referenced by Ms. Austin.

Action: It was moved by Councilmember Jones, and seconded by Councilmember Arambula to continue the public hearing to a date certain of February 18, 2020, that no new sensitive uses would prejudice the applicant from moving forward. Speaker slips submitted will be continued to the meeting as well.

The motion passed by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Vasquez, Mendoza, Altamirano, Arambula, Jones

Noes: None

Absent: None.

3. Public Hearing to Consider a Planned Development Permit No. PDP-170-0003 and Tentative Map TMO-000-0064; A Request to Construct Six (6) Townhome Units at 8200 Hilltop Drive in the Residential Medium High (RMH) Zone.

Mayor Vasquez introduced Noah Alvey, Community Development Manager and Arturo Ortuno, Assistant Planner, who provided the report and a PowerPoint Presentation.

Mayor Vasquez opened the Public Hearing at 7:21 p.m.

Appearing to Comment were: John L. Wood and Tricia Barnes

Action: The public hearing was closed at 7:42 p.m. on a motion by Councilmember Jones, and second by Councilmember Arambula.

The motion passed by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Vasquez, Mendoza, Altamirano, Arambula, Jones

Noes: None

Absent: None.

Action: It was moved by Councilmember Jones, and seconded by Councilmember Arambula to adopt Resolution No. 2020-3701, A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Lemon Grove, California, Approving of Tentative Map (Condominium) TM0-000-0064; Authorizing the Subdivision of an existing undeveloped 0.25-Acre Parcel into Six (6) Townhome Units at 8200 Hilltop Drive;" and adopt Resolution No. 2020-3702, entitled, "A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Lemon Grove, California, Approving Planned Development Permit No. PDP-170-0003; Authorizing the Construction of Six (6) Townhome Units at 8200 Hilltop Drive."

The motion passed by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Vasquez, Mendoza, Altamirano, Arambula, Jones

Noes: None

Absent: None.

Closed Session:

1. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION
Government Code Section 54956.9b
Number of potential cases: 3

City Attorney Kristen Steinke announced the City Council will be adjourning to closed session at 7:43 p.m. for the purposes above.

City Attorney Steinke reported no reportable action on items discussed in Closed Session.

Adjournment:

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m. to a meeting to be held Tuesday, February 4, 2020, in the Lemon Grove Community Center located at 3146 School Lane, for a Regular Meeting.

Shelley Chapel, MMC
City Clerk



CITY OF LEMON GROVE

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

Item No. 1.D

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020

Submitted to: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

Department: City Manager's Office

Staff Contact: Christian Olivas, Management Analyst

colivas@lemongrove.ca.gov

Item Title: Resolution Authorizing the Submittal of a CalRecycle Local Government Waste Tire Enforcement Grant Application in Partnership with the City of San Diego-Solid Waste Local Enforcement Agency and Authorizing the City of San Diego to Act on Behalf of the City of Lemon Grove to Execute All Necessary Grant Documents

Recommended Action: Adopt a resolution authorizing the submittal of a California Department of Resource Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) Local Government Waste Tire Enforcement (TEA) Grant application in partnership with the City of San Diego-Solid Waste Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) and authorizing the City of San Diego to act on behalf of the City of Lemon Grove to execute all necessary grant documents for the purpose of securing funds and to implement the specified grant activities.

Summary:

Waste Tire Statutes and Regulations authorize CalRecycle to regulate generators, transporters, and end-use facilities of waste and used tires. To this end, CalRecycle administers the TEA Grant that provides funding to city, county, and county agencies in California that apply individually or in collaboration for waste tire enforcement activities.

In 1999, the LEA entered into a partnership with CalRecycle to enforce existing waste tire regulations in the City of San Diego. Since 2007, the LEA has been designated as a Lead Collaborating Jurisdiction (LCJ) and has managed the TEA Grant in collaboration with various cities; including Chula Vista, Imperial Beach, and El Cajon. Recently, the LEA contacted the City of Lemon Grove to determine the City's interest in joining this partnership in the upcoming CalRecycle Grant opportunity.

The purpose of this agenda item is to determine the City's potential participation in the TEA Grant application with the City of San Diego's LEA for up to a five (5) year period for Fiscal Years 2019-2020 through 2023-2024. The following sections provide background information regarding waste tire regulations and the role of CalRecycle in waste tire enforcement, a discussion of the LEA in implementing the TEA Grant Program, and staff's

recommendation to adopt a resolution authorizing the submittal of the grant application through this partnership.

Background:

In 1990, the California Legislature enacted comprehensive requirements for the storage and disposal of used and waste tires. A waste tire is a tire that is no longer mounted on a vehicle and is no longer suitable for use as a vehicle tire due to wear, damage, or deviation from the manufacturer’s original specifications; this includes tires that will be retreaded or repaired. These requirements were intended to address potential fire and health risks posed by the growing number of tire piles in the State. They also enhance efforts to reduce, recycle and reuse solid waste generated in the State, thereby preserving landfill capacity, protecting public health and safety, and the environment.

Waste Tire Statutes and Regulations authorize CalRecycle to regulate generators, transporters, and end-use facilities of waste and used tires, including the storage and disposal of such tires. To meet this end, the California Tire Recycling Act of 1989 (AB 1843) authorized the creation of the California Tire Recycling Management Fund that provides funding opportunities to the TEA Grant that is administered by CalRecycle. A fee is assessed on the sale of each new tire purchased in California and is deposited quarterly into a special fund for waste tire grant programs. The TEA Grant provides funding to city, county, and county agencies in California that apply individually or in collaboration for waste tire enforcement activities.

Beginning in 1999, the LEA entered into a partnership with CalRecycle to enforce existing waste tire regulations in the City of San Diego. Since 2007, the LEA has been designated as the Lead Collaborating Jurisdiction (LCJ) and began implementing and managing the TEA Grant with the Cities of Chula Vista and Imperial Beach in 2007, the City of El Cajon in 2010, and the City of La Mesa has agreed to participate in the upcoming grant cycle, expanding their involvement in waste tire enforcement. Earlier this year, the LEA contacted the City of Lemon Grove to offer the opportunity to participate in this upcoming Fiscal Year’s (FY) 2019-2020 CalRecycle Grant.

Discussion:

There are currently 21 active waste tire generator sites in the City of Lemon Grove that would be subject to waste tire enforcement. However, due to limited CalRecycle staff, only the most egregious violations in Lemon Grove are able to be addressed by the state.

This TEA Grant Program would provide funding to the LEA for waste tire enforcement activities. No matching funds are required by the City of Lemon Grove to participate in the program. There are no fees required from these businesses since all activities are reimbursed through the grant.

As a collaborating jurisdiction, LEA staff would perform the following activities in accordance with State regulations:

- Provide education to waste tire facilities regarding their responsibilities and the dangers of improperly stored waste tires;

- Conduct inspections of waste tire facilities, and survey tire dealers, auto dismantlers, tire haulers, fleet service facilities and other points of waste tire generation to ensure compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, including the manifest system; and
- Perform patrolling, enforcement, and case development for waste-related activities, including illegal tire disposal activities.

Businesses identified as waste tire generators will be subject to periodic routine inspections every one (1) to three (3) years depending on their level of compliance. If necessary, LEA staff will investigate illegal tire disposal activities and when applicable, they will issue a Notice Violation on behalf of the State through CalRecycle’s Waste Tire Management System (WTMS). CalRecycle will take the necessary enforcement action against non-compliant operators such as Clean-up and Abatement Orders (CAOs), penalties, and/or fines at their discretion.

Grant awards will be announced and agreements distributed in early 2020. The attached resolution would authorize the LEA to represent the City in future grant cycles for up to five (5) years, and the City would have the ability to opt-out of the additional cycles with a new resolution.

Environmental Review:

- Not subject to review
 Negative Declaration
 Categorical Exemption, Section | | Mitigated Negative Declaration

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact associated with this action.

Public Notification: None.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the City Council adopt a resolution authorizing the submittal of a CalRecycle Local Government Waste Tire Enforcement Grant (TEA) Application in partnership with the City of San Diego-Solid Waste Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) and authorizing the City of San Diego to act on behalf of the City of Lemon Grove to execute all necessary grant documents for the purpose of securing funds and to implement the specified grant activities.

Attachments:

Attachment A – Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 2020-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LEMON GROVE, CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE SUBMITTAL OF THE CALRECYCLE LOCAL GOVERNMENT WASTE TIRE ENFORCEMENT GRANT APPLICATION IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO - SOLID WASTE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO TO ACT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF LEMON GROVE TO EXECUTE ALL APPLICATIONS, CONTRACTS, PAYMENT REQUESTS, AGREEMENTS AND AMENDMENTS FOR THE PURPOSES OF SECURING GRANT FUNDS AND TO IMPLEMENT AND CARRY OUT THE WORK SPECIFIED IN THE GRANTS THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2023-2024

WHEREAS, Public Resources Code sections 40000 et seq. authorized the California Department of Resource Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) to administer various grant programs in furtherance of the efforts of the State of California (the “State”) to reduce, recycle and reuse solid waste generated in the State, thereby preserving landfill capacity and protecting public health and safety and the environment; and

WHEREAS, in furtherance of this authority CalRecycle is required to establish procedures governing the application, awarding, and management of the grants; and

WHEREAS, grant application procedures requires an applicant’s governing body to authorize by resolution its approval for submittal of the grant application identified above, and to further authorize the execution of all grant documents; and

WHEREAS, funds are allocated and available from CalRecycle for grants to solid waste Local Enforcement Agencies (“LEAs”) to perform enforcement, compliance, and surveillance activities at waste tire facilities; and

WHEREAS, the City of San Diego-Solic Waste Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) has agreed to act as lead jurisdiction on behalf of the cities of Chula Vista, Imperial Beach, El Cajon, La Mesa, and Lemon Grove.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Lemon Grove, California, hereby approves the submittal of the Waste Tire Enforcement Grant Application in partnership with the City of San Diego-Local Enforcement Agency.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, upon approval in form and substance by the City Manager or the City Manager’s designee, the City of San Diego is hereby authorized and empowered to execute on the behalf of the City of Lemon Grove all waste tire enforcement grant documents, including, but not limited to, applications, agreements, amendments, and requests for payment, necessary to secure waste tire grant funds and implement the approved grant project.

PASSED AND ADOPTED on _____, 2020, the City Council of the City of Lemon Grove, California, adopted Resolution No. _____, passed by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Racquel Vasquez, Mayor

Attest:

Shelley Chapel, MMC, City Clerk

Approved as to Form:

Kristen Steinke, City Attorney



CITY OF LEMON GROVE

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

Item No. 1.E

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020

Submitted to: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

Department: Public Works Department

Staff Contact: Mike James, Assistant City Manager / Public Works Director

mjames@lemongrove.ca.gov

Item Title: **Rejection of Claim**

Recommended Action: That the City Council rejects a claim submitted by Edward Dominick. .

Summary: On December 4, 2019, the City of Lemon Grove received a claim from Edward Dominick. After reviewing the claim, staff recommends that the City Council rejects the claim.

Environmental Review:

Not subject to review

Negative Declaration

Categorical Exemption, Section |

Mitigated Negative Declaration

Fiscal Impact: None.

Public Notification: None.

Staff Recommendation: That the City Council rejects a claim submitted by Edward Dominick.

Attachments: None.



CITY OF LEMON GROVE

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

Item No. 1.F

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020

Submitted to: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

Department: Public Works Department

Staff Contact: Mike James, Assistant City Manager / Public Works Director

mjames@lemongrove.ca.gov

Item Title: **Rejection of Claim**

Recommended Action: That the City Council rejects a claim submitted by Diane Ravelle.

Summary: On January 6, 2020, the City of Lemon Grove received a claim from Diane Ravelle. That claim was returned as insufficient. On January 13, 2020 an amended claim was received. After reviewing the amended claim, staff recommends that the City Council rejects it.

Environmental Review:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not subject to review | <input type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exemption, Section | <input type="checkbox"/> Mitigated Negative Declaration |

Fiscal Impact: None.

Public Notification: None.

Staff Recommendation: That the City Council rejects a claim submitted by Diane Ravelle.

Attachments: None.



CITY OF LEMON GROVE

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

Item No. 1.G

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020

Submitted to: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

Department: Public Works Department

Staff Contact: Mike James, Assistant City Manager / Public Works Director

mjames@lemongrove.ca.gov

Item Title: Rejection of Claim

Recommended Action: That the City Council rejects a claim submitted by Edward Wong.

Summary: On January 13, 2020, the City of Lemon Grove received a claim from Edward Wong. After reviewing the claim, staff recommends that the City Council rejects the claim

Environmental Review:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not subject to review | <input type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exemption, Section | <input type="checkbox"/> Mitigated Negative Declaration |

Fiscal Impact: None.

Public Notification: None.

Staff Recommendation: That the City Council rejects a claim submitted by Edward Wong.

Attachments: None.



CITY OF LEMON GROVE

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

Item No. 2

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020

Submitted to: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

Department: Public Works

Staff Contact: Mike James, Assistant City Manager / Public Works Director

mjames@lemongrove.ca.gov

Item Title: **Rename Civic Center Park to Treganza Heritage Park**

Recommended Action: Adopt a resolution approving the renaming of Civic Center Park to Treganza Heritage Park.

Summary: In 2019, city staff received a proposal from the Lemon Grove Historical Society to change the name of Civic Center Park to Treganza Heritage Park. The Lemon Grove Historical Society seeks to honor a pioneer family of Lemon Grove that has been affiliated with agricultural growth, the rise of the citrus industry, as well as four generations of Treganza's leading the advancement in arts/culture, science, medicine, education, business, international relations and local/national service organizations beginning in the late 19th century and continuing to the 21st century. Most recently, on December 17, 2019, the City Council received public comment asking for action to be taken to rename Civic Center Park. At that meeting, the City Council directed staff to prepare a report for the City Council to consider. After reviewing the proposal, staff is recommending that the name of Civic Center Park is changed to Treganza Heritage Park.

Discussion: In 2019, the Lemon Grove Historical Society (Historical Society) submitted a proposal (**Attachment B**) requesting that the City Council change the name of Civic Center Park to Treganza Heritage Park.

Civic Center Park is approximately 1.76-acres in size and is located at 3200 Olive Street, Lemon Grove (**Attachment C**). Originally designed in 2002, the existing amenities include open green space, water fountain, walking paths with lemon groves, rose garden, location of the annual Lemon Grove Bonfire, and the two Lemon Grove historic buildings the H. Lee House and the Parsonage Museum. Additionally, the Lemon Grove Community Garden is located just south of the park across the parking lot.

While the proposal provides a significant amount of detail, staff wanted to highlight a few key points from the proposal that support the request to rename the park to Treganza Heritage Park.

1. The Treganza family is recognized as a founding, pioneer family of Lemon Grove.
2. The family is affiliated with agricultural growth, the rise of the citrus industry, as well as four generations of Treganza's leading the advancement in arts/culture, science, medicine, education, business, international relations and local/national service organizations beginning in the late 19th century and continuing to the 21st century.
3. The family ancestors hailed from Spain, Cornwall in Great Britain, Mexico, and the United States which created a diverse heritage that is found in the modern day population of Lemon Grove.

After reviewing the proposal, staff recommends that the City Council approve the request to rename Civic Center Park to Treganza Heritage Park.

Lastly, this discussion brings to light the process in which the City Council hears requests to name a city facility. In the past decade, this report is only the third time that a city asset was named and/or renamed. The first naming of a City facility was Firefighters Skatepark and the second was the renaming of the rental hall at the Senior Center to Lemon Blossom Hall. While there are only three events during the past decade this highlights an area when a formal facility naming policy may be beneficial. If the City Council believes that other requests may be received by the public, staff can include this discussion with the City Council Goals Setting agenda later this calendar year.

Environmental Review:

- Not subject to review Negative Declaration
 Categorical Exemption, Section | Mitigated Negative Declaration

Fiscal Impact: Financial support to amend the existing signage may not be required. The cost for City staff to install new signs may be necessary. This support is similar to past activities that the City has provided while partnering with the Lemon Grove Historical Society.

Public Notification: None.

Staff Recommendation: That the City Council adopts a resolution approving the renaming of Civic Center Park to Treganza Heritage Park.

Attachments:

Attachment A – Resolution

Attachment B – Proposal Submitted by the Lemon Grove Historical Society

Attachment C – Park Location Map

RESOLUTION NO. 2020 -

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LEMON GROVE,
CALIFORNIA, CHANGING THE NAME OF CIVIC CENTER PARK TO
TREGANZA HERITAGE PARK**

WHEREAS, Civic Center Park is a 1.76-acre park located at 3200 Olive Street;
and

WHEREAS, on December 17, 2019, the City Council heard public comment that
asked for the consideration of changing the name of Civic Center Park to Treganza
Heritage Park; and

WHEREAS, the Treganza family significantly contributed to the community by
advancing the arts/culture, science, medicine, education, business, international
relations and local/national service organizations beginning in the late 19th century and
continuing to the 21st century; and

WHEREAS, the renaming of Civic Center Park is consistent with the direction
and goals of the City Council is the in the public's interest to perform; and

WHEREAS, no public funds will be used to facilitate the changing of the signage
at the park; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of
Lemon Grove, California, hereby:

1. Changes the name of Civic Center Park to Treganza Heritage Park; and
2. Directs the City Manager or her designee to manage the naming changing process
on all signage and physical reference in the City's records.

PASSED AND ADOPTED on _____, 2020, the City Council of the City of Lemon Grove, California, adopted Resolution No. _____, passed by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Racquel Vasquez, Mayor

Attest:

Shelley Chapel, MMC, City Clerk

Approved as to Form:

Kristen Steinke, City Attorney

**2020 Heritage Project for the City of Lemon Grove
Proposed by the Lemon Grove Historical Society**

Treganza Heritage Park

—an idea whose time has come—

Nature, including public parks and wild areas, was an integral part of the Treganza Family’s esthetic sense, lifelong personal interests and bequests to our community in the form of photographs, paintings, letters and diaries.

Ornithology, conchology and botany were just three of the areas in the natural world that absorbed four generations of Treganzas.

No wonder they loved “The Best Climate on Earth”!

There is no stimulus to my life’s work like study and communion with nature.

—Alberto Owen Treganza, 1914

The beauty of the bird, its wild, wanton call, its feathered splendor, thrills the heart!

—Antwonet Kaufman Treganza, 1928

Save it as we would save the Redwoods! Don’t let the Atherton Chapel perish!

—Amorita Treganza, 1987

Let us go forth and rename the park our City built in 2002, which holds two of its most notable historic sites, both known to and loved by the Treganzas.

The Lemon Grove Historical Society Heritage Project 2020

Purpose of Project:

Change the name of Civic Center Park, 3200 Olive Street, Lemon Grove, CA 91945 to TREGANZA HERITAGE PARK.

Methodology:

Creation of two, double-sided signs, one for the Olive Street entrance, the other for the Main Street entrance to the park. Existing signage near the Main Street entrance would remain as part of park history. The signs would be designed by the same North Avenue company, which has designed the city's signage for years (and designed the signage we commissioned and bought, with City approval, for the Parsonage Museum and H. Lee House). The company would develop the design for presentation to staff and council for approval. We and the company would walk the area with city staff to determine precise placement.

Justification:

We seek to honor a founding, pioneer family of Lemon Grove that fostered agricultural growth, the rise of the citrus industry, which put Lemon Grove "on the map" as a source of award-winning lemons. The talented Treganzas also led the growth of culture, science, medicine, education, business, international relations and local and national service organizations starting in the late 19th century and continuing through the 20th and early 21st centuries. Four generations of Treganzas have left their imprint on our city, county, California and the nation.

What is a Pioneer?

A person or group that explores new places, tries out new things, thinks differently and constructively, is unfazed by hardship or defeat, and evinces patience, imagination, curiosity and a can-do spirit can be termed a pioneer. American history is full of such trailblazers, those who went before us and made our presence and lives possible in the aftermath of their achievements. We know the names of those who became famous during national trailblazing. *But it falls to local historical societies like ours to preserve and share local pioneer stories of those who made possible places like Lemon Grove.*

Treganza Family Background:

The family ancestors hailed from Spain, Cornwall in Great Britain, Mexico and the USA. The Spanish Treganza name dates to the 16th century when Spanish sailors settled in Cornwall in the wake of the defeat of the Spanish Armada. The Treganzas' Chippewa background in the U. S. resulted from intermarriage by Almira Owen, a mixed-race Anglo-Indian born in the 1830s in the Wisconsin Territory; she became the mother of Josefina Treganza (see below). Mexican heritage stems from the first husband of Dr. Amorita Treganza, father of her son. This diverse heritage can be found in the modern day population of Lemon Grove, making the naming of a public park for the Treganzas all the more appropriate.

Treganza Family Achievements:

Don Eduardo (1844-1930) and his wife Doña Josefina Treganza (1854-1948) crossed the plains by wagon from Utah to San Diego County in 1889. They brought with them their son, Alberto, then 13, and a life-long interest in painting, poetry, ornithology, horticulture and sea life, all of which was reflected in their descendants' careers and avocations. Don Eduardo was a fine artist and horticulturist, while Doña Josefina was a poet and amateur conchologist with world-wide connections. At first they lived in rented quarters in San Diego before buying one of six lots on Kempf Street for \$5 in 1906 from Edward Kempf (1842-1930), a local rancher and land developer. Eduardo taught grafting and budding techniques to newly arrived growers like Troxell, Waite, Lester and others. In 1919, he aided Howard Hunter, a neophyte grower in establishing Hunter's Nursery. By then, Lemon Grove was known as "a sea of lemon trees" and "the Pasadena of San Diego County."

Almarine Treganza

Brother of Eduardo and founder/operator of Lemon Grove's first blacksmith shop, then located behind the 1891 general store (today the bakery building at 3008 Main Street).

Alberto Owen Treganza (1876-1944), son of Eduardo and Josefina, became a noted architect, amateur ornithologist (he discovered Utah's Treganza Blue Heron, named for him; *Ardea herodias treganzai*), painter, furniture maker and inventor. By 1911, when he completed his parents' Arts & Crafts style home, extant in fine condition at 3251 Kempf Street, his architectural career was in full swing. His beautiful Spanish style homes survive in Lemon Grove, Bonita, Rancho Santa Fe, La Jolla and San Diego, and have sold for millions of dollars. In 1928 he designed The Big Lemon for our city. In 1935, with the Quayle Brothers, he co-designed the original San Diego Police Head-quarters, now a federal historic site by Old Town. He was commissioned to rescue and redesign the Spanish Village, Balboa Park, as an artists' haven for the famous 1935-36 exposition.

Antwonet Kaufman Treganza (1854-1948) second wife of Alberto, was raised in a St. Louis orphanage and became a poet, first woman to head the Lemon Grove Chamber of Commerce, first woman postmistress in Lemon Grove, amateur ornithologist, a weekly columnist in the *Lemon Grove Empire* and *San Diego Union* ("Walks and Talks With Mother Nature"), and a force in county flower and gardening societies.

Dr. Amorita Treganza (1912-2002) daughter of Alberto and Antwonet, performed with Craig Noel at the Old Globe Theatre in its forerunner, the San Diego Players. An honor graduate of Grossmont High School and SDSU, she became a pioneering children's eye doctor. Her offices on Broadway, Lemon Grove, and downtown San Diego opened in 1944. The former was the first in Lemon Grove and is managed today by two doctors she trained. She was the first woman to found and head a national medical association, The College of Optometry in Vision Development. She made many flights into Baja California with the Flying Samaritans to perform eye operations for impoverished residents. She was the first Miss Lemon Grove in 1928, San Diego's Woman of the Year in 1964, winner of many professional awards, charter member and former president of the

Lemon Grove Historical Society, and founder of its third and eighth grade essay competitions in 1990. She was instrumental in saving local history.

Dr. Adan Treganza, Ph.D. (1916-1968), brother of Dr. Amorita, attended Lemon Grove schools and became a noted anthropologist, explorer, artist and metal worker. He made numerous discoveries in Baja California and the Southwestern U. S., most of them now in museum collections, and wrote many articles about his and others' research. He founded the Anthropology Department at San Francisco State University, where the museum is named for him.

Robert Turnbull III, first husband of Dr. Amorita in 1933, was an artist, cameraman and Foley inventor (motion picture sound effects) for Warner Brothers. His Foley textbook is used in film schools today. He was the first to photograph Sandrino, the Nicaraguan re-revolutionary during that nation's civil war. The couple graduated from San Diego State College and established The Lemon Grove Players in 1934- 36. His parents were a French mother, Jessie Burnett, a vaudeville and silent film actress, and Mexican American Roberto Obregón Turnbull II.

Roberto Obregon Turnbull II was the first cameraman hired by Warner Brothers. He was personal photographer to Mexican revolutionary leaders and a friend of muralist Diego Rivera. He taught his son (above) to shoot sync sound on location in Mexico and forge a career in film. He was related to Álvaro Obregón, Mexican President 1920-24.

Carmen de Felix Obregón Turnbull was married to Roberto Turnbull II (above) and was the mother of Robert Turnbull III. She often stayed with Amorita and Robert Turnbull, referring to the former as "mi querida Amorita de quien la ama." Her life exemplified the close ties between the U. S. and Mexico.

Robert "Bob " Turnbull (1936-), only child of Dr. Amorita and Robert Turnbull III, was an award-winning actor at the Old Globe Theatre. He was a columnist for the *Lemon Grove Review* while a student at Helix High School. With schoolmate Dennis Hopper, he went to Hollywood and developed a career in films and television (*Tora! Tora! Tora!*, *Hawaii Five-O*, others). In Hawaii he became "The Preacher of Waikiki" and established a national ministry with his wife Yvonne, known today as Turnbull Ministries, La Quinta.

Conclusion:

This project is fully underwritten by local residents, Treganza descendants in various parts of the U. S., and the Lemon Grove Historical Society. We believe that meaningful civic projects, e.g., saving historic buildings and constructing a community garden, should not rest solely on the shoulders of civic government. This is "citizens' work" and should be the purview of the body politic.

We urge the City Council to vote to make Treganza Heritage Park a reality we can all be proud of, knowing how much our residents will appreciate your recognition of local heritage. Indeed, the present city council will be the first Lemon Grove council to

officially recognize our pioneer forebears in a highly public way.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Roberta Ford Bulling, 2020 interim president and the 2020 Board
Helen M. Ofield, past president and project director

Civic Center Park
3200 Olive Street
1.76-acres





CITY OF LEMON GROVE

CITY COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

Item No. 3

Meeting Date: February 4, 2020

Submitted to: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

Department: Community Development Department

Staff Contact: Noah Alvey, Community Development Manager

Nalvey@lemongrove.ca.gov

Item Title: State of California Senate Bill 50

Recommended Action: Receive and file

Summary: Senate Bill (SB) 50 is by Senator Scott Weiner from the 11th Senate District, which encompasses the northern San Francisco peninsula, including the city-county of San Francisco. SB 50 is titled the “More HOMES Act of 2020: Housing, Opportunity, Mobility, Equity, Stability” and is intended to allow for building housing near key job centers and public transportation.

Discussion: Existing law allows the majority of zoning and land use decisions to occur at the local level with no minimum density standards near state- and federally-funded transit infrastructure. SB 50 will create parameters for cities to adopt plans that increase housing options near high-quality transit and in job-rich areas to ensure that the benefits of public investments in transportation are broadly accessible to Californians of all incomes. SB 50 will also establish a default zoning program for cities who choose not to adopt their own specialized local plan.

Every community in California will be given two years of delayed implementation to determine whether they will submit their own local housing plan, so long as it meets the goals of increasing housing density in a way that reduces driving and affirmatively furthers fair housing. A community may create a new plan, or submit a plan that has been previously adopted by the City in the past, so long as it meets the requirements. These plans will be reviewed and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development, in consultation with the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research.

Although the current version of SB 50 incorporates additional flexibility for the creation of a housing plan, it will likely result in changes to height limitations, housing densities, and parking requirements near transit stations in the City. Since the City produced more housing units than required during the previous General Plan Housing Element (Housing Element) cycle, staff believes that a State mandated zoning solution is not necessary for the City. The Housing Element process requires significant City resources to develop, obtain public input, and receive approval from the State. SB 50 would require cities to use precious time and resources to create a duplicative process that competes with the Housing Element.

SB 50 was considered a 2-year bill, meaning it had to get out of its house of origin by a date certain. On January 30, 2020, SB 50 failed to get off the Senate Floor by an 18-15 vote (7 abstains/not voting and 1 vacancy), falling short of the 21 votes needed to advance. This bill is no longer up for consideration by the Legislature this year. Senator Weiner can introduce a new housing bill in the 2020 legislative cycle. All new legislation must be introduced by February 21, 2020. Staff will continue to monitor state legislation and should a similar measure be introduced we will bring it to the Council's attention.

Environmental Review:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not subject to review | <input type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exemption, Section | <input type="checkbox"/> Mitigated Negative Declaration |

Fiscal Impact: None.

Public Notification: N/A

Staff Recommendation: That the City Council receives and file this report.

Attachments: N/A



Senator Scott Wiener, 11th Senate District

SB 50 – More HOMES Act of 2020:

Housing, Opportunity, Mobility, Equity, Stability

SUMMARY

Senate Bill 50 allows for building housing near key job centers and public transportation, and includes strong protections against displacement for renters and vulnerable communities in those areas.

The bill is expected to help relieve the acute housing shortage and affordability crisis in California communities. It will also reduce climate pollution and improve public health by expanding access to public transportation and by allowing people to live closer to where they work, leading to more time with family and less time commuting.

BACKGROUND/EXISTING LAW

Existing law leaves most zoning and land use decisions to local governments, and includes no minimum density standards near state- and federally-funded transit infrastructure. While state land use standards in the Density Bonus Law and SB 375 establish general guidelines and principles, they do not include adequate provisions for enforcement.

Due to the lack of adequate and enforceable statewide standards, most California cities (with a few noteworthy exceptions) are still operating from outdated and highly restrictive zoning ordinances that make it difficult or impossible to build multi-family dwellings at any density. Duplexes, fourplexes, and other modest infill housing types are routinely banned due to neighborhood objections and underlying single-family zoning, even in places close to key job centers and public transportation.

Solving California’s housing crisis must include greatly expanding access to transit services for workers at all income levels while addressing the well-documented housing shortage. The status quo is jeopardizing several of the State’s high-priority policy objectives:

- **On housing affordability:** [The California Legislative Analyst’s Office](#) has found that the housing shortage in coastal cities is pushing a growing share of Californians into poverty, and forcing a large and growing cohort to spend more than half their income on rent.

- **On climate change:** The [California Air Resources Board has found](#) that the state will miss its climate targets unless Californians reduce the amount they drive by 25 percent by 2030. Absent a surge of new housing development in livable, pedestrian-oriented areas near public transit, such reductions in vehicle miles travelled are impossible.
- **On equitable growth:** [According to the California Department of Housing and Community Development](#), “Today’s population of 39 million is expected to grow to 50 million by 2050. Without intervention, much of the population increase can be expected to occur further from job centers, high-performing schools, and transit, constraining opportunity for future generations.”

PROBLEM

Economic and educational opportunities in California are increasingly concentrated close to key job centers and public transportation, but housing construction has not kept pace with demand for access to these opportunities. Local governments play the lead role in determining the location and amount of housing in their jurisdictions, including which developments will be located near high-quality transit corridors. They also control, via housing supply, reasonable access to schools, parks, libraries and other vital services that improve community well-being. Right now, there is uneven access to these key public goods, making it disproportionately harder for disadvantaged and housing-burdened Californians benefit from them.

The lack of new housing, particularly in California’s highest-opportunity areas, has compounded over the last several decades into a [shortage of 3.5 million homes](#), according to California’s Department of Housing and Community Development.

California’s workers and families feel the results of this shortage in the form of exorbitant rents and the highest home purchase prices in the nation. Excessive competition for limited housing supply is also [driving a statewide epidemic of displacement, evictions, and homelessness](#).

California's failure to keep home building on pace with job growth is directly responsible for longer commutes and increased air pollution. Millions of low- and middle-income Californians have [multi-hour commutes](#), as they seek affordable housing far from areas with concentrated economic and educational opportunities.

Statewide, California's businesses have created 4.5 jobs for every new housing unit; according to the [Building Industry Association](#), the ideal ratio is 1.5 jobs per housing unit.

[According to the Department of Housing and Community Development:](#)

“Land use policies and planning can help encourage greater supply and affordability, as well as influence the type and location of housing. Thoughtful land use policies and planning can translate into the ability for families to access neighborhoods of opportunity, with high-performing schools, greater availability of jobs that afford entry to the middle-class, and convenient access to transit and services. Easy access to jobs and amenities reduces a household's daily commute and other travel demands. Encouraging new homes in already developed areas and areas of opportunity not only alleviates the housing crisis, but also supports the State's climate change and equity goals.”

SOLUTION

Senate Bill 50 expands the benefits of affordable, transit-rich and job-rich housing across the state. The bill will give cities new tools to provide relief to rent-burdened workers and families while reversing the growing, and alarming, trends of homelessness, displacement, and migration out of California.

State Guidelines for More Housing Choices:

The bill creates parameters for cities to adopt plans that increase housing options near high-quality transit and in job-rich areas to ensure that the benefits of public investments in transportation are broadly accessible to Californians of all incomes, and establishes a default zoning program for cities who choose not to adopt their own specialized local plan.

The bill also includes specific requirements to provide low-income housing in new development to ensure that market-rate construction is always coupled with affordable units for the lowest income Californians, and provides that forty percent of the low-income housing units are prioritized for people previously living within a half mile of the development.

If a city chooses not to exercise the option of crafting their own local housing plan, SB 50's default program

will apply, allowing more housing density on sites that are either within 1/2 mile of high-quality public transportation, or within a job-rich, high-opportunity neighborhood close to key job centers. Middle-density housing will be allowed with no parking requirements, provided the site is adjacent to transit, or reduced parking requirements in areas close to jobs and high-quality schools. Height limits for new housing with close, walkable access to rail or connected transit will be loosened to encourage mid-rise, medium-density housing construction. For example, in areas close to rail or transit-connected ferry service, a local government may allow buildings of up to 4-5 stories, depending on the distance from transit, and homeowners throughout California have the option of renovating an existing structure to add up to a three additional units. These projects will not substantially increase the exterior or size of the building, and will have to conform to local neighborhood design standards.

Preservation of Local Control:

Under the legislation, all housing projects will still be subject to environmental review (the California Environmental Quality Act), and must follow existing labor and employment standards for new construction. Development fees, community engagement, and architectural design review for each housing development will remain as-is. Additionally:

- **Local flexibility:** Every community in California will be given two years of delayed implementation to determine whether they will submit their own local housing plan, so long as it meets the goals of increasing housing density in a way that reduces driving and affirmatively furthers fair housing. A community may create a new plan, or submit a plan that has been previously adopted by the city in the past, so long as it meets the requirements. These plans will be reviewed and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development, in consultation with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research. The default bonus program outlined in SB 50 will only apply in cases where a city has not adopted its own plan after two years. (Sensitive communities, or neighborhoods at particular risk of gentrification and displacement, will have a delayed implementation of five years to adopt their own land use policies coupled with additional community stabilization policies.)
- **Anti-demolition:** A local government retains existing authority to ban, prohibit, or restrict demolition of existing housing, consistent with the Housing Accountability Act. At a minimum, a local government may not issue demolition permits for housing currently or recently occupied by renters.

- **Local affordable housing policy:** If a local government requires more affordable housing than what is required in SB 50, that policy will be honored in new developments.
- **Neighborhood height limits:** A local government retains authority to set or maintain local height limits for new housing in areas without easy access to rail transit.
- **Preserving local historic districts:** SB 50 now affirmatively protects historic structures from demolition. It also says a project would be ineligible for the bonus if it is located in a neighborhood that was deemed historic as December 31, 2010, or is listed on the California Register of Historic Places.
- **Sensitivity to smaller communities:** In counties fewer than 600,000 people, there would be no bonus, unless the project is in a town larger than 50,000: height increases would be capped at 15 feet above what local zoning allows here, which means buildings could be built to about 5 stories in most places. SB 50 does NOT exempt any community in California from doing its fair share of producing needed housing. SB 50 now allows the production of small duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes everywhere in California, including small counties.
- **High fire risk areas unaffected:** Areas at very high risk of wildfire would not be eligible for the SB 50 bonus.

Key provisions for renters and sensitive communities:

SB 50 includes the following provisions:

- **Tenant Protections:** Establishes strict tenant protections to ensure long-time residents will not be displaced from their communities, including a prohibition on demolishing buildings currently or recently occupied by renters.
- **Affordable Housing:** Establishes a requirement that every new housing development larger than 20 units must include a significant number of housing units affordable to for low, very low, or extremely low-income households, ensuring affordable housing will be built for people of all income levels. Each project must designate 15-25% of the total units to low-income families, or designate an equivalent amount for very low- or extremely low-income families.

- **Neighborhood Preference for Affordable Housing Units:** Requires that at least forty percent of the affordable housing units in every development be prioritized for residents of the community living within 1/2 mile of the project, in order to ensure that affordable housing has immediate anti-displacement benefits to local community members at risk of housing insecurity.
- **Sensitive Communities:** Allows for a five-year delayed implementation in sensitive communities at risk of gentrification and displacement, and grants five years for a community-led planning process in these neighborhoods.
- **Job-Rich Communities:** Proposes a new “job-rich housing project” designation to ensure that high-opportunity communities with easy access to jobs allow a broader range of multifamily housing choices for people of all income levels, even in the absence of high-quality transit.

STATUS

- Passed Senate Housing Committee (9-1)
- Passed Senate Governance and Finance Committee (6-1)
- Pending final votes in Senate January 2020

CO-AUTHORS

- Sen. Anna Caballero (D-Salinas)
- Sen. Ben Hueso (D-San Diego)
- Sen. Mike McGuire (D-Healdsburg)
- Sen. John Moorlach (R-Costa Mesa)
- Sen. Richard Roth (D-Riverside)
- Sen. Nancy Skinner (D-Berkeley)
- Asm. Kansen Chu (D-San Jose)
- Asm. Tyler Diep (R-Westminster)
- Asm. Vince Fong (R-Bakersfield)
- Asm. Ash Kalra (D-San Jose)
- Asm. Kevin Kiley (R-Rocklin)
- Asm. Evan Low (D-Campbell)
- Asm. Kevin McCarty (D-Sacramento)
- Asm. Sharon Quirk-Silva (D-Fullerton)
- Asm. Robert Rivas (D-Hollister)
- Asm. Phil Ting (D-San Francisco)
- Asm. Buffy Wicks (D-Oakland)

SPONSORS/SUPPORT

- **California YIMBY** (Co-Sponsor)
- **Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California** (Co-Sponsor)

- **California Association of Realtors** (Co-Sponsor)
- 6Beds, Inc.
- Abundant Housing Los Angeles
- American Association of Retired Persons – (AARP)
- Associated Students of San Jose State University
- Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC)
- Associated Students of the University of California, Irvine (ASUCI)
- Bay Area Council
- Bay Area Housing Advocacy Coalition
- Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)
- Black American Political Association of California (BAPAC) – Sacramento Chapter
- Bridge Housing Corporation
- Building Industry Association, Bay Area
- Burbank Housing Development Corporation
- California Apartment Association
- California Asian Pacific Islander Chamber of Commerce
- California Building Industry Association (CBIA)
- California Chamber of Commerce
- California Community Builders
- California Community Economic Development Association
- California Downtown Association
- California Foundation of Independent Living Centers
- California Labor Federation
- California League of Conservation Voters – (*Conditional Support*)
- California Public Interest Research Group (CalPIRG)
- California Renters Legal Advocacy and Education Fund (CaRLA)
- California State Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL-CIO
- California State Controller, Betty Yee
- California State Treasurer, Fiona Ma
- Central City Association of Los Angeles
- Chicano Federation of San Diego County
- Circulate San Diego
- City and County of San Francisco, Mayor London Breed
- City of Alameda, Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft
- City of Anaheim, Councilmember Jordan Brandman
- City of Berkeley, Councilmember Rigel Robinson
- City of Campbell, Former Councilmember Jeffrey R. Cristina
- City of Carson, Mayor Albert Robles
- City of Carson (*Conditional Support*)
- City of Culver City, Councilmember Alex Fisch
- City of Culver City, Mayor Meghan Sahli-Wells
- City of El Cerrito, Councilmember Gabe Quinto
- City of Emeryville Councilmember Dianne Martinez
- City of Emeryville, Councilmember John Bauters
- City of Fairfield, Councilmember Chuck Timm
- City of Foster City, Vice Mayor Herb Perez
- City of Fullerton, Councilmember Ahmad Zahra
- City of La Mesa, Councilmember Colin Parent
- City of Los Gatos, Councilmember Rob Rennie
- City of Milpitas, Former Councilmember Marsha Grilli
- City of Monterey, Councilmember Tyller Williamson
- City of Moreno, Councilmember David Marquez
- City of Oakland, Mayor Libby Schaaf
- City of Palo Alto, Councilmember Adrian Fine
- City of Pinole, Councilmember Vincent Salimi
- City of Rancho Cordova, Councilmember Donald Terry
- City of Richmond, Interim City Manager Steven Falk
- City of Rohnert Park, Councilmember; Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Commissioner and Past Chair, Jake Mackenzie
- City of Sacramento, Mayor Darrell Steinberg
- City of San Jose, Mayor Sam Liccardo
- City of South San Francisco, Former Mayor Pradeep Gupta
- City of Stockton, Mayor Michael Tubbs
- City of Woodland, Councilmember Enrique Fernandez
- Clínica Monseñor
- College Democrats of the University of Southern California
- Council of Infill Builders
- County of Alameda, Supervisor Keith Carson
- County of Humboldt, Supervisor Steve Madrone
- County of Imperial, Supervisor Michael Kelley
- County of San Joaquin, Supervisor Miguel Villapudua
- County of San Mateo, Supervisor David Canepa

- County of San Mateo, Supervisor Don Horsley
- County of Santa Barbara, Supervisor Das Williams
- County of Solano, Supervisor Jim Spering
- Dana Point Chamber of Commerce
- EAH Housing
- East Bay for Everyone
- East Bay Young Democrats
- Emerald Fund
- Environment California
- Facebook
- Fair Housing Advocates of Northern California
- Fieldstead and Company, Inc.
- First Community Housing
- Fossil Free California
- Greater Ontario Business Council
- Grow The Richmond
- Habitat for Humanity – California
- Habitat for Humanity – San Diego
- Haight Ashbury Neighbors for Density
- Hamilton Families
- Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
- Homeless Services Center (Santa Cruz)
- House Sacramento
- Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County
- Initiating Change in Our Neighborhoods (ICON) Community Development Corporation
- Indivisible Sacramento
- Inland Empire Regional Chamber of Commerce
- LandWatch, Monterey County
- League of Women Voters of California
- Livable Sunnyvale
- Local Government Commission
- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) San Diego
- Los Angeles Business Council
- Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce
- Mission YIMBY
- Murrieta Chamber of Commerce
- National Association of Hispanic Real Estate Professionals (NAHREP)
- Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)
- New Way Homes
- NextGen Marin
- North Bay Leadership Council
- North Orange County Chamber of Commerce
- Northern California Conference of Carpenters
- Northern Neighbors
- Oakland Chamber of Commerce
- Orange County Business Council (OCBC)
- Orange County Poverty Alleviation Coalition
- Oxnard Chamber of Commerce
- Pacoima Beautiful
- Pacoima Community Housing Corporation
- Peace Builders of Orange County
- Peninsula Young Democrats
- People for Housing - Orange County
- Progress Noe Valley
- Related California
- San Diego Chamber of Commerce
- San Francisco Foundation
- San Francisco Housing Action Coalition
- San Francisco Planning and Urban Research (SPUR)
- San Mateo Building Trades Council
- San Mateo Labor Council
- Santa Cruz County Business Council
- Santa Cruz County Chamber of Commerce
- Santa Cruz Yimby
- Santa Maria Valley Chamber of Commerce
- Save the Bay
- Silicon Valley @ Home
- Silicon Valley Community Foundation
- Silicon Valley Leadership Group
- Silicon Valley Organization
- Silicon Valley Young Democrats
- South Bay Jewish Federation
- South Bay Yimby
- Southern Alameda County Young Democrats
- State Council on Developmental Disabilities
- Stripe
- TechNet
- The Two Hundred
- TMG Partners
- University Council – American Federation of Teachers (UC-AFT)
- Up For Growth, California
- Valley Industry Commerce Association (VICA)
- YIMBY Action
- Yimby Democrats of San Diego

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Annie Fryman, *Legislative Aide*
 Email: ann.fryman@sen.ca.gov
 Phone: (916) 651-4011



January 14, 2020

2019-20 OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Honorable Scott Wiener
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 5100
Sacramento, CA 95814

PRESIDENT
JUAN GARZA
BELLFLOWER

VICE PRESIDENT
BLANCA PACHECO
DOWNEY

SECRETARY/TREASURER
JAMES BOZAJIAN
CALABASAS

STATE LEAGUE DIRECTOR
ANA MARIA QUINTANA
BELL

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT
MIGUEL CANALES
ARTESIA

REGIONAL DIRECTORS

ARROYO VERDUGO JPA
DIANA MAHMUD
SOUTH PASADENA

GATEWAY CITIES COG
STEVE CROFT
LAKEWOOD

LAS VIRGENES-MALIBU COG
KAREN FARRER
MALIBU

SAN FERNANDO VALLEY COG
EMILY GABEL-LUDDY
BURBANK

SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG
MARGARET CLARK
ROSEMead

SOUTH BAY CITIES COG
BEA DIERINGER
ROLLING HILLS

WESTSIDE CITIES COG
SUE HIMMELRICH
SANTA MONICA

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
JOHN WICKHAM
LOS ANGELES

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
JENNIFER QUAN

RE: **SB 50 (Wiener) Planning and zoning: housing development: streamlined approval: incentives.**
Oppose Unless Amended (as amended 1/6/20) as recommended

Dear Senator Wiener,

I write to you today in response to your January 6, 2020 amendments to SB 50. In line with you and other legislative leaders, the Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities® (Division), representing 86 cities in the county, recognizes the urgent and unprecedented housing crisis that our state is facing and we commend you and other legislative leaders for your efforts to develop concepts to tackle this challenge. In this spirit, the Division has proactively made continued efforts to engage with you, beginning with our July 12, 2019 driving tour through Southeast Los Angeles County, to initiate consistent personal messages and most recently to produce our December 15, 2019 letter and white paper outlining our concerns with your bill. We offered viable and proactive solutions that could increase housing, provide affordability and sustain community services, in order to meet our state's collective housing needs sooner rather than later.

Our Division Board was intentional and proactive in creating the SB 50 Working Group that developed our alternative proposal. Our group was comprised of mayors and council members with diverse backgrounds, political perspectives, professional disciplines, and represented different regions with varying populations in Los Angeles County. We invested an incredible amount of time and resources to demonstrate our genuine goal and sincerity to be a partner with you and provide viable solutions to the state's housing crisis. Additionally, I took personal efforts to reach out to you with our proposal prior to distributing the letter to our Los Angeles Delegation and other stakeholders. This is why we are very disappointed that despite our efforts to create an open dialogue, our proposal, from the largest Division and group of cities in our state, was unanswered and not reflected in the amended version of your bill.

We are left with no alternative but to continue to oppose SB 50 unless amended not only on its lack of sound planning and real affordability measures, but because our good-faith efforts to work with you have not been reciprocated.

Our alternative proposal to SB 50 is updated below. We have also attached our white paper that includes an expanded discussion based on the proposed amendments.

Recommended Locally-Led Alternatives to Addressing the Housing Crisis

- **Create entitlement certainty for multi-family housing.** The "local flexibility plan" developed under the amended version of SB 50 is duplicative of existing

planning processes, and establishes hypothetical development baselines that depend on a city speculating developer interest in equitable community incentives.

Alternative: A mandatory local entitlement process (entitlement incentives) for multi-family housing developments, in areas selected by local governments (transit corridors, commercial corridors, downtown districts, and other locally defined areas) could give certainty to the development community while preserving local control and protecting community engagement. A process similar to SB 540 (Roth, 2017), which created a voluntary entitlement program and was sponsored by the League of California Cities, could be replicated and required.

- **Density must be combined with long-term funding tools.** SB 50 does not provide funding for local governments to sustain exponential long-term density.

Alternative: Incentives should be offered that provide permanent, ongoing funding sources for multi-family and affordable housing projects to ensure their sustainability and success. These can include housing block grants or tax increment programs like SB 795 (Beall/Portantino/McGuire) that provide a long-term financing tool for cities to address increased vital services for infrastructure, park, public safety and other community priorities resulting from the greater demand for such services that occurs with new construction. We recognize the state's effort to provide funding through SB 2 and AB 101/SB 102. However, those funding sources are either one-time uses or insufficient to sustain the state's housing goals.

- **Affordability must be prioritized and sensitive communities must be protected from displacement.** SB 50 gives generous "equitable community incentives" to a developer within a specified radius of a "transit rich or "jobs rich" area. However, the affordability requirement in SB 50 does little to address rising housing costs that affect our communities' most vulnerable residents.

Alternative: Multi-family housing developments must provide a minimum of 25% inclusionary housing, unless a local agency has enacted a higher minimum, to receive any development incentives and entitlement certainty incentives for multifamily developments. The State should also encourage the development of more local Housing Authorities to facilitate construction of affordable housing.

Why SB 50 (as amended 1/6/20) is Not a Practical Solution to the Housing Crisis

Notwithstanding the alternatives to SB 50 recommended above, there continues to be unsustainable flaws to the bill in its current form:

- **The Local Flexibility Plan established under the amended SB 50 is duplicative of existing planning process.** This Plan lacks any real local flexibility and would establish a hypothetical development baseline that depends on a city speculating developer interest in and use of various equitable community incentives. The Division remains concerned that "one size fits all" metrics of SB 50 do not work in real world circumstances that exist in many of our communities. Cities and California's Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) have an established Housing Element process created through state law along with financial penalties for non-compliance. The Housing Element process requires significant city resources to develop, obtain public input, and receive approval from HCD. SB 50 would require cities to use precious time and resources to create a duplicative process that competes with the Housing Element.

Alternative: The Division proposes amending SB 50 to "create entitlement certainty for multi-family housing" in urban areas of California. The mandatory local entitlement process (entitlement incentives) for multi-family housing developments, in areas selected by local governments (transit corridors, commercial corridors, downtown districts, and other locally defined areas) would give entitlement certainty to the development community, while preserving local control and protecting community engagement. A process similar to SB 540 (Roth, 2017), which created a voluntary entitlement program and was sponsored by the League of California Cities, is proposed to be replicated and required in SB 50.

- **Carve outs must have merit.** The proposed carve-outs in SB 50 are arbitrary and will do little to solve the crisis.
Alternative: While the Division believes that the entire state should contribute to solving our unprecedented housing crisis, we believe that carve outs should only be carefully considered for the most dense and sensitive areas of the state, as well as coastal zones and historical districts. Carve outs for coastal zones recognizes the unique landscape in these areas and carve outs for historical districts would prevent the demolition of historic resources and protect the planning and architectural character of neighborhoods with a high number of historic residences and other historically significant buildings.
- **Focus Should be on Multi-Modal Transportation Options.** Definitions of “transit rich” areas in SB 50 are poorly defined, in many cases, based on routes that were established decades ago and in some cases, temporary in nature.
Alternative: Access to transit varies widely throughout the state, including providing limited or no weekend services, which do not fulfill the mobility needs for residents to reach employment or other destinations. Local leaders are in the best position to address transportation options and transit access as part of the multi-family housing development planning process.
- **Jobs Accessibility Areas should be defined by the local agency.** Current definitions of “jobs rich” is loosely defined in SB 50.
Alternative: Replace the ambiguous “jobs rich” definition with the locally defined “jobs accessibility areas”. Local leaders have the most intimate knowledge of their communities to map these areas based on real local data that will take into account local zoning, the safety and appropriate co-location of jobs and housing, and to successfully connect them with effective transportation options and development.
- **Recent State legislation already eliminates Single Family Residential (SFR) neighborhoods.** Four-plexes or other small developments in former SFR zones are unnecessary as new legislation currently allow up to three units of housing in existing SFR neighborhoods. Further, none of these units are required to have an affordability requirement.
Alternative: Remove language related to four-plexes to allow local governments to implement Accessory Dwelling Unit legislation.
- **Commercial/Multi-Family areas need flexible ratios to accommodate different neighborhoods.** SB 50 requires commercial/multi-family ratios that may not be logistically or financially feasible in some communities.
Alternative: Allow a lower residential threshold that may expand the number of commercial developments open to mixed-use residential uses.

Conclusion

The state and our region have faced many housing crises. The causes of the latest crisis are multi-faceted and complex. There is no single solution. Our discussion on solutions cannot happen in a vacuum without tackling various related issues such as CEQA obstacles, potential revisions of the housing element and zoning laws and practices. It will take a long-term effort of engagement, education and consensus building with all stakeholders. It is our hope that our proposal is included in that spirit of open dialogue and cooperation.

Again, we acknowledge your and other state leaders’ bold efforts to tackle our state’s housing crisis. We appreciate efforts to work with all stakeholders to ensure that the goals of any housing solutions are balanced with community essentials like equity, infrastructure, and public safety, among other important values. We continue to be prepared to work with the legislature in January 2020 and beyond to find long-term, viable and sustainable solutions to this crisis, and look forward to discussing our proposals with you in greater detail and context in the near future. Despite the aforementioned lack of response from you, I continue to be hopeful that, through a collaborative and sincere approach in resolving our state’s comprehensive housing needs,

together we can all contribute towards solving this problem and especially help those most vulnerable in our mutual communities.

If you have any questions, please contact Division Staff, Jennifer Quan at jquan@cacities.org or 626-786-5142.

Regards,



Juan Garza
President, Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities
Mayor, City of Bellflower

cc: Office of Governor Gavin Newsom
Los Angeles County Legislative Delegation

Attachment: Goals and Objectives for Amendments to SB 50 as approved by the Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities, November 22, 2019



**Goals and Objectives for Amendments to SB 50
as approved by the Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities
November 22, 2019**

Provide Local Government with the flexibility, tools and resources to meet their housing needs

- ✓ SB 50 should be amended to provide cities with the flexibility, planning tools and resources they need to meet the housing shortage

The Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities supports the concepts in SB 50. However, the State of California is too large and diverse for a “one-size fits all” solution to the housing shortage. Cities know their communities best and require planning flexibility in order to locate multi-family housing in areas that are most conducive to community acceptance and support. In order to be effective, cities will require additional planning tools and financial resources in order to facilitate additional multi-family housing.

There are rural areas in Los Angeles County and the State where SB 50’s requirements will not work. In order to be successful, SB 50 should be amended to encourage maximum flexibility for cities to meet their housing needs. There are many good examples of how this planning flexibility has been organically occurring in a number of Los Angeles County cities, including in Bellflower¹, Carson², Los Angeles³, Pasadena⁴, and Signal Hill⁵.

Create Entitlement Certainty for Multi-Family Housing Developments

- ✓ Assist cities in meeting multi-family housing goals
- ✓ Streamline the entitlement process for the development community
- ✓ Provide a defined public hearing process for addressing community concerns and the need for neighborhood input
- ✓ Respect the CEQA process, but eliminate CEQA challenges at the project level

Discussion

SB 50 should be amended to establish a mandatory local entitlement process for multi-family developments that will substantially reduce the uncertainty for all stakeholders. Developers are reluctant to invest the time and resources when there is a great degree of development uncertainty in the local planning process and at the project level. Local officials are often called to mediate between developers, community stakeholders and apply local, regional and state development policies and regulations in a transparent manner. The current multifamily entitlement process can take years and require multiple steps, including and up to litigation.

¹ <https://archive.bellflower.org/weblink/DocView.aspx?dbid=0&id=158292&page=1&cr=1>

² <https://www.dailybreeze.com/2017/06/19/carson-kicks-off-a-major-planning-overhaul-to-transform-city/>

³ <https://www.lacity.org/highlights/city-planning-releases-measure-iii-and-transit-oriented-communities-housing-progress-report>

⁴ <https://www.pasadenaindependent.com/news/amid-growing-debate-pasadena-finds-itself-at-crossroads-over-housing-development-preservation/>

⁵ <https://www.cityofsignalhill.org/611/Heritage-Square>

Current general plan law requires that local governments identify “sufficient sites” for a range of housing income types through the housing element update process. This general plan requirement eliminated some development uncertainty, by identifying sites. However, a great deal of development uncertainty remains for all stakeholders even with sites being identified. The recommended next step in the process should be a step where communities ensure that new multi-family projects are not only properly located, but that projects are designed and mitigated in an efficient planning process.

Local governments should be required to prepare multi-family area plans consistent with their housing elements. Cities with existing plans that address multi-family development and meet RHENA projections would be substituted for these plans. SB 50 includes a provision to financially assist cities in revising their housing elements. This financial assistance should be extended to local governments as they fund the preparation of the multi-family area plans. The State should also provide funding for the planning staffing and services that each city will require to expedite multi-family projects.

The multi-family area plans could take the form of community level plans, such as transit corridor plans, downtown plans, conversion of obsolete strip commercial zoned areas, properly remediated brownfield and former industrial sites, identification of surplus governmental properties, such as school sites, State facilities and other neighborhood plans. The multi-family area plans would address development standards, infrastructure needs, urban design and planning issues unique to each community, such as historic preservation or parking needs.

The multi-family area plans would provide for public and stakeholder input prior to the approval of the plan. The plans would include appropriate development standards to mitigate concerns over setback, height, parking and other community issues. The plans would include implementation of housing incentives and development bonus programs.

The multi-family area plans would be accompanied by the appropriate Master CEQA document that would identify and mitigate environmental issues. Future multi-family projects, that are consistent with the general plan, the development standards in the multi-family area plan and the master environmental document, would receive expedited development review and would be exempted from further CEQA review. Additional public hearings would be limited to ensuring that the development standards have been implemented to protect surrounding properties.

Improve the Housing Element Certification Process

- ✓ Establish time frames for HCD to complete their review of housing elements
- ✓ Provide financial resources to cities to complete their Housing Elements and the Multi-Family Area Plans

Discussion

SB 50 includes a series of financial penalties should cities fail to receive HCD approval of their housing elements. SB 50 amendments should address HCD’s responsibilities in the housing element review process, which can be a complex and multi-year effort. During this multi-year review time the requirements can change and the individual HCD staff reviewing the element can change. Draft housing elements can be outdated by the time HCD comments are provided back to the city.

The housing element review process would be improved if housing elements were required to meet the requirements of the statutes when they are submitted. SB 50 amendments should include a processing time-line for HCD to submit their comments and for the cities to respond, with an initial review and a recheck by HCD. There should be consequences for HCD failing to meet the review deadlines. One consequence may be the automatic approval of the housing element.

Mitigate the Long-Term Impacts that Multi-Family Developments place on critical Local Services and Infrastructure

- ✓ Provide a new State subvention/ or an adjustment to existing subventions to help cities mitigate the impacts on local services from multi-family developments

Discussion

Property taxes in many communities are insufficient to support basic municipal services. Additional multi-family residential development will place new demands on municipal services that are currently strained in our communities. Providing police or sheriff services, along with fire and paramedic services can be as much as 70% of a city's entire general fund budget. There are rare mixed-use projects that provide a combination of revenues to support their municipal service costs; however, the majority of multi-family housing for moderate and low-income families does not provide sufficient revenues to offset their service demands.

SB 50 should include a new or adjusted State subvention to provide revenues to support local services. Another approach may be to reduce the existing county share of property tax revenues from multi-family projects to fund safety service. This may require amendments to AB 1197 or to AB 8 implementation. It is important that the new funding source for multi-family developments be secured and not subject to State "take-aways" as in the past. The new revenues should be applied to all ADUs. The State should also consider making the new revenues available to serving existing multi-family developments as well.

AB 50 should be amended to address affordable housing needs

- ✓ With Federal housing support being limited, California should establish a housing block grant program to provide consistent revenue to local governments on an annual basis for the construction of affordable housing
- ✓ Require that cities in metropolitan areas adopt a housing authority to address affordable housing issues, for receiving State and federal grants and other funds and for working with developers and non-profit affordable housing providers
- ✓ Regional housing authorities based on JPA's or COG's can be formed to create economies of scale.
- ✓ Staffing for housing authorities should be funded through property tax revenues or a State subvention

Discussion

The planning and construction of affordable housing requires commitments of time and consistency in planning and funding. When the State disbanded redevelopment agencies in 2011, it also dismantled the local organizations and funding that was producing affordable housing projects, including city staffing working on these projects. Effective affordable housing projects can require time consuming land assembly, complex financing mechanisms and city staff with knowledge of the process.

SB 50 should include a housing block grant for local government. SB 50 should be amended to require that local governments in metropolitan areas adopt housing authorities to address affordable housing issues unique to their communities. These authorities would be empowered to receive State and Federal grants and funds, issue housing bonds and negotiate incentives to developers of multi-family housing. Housing authorities can also be used to address specific homeless issues in each community. The housing authorities would be a logical agency for the SB-5 funds. The housing block grant program should assist cities in funding the staffing and resources necessary to operate the housing authority.

Providing Effective Multi-Modal Transportation Options for Multi-Family Projects

- ✓ The transit provisions in SB 50 simply do not work for many communities in Los Angeles County and may inadvertently limit multi-family housing locations

- ✓ Reductions in parking standards should be carefully considered by each community based on available street parking and neighborhood car ownership rates, as well as access to transit
- ✓ Cities should be allowed to establish reasonable parking minimums when they prepare their multi-family area plan
- ✓ SB 50 should be encouraging alternatives to expensive onsite construction of parking, such as centralized parking and fee payments
- ✓ Studies conclude that the quality of life for low income residents is improved by car ownership, since they can more easily reach and maintain their employment

Discussion

A recent University of Minnesota study reported that less than 1% of Los Angeles County residents can reach their job by transit in 30 minutes, by car 33% can reach their job in 30 minutes. The average commute in Los Angeles County is 28 minutes by car and 51 minutes by transit. Eighty-four percent of employees in Los Angeles County drive to work. Transit ridership in the county is lower now than it was in 1990 and continues to fall despite \$16 billion in investment in rail construction since 1990.⁶

The transit headway concept in SB 50 does not work in Los Angeles County, since it does not account for the multiple transfers necessary for transit users to reach their place of employment. SB 50 ignores weekend ridership, when people need to reach their employment or other destinations in a reasonable time frame.

A variety of factors limit effective transit to many Los Angeles County communities. SB 50 amendments should recognize that multi-family projects should not be permitted to be “under parked” if public transit is providing inadequate service to the area. Under parking projects in these circumstances will only result in public backlash.

Issues with the “Jobs Rich” Definition in SB 50 – The Problems of Relying on Census Tract Information

- ✓ SB 50 relies on Census Tracts as the planning unit for locating multi-family projects. This is the wrong planning guideline.
- ✓ Local communities are in the best position to locate multi-family projects
- ✓ Census tract planning should be eliminated from SB 50

Discussion

SB 50 defers the defining of “jobs rich” to a “black box” process that HCD will undertake in the future. Cities need to understand what areas in their communities will have local zoning and general planning overridden by SB 50 in advance of the bill being supported. SB 50 implies that job rich areas will be measured relying on U.S. Census Tracts. The use of census tracts for SB 50 implementation will prove to be extremely problematic, creating major inconsistencies with local general plans, zoning and transit.

Census tracts are too small of a geographic unit to complete effective community planning, which calls for larger, more comprehensive geographic areas to plan for increased residential density.

In order to test this concern- that Census Tracts are the wrong planning unit – the Working Group examined three census tracts in the San Gabriel Valley, using the Mapping Opportunity tool. We examined the bus lines serving three census tracts in order to determine if they met the current transit definition in SB 50.

⁶ <https://www.ocregister.com/2019/09/15/transit-planners-want-to-make-your-life-worse/>

Census Tract – Cal State LA – City of Alhambra

The Mapping Opportunity tool identifies this census tract as “jobs rich.” This is understandable, since the university has 2,100 faculty and staff. The census tract is a small 20-block area, with the campus as the largest single land use. The campus is surrounded by single family homes on small lots. Requiring development incentives and overriding local general plan and zoning will create chaos in this neighborhood. The university is served by METRO 258 and meets the peak time headways identified in SB 50. The University is also the location of a Metro Link station.

Census Tract – SCE Headquarters – City of Rosemead

SCE’s Corporate Headquarters is identified as a “jobs rich” census tract, as would be expected. The corporate headquarters is located on Walnut Grove Avenue. However, it is surrounded by single-family neighborhoods. Requiring development incentives and overriding local general plan and zoning will create chaos in this neighborhood. Transit access is provided from Walnut Grove and Garvey Avenue. The headquarters is served by METRO Rapid Line 770.

Census Tract – Avocado Heights – Industry

This census tract is identified as “job rich” and primarily consists of heavy industrial and warehouse uses. The tract is served by Foothill Transit’s Line 194, which meets SB 50 headway times. The tract contains single family homes to the west of the industrial area and is surrounded on the north by single family neighborhoods in La Puente. Requiring development incentives and overriding local general plan and zoning will create chaos in this neighborhood. The tract is bounded by the Pomona Freeway on the south side.

SB 50 should be exploring mechanisms that create regional opportunities for housing for communities that have existing uses incompatible with housing. Beginning in 1992 the City of Industry was authorized by State law to transfer its CRA’s housing set aside funds to the Los Angeles County Housing Authority. Prior to the dissolution of RDA’s by the State in 2011, the City of Industry had transferred approximately \$239 million in housing funds, resulting in the construction of 8,700 units, with 6,700 deed restricted to low income and special needs housing groups.

Account for the Demographic Aging Trends in California

- ✓ Provide cities and counties with residential unit credits for assisted living developments, since these residents are moving from homes and apartments into these facilities, freeing up existing housing stock. Provide credits for long-term rental for single-room occupancies

Discussion

There are a series of credible studies arguing that public policy is focused on the wrong metrics and we are ignoring the rapid growth of an aging population, where government should be focusing its problem solving. California’s Department of Aging reports that the State’s population over the age of 60 is expected to grow by more than three times the rate of the general population from 2010 to 2060. Los Angeles County will experience a 171.3% population growth in adults over the age of 60 in this time period.⁷ By 2030 the State will be home to over 10 million persons over the age of 60.⁸

We are also finding that older residents will take in room mates by renting bedrooms. This should be encouraged and counted towards providing housing. Cities can keep track of long term rentals by requiring a low-cost business license and reporting annually to HCD the long term rentals in their communities.

⁷ https://www.aging.ca.gov/Data_and_Reports/Facts_About_California%27s_Elderly/

⁸ <https://www.aging.ca.gov/download.ashx?IE0rcNUV0zbUyIiwYmWKng%3D%3D>

Encourage Mixed Use Development

- ✓ Many cities have been encouraging mixed use commercial/residential developments in their communities, including their historic downtowns. SB 50 should not discourage mixed use development and allow communities to protect historic resources.

Discussion

SB 50 currently defines a mixed-use development as a project where two-thirds of the floor area is devoted to residential development. This provision should be eliminated from SB 50, giving communities more flexibility to plan mixed use projects or convert existing commercial buildings that might not meet the proposed two-thirds rule in SB 50. We should be encouraging all types and sizes of mixed-use developments.

Freeze on Additional State ADU Regulations

- ✓ SB 50 proposed that four units be allowed in single-family neighborhoods by right, with no parking required. This will prove to be disruptive to established neighborhoods, where property owners do not fully understand that 2 ADUs are already permitted.

Discussion

The State has passed a series of new regulations on ADUs, which cities are attempting to comply with. We have received reports that the HCD review of local ADU ordinances has backlog and cities are required to default to the State's regulations. The State's ADU requirements are not well understood by the general public and we remain concerned that when a significant number of ADU's are constructed, further negatively impacting residential neighborhoods, that the public will grow increasingly concerned. Cities need time to develop ADU regulations that address the specific issues in their communities.