

**CITY OF GRASS VALLEY**  
**CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

**Lisa Swarthout, Mayor**  
**Jan Arbuckle**

**Howard Levine**

**Ben Aguilar, Vice Mayor**  
**Hilary Hodge**

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE GRASS VALLEY CITY COUNCIL,  
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AUTHORITY AND REDEVELOPMENT “SUCCESSOR  
AGENCY”**  
**7:00 P. M., TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 2020**

COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
GRASS VALLEY CITY HALL (LOWER LEVEL)  
125 EAST MAIN STREET, GRASS VALLEY, CALIFORNIA  
Telephone: (530) 274-4310 – Fax: (530) 274-4399

E-Mail: [info@cityofgrassvalley.com](mailto:info@cityofgrassvalley.com) Web Site: [www.cityofgrassvalley.com](http://www.cityofgrassvalley.com)

In response to Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20 and Resolution 2020-09 Declaring the Existence of a Local Emergency related to the COVID-19 pandemic, public participation in the City of Grass Valley City Council and other public meetings shall be electronic only, and without a physical location for public participation, until further notice in compliance with California state guidelines on social distancing. City Council welcomes you to attend the meetings electronically, which are scheduled at 7:00 p.m. on the 2nd and 4th Tuesdays of each month. Your interest is encouraged and appreciated. This meeting is being broadcast “live” on Comcast Channel 17 by Nevada County Media and on the internet at [www.cityofgrassvalley.com/agendas-minutes-meetings](http://www.cityofgrassvalley.com/agendas-minutes-meetings). Indexed archives of meetings are available via this link as well. Members of the public are encouraged to submit public comments via voicemail at (530) 274-4390 and email to [public@cityofgrassvalley.com](mailto:public@cityofgrassvalley.com). Comments will be reviewed and distributed before the meeting if received by 5pm. Comments received after that will be addressed during the item and/or at the end of the meeting. Council will have the option to modify their action on items based on comments received. Action may be taken on any agenda item. Agenda materials, staff reports, and background information related to regular agenda items are available on the City of Grass Valley website: [www.cityofgrassvalley.com](http://www.cityofgrassvalley.com). Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Council after distribution of the agenda packet will be made available on the City of Grass Valley website at [www.cityofgrassvalley.com](http://www.cityofgrassvalley.com) subject to City staff’s ability to post the documents before the meeting. If you do not have the means to participate in meetings electronically, contact the City at (530) 274-4390 and staff will be happy to identify alternative means for you to participate.

**AGENDA**

**A. CALL TO ORDER:**  
**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**  
**ROLL CALL:**

**B. AGENDA APPROVAL**  
The City Council reserves the right to hear items in a different order to accomplish business in the most efficient manner.

**C. REPORT OUT OF CLOSED SESSION**

**D. INTRODUCTIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

**E. PUBLIC COMMENT** – Members of the public are encouraged to submit public comments via voicemail at (530) 274-4390 and email to [public@cityofgrassvalley.com](mailto:public@cityofgrassvalley.com). Comments will be reviewed and distributed before the meeting if received by 5pm. Comments received after that will be addressed during the item and/or at the end of the meeting. Council will have the option to modify their action on items based on comments received. Action may be taken on any agenda item.

**F. CONSENT ITEMS** – All matters listed under the Consent Calendar are to be considered routine by the City Council and/or Grass Valley Redevelopment Agency and will be enacted by one motion in the form listed. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless, before the City Council and/or Grass Valley Redevelopment Agency votes on the motion to adopt, members of the Council and/or Agency, staff or the public request specific items to be removed from the Consent Calendar for separate discussion and action (roll call vote).

1. Approval of the Regular Meeting Minutes of March 24, 2020  
RECOMMENDATION: Council approve minutes as submitted.
2. Local Emergency Proclamation (COVID-19)  
RECOMMENDATION: Continuance of Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) proclamation declaring a Local State of Emergency.
3. Local Emergency Proclamation  
RECOMMENDATION: Continuance of sinkhole proclamation declaring a Local State of Emergency due to extreme weather.
4. 2018/19 Measure E Street Rehabilitation Project – Final Acceptance  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council: 1) accept the 2018/19 Measure E Street Rehabilitation Project as complete and 2) authorize the Assistant City Engineer to file a Notice of Completion with the County Recorder.
5. 2020/21 Capital Improvement Program – RMRA Budget  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council adopt a Resolution to include Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) funding in the Fiscal Year 2020/21 budget and specifying a list of projects to be funded with RMRA funds.
6. Nevada County Transportation Commission FY 2020/21 Overall Work Program Approval  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council: 1) review the projects proposed for inclusion in the Nevada County Transportation Commission FY 2020/21 Overall Work Program, 2) adopt a Resolution approving the projects for inclusion in the Nevada County Transportation Commission Overall Work Program

**G. ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT CALENDAR FOR DISCUSSION OR SEPARATE ACTION AND / OR ANY ADDED AGENDA ITEMS**

**H. PUBLIC HEARING**

7. Continued Public Hearing on the Dorsey Marketplace project from the January 28, and March 24, 2020 City Council meetings. Request to continue the hearing to April 28, 2020 and provide direction on additional opportunities to provide public comments.  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council continue the public hearing on the Dorsey Marketplace project to the April 28, 2020 meeting.
8. Extension of Urgency Ordinance No. 794 Amending Chapter 17.46 and Chapter 17.100 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code regarding Wireless Telecommunications  
RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council Adopt Ordinance No 801, by a four-fifths vote, Extending Urgency Ordinance No. 794 Amending Chapter 17.46 and Chapter 17.100 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code regarding Wireless Telecommunications for a period of one year in accordance with Government Code Section 65858.

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE**

9. FY 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget Review  
RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the City Council approve by Motion updates to the FY 2019-20 Budget with recommended mid-year budget revisions.
10. Local Financial Emergency Proclamation (COVID-19) and Notification of Personnel Layoffs  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council approve the Resolution proclaiming a local financial emergency and the necessity to layoff multiple city employees to mitigate the economic impacts of COVID-19.

**J. BRIEF REPORTS BY COUNCIL MEMBERS**

**K. ADJOURN**

**Posted:**

---

<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Andy Heath, Acting City Clerk</b>
-------------	-------------	--------------------------------------

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**CITY OF GRASS VALLEY**  
**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MARCH 24<sup>TH</sup>, 2020**

**Lisa Swarthout, Mayor**  
**Jan Arbuckle**

**Howard Levine**

**Ben Aguilar, Vice Mayor**  
**Hilary Hodge**

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE GRASS VALLEY CITY COUNCIL,  
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AUTHORITY AND REDEVELOPMENT “SUCCESSOR  
AGENCY”**  
**7:00 P. M., TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 2020**

**AGENDA**

- A. CALL TO ORDER:** 7pm by Mayor Swarthout  
**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Mayor Swarthout  
**ROLL CALL:** Council Member Arbuckle, Council Member Levine, Council Member Hodge, Vice Mayor Aguilar, and Mayor Swarthout were present.
- B. AGENDA APPROVAL**  
City Manager, Tim Kiser requested that item #3 of section F. in Consent Items be moved to Section G. in Items Removed from Consent Calendar for Discussion or Separate Action and/or any added Agenda Items.
- C. REPORT OUT OF CLOSED SESSION**  
There was no closed session.
- D. INTRODUCTIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**  
There were no introductions or presentations.
- E. PUBLIC COMMENT –**  
There was no public comment.
- F. CONSENT ITEMS –**  
Council Member Aguilar moved to approve the consent agenda as submitted. Council Member Levine seconded, and the motion carried by a 5-0 roll call vote
1. Approval of the Regular Meeting Minutes of March 10, 2020  
**RECOMMENDATION:** Council approve minutes as submitted.
  2. Local Emergency Proclamation (COVID-19)  
**RECOMMENDATION:** Continuance of Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) proclamation declaring a Local State of Emergency.
  3. ~~Urgency Ordinance Enacting a Temporary Moratorium on Evictions of Residential and Commercial Tenants~~  
~~**RECOMMENDATION:** That Council approve an Urgency Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Grass Valley enacting a temporary moratorium on evictions of residential and commercial tenants for nonpayment of rent due to a loss of income caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and declaring the ordinance to be an urgency measure to take effect~~

- ~~immediately upon adoption.~~
4. Local Emergency Proclamation  
RECOMMENDATION: Continuance of sinkhole proclamation declaring a Local State of Emergency due to extreme weather.
  5. Second Reading of Ordinance 799 to add Chapter 17.41 to the City of Grass Valley Municipal Code, Title 15  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council conduct the second reading, by title only, and adopt Ordinance 799 to add Chapter 17.41, which addresses Vacant Storefront Windows in the Town Core (TC) Zoning District, to the Grass Valley Municipal Code.
  6. Second Reading of Ordinance No. 798 amending Chapter 17.44.190 regarding Second Units in accordance with State law  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council conduct the second reading, by title only, of Ordinance No. 798, which finalizes the amendments of Chapter 17.44.190, Second Units.
  7. Conflict of Interest Code Update  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council approve the City Manager signing of the City of Grass Valley Biennial Notice and adopt the 2020 Conflict of Interest Code and corresponding Resolution 2020-11 approving changes to the code.
  8. Condon Park Accessibility & Connectivity Project – Award Contract  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council 1) authorize the Assistant City Engineer to award a contract for the Condon Park Accessibility & Connectivity Project to Hansen Bros. Enterprises, 2) authorize the Mayor to execute the construction contract, subject to legal review, and 3) authorize the Assistant City Engineer to approve contract change orders up to 10% of the contract amount.
  9. Kate Hayes Street and Empire Court Sewer Line Replacement Project – Final Acceptance  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council 1) accept the Kate Hayes Street and Empire Court Sewer Line Replacement Project as complete, 2) authorize the Finance Director to execute a budget transfer in the amount of \$358,331.70 from the Water Rate Fund to this project, and 3) authorize the Assistant City Engineer to file a Notice of Completion with the County Recorder.
  10. Approve Resolution No. 2020-10 Delegating Authority to the Police Chief to submit a grant proposal to the State Board of Community Corrections  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council 1) approve Resolution No. 2020-10 Delegating Authority to the Police Chief to submit a grant proposal to the State Board of Community Corrections
  11. Approve Resolution 2020-12 Authorizing Investment to the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council Approve Resolution 2020-12 authorizing investment of monies in the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF).

**G. ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT CALENDAR FOR DISCUSSION OR SEPARATE ACTION AND / OR ANY ADDED AGENDA ITEMS**

1. Urgency Ordinance Enacting a Temporary Moratorium on Evictions of Residential and Commercial Tenants  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council approve an Urgency Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Grass Valley enacting a temporary moratorium on evictions of residential and commercial tenants for nonpayment of rent due to a loss of income caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and declaring the ordinance to be an urgency measure to take effect immediately upon adoption.

- Tim Kiser City Manager request that Council approve an Urgency Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Grass Valley enacting a temporary moratorium on evictions of residential and commercial tenants for nonpayment of rent due to a loss of income caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and declaring the ordinance to be an urgency measure to take effect immediately upon adoption. Council Member Arbuckle request that we follow the County of Nevada in their ordinance and waive the six month pay back period and have any missed rent due on May 31<sup>st</sup>. Council Member Hodge is in support of the ordinance and understands that because of the shelter in place ordinance residences will be losing a major source of income. Council Member Levine questioned if six months would be enough time for people to get back on their feet during the recovery of this and that evictions during this time would be devastating to our economy he expressed his support for this item and would be welcome to adjusting it so that all parties would be in support for this ordinance. Michael Colantuno City Attorney explains further the six-month grace period to pay back any missed rent for April or March. Council Agular requested some clarification on if the Governors ruling supersede the City's ordinance, Michal Colantuno clarified that this ordinance followed the Governors ruling and if he was to adjust his then the City would revisit our ordinance to be in compliance with the state. Mayor Swarouth recommends that the City modify the Ordinance to fit with the County of Nevada's Ordinance and remove the six months pay off period but allow for an extension of this ordinance if it is needed in the future.
- The council received four public comment emails that were read during the meeting. Mr. & Mrs. White expressed opposition to the ordinance as they believe it will hurt the landlords and recommends the City go on a month by month base rather than six months. Mr. Juvinal expressed opposition because it will affect landlords ability to pay mortgages. Mr. Alberti expressed opposition to the ordinance because of the impact it will cause to be able to afford property taxes, mortgage, etc. Mr. George expressed opposition to the ordinance due to the impact that it would have on the landlords, he also believes that it will create more problems than solutions, and his recommendation is to vote no or make an amendment to go month to month on the ordinance.
- Council Member Arbuckle moved to approve Urgency Ordinance Enacting a Temporary Moratorium on Evictions of Residential and Commercial Tenants with the adjustment to the ordinance to remove the six months pay off grace period and have the payoff due May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020 or the ability for Council to extend the date. Vice Mayor Levine seconded, and the motion carried by a 5-0 roll call vote.

## H. PUBLIC HEARING

3. Continued Public Hearing on the Dorsey Marketplace project from the January 28, 2020 City Council meeting  
RECOMMENDATION: That Council continue the public hearing on the Dorsey Marketplace project to the April 14, 2020 meeting.
4. Council Member Hodge moved to Continue Public Hearing on the Dorsey Marketplace project from the January 28, 2020 City Council meeting. Council Member Arbuckle seconded, and the motion carried by a 4-0-1 roll call vote. Vice Mayor Agular had to recuse himself from this item.

**I. ADMINISTRATIVE**

There were no Administrative items.

**K. Public Comments Continued**

There were no further Public Comments that were received.

**J. BRIEF REPORTS BY COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Council Member Arbuckle was in Washington DC for meetings with the League of Cities and met with the Senator for a very productive meeting. Since being back she has on many phone calls throughout the day getting constant updates on the COVID-19 virus and it is change rapidly throughout the day and urges people to stay inside and to take the virus very seriously. Council Member Hodge commends this community and the innovation that our community is having to make sure that we come together and still have a sense of communities. She was able to do a choir practice with a whole bunch of people on zoom. She wants everyone to stay safe. Council Member Levine reflects on how his age has never really been a factor over the years until now and he is realizing that he is become more aware of it now and is becoming much humbler with our communities. He wanted to give a thank you to the City Staff and the Hospital Staff with all of their hard work. He also gives his condolences to the Tassone family in the passing of Former Mayor Gerard Tassone. Vice Mayor Aguilar shared his experience with working still in the new environment and how cautious everyone around him is and how the essentials jobs are ever changing as well because of the time. He urges everyone to stay at home because it is really important factor to overcome this virus. He also gives his condolences to the Tassone family in the passing of Former Mayor Gerard Tassone. Mayor Swarhout looking for information city website has a banner that links to information about what is going on locally and federally. Also connecting point at 211 is a great resource. She is trying to respond all comments via her email and phone calls. Although City Hall is closed the staff is still operating as usual and you can still pay utility bills online or in the drop box and pull building permits online. You can always call and the staff will answer your questions. She also apologized about the parks being closed but the City feels that as a part of the communities safty it is best that the parks are closed and will reopen as soon as possible.

**L. ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned by Mayor Swarhout at 7:51 pm.

---

Lisa Swarhout, Mayor

---

Andy Heath, Administrative Services Director



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

**Council Meeting Date:** April 14, 2020

**Date Prepared:** April 9, 2020

**Prepared by:** Timothy M. Kiser, City Manager

**Title:** Local Emergency Proclamation (COVID-19)

**Recommended Motion:** Continuance of Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) proclamation declaring a Local State of Emergency.

**Agenda:** Consent

**Background Information:** On March 5, 2020 the City Manager, acting as the Director of Emergency Services for the City of Grass Valley and the Disaster Council (Vice Mayor Aguilar and Councilmember Arbuckle), declared a local State of Emergency to ensure emergency personnel can obtain equipment and resources in the most timely and effective manner. In accordance with the Emergency Services Act Section 8630 (b) the governing body must ratify the declared emergency within 7 days for it to remain in effect. On March 10, 2020, at the Grass Valley City Council Meeting, the City Council approved Resolution 2020-09, Proclamation of Local Emergency. The City Council shall review, at its regularly scheduled meeting until the local emergency is terminated, the need for continuing the local emergency.

On March 16, 2020, the City Manager, acting as the Director of the Emergency Services for the City of Grass Valley and the Disaster Council (all five Council Members), declared that all commercial places of public assembly with a Fire Code occupancy limit of 25 or more persons shall no longer operate for commercial purposes. Places of public assembly include, but are not limited to, movie theaters, performing arts venues, and auditoriums. This action does not include restaurants, and/or similar uses, and does not override the First Amendment right of persons to congregate for non-commercial activities. To reduce the spread of COVID-19, the Disaster Council approved, at the Director of Emergency Services' request, waiving the administrative charges for using credit cards to pay utility bills for the next 60 days. For more information, see attached Grass Valley Disaster Council Order 2020-01.

**Council Goals/Objectives:** Continuance of the proclamation declaring a Local State of Emergency due to prepare against coronavirus COVID-19 executes portions of City Strategic Goal #6: Public Safety. The City of Grass Valley is devoted to providing a safe Place to Live, Work and Play.

**Fiscal Impact:** The Fiscal Impact is anticipated at more than \$940,000 over the rest of this Fiscal Year and Fiscal Year 2020-21, but due to the constantly changing impacts of COVID-19 the actual fiscal impact may change.

**Funds Available:** N/A

**Account#:** N/A

**Reviewed by:**  City Manager

G:\WPDATA\Council Action Sheets for 2020\AG041420\Emergency Proclamation for COVID-19 (Final).docx

**Agenda Item #**





**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

**Council Meeting Date:** April 14, 2020

**Date Prepared:** April 9, 2020

**Prepared by:** Mark Buttron, Fire Chief

**Title:** Local Emergency Proclamation

**Recommended Motion:** Continuance of sinkhole proclamation declaring a Local State of Emergency due to extreme weather.

**Agenda:** Consent

**Background Information:** On January 11, 2017 the City Manager, acting as the Director of Emergency Services for the City of Grass Valley, declared a local State of Emergency as a result of damages caused by extreme weather. In accordance with the Emergency Services Act Section 8630 (b) the governing body must ratify the declared emergency within 7 days for it to remain in effect. Resolution 2017-02, Proclamation of Local Emergency, was ratified on January 17<sup>th</sup> at a special meeting of the Grass Valley City Council. The City Council shall review, at its regularly scheduled meeting until the local emergency is terminated, the need for continuing the local emergency.

**Council Goals/Objectives:** Continuance of the proclamation declaring a Local State of Emergency due to extreme weather executes portions of City Strategic Goal #6: Public Safety. The City of Grass Valley is devoted to providing a safe Place to Live, Work and Play.

**Fiscal Impact:** The Majority (more than 75%) of the costs should be reimbursed by various agencies.

**Funds Available:** N/A

**Account#:** N/A

**Reviewed by:**  City Manager



City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet

**Council Meeting Date:** April 14, 2020

**Date Prepared:** April 9, 2020

**Prepared by:** Bjorn P. Jones, PE, Assistant City Engineer *Bj*

**Title:** 2018/19 Measure E Street Rehabilitation Project – Final Acceptance

**Recommended Motion:** That Council: 1) accept the 2018/19 Measure E Street Rehabilitation Project as complete and 2) authorize the Assistant City Engineer to file a Notice of Completion with the County Recorder.

**Agenda:** Consent

**Background Information:** On April 23, 2019, Council authorized the award of a contract for the 2018/19 Measure E Street Rehabilitation Project to All-American Construction, Inc. in the amount of \$1,912,464.50. The project involved drainage improvements, concrete sidewalk, curb ramp and accessibility improvements, pavement grinding, overlay and replacement, utility adjustments, signing and striping.

All the work has been completed by the contractor and three contract change orders were issued as part of the project. Final construction costs total \$2,103,709.14, within the allowable 10% contingency amount budgeted for the project.

The Engineering Division has field accepted the work and the contractor has provided the City with a guarantee of work for a period of one year following the date of acceptance of the project. Upon Council's acceptance, Staff will file a Notice of Completion with the County Recorder's Office. If no Stop Notices are received by the City after a period of thirty-five (35) days from the filing date of the Notice, all appropriate bonds will be released to the contractor.

**Council Goals/Objectives:** The 2018/19 Measure E Street Rehabilitation Project executes portions of work towards achieving/maintaining Strategic Plan – City Infrastructure Investment.

**Fiscal Impact:** This project was fully funded in the FY 19/20 CIP Budget with Measure E funds.

**Funds Available:** Yes

**Account #:** 180-6385

**Reviewed by:** *TMR* City Manager

\_\_\_\_\_ Finance Director

RECORDING REQUESTED BY and  
WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:

**ENGINEERING DIVISION  
CITY OF GRASS VALLEY  
125 East Main Street  
Grass Valley, CA 95945**

SPACE ABOVE THIS LINE FOR RECORDER'S USE ONLY

## NOTICE OF COMPLETION

### NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT:

1. That the undersigned is OWNER or agent of the OWNER of the interest or estate stated below in the property hereinafter described.
2. The FULL NAME of the OWNER is the **City of Grass Valley**.
3. The FULL ADDRESS of the OWNER is **125 East Main Street, Grass Valley, CA 95945**.
4. The nature of the INTEREST or ESTATE of the undersigned is: **FEE**.
5. A work of improvement on the property hereinafter described was COMPLETED: **April 3, 2020**.
6. The work of improvement completed is described as follows: **Drainage improvements, accessibility improvements, pavement grinding, overlay and replacement and pavement marking and striping**.
7. The NAME OF THE CONTRACTOR, if any, for such work of improvement is: **All-American Construction, Inc.**
8. The street address of said property is: **Various Roadways throughout the City**.
9. The property on which said work of improvement was completed is in the City of **Grass Valley**, County of **Nevada**, State of California and is described as follows: **City Roadway Rehabilitation**.

\_\_\_\_\_  
City of Grass Valley  
Owner

by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Bjorn P. Jones, Asst. City Engineer

"I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct."

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date and Place)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

**Council Meeting Date:** April 14, 2020

**Date Prepared:** April 9, 2020

**Prepared by:** Bjorn Jones, PE, Assistant City Engineer *BJ*

**Title:** 2020/21 Capital Improvement Program – RMRA Budget

**Recommended Motion:** That Council adopt a Resolution to include Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) funding in the Fiscal Year 2020/21 budget and specifying a list of projects to be funded with RMRA funds.

**Agenda:** Consent

**Background Information:** California State Senate Bill 1 (SB 1), the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, was passed by the Legislature and signed into law by the Governor in April 2017 in order to address significant transportation infrastructure funding shortfalls statewide. SB 1 includes accountability and transparency provisions that will ensure the residents of the City of Grass Valley are aware of the projects proposed for funding in our community and which projects have been completed each fiscal year. SB 1 requires the City of Grass Valley to provide a specific list of projects proposed to receive funding from RMRA funding, including a description and location of each proposed project.

Overall, the City of Grass Valley is scheduled to receive an estimated \$242,885 in RMRA funding in Fiscal Year 2020/21. Staff recommends that the FY 2020/21 budget and specifically the Annual Street Rehabilitation Project budget, include the full \$242,885 in RMRA funds. The Annual Street Rehab Project will focus on basic maintenance and rehabilitation of the street infrastructure, with proposed locations including Freeman Lane, Taylorville Road, McKnight Way and La Barr Meadows Road. Staff requests that Council adopt the attached Resolution specifying a list of RMRA funded projects in the CIP Budget.

**Council Goals/Objectives:** Utilization of RMRA funding executes portions of work tasks towards achieving/maintaining Strategic Plan – Community Safety and City Infrastructure Investment.

**Fiscal Impact:** The City of Grass Valley will receive an estimated \$242,885 in RMRA funding.

**Funds Available:** N/A

**Account #:** 180-6133

**Reviewed by:** *TMX* City Manager

\_\_\_\_ Finance Director

**RESOLUTION NO. 2020- \_\_\_\_**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRASS VALLEY  
AUTHORIZING THE INCLUSION OF ROAD MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION  
ACCOUNT FUNDS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 2020/21 BUDGET AND INCORPORATING A LIST  
OF PROJECTS FUNDED BY SENATE BILL 1**

**WHEREAS**, Senate Bill 1 (SB 1), the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, was passed by the Legislature and Signed into law by the Governor in April 2017 in order to address the significant transportation funding shortfalls statewide; and

**WHEREAS**, SB 1 includes accountability and transparency provisions that will ensure the residents of the City of Grass Valley are aware of the projects proposed for funding in our community and which projects have been completed each fiscal year; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Grass Valley must adopt by resolution a list of projects proposed to receive fiscal year funding from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA), created by SB 1, which must include a description and the location of each proposed project, a proposed schedule for the project's completion, and the estimated useful life of the improvement; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Grass Valley will receive an estimated \$242,885 in RMRA funding in Fiscal Year 2020/21 from SB 1; and

**WHEREAS**, the funding from SB 1 will help the City of Grass Valley maintain and rehabilitate the City street infrastructure; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed project list and budget included in this resolution reflect a list of projects to be funded by SB 1; and

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRASS VALLEY**, as follows:

1. The 2020/21 fiscal year budget include an estimated \$242,885 in RMRA funds.
2. The attached list of proposed projects, including the 2020/21 Annual Street Rehabilitation Project, will be funded in-part with the fiscal year 2020/21 RMRA revenues.

**ADOPTED** as a Resolution by the City Council of the City of Grass Valley at a regular meeting thereof held on the 14th day of April 2020, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Swarthout, MAYOR

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael G. Colantuono, CITY ATTORNEY

\_\_\_\_\_  
Andy Heath, Acting CITY CLERK

## **SB 1 - ROAD MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION ACCOUNT PROJECTS**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) projects will resurface or repave several streets throughout the City of Grass Valley. Streets are selected and prioritized based on the City's Pavement Management System in order to most effectively address deferred maintenance on the local street system and prioritize the delivery of basic street maintenance and rehabilitation projects

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The following locations are tentatively scheduled for road maintenance and rehabilitation in Fiscal Year 2020/21:

### **2020/21 ANNUAL STREET REHABILITATION PROJECT**

- Freeman Lane
- McKnight Way
- Taylorville Road
- La Barr Meadows Road

**SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETION:** It is anticipated that each project will be completed before the end of the fiscal year in which the project is identified.

**ESTIMATED USEFUL LIFE:** Many factors can affect a pavement's useful life, including the quality of the subgrade, drainage conditions, traffic loads, etc. Typically, the City of Grass Valley expects a 15 to 20 year useful life out of a pavement overlay and a 5 to 7 year useful life out of a resurfacing.



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

**Council Meeting Date:** April 14, 2020

**Date Prepared:** April 9, 2020

**Prepared by:** Bjorn Jones, PE, Assistant City Engineer *BJJ*

**Title:** Nevada County Transportation Commission FY 2020/21 Overall Work Program Approval

**Recommended Motion:** That Council: 1) review the projects proposed for inclusion in the Nevada County Transportation Commission FY 2020/21 Overall Work Program, 2) adopt a Resolution approving the projects for inclusion in the Nevada County Transportation Commission Overall Work Program

**Agenda:** Consent

**Background Information:** Staff for Nevada County Transportation Commission (NCTC) have prepared a draft Overall Work Program (OWP) for FY 2020/21. The OWP is prepared on an annual basis as a scope of work and budget for transportation planning activities for the fiscal year. The OWP is a requirement of NCTC's Master Fund Transfer Agreement with the State of California and includes the following three components: Introduction, Work Elements, and Budget. The purpose of the proposed OWP for FY 2020/21 is to: 1) show how the Federal Planning Factors will be integrated into the OWP work elements; 2) outline continuing and new major activities; and 3) present a summary of the expected revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year. A final OWP will be presented at the May 20, 2020 NCTC meeting.

Adoption of the attached Resolution is recommended, approving the proposed projects for inclusion in the Nevada County Transportation Commission Overall Work Program.

**Council Goals/Objectives:** The NCTC Overall Work Program executes portions of work tasks towards achieving/maintaining Strategic Goal - City Infrastructure Investment.

**Fiscal Impact:** N/A

**Funds Available:** N/A

**Account #:** N/A

**Reviewed by:** *TMK* City Manager

**RESOLUTION NO: 2020-\_\_\_\_**  
**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRASS VALLEY**  
**APPROVING THE PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR INCLUSION IN THE**  
**NEVADA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION'S**  
**FY 2020/21 OVERALL WORK PROGRAM**

**WHEREAS**, on October 8, 1991, the Council did adopt Resolution No. 91-172, which authorized the Mayor to execute a Memorandum of Understanding on behalf of the City of Grass Valley with the Nevada County Transportation Commission relating to regional transportation planning; and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with the above referenced Memorandum of Understanding, the Nevada County Transportation Commission has submitted the projects to be included in its FY 2020/21 Overall Work Program for the review and approval of the City Council of the City of Grass Valley.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRASS VALLEY:**

1. That the City Council hereby acknowledges its approval of the projects proposed for inclusion in the FY 2020/21 Overall Work Program of the Nevada County Transportation Commission as submitted; and
2. That the City Council encourages the Nevada County Transportation Commission to continue its efforts to coordinate the regional transportation planning process and to work closely with the staff of the City of Grass Valley to identify and resolve issues that are of common concern; and

**ADOPTED** as a Resolution by the City Council of the City of Grass Valley at a regular meeting thereof held on the 14th day of April 2020, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAINS:

ABSENT:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Swarthout, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael G. Colantuono, City Attorney

\_\_\_\_\_  
Andy Heath, Acting City Clerk





**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

**Council Meeting Date:** April 14, 2020

**Date Prepared:** April 8, 2020

**Prepared by:** Thomas Last, Community Development Director

**Title:** Continued Public Hearing on the Dorsey Marketplace project from the January 28, and March 24, 2020 City Council meetings. Request to continue the hearing to April 28, 2020 and provide direction on additional opportunities to provide public comments.

**Recommended Motion:** That Council continue the public hearing on the Dorsey Marketplace project to the April 28, 2020 meeting.

**Agenda:** Public Hearing

**Background Information:** On January 28, 2020, the City Council continued the public hearing on the Dorsey Marketplace project to March 24, 2020. The Council then continued the March public hearing to April 14<sup>th</sup>. The purpose of the second continuance was to allow staff to take steps to allow public accessibility and input on the project while limiting City Council and City staff's potential exposure to the COVID-19 virus. Though staff took extraordinary steps to contact all interested members of the public and inform them of the different methods to provide comments, staff is requesting a two-week continuance to allow additional outreach efforts. Staff will once again notify all members of the public on its Dorsey Marketplace email list and will contact the local radio stations and The Union to explain the different methods and timelines to provide comments on the project.

**Council Goals/Objectives:** N/A

**Fiscal Impact:** N/A

**Funds Available:** N/A

**Account #:** N/A

**Reviewed by:**

 City Manager

**Attachments:**



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

**Council Meeting Date:** April 14, 2020

**Date Prepared:** April 3, 2020

**Prepared by:** Lance E. Lowe, AICP, Principal Planner

**Title:** Extension of Urgency Ordinance No. 794 Amending Chapter 17.46 and Chapter 17.100 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code regarding Wireless Telecommunications.

**Recommended Motion:** That the City Council Adopt Ordinance No 801, by a four-fifths vote, Extending Urgency Ordinance No. 794 Amending Chapter 17.46 and Chapter 17.100 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code regarding Wireless Telecommunications for a period of one year in accordance with Government Code Section 65858.

**Agenda:** Public Hearing

**Background Information:** On April 9, 2019, the City Council adopted Urgency Ordinance No. 793 Amending Chapter 17.46 and Chapter 17.100 of the City's Development Code regulating telecommunications facilities for a forty-five (45) day period.

Prior to expiration of the Urgency Ordinance, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 794 on May 14, 2019, extending the Urgency Ordinance for a period of 10 months and 15 days in accordance with Government Code Section 65858.

Consideration of the Telecommunications Ordinance was scheduled for the March 17, 2020, Planning Commission meeting; however, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Planning Commission meeting was canceled.

In order to allow sufficient time for consideration of the ordinance, staff is requesting that the Urgency Ordinance be extended for one additional year in accordance with Government Code Section 65858.

During the extension period, the Planning Commission and City Council will consider the adoption of a regular ordinance. This extension ensures that the regulations will continue to be in effect for small wireless facilities until the regular ordinance is adopted, and thus is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety.

The City has received numerous emails recommending that the City impose a moratorium during the COVID-19 pandemic (**Attachment 3 – Email Correspondence**). The 2018 FCC Order cited in the emails states “[w]e recognize that there may be limited situations in the case of a natural disaster or other comparable emergency where an express or de facto moratoria that violates section 253(a) may nonetheless be ‘necessary’ to ‘protect the public safety and welfare’ or to ‘ensure the continued quality of telecommunications services.’” As an example, the FCC Order describes a temporary moratorium in response to widespread power outages that necessitate government entities to limit access to poles. Permissible moratoria under the FCC Order are those



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

that are (1) competitively neutral, (2) necessary to address the emergency or disaster or related public safety needs, and (3) targeted only to those geographic areas that are affected by the disaster or emergency. In other words, moratoria on small cell facilities must be narrowly tailored to meet the demands of the specific emergency. The Governor has designated as Essential Critical Infrastructure Workers “[e]ngineers, technicians, and associated personnel responsible for infrastructure **construction** and restoration...” of communications facilities. This is not limited to maintenance of existing communications systems. As the Governor has declared that construction and restoration of communications facilities is an essential activity during the COVID-19 emergency, staff recommends that the City Council do not proceed with a moratorium on such applications.


**Council Goals/Objectives:** The adoption of this ordinance fulfills the infrastructure objectives outlined in the adopted Grass Valley Strategic Plan.

**Fiscal Impact:** This is a City-sponsored project with funding provided in the 2019-20 Budget.

**Funds Available:** N/A

**Account #:** N/A

**Reviewed by:**

 City Manager

 Community Development Director

**Attachments:**

**Attachment 1** – Ordinance No. 801 Extending Urgency Ordinance No. 794

**Attachment 2** – May 14, 2019, Staff Report with Attached Urgency Ordinance No. 794

**Attachment 3** – Email Correspondence



# ATTACHMENTS

**ORDINANCE NO. 801**

**EXTENSION OF AN URGENCY ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRASS VALLEY AMENDING CHAPTER 17.46 OF THE GRASS VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES APPLICATIONS AND AMENDING THE DEFINITION OF "TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES" IN SECTION 17.100.020 OF CHAPTER 17.100 OF TITLE 17 OF THE GRASS VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE**

**WHEREAS**, Government Code section 65858 and Article VII, § 1 of the Grass Valley City Charter authorize the City Council by a four-fifths vote to adopt an urgency ordinance for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety; and

**WHEREAS**, federal law, regulations, and decisions of regulatory agencies regarding small wireless telecommunications facilities will significantly change effective April 15, 2019; and

**WHEREAS**, without an ordinance regulating small wireless telecommunications facilities to the extent authorized and in accordance with federal and state law, the City may not be authorized to regulate the location and aesthetics of these facilities; and

**WHEREAS**, the unrestricted installation of redundant wireless telecommunications facilities presents a current and immediate threat to the City's efforts to stabilize economic and social aspects of neighborhood environments, and to the health, safety, and welfare of the City and its residents; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council adopted Urgency Ordinance No. 793 by a four-fifths vote, pursuant to Government Code section 65858 and Article VII, § 1 of the Grass Valley City Charter on April 9, 2019 in response to the federal law, regulations, and decisions regarding small wireless telecommunications facilities; and

**WHEREAS**, the extension of Urgency Ordinance No. 793 is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, and safety because more time is needed than forty-five (45) days to study the effects of the recent changes to federal law, regulations and decisions regarding small wireless telecommunications facilities; and

**WHEREAS**, on May 3, 2019, a notice of public hearing to be held on this Ordinance on May 14, 2019 was published in accordance with Government Code sections 65858 and 65090; and

**WHEREAS**, on May 14, 2019, the City Council held a public hearing on this Ordinance in accordance with Government Code section 65858.

**WHEREAS**, on April 3, 2020, a notice of public hearing to be held on this Ordinance on April 14, 2020 was published in accordance with Government Code sections 65858 and 65090; and

**WHEREAS**, on April 14, 2020, the City Council held a public hearing on this Ordinance in accordance with Government Code section 65858 to consider a one-year extension.

Be it ordained by the council of the City of Grass Valley:

SECTION 1. CODE AMENDMENT. Section 17.46.040 of Chapter 17.46 of Title 17 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code is amended as follows:

**17.46.040 – Permit Requirements**

- A. **Use Permit or Minor Use Permit.** Use Permit approval is required for all communication facilities subject to this Chapter, except for the following, which shall require Minor Use Permit approval. The Director shall ensure through the Minor Use Permit approval that each of the following facilities complies with all applicable requirements of this Chapter. The Director may also choose to defer action and refer any of the following facilities to the Commission for consideration as a Use Permit application when:
1. An antenna that is installed and maintained on an existing structure and is:
    - a. Under the roofline or above, behind, and below an existing approved roof screen and does not extend above the highest point of the structure; or
    - b. Camouflaged within an existing structure so as not to be visible from a public right-of-way or other property; or
    - c. Architecturally blended into the structure.
  2. A communication facility in which the antenna is mounted on a mast less than 10 feet high, is not located on a historic structure, and is not visible from a public right-of-way.
  3. An antenna that is co-located on an existing telecommunications tower.
  4. An amateur and/or citizens band antenna operated by a person holding a license issued by the FCC in compliance with 47 C.F.R. Part 97, and used solely in connection with that license, and which shall be subject to the "minimum practicable regulation to accomplish the local authority's legitimate purpose," in keeping with the order of the FCC known as "PRB-1," FCC 85-506, released September 19, 1985; provided that there shall be no more than one antenna support structure on a single parcel and that the antenna structure complies with the height limits of the applicable zone.

B. **Application requirements.** In addition to the information required for Use Permit or Minor Use Permit application by Chapter 17.70 (Permit Application Filing and Processing) the application for a communication facility shall include:

1. **Map and analysis of future service needs and technology of proposed facility.** A map showing planned and/or anticipated future needs of wireless communication services within and throughout the County. In addition to the map, the applicant shall explain the basis for the projected service requirements. To the extent feasible, planned and anticipated needs for future wireless communication facilities shall be forecasted for a minimum of two years following the date of application for a new wireless communication facility. An applicant not able to submit planned and/or anticipated needs forecasted for two years shall explain why it is not feasible to do so. The applicant shall also supply a "search ring" within which their new facilities and associated communications equipment must be sited, and shall explain the criteria used to establish the "search ring" and the constraints of siting facilities outside of it. The applicant shall include a technical report demonstrating that the proposed facility uses the best commercially available technology to accomplish the applicant's wireless service coverage objectives, to minimize the number and frequency of continued upgrades and community disruptions caused by facilities with substandard technology.
2. **An alternative site analysis.** An alternative site analysis detailing the specific steps undertaken to determine the applicant's selection of a particular project site and its relationship to the location preferences prescribed in this Chapter. The analysis shall include a radio propagation model for each carrier, or carriers if the monopole/towers are for multiple users. The alternative analysis shall include the following information:
  - a. A topographical map of the proposed local service area and which identifies the local network facilities with which the proposed site will interconnect;
  - b. Identification of all other existing structures which might provide an opportunity for ~~attached antenna facilities~~ co-location;
  - c. Identification of service gaps in the proposed service area, or areas of high usage requiring in-fill of existing service areas; and
  - d. A technical report discussing why alternatives would not be feasible for use as a communications site. This may include construction, interconnect, utility or other factors precluding development of the property or facility as a suitable site.

- e. This subdivision (B)(2) shall not apply to small wireless facility applications.
- 3. **Certification of compliance with standards.** Certification acceptable to the Director that the proposed facility will at all times comply with all applicable health requirements and standards pertaining to electromagnetic and/or radio frequency radiation.
- 4. **Report on potential interference with emergency service provider communications.** A report, as required by the Police Department, to evaluate the potential for interference (e.g., HF, UHF, VHF, 800 MHz). The applicant shall be responsible for paying any costs incurred by the City, including the costs of retaining consultants, to review and analyze the report.
- 5. **Visual Simulations.** A visual analysis that includes (1) scaled visual simulations that show unobstructed before-and-after construction daytime and clear-weather views from at least four (4) angles, together with a map that shows the location of each view angle; (2) a color and finished material palate for proposed screening materials; and (3) a photograph of a completed facility of the same design and in roughly the same setting as the proposed wireless communication facility.
- 6. **Small-Cell Applications.** For small wireless applications, any proposed facility must be in the most preferred location and configuration, as described in section 17.46.060(A)(3), within 250 feet from the proposed site in any direction, or the applicant must demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence in the written record that any more-preferred location or configuration within 250 feet would be technically infeasible, applying the preference standards of this section.
- C. **Master Use Permit.** A service provider who intends to establish multiple wireless telecommunications facilities within the City is encouraged to apply for the approval of all facilities under a Master Use Permit. Under this approach, all proposed facilities may be acted upon by the City as a single application, ensuring feasibility of long-range company projections
- D. **Communications consultant may be required.** In the event that the City needs assistance in understanding the technical aspects of a particular proposal, the services of a communications consultant may be requested to determine the engineering or screening requirements of establishing a specific wireless communications facility. This service will be provided at the applicant's expense.
- E. **Required findings for approval.** The approval of a Use Permit or Minor Use Permit for a communication facility shall require that the review authority first



make the following findings, in addition to those required for Use Permit approval by Section 17.72.060 (Use Permit and Minor Use Permit):

1. The height of the tower is no taller than necessary to meet the technical requirements of the proposed wireless communication system;
2. The applicant has agreed to accept proposals from future applicants to co-locate at the approved site;
3. The project as proposed is necessary for the provision of an efficient wireless communication system;
4. The communication facility will not adversely impact the character and aesthetics of any public right-of-way; and
5. The communication facility complies with all applicable requirements of this Chapter.

**F. Shot Clocks.**

1. Within 30 calendar days after receiving a small wireless permit application, the director shall review the application for completeness, and if any application does not contain all the materials required, shall send written notice to the applicant that identifies the missing or incomplete requirements.
2. Unless a written agreement between the applicant and the city provides otherwise, the application review period is tolled when the city notifies the applicant within ten (10) days of the applicant's submission of the application that the application is materially incomplete and identifies the missing documents or information. The shot clock may again be tolled if the city provides notice within ten (10) days of the application's resubmittal that it is materially incomplete and identifies the missing documents or information. For an application to deploy small wireless facilities, if the city notifies the applicant on or before the tenth (10th) day after submission that the application is materially incomplete, and identifies the missing documents or information and the rule or regulation creating the obligation to submit such documents or information, the shot clock date calculation will restart at zero on the date the applicant submits a completed application.
3. The city must approve or deny an application for all facility permits, together with any other city permits required for a proposed telecommunication facility, within ninety (90) days after the applicant submits an application to collocate a telecommunication facility using an existing structure, and within one hundred and fifty (150) days after the applicant submits an application to deploy a telecommunication facility using a new structure.

4. Notwithstanding subdivision (a)(3) of this section, the city must approve or deny an application for the modification of an existing wireless tower or base station that does not substantially change the physical dimensions of that tower or base station within sixty (60) days after the applicant submits such an application to modify a telecommunication facility.
5. Notwithstanding subdivision (a)(3) of this section, the city must approve or deny an application for a small wireless facility permit, together with any other city permits required for a proposed small wireless facility, within sixty (60) days after the applicant submits an application to collocate a small wireless facility using an existing structure, and within ninety (90) days after the applicant submits an application to deploy a small wireless facility using a new or replacement structure.

SECTION 2. CODE AMENDMENT. Section 17.46.060 of Chapter 17.46 of Title 17 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code is amended as follows:

#### **17.46.060 – Facility Design and Development Standards**

Each proposed communication facility shall comply with the following standards; except that any standard may be modified or waived by the review authority upon a determination that effective signal reception and transmission will not occur if the facility complies with these standards. The review authority may also grant an exception to the following standards, on such terms as the City may deem appropriate, if the review authority determines that granting an exception is necessary to comply with state and federal law or regulations and if the applicant shows by clear and convincing evidence that no other location or combination of locations or other proposed facility in compliance with these standards can provide comparable communications.

##### **A. Facility placement.**

1. Standards for all facilities.
  - a. A roof-mounted antenna on a structure that complies with applicable height limits shall be set back from the nearest roof edge the equivalent of the height of the tower or a minimum of 10 feet, whichever is greater.
  - b. A ground-mounted communication facility (including towers and antennas) shall be located as far as possible from all property boundaries, and set back from the property line at a ratio of 1.5 horizontal feet for every one foot of height, where feasible.
  - c. A tower or antenna shall be set back from all property and public right-of-way lines by a minimum of 25 feet. No part of any tower

shall extend into a required front setback or beyond a property line of the site.

- d. Communication facilities other than towers and antennas shall be located either within a structure, underground, in a rear yard (not visible from a public right-of-way), or on a screened roof top area. Communications equipment may be located within a front or side setback or within a public right-of-way only if it is underground. See also Subsection D. (Visibility and screening), below.
2. Facilities within commercial and industrial zones. Within an industrial zone, a minimum distance of 500 feet shall be provided between towers, and there shall be no more than two towers on a single Assessor's parcel or developed site, unless the towers are located on a public facility as described in A.1, above.
3. Small wireless facilities. The city prefers that small wireless facilities in the public right of way be configured on the following support structures, in order of preference from most to least preferred: existing or replacement street light standard; existing or replacement concrete or steel utility pole; existing or replacement wood utility pole; new street light standard; new utility pole. The city prefers that small wireless facilities outside the public right of way be configured on the following support structures, in order of preference from most to least preferred: on existing, approved wireless facility support structures operating in compliance with the Municipal Code; on existing buildings or non-tower structures; on existing or replacement utility poles or towers; in new towers meeting the height requirements of the applicable FCC regulations.

#### **B. Height limitations.**

1. All ground mounted communication equipment, antennas, poles, or towers shall be of a minimum functional height.
2. The height of a communications tower shall be no taller than necessary to meet the technical requirements of the proposed communication system. A technical report and/or radio propagation model shall be submitted with each application and in compliance with Section 17.46.040.B.
3. The height of a communications facility located on a structure other than a dedicated support tower shall not exceed 20 feet above the highest point of the structure and shall at no time exceed the height allowed by the applicable zone.
4. An antenna mounted on the side of a structure shall not extend above the structure's parapet so that it is visible from below against the sky.

#### **C. Colors and materials.**

1. All antennas, poles, towers, or equipment, including ancillary support equipment, shall have a non-reflective finish and shall be painted or otherwise treated to match or blend with the primary background and minimize visual impacts.
  2. Antennas attached to a structure shall be painted or otherwise treated to match the exterior of the structure or the antenna's background color.
  3. A new freestanding tower shall be designed to appear as a native pine tree to the extent feasible.
  4. All ground-mounted equipment shall be covered with a clear anti-graffiti type material of a type approved by the Director or shall be adequately secured to prevent graffiti.
- D. **Visibility and screening.** All ground mounted equipment shall be sited in compliance with Subsection A.1.d above, and so that it will be screened by existing development, topography, or vegetation. Ground mounted facilities shall be located within structures, underground, or in areas where substantial screening by existing structures or vegetation can be achieved. The applicant shall use the smallest and least visible antennas possible to accomplish the owner/operator's coverage objectives. All facilities shall be designed and constructed to be integrated into a building, light standard, or other structure, or placed on or within a building or other structure to the maximum extent feasible. All facilities shall include appropriate stealth and concealment techniques given the proposed location, design, visual environment, and nearby uses and/or structures. All equipment shall be placed underground to the maximum extent feasible. All wires, cables, and any other connections shall be concealed from public view to the maximum extent feasible.
- E. **Additional screening and landscaping.** As part of project review, the Director, the Commission, or the Council (on appeal) may require additional screening and/or landscaping, undergrounding, an alternative color scheme, or relocation of a tower or ancillary equipment to a less obtrusive area of the site where it would have a less prominent visual presence due to slope, topography, size, or relationship to public right-of-ways.
- F. **Power lines.** All power lines to and within a communication facility site shall be underground.
- G. **Backup power supplies.** A backup power supply (i.e., generator) located in an industrial zone shall be enclosed within a structure and operated in compliance with Section 17.46.060.D (Visibility and screening). In any zone, ancillary power supplies and fuel storage tanks to support backup power supplies shall require Use Permit approval.

- H. **Historic District.** A facility in a City's historic district shall not adversely impact the historic district's character-defining elements and contributing buildings nor adversely impact non-contributing buildings in a way that adversely impacts the historic district's overall character. A facility in a City must be designed to be entirely stealth, meaning it must be designed and constructed to be integrated into a building, light standard, or other structure, or placed on or within a building or other structure, so that any antennas, equipment cabinets, transmission equipment, or any other apparatus associated with the facility's function is completely hidden and not visible. Only non-functional, screening material equivalent in appearance to the existing, underlying building, light standard, or other structure may be visible. A wireless facility may be not located within or on a building or structure that is defined as a contributing building or structure to the historic district.
- I. **Small Cell Facilities.** A restriction in this section shall not apply to small wireless facilities if the applicant provides, as part of the permit application, clear and convincing evidence that:
1. The restriction materially inhibits the provision of wireless service; or
  2. It is technically infeasible to comply with a restriction while supporting a small cell facility.

SECTION 3. CODE AMENDMENT. The Definition of "Telecommunications Facility" in Section 17.100.020 of Chapter 17.100 of Title 17 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code is amended as follows:

**Telecommunications Facility.** Public, commercial and private electromagnetic and photoelectrical transmission, broadcast, repeater and receiving stations for radio, television, telegraph, telephone, data network, and wireless communications, including commercial earth stations for satellite-based communications. Includes antennas, commercial satellite dish antennas, and equipment buildings. Does not include telephone, telegraph and cable television transmission facilities utilizing hard-wired or direct cable connections. The following terms and phrases are defined for the purposes of Chapter 17.44 (Telecommunications Facilities).

1. **Antenna.** Any system of poles, panels, rods, reflecting discs or similar devices used for the transmission or reception of electromagnetic waves or radio frequency signals.
2. **Colocation.** The location of two or more wireless, hard wire, or cable communication facilities on a single support structure or otherwise sharing a common location. Collocation shall also include the location of communication facilities with other facilities (e.g., water tanks, light standards, and other utility facilities and structures).

3. **Communication Facility.** An unstaffed facility, generally consisting of antennas, and equipment cabinet or structure, and related equipment, which receives and/or transmits electromagnetic waves, light waves, radio frequencies or other types of signals. Communication Facility includes Small Wireless Facility, as defined in this section.
4. **Equipment Cabinet.** A cabinet or structure used to house equipment associated with a wireless, hard wire, or cable communication facility.
5. **Monopole.** A single freestanding pole, post, or similar structure, used to support equipment associated with a single communication facility.
6. **Multipoint Distribution Service.** A microwave communication service that delivers video programming, data and/or voice communication directly to subscribers, including multi-channel multipoint distribution series, instructional television fixed services, and local multipoint distribution services, or as defined by the Section 207 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Section 1.4000 of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations and any interpretative decisions thereof issued by the Federal Communications Commission.
7. **Service Provider.** Any authorized provider of telecommunications services.
8. **Shot Clock.** The timeframe within which the city shall act on a wireless application, as defined by the FCC and applicable state law and as may be amended from time to time.
9. **Small Wireless Facility.** A small wireless facility as defined by the FCC and that meets the following requirements:
  - a. The small wireless facilities:
    - i. Are mounted on structures 50 feet or less in height including their antennas, or
    - ii. Are mounted on structures no more than 10 percent taller than other adjacent structures, or
    - iii. Do not extend existing structures on which they are located to a height of more than 50 feet or by more than 10 percent, whichever is greater;
  - b. Each antenna associated with the deployment, excluding associated antenna equipment, is no more than three cubic feet in volume;
  - c. All other wireless equipment associated with the structure, including the wireless equipment associated with the antenna and any pre-existing associated equipment, is no more than 28 cubic feet in volume;
  - d. The facilities do not require antenna structure registration under part 17 of 47 C.F.R.;
  - e. The facilities are not located on Tribal lands; and
  - f. The facilities do not result in human exposure to radiofrequency radiation in excess of the applicable safety standards specified in 47 C.F.R. section 1.1307(b).

10. **Tower.** Any ground or roof mounted pole, spire, structure, or combination thereof taller than 15 feet, including supporting lines, cables, wires, braces, and masts, intended primarily for the purpose of mounting an antenna or similar apparatus above grade.

SECTION 4. CEQA Findings. This Ordinance is not a project within the meaning of Section 15378 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines because it has no potential to result in physical change in the environment, directly or indirectly. If this Ordinance is found to be a project under CEQA, it is exempt under CEQA Guideline 15061(b)(3) because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the Ordinance may have a significant effect on the environment.

SECTION 5. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion of this Ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or its application to other persons and circumstances. The City Council of the City of Grass Valley declares that it would have adopted this Ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion thereof despite the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or portions be declared invalid or unconstitutional and, to that end, the provisions hereof are hereby declared to be severable.

SECTION 6. Extension of Urgency Ordinance No. 793. Adoption of this ordinance shall constitute an extension of Urgency Ordinance No. 793 for a period of 10 months and 15 days pursuant to the authority set forth in Section 65858 of the California Government Code. All provisions of Ordinance No. 793 shall remain in full force and effect during the term of this ordinance.

SECTION 7. Effective Date. This urgency ordinance shall become effective immediately because its passage is required for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety. This ordinance shall expire 10 months and 15 days following such effective date, unless otherwise further extended in compliance with California Government Code section 65858.

SECTION 8. Publication. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Ordinance and shall cause the same to be published once in *The Union*, a newspaper of general circulation printed, published, and circulated within the City.

FINAL PASSAGE AND ADOPTION by the City Council was at a meeting held on the 14th day of April 14, 2020, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINING:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Swarthout, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael G. Colantuono, City Attorney

\_\_\_\_\_  
Andy Heath, Acting City Clerk





**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

**Council Meeting Date:** May 14, 2019

**Date Prepared:** May 8, 2019

**Prepared by:** Ryan Reed, Assistant City Attorney *RR*  
Lance E. Lowe, AICP, Principal Planner *KL*

**Title:** Extension of Urgency Ordinance No. 793 Amending Chapter 17.46 and Chapter 17.100 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code regarding Wireless Telecommunications.

**Recommended Motion:** That the City Council Adopt Ordinance 794, by a four-fifths vote, Extending Urgency Ordinance No. 793 amending Chapter 17.46 and Chapter 17.100 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code regarding Wireless Telecommunications for a period of 10 months and 15 days in accordance with Government Code Section 65858.

**Agenda:** Public Hearing

**Background Information:** On April 9, 2019, the City Council adopted Urgency Ordinance No. 793 amending Chapter 17.46 and Chapter 17.100 of the City's Development Code regulating wireless telecommunications facilities for a forty-five (45) day period. Urgency Ordinance No. 793 ensured that the City had regulations in place before April 15, 2019, when Federal Communications Commission regulations became effective.

As directed by the City Council on April 9, 2019, prior to the expiration of Urgency Ordinance No. 793, staff is initiating amendments to the City's Development Code Chapter 17.46 entitled Telecommunications Facilities for Planning Commission recommendation and City Council consideration. Staff has determined that more time is needed than 45 days to study the effects of the recent changes to federal law, regulations, and decisions. Therefore, the City Council will adopt Ordinance No. 794 to extend Urgency Ordinance No. 793 for a period of 10 months and 15 days in accordance with Government Code Section 65858. During that period, the Planning Commission and City Council will consider the adoption of a regular ordinance. This extension ensures that regulations will continue to be in effect for small wireless facilities until the regular ordinance is adopted, and thus is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety.

**Council Goals/Objectives:** The ordinances fulfill the infrastructure objectives outlined in the adopted Grass Valley Strategic Plan.

**Fiscal Impact:** The ordinances and amendment of Chapter 17.46 have and will be completed by both Community Development Department staff and the City Attorney's Office, with existing staffing resources allocated within the adopted 18 -19 budget.

ATTACHMENT 2

Agenda Item # **10-1**

8 - 16



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

**Funds Available:** N/A

**Account #:** N/A

**Reviewed by:**

*ML* City Manager

*JL* Community Development Director

**Attachment:**

**Attachment 1 – Ordinance No. 794 Extending Urgency Ordinance No. 793**



# ATTACHMENT

**ORDINANCE NO. 794**

**EXTENSION OF AN URGENCY ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRASS VALLEY AMENDING CHAPTER 17.46 OF THE GRASS VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES APPLICATIONS AND AMENDING THE DEFINITION OF "TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES" IN SECTION 17.100.020 OF CHAPTER 17.100 OF TITLE 17 OF THE GRASS VALLEY MUNICIPAL CODE**

**WHEREAS**, Government Code section 65858 and Article VII, § 1 of the Grass Valley City Charter authorize the City Council by a four-fifths vote to adopt an urgency ordinance for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety; and

**WHEREAS**, federal law, regulations, and decisions of regulatory agencies regarding small wireless telecommunications facilities will significantly change effective April 15, 2019; and

**WHEREAS**, without an ordinance regulating small wireless telecommunications facilities to the extent authorized and in accordance with federal and state law, the City may not be authorized to regulate the location and aesthetics of these facilities; and

**WHEREAS**, the unrestricted installation of redundant wireless telecommunications facilities presents a current and immediate threat to the City's efforts to stabilize economic and social aspects of neighborhood environments, and to the health, safety, and welfare of the City and its residents; and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council adopted Urgency Ordinance No. 793 by a four-fifths vote, pursuant to Government Code section 65858 and Article VII, § 1 of the Grass Valley City Charter on April 9, 2019 in response to the federal law, regulations, and decisions regarding small wireless telecommunications facilities; and

**WHEREAS**, the extension of Urgency Ordinance No. 793 is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, and safety because more time is needed than forty-five (45) days to study the effects of the recent changes to federal law, regulations and decisions regarding small wireless telecommunications facilities; and

**WHEREAS**, on May 3, 2019, a notice of public hearing to be held on this Ordinance on May 14, 2019 was published in accordance with Government Code sections 65858 and 65090; and

**WHEREAS**, on May 14, 2019, the City Council held a public hearing on this Ordinance in accordance with Government Code section 65858.

Be it ordained by the council of the City of Grass Valley:

SECTION 1. CODE AMENDMENT. Section 17.46.040 of Chapter 17.46 of Title 17 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code is amended as follows:

**17.46.040 – Permit Requirements**

- A. **Use Permit or Minor Use Permit.** Use Permit approval is required for all communication facilities subject to this Chapter, except for the following, which shall require Minor Use Permit approval. The Director shall ensure through the Minor Use Permit approval that each of the following facilities complies with all applicable requirements of this Chapter. The Director may also choose to defer action and refer any of the following facilities to the Commission for consideration as a Use Permit application when:
1. An antenna that is installed and maintained on an existing structure and is:
    - a. Under the roofline or above, behind, and below an existing approved roof screen and does not extend above the highest point of the structure; or
    - b. Camouflaged within an existing structure so as not to be visible from a public right-of-way or other property; or
    - c. Architecturally blended into the structure.
  2. A communication facility in which the antenna is mounted on a mast less than 10 feet high, is not located on a historic structure, and is not visible from a public right-of-way.
  3. An antenna that is co-located on an existing telecommunications tower.
  4. An amateur and/or citizens band antenna operated by a person holding a license issued by the FCC in compliance with 47 C.F.R. Part 97, and used solely in connection with that license, and which shall be subject to the "minimum practicable regulation to accomplish the local authority's legitimate purpose," in keeping with the order of the FCC known as "PRB-1," FCC 85-506, released September 19, 1985; provided that there shall be no more than one antenna support structure on a single parcel and that the antenna structure complies with the height limits of the applicable zone.
- B. **Application requirements.** In addition to the information required for Use Permit or Minor Use Permit application by Chapter 17.70 (Permit Application Filing and Processing) the application for a communication facility shall include:
1. **Map and analysis of future service needs and technology of proposed facility.** A map showing planned and/or anticipated future needs of wireless communication services within and throughout the County. In addition to the map, the applicant shall explain the basis for the projected

service requirements. To the extent feasible, planned and anticipated needs for future wireless communication facilities shall be forecasted for a minimum of two years following the date of application for a new wireless communication facility. An applicant not able to submit planned and/or anticipated needs forecasted for two years shall explain why it is not feasible to do so. The applicant shall also supply a "search ring" within which their new facilities and associated communications equipment must be sited, and shall explain the criteria used to establish the "search ring" and the constraints of siting facilities outside of it. The applicant shall include a technical report demonstrating that the proposed facility uses the best commercially available technology to accomplish the applicant's wireless service coverage objectives, to minimize the number and frequency of continued upgrades and community disruptions caused by facilities with substandard technology.

2. **An alternative site analysis.** An alternative site analysis detailing the specific steps undertaken to determine the applicant's selection of a particular project site and its relationship to the location preferences prescribed in this Chapter. The analysis shall include a radio propagation model for each carrier, or carriers if the monopole/towers are for multiple users. The alternative analysis shall include the following information:
  - a. A topographical map of the proposed local service area and which identifies the local network facilities with which the proposed site will interconnect;
  - b. Identification of all other existing structures which might provide an opportunity for ~~attached antenna facilities~~ co-location;
  - c. Identification of service gaps in the proposed service area, or areas of high usage requiring in-fill of existing service areas; and
  - d. A technical report discussing why alternatives would not be feasible for use as a communications site. This may include construction, interconnect, utility or other factors precluding development of the property or facility as a suitable site.
  - e. This subdivision (B)(2) shall not apply to small wireless facility applications.
3. **Certification of compliance with standards.** Certification acceptable to the Director that the proposed facility will at all times comply with all applicable health requirements and standards pertaining to electromagnetic and/or radio frequency radiation.
4. **Report on potential interference with emergency service provider communications.** A report, as required by the Police Department, to

evaluate the potential for interference (e.g., HF, UHF, VHF, 800 MHz). The applicant shall be responsible for paying any costs incurred by the City, including the costs of retaining consultants, to review and analyze the report.

5. **Visual Simulations.** A visual analysis that includes (1) scaled visual simulations that show unobstructed before-and-after construction daytime and clear-weather views from at least four (4) angles, together with a map that shows the location of each view angle; (2) a color and finished material palate for proposed screening materials; and (3) a photograph of a completed facility of the same design and in roughly the same setting as the proposed wireless communication facility.
  6. **Small-Cell Applications.** For small wireless applications, any proposed facility must be in the most preferred location and configuration, as described in section 17.46.060(A)(3), within 250 feet from the proposed site in any direction, or the applicant must demonstrate with clear and convincing evidence in the written record that any more-preferred location or configuration within 250 feet would be technically infeasible, applying the preference standards of this section.
- C. **Master Use Permit.** A service provider who intends to establish multiple wireless telecommunications facilities within the City is encouraged to apply for the approval of all facilities under a Master Use Permit. Under this approach, all proposed facilities may be acted upon by the City as a single application, ensuring feasibility of long-range company projections
- D. **Communications consultant may be required.** In the event that the City needs assistance in understanding the technical aspects of a particular proposal, the services of a communications consultant may be requested to determine the engineering or screening requirements of establishing a specific wireless communications facility. This service will be provided at the applicant's expense.
- E. **Required findings for approval.** The approval of a Use Permit or Minor Use Permit for a communication facility shall require that the review authority first make the following findings, in addition to those required for Use Permit approval by Section 17.72.060 (Use Permit and Minor Use Permit):
1. The height of the tower is no taller than necessary to meet the technical requirements of the proposed wireless communication system;
  2. The applicant has agreed to accept proposals from future applicants to co-locate at the approved site;
  3. The project as proposed is necessary for the provision of an efficient wireless communication system;

4. The communication facility will not adversely impact the character and aesthetics of any public right-of-way; and
5. The communication facility complies with all applicable requirements of this Chapter.

**F. Shot Clocks.**

1. Within 30 calendar days after receiving a small wireless permit application, the director shall review the application for completeness, and if any application does not contain all the materials required, shall send written notice to the applicant that identifies the missing or incomplete requirements.
2. Unless a written agreement between the applicant and the city provides otherwise, the application review period is tolled when the city notifies the applicant within ten (10) days of the applicant's submission of the application that the application is materially incomplete and identifies the missing documents or information. The shot clock may again be tolled if the city provides notice within ten (10) days of the application's resubmittal that it is materially incomplete and identifies the missing documents or information. For an application to deploy small wireless facilities, if the city notifies the applicant on or before the tenth (10th) day after submission that the application is materially incomplete, and identifies the missing documents or information and the rule or regulation creating the obligation to submit such documents or information, the shot clock date calculation will restart at zero on the date the applicant submits a completed application.
3. The city must approve or deny an application for all facility permits, together with any other city permits required for a proposed telecommunication facility, within ninety (90) days after the applicant submits an application to collocate a telecommunication facility using an existing structure, and within one hundred and fifty (150) days after the applicant submits an application to deploy a telecommunication facility using a new structure.
4. Notwithstanding subdivision (a)(3) of this section, the city must approve or deny an application for the modification of an existing wireless tower or base station that does not substantially change the physical dimensions of that tower or base station within sixty (60) days after the applicant submits such an application to modify a telecommunication facility.
5. Notwithstanding subdivision (a)(3) of this section, the city must approve or deny an application for a small wireless facility permit, together with any other city permits required for a proposed small wireless facility, within



sixty (60) days after the applicant submits an application to collocate a small wireless facility using an existing structure, and within ninety (90) days after the applicant submits an application to deploy a small wireless facility using a new or replacement structure.

SECTION 2. CODE AMENDMENT. Section 17.46.060 of Chapter 17.46 of Title 17 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code is amended as follows:

#### **17.46.060 – Facility Design and Development Standards**

Each proposed communication facility shall comply with the following standards; except that any standard may be modified or waived by the review authority upon a determination that effective signal reception and transmission will not occur if the facility complies with these standards. The review authority may also grant an exception to the following standards, on such terms as the City may deem appropriate, if the review authority determines that granting an exception is necessary to comply with state and federal law or regulations and if the applicant shows by clear and convincing evidence that no other location or combination of locations or other proposed facility in compliance with these standards can provide comparable communications.

##### **A. Facility placement.**

###### **1. Standards for all facilities.**

- a. A roof-mounted antenna on a structure that complies with applicable height limits shall be set back from the nearest roof edge the equivalent of the height of the tower or a minimum of 10 feet, whichever is greater.
- b. A ground-mounted communication facility (including towers and antennas) shall be located as far as possible from all property boundaries, and set back from the property line at a ratio of 1.5 horizontal feet for every one foot of height, where feasible.
- c. A tower or antenna shall be set back from all property and public right-of-way lines by a minimum of 25 feet. No part of any tower shall extend into a required front setback or beyond a property line of the site.
- d. Communication facilities other than towers and antennas shall be located either within a structure, underground, in a rear yard (not visible from a public right-of-way), or on a screened roof top area. Communications equipment may be located within a front or side setback or within a public right-of-way only if it is underground. See also Subsection D. (Visibility and screening), below.

2. Facilities within commercial and industrial zones. Within an industrial zone, a minimum distance of 500 feet shall be provided between towers, and there shall be no more than two towers on a single Assessor's parcel or developed site, unless the towers are located on a public facility as described in A.1, above.
3. Small wireless facilities. The city prefers that small wireless facilities in the public right of way be configured on the following support structures, in order of preference from most to least preferred: existing or replacement street light standard; existing or replacement concrete or steel utility pole; existing or replacement wood utility pole; new street light standard; new utility pole. The city prefers that small wireless facilities outside the public right of way be configured on the following support structures, in order of preference from most to least preferred: on existing, approved wireless facility support structures operating in compliance with the Municipal Code; on existing buildings or non-tower structures; on existing or replacement utility poles or towers; in new towers meeting the height requirements of the applicable FCC regulations.

**B. Height limitations.**

1. All ground mounted communication equipment, antennas, poles, or towers shall be of a minimum functional height.
2. The height of a communications tower shall be no taller than necessary to meet the technical requirements of the proposed communication system. A technical report and/or radio propagation model shall be submitted with each application and in compliance with Section 17.46.040.B.
3. The height of a communications facility located on a structure other than a dedicated support tower shall not exceed 20 feet above the highest point of the structure and shall at no time exceed the height allowed by the applicable zone.
4. An antenna mounted on the side of a structure shall not extend above the structure's parapet so that it is visible from below against the sky.

**C. Colors and materials.**

1. All antennas, poles, towers, or equipment, including ancillary support equipment, shall have a non-reflective finish and shall be painted or otherwise treated to match or blend with the primary background and minimize visual impacts.
2. Antennas attached to a structure shall be painted or otherwise treated to match the exterior of the structure or the antenna's background color.
3. A new freestanding tower shall be designed to appear as a native pine tree to the extent feasible.

4. All ground-mounted equipment shall be covered with a clear anti-graffiti type material of a type approved by the Director or shall be adequately secured to prevent graffiti.
- D. **Visibility and screening.** All ground mounted equipment shall be sited in compliance with Subsection A.1.d above, and so that it will be screened by existing development, topography, or vegetation. Ground mounted facilities shall be located within structures, underground, or in areas where substantial screening by existing structures or vegetation can be achieved. The applicant shall use the smallest and least visible antennas possible to accomplish the owner/operator's coverage objectives. All facilities shall be designed and constructed to be integrated into a building, light standard, or other structure, or placed on or within a building or other structure to the maximum extent feasible. All facilities shall include appropriate stealth and concealment techniques given the proposed location, design, visual environment, and nearby uses and/or structures. All equipment shall be placed underground to the maximum extent feasible. All wires, cables, and any other connections shall be concealed from public view to the maximum extent feasible.
- E. **Additional screening and landscaping.** As part of project review, the Director, the Commission, or the Council (on appeal) may require additional screening and/or landscaping, undergrounding, an alternative color scheme, or relocation of a tower or ancillary equipment to a less obtrusive area of the site where it would have a less prominent visual presence due to slope, topography, size, or relationship to public right-of-ways.
- F. **Power lines.** All power lines to and within a communication facility site shall be underground.
- G. **Backup power supplies.** A backup power supply (i.e., generator) located in an industrial zone shall be enclosed within a structure and operated in compliance with Section 17.46.060.D (Visibility and screening). In any zone, ancillary power supplies and fuel storage tanks to support backup power supplies shall require Use Permit approval.
- H. **Historic District.** A facility in a City's historic district shall not adversely impact the historic district's character-defining elements and contributing buildings nor adversely impact non-contributing buildings in a way that adversely impacts the historic district's overall character. A facility in a City must be designed to be entirely stealth, meaning it must be designed and constructed to be integrated into a building, light standard, or other structure, or placed on or within a building or other structure, so that any antennas, equipment cabinets, transmission equipment, or any other apparatus associated with the facility's function is completely hidden and not visible. Only non-functional, screening material

equivalent in appearance to the existing, underlying building, light standard, or other structure may be visible. A wireless facility may be not located within or on a building or structure that is defined as a contributing building or structure to the historic district.

- I. Small Cell Facilities. A restriction in this section shall not apply to small wireless facilities if the applicant provides, as part of the permit application, clear and convincing evidence that:
  1. The restriction materially inhibits the provision of wireless service; or
  2. It is technically infeasible to comply with a restriction while supporting a small cell facility.

SECTION 3. CODE AMENDMENT. The Definition of "Telecommunications Facility" in Section 17.100.020 of Chapter 17.100 of Title 17 of the Grass Valley Municipal Code is amended as follows:

**Telecommunications Facility.** Public, commercial and private electromagnetic and photoelectrical transmission, broadcast, repeater and receiving stations for radio, television, telegraph, telephone, data network, and wireless communications, including commercial earth stations for satellite-based communications. Includes antennas, commercial satellite dish antennas, and equipment buildings. Does not include telephone, telegraph and cable television transmission facilities utilizing hard-wired or direct cable connections. The following terms and phrases are defined for the purposes of Chapter 17.44 (Telecommunications Facilities).

1. **Antenna.** Any system of poles, panels, rods, reflecting discs or similar devices used for the transmission or reception of electromagnetic waves or radio frequency signals.
2. **Colocation.** The location of two or more wireless, hard wire, or cable communication facilities on a single support structure or otherwise sharing a common location. Collocation shall also include the location of communication facilities with other facilities (e.g., water tanks, light standards, and other utility facilities and structures).
3. **Communication Facility.** An unstaffed facility, generally consisting of antennas, and equipment cabinet or structure, and related equipment, which receives and/or transmits electromagnetic waves, light waves, radio frequencies or other types of signals. Communication Facility includes Small Wireless Facility, as defined in this section.
4. **Equipment Cabinet.** A cabinet or structure used to house equipment associated with a wireless, hard wire, or cable communication facility.
5. **Monopole.** A single freestanding pole, post, or similar structure, used to support equipment associated with a single communication facility.

6. **Multipoint Distribution Service.** A microwave communication service that delivers video programming, data and/or voice communication directly to subscribers, including multi-channel multipoint distribution series, instructional television fixed services, and local multipoint distribution services, or as defined by the Section 207 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Section 1.4000 of Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations and any interpretative decisions thereof issued by the Federal Communications Commission.
7. **Service Provider.** Any authorized provider of telecommunications services.
8. **Shot Clock.** The timeframe within which the city shall act on a wireless application, as defined by the FCC and applicable state law and as may be amended from time to time.
9. **Small Wireless Facility.** A small wireless facility as defined by the FCC and that meets the following requirements:
  - a. The small wireless facilities:
    - i. Are mounted on structures 50 feet or less in height including their antennas,  
or
    - ii. Are mounted on structures no more than 10 percent taller than other adjacent structures, or
    - iii. Do not extend existing structures on which they are located to a height of more than 50 feet or by more than 10 percent, whichever is greater;
  - b. Each antenna associated with the deployment, excluding associated antenna equipment, is no more than three cubic feet in volume;
  - c. All other wireless equipment associated with the structure, including the wireless equipment associated with the antenna and any pre-existing associated equipment, is no more than 28 cubic feet in volume;
  - d. The facilities do not require antenna structure registration under part 17 of 47 C.F.R.;
  - e. The facilities are not located on Tribal lands; and
  - f. The facilities do not result in human exposure to radiofrequency radiation in excess of the applicable safety standards specified in 47 C.F.R. section 1.1307(b).
10. **Tower.** Any ground or roof mounted pole, spire, structure, or combination thereof taller than 15 feet, including supporting lines, cables, wires, braces, and masts, intended primarily for the purpose of mounting an antenna or similar apparatus above grade.

SECTION 4. CEQA Findings. This Ordinance is not a project within the meaning of Section 15378 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines because it has no potential to result in physical change in the environment, directly or indirectly. If this Ordinance is found to be a project under CEQA, it is exempt under CEQA Guideline

15061(b)(3) because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the Ordinance may have a significant effect on the environment.

SECTION 5. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion of this Ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or its application to other persons and circumstances. The City Council of the City of Grass Valley declares that it would have adopted this Ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion thereof despite the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or portions be declared invalid or unconstitutional and, to that end, the provisions hereof are hereby declared to be severable.

SECTION 6. Extension of Urgency Ordinance No. 793. Adoption of this ordinance shall constitute an extension of Urgency Ordinance No. 793 for a period of 10 months and 15 days pursuant to the authority set forth in Section 65858 of the California Government Code. All provisions of Ordinance No. 793 shall remain in full force and effect during the term of this ordinance.

SECTION 7. Effective Date. This urgency ordinance shall become effective immediately because its passage is required for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety. This ordinance shall expire 10 months and 15 days following such effective date, unless otherwise further extended in compliance with California Government Code section 65858.

SECTION 8. Publication. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Ordinance and shall cause the same to be published once in *The Union*, a newspaper of general circulation printed, published, and circulated within the City.

FINAL PASSAGE AND ADOPTION by the City Council was at a meeting held on the 14th day of May, 2019, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINING:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Swarthout, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael G. Colantuono, City Attorney

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kristi K. Bashor, City Clerk

## Lance Lowe

---

**From:** Abigail Walker  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 7, 2020 9:46 AM  
**To:** Lance Lowe  
**Subject:** FW: Stop Deployment of Wireless during Quarantine

**From:** Alexis Rosenbaum <alexis.rosenbaum@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 7, 2020 9:16 AM  
**To:** Kristi Bashor <kristib@cityofgrassvalley.com>  
**Subject:** Stop Deployment of Wireless during Quarantine

Dear Ms. Bashor,

Dear Mayor & City Council Member,

We ask that you impose a moratorium on “small cells” and other wireless infrastructure permits process and deployment until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

The wireless providers are using the COVID-19 emergency as cover to expand and cement their rapid and virtually unsupervised deployment of harmful wireless infrastructure. Our local leaders should not have to dedicate time and resources to policing whether the wireless companies are following local and state law, they have far more important things to do.

The FCC wireless permit rules allow emergency moratoria. Homeland Security guidelines emphasize that maintenance of existing communications capability is the priority. New construction is not “essential.”

The COVID-19 emergency has led to a government shut down of non-essential activity. Hospitals, emergency response and local officials are overwhelmed and they must be allowed to focus on what is indeed “essential”. Now is not the time to be dedicating resources to expanding, rather than just maintaining, our networks.

The FCC has directly held a local jurisdiction can impose a temporary halt to deployment and permits during emergencies. In the Matter of Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers, FCC 18-111, 33 FCC Rcd 7705, 7784-7785, ¶157 (2018) (“We recognize that there may be limited situations in the case of a natural disaster or other comparable emergency where an express or de facto moratoria that violates section 253(a) may nonetheless be ‘necessary’ to ‘protect the public safety and welfare’ or to ‘ensure the continued quality of telecommunications services.’”)

Homeland Security has declared that local government is on the forefront and can take control over determining whether to temporarily halt all non-essential activity. Homeland Security guidance documents prioritize maintenance of existing Communications Systems, and do not support “essential” status for new construction. See Homeland Security Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency, Identifying Critical Infrastructure During COVID-19, <https://www.cisa.gov/identifying-critical-infrastructure-during-covid-19> (local control); e-Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources Support Annex, <http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-support-cikr.pdf> (focus on “protection, response, recovery, and restoration”). Homeland Security, like the FCC, understands that it is essential in an emergency situations justify focusing on protecting, responding, recovering and restoring of existing systems, but new communications facilities construction is and should be deemed nonessential, and subject to lockdown for so long as we are under emergency conditions.



Cities can and should impose a moratorium on deployment in their local area and freeze the permit process until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

Sincerely,  
Alexis Rosenbaum  
PO Box 3228  
Grass Valley, CA 95945

## Lance Lowe

---

**From:** Abigail Walker  
**Sent:** Monday, April 6, 2020 4:43 PM  
**To:** Lance Lowe  
**Subject:** FW: Stop Deployment of Wireless during Quarantine

**From:** ariel wolansky <arielwolansky@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 6, 2020 4:41 PM  
**To:** Kristi Bashor <kristib@cityofgrassvalley.com>  
**Subject:** Stop Deployment of Wireless during Quarantine

Dear Ms. Bashor,

Dear Mayor & City Council Member,

We ask that you impose a moratorium on "small cells" and other wireless infrastructure permits process and deployment until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

The wireless providers are using the COVID-19 emergency as cover to expand and cement their rapid and virtually unsupervised deployment of harmful wireless infrastructure. Our local leaders should not have to dedicate time and resources to policing whether the wireless companies are following local and state law, they have far more important things to do.

The FCC wireless permit rules allow emergency moratoria. Homeland Security guidelines emphasize that maintenance of existing communications capability is the priority. New construction is not "essential."

The COVID-19 emergency has led to a government shut down of non-essential activity. Hospitals, emergency response and local officials are overwhelmed and they must be allowed to focus on what is indeed "essential". Now is not the time to be dedicating resources to expanding, rather than just maintaining, our networks.

The FCC has directly held a local jurisdiction can impose a temporary halt to deployment and permits during emergencies. In the Matter of Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers, FCC 18-111, 33 FCC Rcd 7705, 7784-7785, ¶157 (2018) ("We recognize that there may be limited situations in the case of a natural disaster or other comparable emergency where an express or de facto moratoria that violates section 253(a) may nonetheless be 'necessary' to 'protect the public safety and welfare' or to 'ensure the continued quality of telecommunications services.'")

Homeland Security has declared that local government is on the forefront and can take control over determining whether to temporarily halt all non-essential activity. Homeland Security guidance documents prioritize maintenance of existing Communications Systems, and do not support "essential" status for new construction. See Homeland Security Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency, Identifying Critical Infrastructure During COVID-19, <https://www.cisa.gov/identifying-critical-infrastructure-during-covid-19> (local control); e-Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources Support Annex, <http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-support-cikr.pdf> (focus on "protection, response, recovery, and restoration"). Homeland Security, like the FCC, understands that it is essential in an emergency situations justify focusing on protecting, responding, recovering and restoring of existing systems, but new communications facilities construction is and should be deemed nonessential, and subject to lockdown for so long as we are under emergency conditions.

Cities can and should impose a moratorium on deployment in their local area and freeze the permit process until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

Sincerely,  
ariel wolansky  
229 HUGHES ROAD  
Grass Valley, CA 95945

## Lance Lowe

---

**From:** Abigail Walker  
**Sent:** Monday, April 6, 2020 8:03 AM  
**To:** Lance Lowe  
**Subject:** FW: Stop Deployment of Wireless during Quarantine

**From:** Steven Swann <jivanswann@att.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 4, 2020 7:48 AM  
**To:** Kristi Bashor <kristib@cityofgrassvalley.com>  
**Subject:** Stop Deployment of Wireless during Quarantine

Dear Ms. Bashor,

Dear Mayor & City Council Member,

We ask that you impose a moratorium on "small cells" and other wireless infrastructure permits process and deployment until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

The wireless providers are using the COVID-19 emergency as cover to expand and cement their rapid and virtually unsupervised deployment of harmful wireless infrastructure. Our local leaders should not have to dedicate time and resources to policing whether the wireless companies are following local and state law, they have far more important things to do.

The FCC wireless permit rules allow emergency moratoria. Homeland Security guidelines emphasize that maintenance of existing communications capability is the priority. New construction is not "essential."

The COVID-19 emergency has led to a government shut down of non-essential activity. Hospitals, emergency response and local officials are overwhelmed and they must be allowed to focus on what is indeed "essential". Now is not the time to be dedicating resources to expanding, rather than just maintaining, our networks.

The FCC has directly held a local jurisdiction can impose a temporary halt to deployment and permits during emergencies. In the Matter of Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers, FCC 18-111, 33 FCC Rcd 7705, 7784-7785, ¶157 (2018) ("We recognize that there may be limited situations in the case of a natural disaster or other comparable emergency where an express or de facto moratoria that violates section 253(a) may nonetheless be 'necessary' to 'protect the public safety and welfare' or to 'ensure the continued quality of telecommunications services.'")

Homeland Security has declared that local government is on the forefront and can take control over determining whether to temporarily halt all non-essential activity. Homeland Security guidance documents prioritize maintenance of existing Communications Systems, and do not support "essential" status for new construction. See Homeland Security Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency, Identifying Critical Infrastructure During COVID-19, <https://www.cisa.gov/identifying-critical-infrastructure-during-covid-19> (local control); e-Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources Support Annex, <http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-support-cikr.pdf> (focus on "protection, response, recovery, and restoration"). Homeland Security, like the FCC, understands that it is essential in an emergency situations justify focusing on protecting, responding, recovering and restoring of existing systems, but new communications facilities construction is and should be deemed nonessential, and subject to lockdown for so long as we are under emergency conditions.

Cities can and should impose a moratorium on deployment in their local area and freeze the permit process until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

Sincerely,  
Steven Swann  
578 sutton way  
Grass valley, CA 95945

## Lance Lowe

---

**From:** Abigail Walker  
**Sent:** Monday, April 6, 2020 8:03 AM  
**To:** Lance Lowe  
**Subject:** FW: Stop Deployment of Wireless during Quarantine

**From:** Trina Spiller <trinaspillerdesign@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 4, 2020 8:02 AM  
**To:** Kristi Bashor <kristib@cityofgrassvalley.com>  
**Subject:** Stop Deployment of Wireless during Quarantine

Dear Ms. Bashor,

Dear Mayor & City Council Member,

We ask that you impose a moratorium on "small cells" and other wireless infrastructure permits process and deployment until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

The wireless providers are using the COVID-19 emergency as cover to expand and cement their rapid and virtually unsupervised deployment of harmful wireless infrastructure. Our local leaders should not have to dedicate time and resources to policing whether the wireless companies are following local and state law, they have far more important things to do.

The FCC wireless permit rules allow emergency moratoria. Homeland Security guidelines emphasize that maintenance of existing communications capability is the priority. New construction is not "essential."

The COVID-19 emergency has led to a government shut down of non-essential activity. Hospitals, emergency response and local officials are overwhelmed and they must be allowed to focus on what is indeed "essential". Now is not the time to be dedicating resources to expanding, rather than just maintaining, our networks.

The FCC has directly held a local jurisdiction can impose a temporary halt to deployment and permits during emergencies. In the Matter of Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers, FCC 18-111, 33 FCC Rcd 7705, 7784-7785, ¶157 (2018) ("We recognize that there may be limited situations in the case of a natural disaster or other comparable emergency where an express or de facto moratoria that violates section 253(a) may nonetheless be 'necessary' to 'protect the public safety and welfare' or to 'ensure the continued quality of telecommunications services.'")

Homeland Security has declared that local government is on the forefront and can take control over determining whether to temporarily halt all non-essential activity. Homeland Security guidance documents prioritize maintenance of existing Communications Systems, and do not support "essential" status for new construction. See Homeland Security Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency, Identifying Critical Infrastructure During COVID-19, <https://www.cisa.gov/identifying-critical-infrastructure-during-covid-19> (local control); e-Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources Support Annex, <http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-support-cikr.pdf> (focus on "protection, response, recovery, and restoration"). Homeland Security, like the FCC, understands that it is essential in an emergency situations justify focusing on protecting, responding, recovering and restoring of existing systems, but new communications facilities construction is and should be deemed nonessential, and subject to lockdown for so long as we are under emergency conditions.

Cities can and should impose a moratorium on deployment in their local area and freeze the permit process until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

Sincerely,  
Trina Spiller  
124 Bank St unit c  
Grass valley, CA 95945

## Lance Lowe

---

**From:** Abigail Walker  
**Sent:** Monday, April 6, 2020 8:03 AM  
**To:** Lance Lowe  
**Subject:** FW: Stop Deployment of Wireless during Quarantine

**From:** Marci Corey <blessedlovevibes@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 4, 2020 8:22 AM  
**To:** Kristi Bashor <kristib@cityofgrassvalley.com>  
**Subject:** Stop Deployment of Wireless during Quarantine

Dear Ms. Bashor,

Dear Mayor & City Council Member,

We ask that you impose a moratorium on “small cells” and other wireless infrastructure permits process and deployment until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

The wireless providers are using the COVID-19 emergency as cover to expand and cement their rapid and virtually unsupervised deployment of harmful wireless infrastructure. Our local leaders should not have to dedicate time and resources to policing whether the wireless companies are following local and state law, they have far more important things to do.

The FCC wireless permit rules allow emergency moratoria. Homeland Security guidelines emphasize that maintenance of existing communications capability is the priority. New construction is not “essential.”

The COVID-19 emergency has led to a government shut down of non-essential activity. Hospitals, emergency response and local officials are overwhelmed and they must be allowed to focus on what is indeed “essential”. Now is not the time to be dedicating resources to expanding, rather than just maintaining, our networks.

The FCC has directly held a local jurisdiction can impose a temporary halt to deployment and permits during emergencies. In the Matter of Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers, FCC 18-111, 33 FCC Rcd 7705, 7784-7785, ¶157 (2018) (“We recognize that there may be limited situations in the case of a natural disaster or other comparable emergency where an express or de facto moratoria that violates section 253(a) may nonetheless be ‘necessary’ to ‘protect the public safety and welfare’ or to ‘ensure the continued quality of telecommunications services.’”)

Homeland Security has declared that local government is on the forefront and can take control over determining whether to temporarily halt all non-essential activity. Homeland Security guidance documents prioritize maintenance of existing Communications Systems, and do not support “essential” status for new construction. See Homeland Security Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency, Identifying Critical Infrastructure During COVID-19, <https://www.cisa.gov/identifying-critical-infrastructure-during-covid-19> (local control); e-Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources Support Annex, <http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-support-cikr.pdf> (focus on “protection, response, recovery, and restoration”). Homeland Security, like the FCC, understands that it is essential in an emergency situations justify focusing on protecting, responding, recovering and restoring of existing systems, but new communications facilities construction is and should be deemed nonessential, and subject to lockdown for so long as we are under emergency conditions.



Cities can and should impose a moratorium on deployment in their local area and freeze the permit process until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

Sincerely,  
Marci Corey  
2036 nevada city hwy #236  
Grass valley, CA 95945

## Lance Lowe

---

**From:** Abigail Walker  
**Sent:** Monday, April 6, 2020 8:01 AM  
**To:** Lance Lowe  
**Subject:** FW: Stop Deployment of Wireless during Quarantine

**From:** Rose Wood <rwood0228@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 3, 2020 7:26 PM  
**To:** Kristi Bashor <kristib@cityofgrassvalley.com>  
**Subject:** Stop Deployment of Wireless during Quarantine

Dear Ms. Bashor,

Dear Mayor & City Council Member,

We ask that you impose a moratorium on “small cells” and other wireless infrastructure permits process and deployment until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

The wireless providers are using the COVID-19 emergency as cover to expand and cement their rapid and virtually unsupervised deployment of harmful wireless infrastructure. Our local leaders should not have to dedicate time and resources to policing whether the wireless companies are following local and state law, they have far more important things to do.

The FCC wireless permit rules allow emergency moratoria. Homeland Security guidelines emphasize that maintenance of existing communications capability is the priority. New construction is not “essential.”

The COVID-19 emergency has led to a government shut down of non-essential activity. Hospitals, emergency response and local officials are overwhelmed and they must be allowed to focus on what is indeed “essential”. Now is not the time to be dedicating resources to expanding, rather than just maintaining, our networks.

The FCC has directly held a local jurisdiction can impose a temporary halt to deployment and permits during emergencies. In the Matter of Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers, FCC 18-111, 33 FCC Rcd 7705, 7784-7785, ¶157 (2018) (“We recognize that there may be limited situations in the case of a natural disaster or other comparable emergency where an express or de facto moratoria that violates section 253(a) may nonetheless be ‘necessary’ to ‘protect the public safety and welfare’ or to ‘ensure the continued quality of telecommunications services.’”)

Homeland Security has declared that local government is on the forefront and can take control over determining whether to temporarily halt all non-essential activity. Homeland Security guidance documents prioritize maintenance of existing Communications Systems, and do not support “essential” status for new construction. See Homeland Security Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency, Identifying Critical Infrastructure During COVID-19, <https://www.cisa.gov/identifying-critical-infrastructure-during-covid-19> (local control); e-Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources Support Annex, <http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-support-cikr.pdf> (focus on “protection, response, recovery, and restoration”). Homeland Security, like the FCC, understands that it is essential in an emergency situations justify focusing on protecting, responding, recovering and restoring of existing systems, but new communications facilities construction is and should be deemed nonessential, and subject to lockdown for so long as we are under emergency conditions.

Cities can and should impose a moratorium on deployment in their local area and freeze the permit process until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

Sincerely,  
Rose Wood  
51 Rockwood dr  
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Dear Ms. Bashor,

Dear Mayor & City Council Member,

We ask that you impose a moratorium on “small cells” and other wireless infrastructure permits process and deployment until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

The wireless providers are using the COVID-19 emergency as cover to expand and cement their rapid and virtually unsupervised deployment of harmful wireless infrastructure. Our local leaders should not have to dedicate time and resources to policing whether the wireless companies are following local and state law, they have far more important things to do.

The FCC wireless permit rules allow emergency moratoria. Homeland Security guidelines emphasize that maintenance of existing communications capability is the priority. New construction is not “essential.”

The COVID-19 emergency has led to a government shut down of non-essential activity. Hospitals, emergency response and local officials are overwhelmed and they must be allowed to focus on what is indeed “essential”. Now is not the time to be dedicating resources to expanding, rather than just maintaining, our networks.

The FCC has directly held a local jurisdiction can impose a temporary halt to deployment and permits during emergencies. In the Matter of Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers, FCC 18-111, 33 FCC Rcd 7705, 7784-7785, ¶157 (2018) (“We recognize that there may be limited situations in the case of a natural disaster or other comparable emergency where an express or de facto moratoria that violates section 253(a) may nonetheless be ‘necessary’ to ‘protect the public safety and welfare’ or to ‘ensure the continued quality of telecommunications services.’”)

Homeland Security has declared that local government is on the forefront and can take control over determining whether to temporarily halt all non-essential activity. Homeland Security guidance documents prioritize maintenance of existing Communications Systems, and do not support “essential” status for new construction. See Homeland Security Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency, Identifying Critical Infrastructure During COVID-19, <https://www.cisa.gov/identifying-critical-infrastructure-during-covid-19> (local control); e-Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources Support Annex, <http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-support-cikr.pdf> (focus on “protection, response, recovery, and restoration”). Homeland Security, like the FCC, understands that it is essential in an emergency situations justify focusing on protecting, responding, recovering and restoring of existing systems, but new communications facilities construction is and should be deemed nonessential, and subject to lockdown for so long as we are under emergency conditions.

Cities can and should impose a moratorium on deployment in their local area and freeze the permit process until the COVID-19 emergency is over.

Sincerely,  
Ananda Breiter  
210 Sutton Way Apt 238  
Grass Valley, CA 95945



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

**Council Meeting Date:** April 14, 2020      **Date Prepared:** April 7, 2020

**Prepared by:** Andy Heath, Finance Director

**Title:** FY 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget Review

**Recommended Motions:** It is recommended that the City Council approve by Motion updates to the FY 2019-20 Budget with recommended mid-year budget revisions.

**Agenda:** Administrative

**BACKGROUND**

The Mid-Year Budget Review is designed to provide a tool for understanding the City's financial condition during the first part of the fiscal year, projecting the financial condition through the end of the fiscal year, and making recommended revisions to bring the adopted budget in line with expectations based on previously approved budget amendments and current economic conditions.

Unlike those presented to the City Council in the past, this year's Mid-Year Budget Review focuses on management's assessment of overall funding impacts likely to result from the ongoing COVID-19 Pandemic. It should be mentioned that the ultimate magnitude of the impact is difficult to predict as this point due to the unavailability of economic data specific to the City; continuously changing economic aid and stimuli afforded to all sectors of the economy; and resulting long-term psychological impacts on consumer behavior as the effects of the Pandemic wane.

This memorandum provides a snapshot of aggregated Mid-Year adjustments recommended for the balance of FY 2019-20 in certain major funds. This memorandum also presents a very preliminary six-year forecast for the City's General Fund and Measure E Fund based on certain COVID-19 impact assumptions. The information noted below will form the foundation for a PowerPoint presentation to be provided at the City Council Meeting.



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

**ANALYSIS**

**General Fund**

Comparison of current Budget-to-Actual performance including Mid-Year adjustments:

	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>
FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget	\$ 12,769,090	\$ 13,093,905
Estimated Amounts @ 06/30/20	\$ 12,746,814	\$ 13,428,993
Recommended Adjustment	(\$ 22,276)	\$ 335,088

As indicated above, it is recommended that the City adjust originally budgeted General Fund revenues downward by \$22,276 and General Fund expenditures upward by \$335,088.

Information noted in the tables below discuss reasons / rationale for selected revenue and expenditure adjustments in the City's General Fund. Anticipated fiscal impacts related to the COVID-19 Pandemic from mid-March through the end of the fiscal year are specifically noted where appropriate.

**General Fund Revenues**

<b>Revenue Type</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Reason / Rationale</b>
Property Taxes	\$15,000	- Increase in property taxes due to higher-than anticipated growth in FY 2019-20 assessed valuation
RPTTF Residual Property Tax	\$99,312	- Increase in RPTTF due to increased amounts available for distribution
Sales Taxes	(\$225,000)	- Increase in sales tax due to significant economic expansion before March 2020 - \$375,000 - Increase in sales tax sharing payment to Nevada County based on outcome of Tax Share Agreement negotiations - \$475,000 - <b><i>Decrease in sales tax related to COVID-19 Pandemic – (\$125,000)</i></b>
Transient Occupancy Taxes	(\$80,000)	- Increase in transient occupancy tax based on prior year results - \$45,000 - <b><i>Decrease in transient occupancy tax related to COVID-19 Pandemic – (\$125,000)</i></b>



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

Revenue Type	Amount	Reason / Rationale
Interest Earnings	\$50,000	- Higher interest earnings related to cash balances and increased market interest rates for the first 8 months of the fiscal year
SB-2 Planning Grants	\$50,000	- Anticipated receipt of a portion of the \$160,000 SB-2 Planning Grant to be used towards the Southern Sphere of Influence Project
Residual Other Revenues	\$68,412	- Aggregate increase in all other revenue sources not specifically noted above - \$128,912 - <i>Aggregate decrease in all other revenue sources related COVID-19 Pandemic – (\$40,500)</i>

General Fund Appropriations

Appropriation	Amount	Reason / Rationale
Finance (Administrative Services)	\$69,473	- Increase in Personal Services budget due funding an Accounting Technician position and transition the Finance Director position from contractual to a permanent employee
Information Services	\$24,000	- Increase in Services & Supplies budget due to additional needs for and continued update of City's Information Technology infrastructure
City Attorney	\$75,000	- Increase in City Attorney costs appropriated due to experience to date
Police	\$160,390	- Increase in Personal Services budget due to not including leave cash-outs in original budget; higher health insurance costs and slight upward adjustment for overtime.
Planning & Building	\$73,309	- Increase in Planning Services and Supplies to account for \$50,000 related to SB-2 Planning Grant; and increase in Personal Services costs related to higher allocation of salaries towards Building activities
Fleet Services	\$27,628	- Decrease in Fleet Services Personal Services budget due to lower salary allocations; Increase in Services and Supplies related to more maintenance on vehicles being done in-house
Streets	\$80,755	- Increase in Street Personal Services budget due to higher salary allocations
Non-Departmental	(\$176,183)	- Increase in Non-Departmental budget due to higher workers compensation and general liability insurance premiums; offset by reduction for unanticipated use of contingency
Residual Other Appropriations	\$716	- Aggregate increase in all other appropriations



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

At the end of the current fiscal year, General Fund reserves (designated and undesignated) are anticipated to be approximately \$7.82 million. It is anticipated that the General Fund will experience a deficit of \$682,179, which is recommended to be funded with the carryover fund balance from FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19 (\$770,337), available in unobligated fund balance. Projected reserve levels as of June 30, 2020 include:

- **\$ 5,926,216 Designated Reserves (See Attachment A for list)**
- **1,895,682 Undesignated Reserves**
  
- **\$ 7,821,898 Total General Fund Reserves**

It should be noted that designated reserves in the General Fund include a Pension Stabilization Reserve (\$1.5 million); Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) Stabilization Reserve (\$500,000); Capital and Deferred Maintenance Reserve (\$1 million); and the Economic Contingency Reserve (\$2.5 million).

**General Fund Forecast**

As previously discussed, development of a multi-year forecast for the City’s General Fund is complicated by currently unknown near-term and longer-term impacts related to the COVID-19 Pandemic on the local, state and national economies. As such, management will continue to frequently monitor economic activity and update the City Council as adjustments are made to forecasts.

The forecast for the General Fund is noted below:

<b>FY 2018-19 to FY 2024-25 General Fund Forecast</b>							
	<b>2018-19 Actual</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>	<b>2024-25</b>
<b>Revenues</b>	\$13,346,588	\$12,746,814	\$12,498,449	\$12,728,201	\$13,041,068	\$13,156,422	\$13,273,265
<b>Expenditures</b>	\$12,857,355	\$13,428,993	\$13,099,856	\$12,871,130	\$13,082,530	\$13,256,921	\$13,432,149
<b>Surplus/(Deficit)</b>	\$489,233	(\$682,179)	(\$601,407)	(\$142,929)	(\$41,462)	(\$100,499)	(\$158,884)
<b>Ending Fund Bal.</b>	\$8,617,965	\$7,935,786	\$7,334,379	\$7,191,451	\$7,149,988	\$7,049,489	\$6,890,605

For years beginning with FY 2020-21, the forecast uses a “Base Budget” concept where essentially all authorized positions are funded; and all one-time revenues and expenditures are





**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

excluded. It should be mentioned that the above forecast does not include any unnegotiated salary increases and does include a contingency appropriation of \$250,000 for each year. Finally, the forecast includes anticipated economic impacts of the COVID-19 Pandemic noted below:

<b>Revenue Type</b>	<b>FY 2019-20</b>	<b>FY 2020-21</b>
Sales Tax	<i>Reduction - \$ 125,000</i>	<i>Reduction - \$ 425,000</i>
Transient Occupancy Tax	<i>Reduction - \$ 125,000</i>	<i>Reduction - \$ 150,000</i>
Property Transfer Tax	<i>Reduction - \$ 10,000</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Parking Revenues	<i>Reduction - \$ 2,500</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Pool Rentals & User Fees	<i>Reduction - \$ 8,000</i>	<i>Reduction - \$15,000</i>
Building Permit Fees	<i>Reduction - \$ 20,000</i>	<i>Reduction - \$50,000</i>
Business License Fees	<i>N/A</i>	<i>Reduction \$ 10,000</i>

Total Annual Reduction:                                 \$ 290,500                                 \$ 650,000

Total Aggregate Reduction:                                 \$ 940,500

The reductions noted above are not forecasted to begin increasing back to normal levels until FY 2021-22, at which point each revenue is forecasted to fully recover over the course of two fiscal years.

**Measure E Fund**

Although accounted for in the City’s financial statements as part of the General Fund, the City segregates the accounting (revenue and expenditures) for the City’s voter-approved 1-cent transaction and use tax in Fund 105 in order to ensure this general-purpose tax is used for its intended purpose (police and fire services and streets and parks projects).

Comparison of current Budget-to-Actual performance including Mid-Year adjustments:

	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>
FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget	\$ 5,626,000	\$ 6,466,652
Estimated Amounts @ 06/30/20	\$ 5,742,664	\$ 10,286,779
Recommended Adjustment	\$ 116,664	\$ 3,820,127



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

Measure E Fund revenues are currently expected to be approximately \$117,000 higher than originally anticipated due to increased collections Sales Tax revenues during the first two-thirds of the fiscal year, offset by anticipated economic impacts associated to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Measure E Fund expenditures are expected to be approximately \$3.82 million higher than originally anticipated due to the use of carryover fund balances towards projects originally budgeted in FY 2018-19 (street projects / Lyman Gilmore Field) and parks projects approved by both the Measure E Oversight Committee and the City Council throughout FY 2019-20 (Minnie Park; Park Bathrooms). It is expected that the Measure E Fund will have some salary savings related to continued paramedic vacancies in the Fire Department.

It is anticipated that the Measure E Fund will have approximately \$948,000 in Fund Balance on June 30, 2020. These funds may be appropriated for any Measure E related purpose in future fiscal years.

Measure E Fund Forecast

Similar to the General Fund above, development of a multi-year forecast for the City’s Measure E Fund is complicated by currently unknown near-term and longer-term impacts related to the COVID-19 Pandemic on the local, state and national economies.

The forecast for the Measure E Fund is noted below:

<b>FY 2018-19 to FY 2024-25 Measure E Fund Forecast</b>							
	<b>2018-19 Actual</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>	<b>2024-25</b>
<b>Revenues</b>	\$5,053,511	\$5,742,664	\$5,260,000	\$5,536,250	\$5,713,881	\$5,742,401	\$5,771,063
<b>Expenditures</b>	\$2,737,807	\$10,286,779	\$5,899,796	\$5,875,804	\$6,419,395	\$5,902,992	\$5,930,672
<b>Surplus/(Deficit)</b>	<b>\$2,315,704</b>	<b>(\$4,544,115)</b>	<b>(\$639,796)</b>	<b>(\$339,554)</b>	<b>(\$705,514)</b>	<b>(\$160,591)</b>	<b>(\$159,610)</b>
<b>Ending Fund Bal.</b>	<b>\$5,492,499</b>	<b>\$948,384</b>	<b>\$308,588</b>	<b>(\$30,966)</b>	<b>(\$736,480)</b>	<b>(\$897,071)</b>	<b>(\$1,056,680)</b>

For years beginning with FY 2020-21, the forecast uses a “Base Budget” concept where essentially all authorized positions are funded; and all one-time revenues and expenditures are excluded. It should be mentioned that the above forecast does not include any unnegotiated salary increases and appropriates a total of \$3 million toward streets/parks projects each year;





**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

It is anticipated that the Water Fund will have approximately \$3.1 million in Fund Balance at the end of FY 2019-20, \$1.76 million of which is reserved for specific purposes. The \$3.1 million ending Fund Balance assumes all capital projects are completed by the end of the fiscal year.

<u><b>Sewer Fund</b></u>	<u><b>Revenues</b></u>	<u><b>Expenditures</b></u>
FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget	\$ 8,206,000	\$ 9,840,247
Estimated Amounts @ 06/30/20	\$ 8,203,893	\$ 10,052,391
Recommended Adjustment	(\$ 2,107)	\$ 212,144

Sewer Fund revenues are currently projected to be approximately \$2,000 lower than originally anticipated due to higher collections of user fees, industrial waste permits, connection fees and interest earnings; offset by a reduction in grant revenue due to receiving a portion in the prior year. Sewer Fund expenditures are recommended to increase by approximately \$212,000 to account for purchases of certain real property and a new Vaccon; offset by reductions in overall capital projects due to certain projects starting in the prior fiscal year. Similar to the capital projects budgeted in the Water Fund, it is not anticipated that the Sewer Fund will complete all capital projects budgeted in FY 2019-20. Funding for projects appropriated in the Sewer Fund is not recommended to be adjusted; with any unspent funding at year-end likely being re-budgeted in the upcoming fiscal year.

It is anticipated that the Sewer Fund will have approximately \$6.2 million in Fund Balance on June 30, 2020, \$4.3 million of which is reserved for specific purposes. The \$6.2 million ending Fund Balance assumes all capital projects are completed by the end of the fiscal year.

**Special Revenue Funds**

<u><b>Gas Tax Fund</b></u>	<u><b>Revenues</b></u>	<u><b>Expenditures</b></u>
FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget	\$ 718,778	\$ 968,000
Estimated Amounts @ 06/30/20	\$ 643,491	\$ 1,173,000
Recommended Adjustment	(\$ 75,287)	\$ 205,000

Gas Tax Fund revenues are projected to be approximately \$75,000 lower than those originally budgeted based the elimination of RSTP received into another fund offset by updates to Gas Tax



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

and SB-1 projections taken from a schedule prepared for all cities by a fiscal consultant to the League of California Cities. Gas tax expenditures are expected to increase by approximately \$205,000 based on updates to certain capital projects anticipated to be funded during the current fiscal year.

It is anticipated that the Gas Tax Fund will have approximately \$734,000 in Fund Balance on June 30, 2020. These funds are typically used to fund the City's streetlights and street maintenance and rehabilitation projects.

<u><b>Traffic Safety Fund</b></u>	<u><b>Revenues</b></u>	<u><b>Expenditures</b></u>
FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget	\$ 160,100	\$ 177,000
Estimated Amounts @ 06/30/20	\$ 135,100	\$ 152,000
 Recommended Adjustment	 (\$ 25,000)	 (\$ 25,000)

Traffic Safety Fund revenues are projected to be approximately \$25,000 lower than those originally budgeted based on the exclusion of expense reimbursements no longer anticipated. Traffic Safety Fund expenditures originally budgeted for FY 2019-20 are also projected to be \$25,000 lower due to reductions in streetlight utilities costs and professional services / contracts.

It is anticipated that the Traffic Safety Fund will have approximately \$885 in Fund Balance on June 30, 2020. These funds may be appropriated in future fiscal years towards traffic safety costs.

<u><b>Developer Impact Fee Fund</b></u>	<u><b>Revenues</b></u>	<u><b>Expenditures</b></u>
FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget	\$ 15,000	\$ 1,145,000
Estimated Amounts @ 06/30/20	\$ 218,505	\$ 1,345,000
 Recommended Adjustment	 \$ 203,505	 \$ 200,000

Developer Impact Fee Fund revenues are projected to be approximately \$204,000 higher than those originally budgeted based on fee collections to date and anticipated interest earnings through the end of the fiscal year. Developer Impact Fee Fund expenditures are projected to increase by approximately \$200,000 to account for expenditure of fees collected for Parks and Recreation purposes related to the Wolf Creek Trail Project.



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

It is anticipated that the Developer Impact Fee Fund will have approximately \$1.88 million in Fund Balance on June 30, 2020. These funds may be appropriated in future fiscal years towards eligible development impact / mitigation projects consistent with collection of fees for specific purposes.

<u>Capital Projects Fund</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>
FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget	\$ 6,866,000	\$ 6,866,000
Estimated Amounts @ 06/30/20	\$ 15,516,904	\$ 14,364,382
Recommended Adjustment	\$ 8,650,904	\$ 7,498,382

The Capital Projects Fund accounts for non-enterprise Capital Projects citywide. Capital Projects are typically funded with non-discretionary (grants, fees, etc.) revenue sources and transfers in from other funds. Capital Projects Fund revenues and expenditures are recommended to increase by approximately \$8.65 million and \$7.50 million, respectively, to account for additional Measure E revenues transferred in and used towards parks projects, water and sewer funds transferred in and used towards Peabody Creek, and other intergovernmental revenue sources used towards annual street rehabilitation projects.

The Capital Projects Fund is expected to have a negative fund balance of approximately \$1.3 million at the end of the current fiscal year due to the carrying of unreimbursed “Storm Damage” costs incurred in and after January 2017. The City is currently working to secure reimbursement for some, if not all, of the unreimbursed costs from related intergovernmental sources. Fund Balance in the Capital Projects Fund varies with the timing of incurring expenditures consistent with revenue availability, which will ultimately offset each other crossing multiple fiscal years.

<u>Special Projects Fund</u>	<u>Revenues</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>
FY 2019-20 Adopted Budget	\$ 44,000	\$ 550,000
Estimated Amounts @ 06/30/20	\$ 735,000	\$ 1,404,178
Recommended Adjustment	\$ 695,000	\$ 854,178

The Special Projects Fund accounts for one-time special projects funded with intergovernmental reimbursements of costs incurred for projects completed in prior years. Revenues are adjusted



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

upward by \$695,000 to account for receipt of a legal settlement related to a former redevelopment project paid for with City discretionary funding. Expenditures appropriated are adjusted upward by \$854,000 to account for the purchase of property and anticipated costs associated with City parking lots.

It is anticipated that the Special Projects Fund will have approximately \$1.38 million in Fund Balance on June 30, 2020.

**COUNCIL GOALS / OBJECTIVES**

The Fiscal Year 2019-20 recommended budget modifications executes portions of the work tasks towards achieving / maintaining the Strategic Plan goal to maintain a High Performance Government and Quality Service.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The Fiscal Year 2019-20 recommended budget modifications balance expenditures with anticipated revenues and carryover monies for noted funds.

Other Attachments - Fund Schedules for:

- Fund 105 – Measure N/E Fund
- Fund 110 – Gas Tax Fund
- Fund 112 – Traffic Safety Fund
- Fund 118 – Developer Impact Fee Fund
- Fund 180 – Capital Projects Fund
- Fund 182 – Special Projects Fund
- Fund 200/201/204 – Water Enterprise Funds
- Fund 210/212/215 – Sewer Enterprise Funds

**REVIEWED BY**

 City Manager

**City of Grass Valley  
Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget  
General Fund Revenue and Expenditure Detail**

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20	Recommended Adjustments
<b>REVENUES</b>					
Taxes	9,990,061	10,579,177	10,570,940	10,379,931	\$ (191,009)
Franchises	744,998	751,898	751,500	758,000	6,500
Licenses	206,802	220,463	205,000	210,000	5,000
Services Charges / Fees	1,007,940	1,082,522	893,300	932,259	38,959
Interest & Use of Money	71,242	207,363	75,000	125,000	50,000
Other Agencies	282,212	209,552	265,800	318,902	53,102
Cost Reimbursements / Transfers	132,793	114,283	3,000	3,000	-
Other Revenues	113,673	181,330	4,550	19,722	15,172
Other Financing Sources	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>12,549,721</b>	<b>13,346,588</b>	<b>12,769,090</b>	<b>12,746,814</b>	<b>\$ (22,276)</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>					
City Council	23,712	30,558	24,085	24,085	\$ -
City Manager	333,321	305,374	301,692	320,331	18,639
Finance Department	565,544	524,079	521,537	591,010	69,473
Personnel	26,226	24,986	22,750	22,750	-
Information Systems	361,758	340,172	180,400	204,400	24,000
City Attorney	122,619	223,000	185,000	260,000	75,000
Police Department	4,285,750	4,241,636	3,966,750	4,127,140	160,390
Police Department - Animal Control	220,357	193,110	175,020	176,084	1,064
Fire Department	2,259,205	2,036,784	2,145,944	2,145,788	(156)
Planning	319,982	300,441	338,807	379,421	40,614
Building	358,712	367,913	392,096	424,791	-
Engineering	348,022	339,467	354,336	356,954	2,618
Facilities	121,336	114,903	122,309	119,079	-
Fleet Services	257,606	104,560	173,570	201,198	-
Streets	560,733	525,192	421,015	501,770	-
Swimming Pools	45,747	85,630	32,038	71,753	-
Parks Maintenance	264,160	288,256	324,988	267,054	-
Recreation	1,202	713	1,000	1,000	-
Non-Departmental	1,063,883	1,930,682	2,040,063	2,106,380	66,317
Debt Service	425,824	437,000	434,255	434,255	-
Appropriation for Contingency	-	-	250,000	7,500	(242,500)
Transfers Out	302,618	442,899	686,250	686,250	-
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 12,268,317</b>	<b>\$ 12,857,355</b>	<b>\$ 13,093,905</b>	<b>\$ 13,428,993</b>	<b>\$ 335,088</b>
Excess / (Deficit) of Revenues over Expenditures	\$ 281,404	489,233	(324,815)	(682,179)	\$ (357,364)
Reserve Transfer to Impact Fee Fund	-	-	-	(167,888)	\$ (167,888)
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 7,901,328	8,182,732	8,671,965	8,671,965	\$ -
Ending Fund Balance	\$ 8,182,732	8,671,965	8,347,150	7,821,898	\$ (525,252)
<b>Less - Designated Reserves:</b>					
Construction Deposits	\$ 179,375	114,418	114,418	114,418	-
Asset Forfeiture Funds	75,602	9,252	9,252	9,252	-
Narcotics Investigation	12,823	12,823	12,823	12,823	-
SMA Park Funds	167,888	167,888	167,888	-	(167,888)
North Star Rock Road Mitigation	16,543	16,543	16,543	16,543	-
Infrastructure Repair and Replacement	19,187	19,187	19,187	19,187	-
Tree Preservation	10,700	10,700	10,700	10,700	-
Whispering Pines	153,160	153,160	153,160	153,160	-
PARSAC Claim Reserves	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	-
ADA Access - SB 1186	12,380	15,133	15,133	15,133	-
Pension Stabilization Reserve	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	-
OPEB Stabilization Reserve	-	500,000	500,000	500,000	-
Capital and Deferred Maintenance Reserve	-	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-
Economic Contingency Reserve	-	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-
Amount Not Obligated at Year End	\$ 5,960,074	2,577,861	2,253,046	1,895,682	\$ (357,364)



**City of Grass Valley  
Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget  
General Fund Revenue Account Detail**

Description	Actual	Actual	Adopted Budget	Mid-Year Budget	Recommended Adjustments
	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2019-20	
Property Taxes	\$ 2,600,061	2,729,648	2,820,000	2,835,000	15,000
RPTTF Residual Property Tax Distributions	156,675	194,005	214,000	313,312	99,312
Property Tax in Lieu of MVLF	1,202,162	1,273,631	1,312,000	1,311,679	(321)
Sales Taxes	6,102,422	6,497,601	6,425,000	6,675,000	250,000
ERAF in Lieu of Sales Tax	-	-	-	-	-
Sales Tax Payment to Nevada County	(974,271)	(1,136,557)	(1,125,000)	(1,600,000)	(475,000)
Transient Occupancy Taxes	818,104	916,808	855,000	775,000	(80,000)
Real Estate Transfer Taxes	71,624	87,470	50,000	50,000	-
Property Tax Homeowners Exemption	22,466	22,692	23,000	23,000	-
Property Tax Payment to NCCFPD	(9,182)	(6,121)	(3,060)	(3,060)	-
<b>TOTAL TAXES</b>	<b>\$ 9,990,061</b>	<b>10,579,177</b>	<b>10,570,940</b>	<b>10,379,931</b>	<b>(191,009)</b>
Franchise - Gas & Electric	\$ 158,799	146,780	145,000	145,000	-
Franchise - Solid Waste	414,785	439,604	433,500	440,000	6,500
Franchise - Cable TV	171,414	165,514	173,000	173,000	-
<b>TOTAL FRANCHISES</b>	<b>\$ 744,998</b>	<b>751,898</b>	<b>751,500</b>	<b>758,000</b>	<b>6,500</b>
Business Licenses	\$ 195,873	208,086	200,000	205,000	5,000
Business License Penalties	10,929	12,377	5,000	5,000	-
<b>TOTAL LICENSES</b>	<b>\$ 206,802</b>	<b>220,463</b>	<b>205,000</b>	<b>210,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>
Planning Department Fees / Permits	\$ 61,306	52,699	40,000	90,000	50,000
Building Department Fees / Permits	255,180	287,173	270,000	250,000	(20,000)
Fire Department Fees / Permits	87,077	105,356	83,500	96,750	13,250
Fire Department Assessments	241,418	248,147	240,000	240,000	-
Public Works / Engineering Fees / Permits	51,154	18,615	25,500	13,500	(12,000)
Animal Shelter Fees / Other Revenues	81,356	80,564	71,000	76,755	5,755
Police Department Fees / Other Revenues	185,132	240,119	118,300	125,076	6,776
Parks Department Fees	45,317	49,849	45,000	40,178	(4,822)
<b>TOTAL SERVICE CHARGES / FEES</b>	<b>\$ 1,007,940</b>	<b>1,082,522</b>	<b>893,300</b>	<b>932,259</b>	<b>38,959</b>

**City of Grass Valley  
Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget  
General Fund Revenue Account Detail**

Description	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20	Recommended Adjustments
Interest Earnings	\$ 71,242	207,363	75,000	125,000	50,000
<b>TOTAL INTEREST &amp; USE OF MONEY</b>	<b>\$ 71,242</b>	<b>207,363</b>	<b>75,000</b>	<b>125,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>
Motor Vehicle License Fees	\$ 6,788	6,336	6,300	6,300	-
Beverage Recycling Program	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	-
Public Safety - Proposition 172	106,121	114,961	118,000	121,102	3,102
FEMA Grants	-	-	-	-	-
COPS Grant - AB 3229	135,585	75,000	135,000	135,000	-
SB-2 Planning Grant	21,608	-	-	50,000	50,000
Other State Reimbursements	7,110	8,255	1,500	1,500	-
ADA Disability (SB-1186 Fee)	-	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL FROM OTHER AGENCIES</b>	<b>\$ 282,212</b>	<b>209,552</b>	<b>265,800</b>	<b>318,902</b>	<b>53,102</b>
Expense Reimbursements	\$ 73,494	111,283	-	-	-
Cost Allocation Reimbursements	-	-	-	-	-
Transfer In from Gas Tax Fund	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	-
Transfers in from Other Funds	18,070	-	-	-	-
Transfer in from Developer Impact Fees	38,229	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL COST REIMBURSEMENTS / TRANSFERS</b>	<b>\$ 132,793</b>	<b>114,283</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>TOTAL OTHER REVENUES</b>	<b>\$ 113,673</b>	<b>181,330</b>	<b>4,550</b>	<b>19,722</b>	<b>15,172</b>
<b>TOTAL OTHER FINANCING SOURCES</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>TOTAL GENERAL FUND</b>	<b>\$ 12,549,721</b>	<b>13,346,588</b>	<b>12,769,090</b>	<b>12,746,814</b>	<b>(22,276)</b>

**City of Grass Valley  
Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget  
General Fund**

Departmental Expenditure Account Detail

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20	Recommended Adjustments
<b>City Administration</b>					
<b>City Council</b>					
Personal Services	\$ 19,301	\$ 18,381	\$ 18,085	\$ 18,085	\$ -
Services and Supplies	4,411	12,177	6,000	6,000	-
Cost Allocation	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>23,712</b>	<b>30,558</b>	<b>24,085</b>	<b>24,085</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>City Manager</b>					
Personal Services	276,891	280,644	265,492	290,831	\$ 25,339
Services and Supplies	56,430	24,730	36,200	29,500	(6,700)
Cost Allocation	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>333,321</b>	<b>305,374</b>	<b>301,692</b>	<b>320,331</b>	<b>18,639</b>
<b>Finance Department</b>					
Personal Services	297,029	241,936	236,887	354,110	\$ 117,223
Services and Supplies	268,515	282,143	284,650	236,900	(47,750)
Cost Allocation	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>565,544</b>	<b>524,079</b>	<b>521,537</b>	<b>591,010</b>	<b>69,473</b>
<b>Personnel</b>					
Personal Services	-	-	-	-	-
Services and Supplies	26,226	24,986	22,750	22,750	-
Cost Allocation	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>26,226</b>	<b>24,986</b>	<b>22,750</b>	<b>22,750</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Information Services</b>					
Personal Services	-	-	-	-	-
Services and Supplies	224,576	257,933	195,500	205,500	10,000
Cost Allocation	(75,820)	-	(45,100)	(51,100)	(6,000)
Capital Outlay	213,002	82,239	30,000	50,000	20,000
<b>Total:</b>	<b>361,758</b>	<b>340,172</b>	<b>180,400</b>	<b>204,400</b>	<b>24,000</b>

**City of Grass Valley  
Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget  
General Fund**

Departmental Expenditure Account Detail

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20	Recommended Adjustments
<b>City Attorney</b>					
Personal Services	-	-	-	-	-
Services and Supplies	122,619	223,000	185,000	260,000	75,000
Cost Allocation	-	-	-	-	-
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>122,619</b>	<b>223,000</b>	<b>185,000</b>	<b>260,000</b>	<b>75,000</b>
<b><u>Public Safety</u></b>					
<b>Police</b>					
Personal Services	3,404,576	3,383,769	3,158,750	3,319,140	160,390
Services and Supplies	815,489	832,963	803,000	803,000	-
Capital Outlay	65,685	24,904	5,000	5,000	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>4,285,750</b>	<b>4,241,636</b>	<b>3,966,750</b>	<b>4,127,140</b>	<b>160,390</b>
<b>Police - Animal Control</b>					
Personal Services	176,756	154,864	143,260	138,134	(5,126)
Services and Supplies	43,601	38,246	31,760	31,760	-
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	6,190	6,190
<b>Total:</b>	<b>220,357</b>	<b>193,110</b>	<b>175,020</b>	<b>176,084</b>	<b>1,064</b>
<b>Fire</b>					
Personal Services	1,744,198	1,627,664	1,643,744	1,603,588	(40,156)
Services and Supplies	420,440	409,120	502,200	542,200	40,000
Capital Outlay	94,567	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>2,259,205</b>	<b>2,036,784</b>	<b>2,145,944</b>	<b>2,145,788</b>	<b>(156)</b>
<b><u>Community Development</u></b>					
<b>Planning</b>					
Personal Services	281,039	238,139	296,807	287,421	(9,386)
Services and Supplies	38,278	62,302	42,000	92,000	50,000
Capital Outlay	665	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>319,982</b>	<b>300,441</b>	<b>338,807</b>	<b>379,421</b>	<b>40,614</b>

**City of Grass Valley  
Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget  
General Fund**

Departmental Expenditure Account Detail

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20	Recommended Adjustments
<b>Building</b>					
Personal Services	193,167	310,790	323,846	356,541	32,695
Services and Supplies	165,545	55,113	60,750	60,750	-
Capital Outlay	-	2,010	7,500	7,500	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>358,712</b>	<b>367,913</b>	<b>392,096</b>	<b>424,791</b>	<b>32,695</b>
<b>Public Works</b>					
<b>Engineering</b>					
Personal Services	306,836	327,219	342,336	344,954	2,618
Services and Supplies	41,186	12,248	12,000	12,000	-
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>348,022</b>	<b>339,467</b>	<b>354,336</b>	<b>356,954</b>	<b>2,618</b>
<b>Facilities</b>					
Personal Services	76,102	68,037	69,809	66,579	(3,230)
Services and Supplies	45,234	46,866	52,500	52,500	-
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>121,336</b>	<b>114,903</b>	<b>122,309</b>	<b>119,079</b>	<b>(3,230)</b>
<b>Fleet Services</b>					
Personal Services	102,866	96,035	159,270	136,698	(22,572)
Services and Supplies	16,670	8,525	14,300	64,500	50,200
Capital Outlay	138,070	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>257,606</b>	<b>104,560</b>	<b>173,570</b>	<b>201,198</b>	<b>27,628</b>
<b>Streets</b>					
Personal Services	445,832	380,417	296,715	377,470	80,755
Services and Supplies	114,901	144,775	124,300	124,300	-
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>560,733</b>	<b>525,192</b>	<b>421,015</b>	<b>501,770</b>	<b>80,755</b>

City of Grass Valley  
 Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget  
 General Fund

Departmental Expenditure Account Detail

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20	Recommended Adjustments
<b>Swimming Pool</b>					
Personal Services	32,884	31,175	12,188	27,403	15,215
Services and Supplies	12,863	54,455	19,850	44,350	24,500
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>45,747</b>	<b>85,630</b>	<b>32,038</b>	<b>71,753</b>	<b>39,715</b>
<b>Parks Maintenance</b>					
Personal Services	199,759	203,141	252,488	189,554	(62,934)
Services and Supplies	64,401	85,115	72,500	77,500	5,000
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>264,160</b>	<b>288,256</b>	<b>324,988</b>	<b>267,054</b>	<b>(57,934)</b>
<b>Recreation</b>					
Personal Services	1,159	713	-	-	-
Services and Supplies	43	-	1,000	1,000	-
Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1,202</b>	<b>713</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>-</b>
<b><u>Non-Departmental / Other</u></b>					
<b>Non-Departmental</b>					
Personal Services	223	907,151	1,128,830	1,156,014	27,184
Services and Supplies	1,063,660	916,514	911,233	949,182	37,949
Cost Allocation	-	-	-	-	-
Appropriation for Contingency	-	-	250,000	7,500	(242,500)
Reimbursable Costs	-	81,304	-	-	-
Capital Outlay	-	25,713	-	1,184	1,184
<b>Total:</b>	<b>1,063,883</b>	<b>1,930,682</b>	<b>2,290,063</b>	<b>2,113,880</b>	<b>(176,183)</b>
<b>Debt Service</b>					
Facility Improvements	-	-	-	-	-
Pension Obligation Bonds	360,747	360,880	360,633	360,633	-
Opterra Solar Lease	65,077	76,120	73,622	73,622	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>425,824</b>	<b>437,000</b>	<b>434,255</b>	<b>434,255</b>	<b>-</b>

City of Grass Valley  
 Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget  
 General Fund

Departmental Expenditure Account Detail

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20	Recommended Adjustments
<b>Transfers Out</b>					
Capital Projects - Fund 180	202,995	442,899	686,250	686,250	-
Transfer to Special Fire Fund - Fund 121	42,943	-	-	-	-
Dorsey Marketplace - 6208	56,680	-	-	-	-
<b>Total:</b>	<b>302,618</b>	<b>442,899</b>	<b>686,250</b>	<b>686,250</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Total Appropriations - General Fund</b>	<b>\$ 12,268,317</b>	<b>\$ 12,857,355</b>	<b>\$ 13,093,905</b>	<b>\$ 13,428,993</b>	<b>\$ 335,088</b>

<b>Total Personal Services:</b>	\$ 7,558,618	\$ 8,270,075	\$ 8,348,507	\$ 8,666,522	\$ 318,015
<b>Total Services and Supplies:</b>	3,545,088	3,491,211	3,377,493	3,615,692	238,199
<b>Total Cost Allocations:</b>	(75,820)	-	(45,100)	(51,100)	(6,000)
<b>Total Capital Outlay:</b>	511,989	134,866	42,500	69,874	27,374
<b>Total Debt Service:</b>	425,824	437,000	434,255	434,255	-
<b>Total Reimbursable Costs:</b>	-	81,304	-	-	-
<b>Total Transfers Out:</b>	302,618	442,899	686,250	686,250	-
<b>Total Appropriation For Contingency:</b>	-	-	250,000	7,500	(242,500)

**City of Grass Valley**  
**Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Mid-Year Budget**  
**Measure E Fund (Fund 105)**

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
<b>Revenues:</b>				
Measure N Sales Tax	2,753,165	859,557	-	10,000
Measure E Sales Tax	-	4,083,505	5,616,000	5,650,000
Fire Department Response Reimbursement	971	4,083	-	7,107
Interest Income	16,568	106,366	10,000	60,000
Other Income	-	-	-	15,557
	2,770,704	5,053,511	5,626,000	5,742,664
<b>Expenditures:</b>				
Police - Personal Services	590,684	790,019	1,120,124	1,071,461
Police - Non-Personal Services	40,354	101,579	101,151	117,239
Fire - Personal Services	589,158	721,079	1,093,707	824,446
Fire - Non-Personal Services	38,760	77,319	144,559	197,099
Public Works - Personal Services	-	-	-	-
Public Works - Non-Personal Services	550	550	-	-
Safety - CalPERS UAAL Amortization	-	90,744	117,751	113,701
Safety - Worker's Compensation Costs	-	32,111	39,360	39,360
Police - Capital Outlay	127,461	125,963	50,000	149,000
Fire - Capital Outlay	108,346	436,592	800,000	873,913
Public Works - Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Transfers Out - Capital Projects Fund	1,084,653	361,851	3,000,000	6,900,000
Transfers Out - Vehicle Replacement Fund	-	-	-	-
	2,579,966	2,737,807	6,466,652	10,286,219
Excess (deficit) of revenues over expenditures	190,738	2,315,704	(840,652)	(4,543,555)
Beginning Fund Balance	2,986,060	3,176,798	5,492,502	5,492,502
Ending Fund Balance	3,176,798	5,492,502	4,651,850	948,947

**Capital Expenditure Detail**

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
<b>Capital Expenditures</b>				
Police Capital - Vehicles / Buildout	31,508	98,339	50,000	84,000
Police Capital - Equipment	95,953	27,624	-	65,000
Fire Capital - Fire Truck	-	52,032	520,000	520,000
Fire Capital - Vehicles / Buildout	54,226	62,126	280,000	280,000
Fire Capital - Equipment / Radios	12,650	322,434	-	73,913
Fire Capital - Opticom Upgrade	41,470	-	-	-
Trf to ISF - Fire - Fire Vehicles	-	-	-	-
Trf to Capital 6324 - CABY Wolf Creek WS	134	-	-	-
Trf to Capital 6367 - Brunswick / E Main	-	-	-	-
Trf to Capital 6385 - Measure E / N Streets	1,084,519	9,997	1,200,000	3,540,000
Trf to Capital XXXX - LG Field	-	13,313	-	1,560,000
Trf to Capital XXXX - Park Bathrooms	-	336,791	-	-
Trf to Capital XXXX - Measure E Park Projects	-	-	910,000	910,000
Trf to Capital XXXX - Minnie Park Project	-	-	560,000	560,000
Trf to Capital XXXX - GV Charter Field Restor.	-	1,750	300,000	300,000
Trf to Capital XXXX - Condon Park Access	-	-	30,000	30,000
	1,320,460	924,406	3,850,000	7,922,913

*FY 2019-20 Staff Allocations - Measure E Fund:*

Police Department - 11.0 FTE  
Fire Department - 9.2 FTE



**City of Grass Valley**  
**Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Final Budget**  
**Water Fund (Fund 200 / 201 / 204)**

	Actuals FY 2017-18	Actuals FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
<b>Revenues:</b>				
Water User Fees	\$ 2,128,351	2,119,113	2,050,000	2,050,000
Water Connection Fees	21,698	189,198	20,000	107,341
Lease Revenues	61,687	88,143	60,000	47,222
Interest Earnings	27,776	126,484	35,000	87,500
Miscellaneous Revenues	8,018	21,761	10,000	15,000
Proceeds of Debt	-	-	-	-
Transfers In From Other Funds	-	-	-	-
	<u>\$ 2,247,530</u>	<u>2,544,699</u>	<u>2,175,000</u>	<u>2,307,063</u>
<b>Expenditures:</b>				
Administration - Personal Services	\$ 136,561	152,502	248,563	165,403
Administration - Non-Personal Services	204,088	188,640	185,000	185,000
Plant - Personal Services	208,966	181,175	173,465	157,704
Plant - Non-Personal Services	482,896	443,146	450,000	450,000
Distribution - Personal Services	133,490	104,868	63,258	175,000
Distribution - Non-Personal Services	50,648	73,883	63,000	130,000
CalPERS UAAL Payment - 10.5% MISC	-	69,230	88,847	85,895
Workers Compensation Expenses	-	13,888	34,975	34,975
Debt Service	324,532	325,520	329,334	329,334
Capital Outlay	-	2,266	50,000	104,087
Capital Expenses	477,534	379,945	1,106,000	2,095,000
Transfers Out - Capital Projects Fund	-	-	21,875	21,875
	<u>\$ 2,018,715</u>	<u>1,935,063</u>	<u>2,814,317</u>	<u>3,934,273</u>
Excess (deficit) of revenues over expenditures	\$ 228,815	609,636	(639,317)	(1,627,210)
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 3,925,413	4,154,228	4,763,864	4,763,864
Ending Fund Balance	<u>\$ 4,154,228</u>	<u>4,763,864</u>	<u>4,124,547</u>	<u>3,136,654</u>
<b>Reserved Fund Balance:</b>				
Safe Drinking Water Loan Debt Svc. Reserve	\$ 148,700	148,700	148,700	148,700
Trustee Cash - Capital Leases Payable	-	-	-	-
Pension Reserve	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Working Capital Reserve	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
Water System Reinvestment Reserve	360,663	360,663	360,663	360,663
Emergency Reserve	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Connection Fee Capital Reserve	785,198	999,685	898,523	555,864
Unobligated Fund Balance	<u>\$ 2,234,667</u>	<u>2,629,816</u>	<u>2,016,661</u>	<u>1,371,427</u>

**City of Grass Valley**  
**Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Final Budget**  
**Water Fund (Fund 200 / 201 / 204)**

**Capital Expenditure Detail**

<u>Capital Expenditures</u>	<u>Actuals</u> <u>FY 2017-18</u>	<u>Actuals</u> <u>FY 2018-19</u>	<u>Adopted Budget</u> <u>FY 2019-20</u>	<u>Mid-Year Budget</u> <u>FY 2019-20</u>
Trf Capital 6374 - Florence Avenue Project	\$ -	92,188	-	-
Trf Capital 6376 - WWTP / WTP Alarms	-	-	-	-
Trf Capital 6384 - WM/S/C Ped Impvmets	-	-	-	-
Trf Capital 6388 - OpTerra Facility Impvmets	-	-	-	-
Trf Capital XXXX - Aerial Survey Update	-	-	21,875	21,875
Trf to Capital 6342 - CH/PD Security Project	-	34,184	-	-
6521 - Water Systems Plan	60,635	3,214	76,000	20,000
6524 - Empire Water Tank	-	-	170,000	200,000
6528 - 2011 Water Line (Depot Street)	-	-	150,000	450,000
6529 - 2011 Water Valves	-	-	-	-
6530 - Jan/Hill Water Project	-	-	100,000	150,000
6533 - Water Treatment Plant Maintenance	6,339	12,908	30,000	50,000
6534 - Annual Water System Maintenance	314,969	190,123	150,000	200,000
6535 - Annual Flushing Program	95,591	22,270	100,000	100,000
6536 - Forest Glade Water Project	-	-	-	-
6531 - 2014 Water Line (Cherry & Main)	-	-	250,000	-
6532 - Waterline Reconfiguration Project	-	-	5,000	-
6523 - Water Rate Impact Fee Study	-	-	75,000	75,000
6537 - Richardson St Line Replacement	-	25,058	-	850,000
	<u>\$ 477,534</u>	<u>379,945</u>	<u>1,127,875</u>	<u>2,116,875</u>

**City of Grass Valley**  
**Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget**  
**Sewer Fund (Fund 210 / 212 / 215)**

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
<b>Revenues:</b>				
Wastewater Service Fees	\$ 4,741,767	4,793,659	4,700,000	4,750,000
Industrial Waste Permits	239,196	286,279	225,000	250,000
Sewer Connection Fees	629,319	358,048	35,000	117,893
Grants	1,633,740	2,606,870	3,100,000	2,900,000
Lease Agreement Revenues	36,000	49,472	36,000	36,000
Miscellaneous Revenues	136,504	609	50,000	5,000
Interest Earnings	63,297	178,262	60,000	145,000
Proceeds of Debt	-	-	-	-
Gain on Sales of Assets	14,997	8,800	-	-
Transfers In From Other Funds	-	-	-	-
	<u>\$ 7,494,820</u>	<u>8,281,999</u>	<u>8,206,000</u>	<u>8,203,893</u>
<b>Expenditures:</b>				
Administration - Personal Services	\$ 170,570	207,629	172,155	196,157
Administration - Non-Personal Services	267,042	360,935	325,000	325,000
Plant - Personal Services	761,577	686,306	772,992	642,953
Plant - Non-Personal Services	1,281,691	1,413,339	1,275,000	1,275,000
Collection - Personal Services	314,941	210,278	207,963	186,612
Collection - Non-Personal Services	64,037	52,475	70,000	-
CalPERS UAAL Payment - 24.5% MISC	-	171,691	211,115	203,752
Workers Compensation	-	-	83,105	-
Debt Service	1,262,084	1,273,057	1,291,042	1,291,042
Other Expenses	-	-	-	-
Capital Outlay - Equipment	145,765	39,191	50,000	950,000
Capital Expenses	5,365,410	1,884,557	5,360,000	5,260,874
Transfers Out - Capital Projects Fund	-	-	21,875	21,875
	<u>\$ 9,633,117</u>	<u>6,299,458</u>	<u>9,840,247</u>	<u>10,353,265</u>
Excess (deficit) of revenues over expenditures	\$ (2,138,297)	1,982,541	(1,634,247)	(2,149,372)
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 8,511,195	6,372,898	8,355,439	8,355,439
Ending Fund Balance	<u>\$ 6,372,898</u>	<u>8,355,439</u>	<u>6,721,192</u>	<u>6,206,067</u>
<b>Reserved Fund Balance:</b>				
Bond Reserve	\$ 44,512	44,512	44,512	44,512
Trustee Cash - Leases and Other Debt	589,713	592,457	586,190	589,713
FHMA Debt Service Reserve	134,362	134,362	134,362	134,362
Glenbrook Sewer Improvement Reserve	176,248	176,248	-	-
Working Capital Reserve	850,000	850,000	850,000	850,000
Pension Reserve	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
System Reinvestment Reserve	1,735,887	1,735,887	1,735,887	1,735,887
Emergency Reserve	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
Connection Fee Capital Reserve	1,142,746	1,537,693	1,537,693	-
Unobligated Fund Balance	<u>\$ 774,430</u>	<u>2,359,280</u>	<u>907,548</u>	<u>1,926,593</u>

**City of Grass Valley**  
**Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget**  
**Sewer Fund (Fund 210 / 212 / 215)**

**Capital Expenditure Detail**

<u>Capital Expenditures</u>	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
Trf Capital 6374 - Florence Avenue Project	\$ -	100,000	-	-
Trf Capital 6342 - WWTP Video Project	-	34,183	-	-
Trf Capital 6336 - Wolf Creek Trail Phs I	-	109,904	-	-
Trf Capital XXXX - Aerial Survey Update	-	-	21,875	21,875
6617 - WWTP Security Project	-	-	-	300,874
6659 - NPDES 2008-13	51,405	-	60,000	60,000
6660 - WWTP Future Analysis	68,368	-	20,000	-
6667 - WWTP Headworks	-	-	-	-
6669 - 2011 Sewer Line	2,229	28,244	600,000	850,000
6670 - 2011 I&I	-	-	-	-
6671 - Railroad Lift Station	-	-	-	-
6676 - Le Duc Sewer Line	-	-	-	-
6680 - 2013 Sewer Line Repairs	-	-	-	-
6681 - Sewer Cleaning and Inspection	-	-	-	-
6682 - Annual Sewer Maintenance	38,339	14,045	100,000	150,000
6683 - Primary Clarifier Rehabilitation	-	-	-	-
6685 - Annual Sewer Lateral Project	-	-	-	-
6686 - Crg Hs Lift Station	445,058	-	-	-
6688 - Aeration Basin Modifier	-	-	-	-
6689 - Annual WWTP Projects	305,591	360,714	680,000	365,000
6690 - Sewer Line Repair	-	-	-	-
6691 - GV Sewer System	4,445,263	830,423	-	-
6692 - Ocean Avenue Replacement	-	140,657	-	-
6695 - Wolf Creek Trail / Access Road	-	-	-	-
6696 - 2018 WWTP Improvements Project	4,986	264,323	3,500,000	3,300,000
6694 - Slate Creek Lift Station	4,171	2,064	300,000	100,000
XXXX - Lift Station Security Upgrades	-	-	-	35,000
XXXX - Sewer Rate Study	-	-	100,000	100,000
	<b>\$ 5,365,410</b>	<b>1,884,557</b>	<b>5,381,875</b>	<b>5,282,749</b>

**City of Grass Valley**  
**Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget**  
**Gas Tax Fund (Fund 110)**

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
<b>Revenues:</b>				
Section 2103 Apportionment	\$ 50,080	43,567	112,320	119,492
Section 2105 Apportionment	69,787	71,551	72,426	78,865
Section 2106 Apportionment	101,980	102,741	102,405	57,052
Section 2107 Apportionment	90,823	89,983	94,594	98,757
Section 2107.5 Apportionment	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Road Repair / Accountability Act / Loan Repay	59,280	255,222	229,033	265,145
Proposition 42 Local Improvements	14,620	14,706		16,180
CDAAGrant (OES)	10,486	-		-
Regional Surface Transportation Program	-	-	100,000	-
Interest Earnings	7,051	31,719	5,000	5,000
	<b>\$ 407,107</b>	<b>612,489</b>	<b>718,778</b>	<b>643,491</b>
<b>Expenditures:</b>				
Capital Outlay - Street Sweeper	\$ 120,000	-	-	-
Transfers Out - General Fund	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Transfers Out - Traffic Safety Fund	150,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Transfers Out - Capital Projects Fund	106,242	196,183	865,000	1,070,000
	<b>\$ 379,242</b>	<b>299,183</b>	<b>968,000</b>	<b>1,173,000</b>
Excess (deficit) of revenues over expenditures	\$ 27,865	313,306	(249,222)	(529,509)
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 922,648	950,513	1,263,819	1,263,819
Ending Fund Balance	\$ 950,513	1,263,819	1,014,597	734,310

**Capital Expenditure Detail**

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
<b>Capital Expenditures</b>				
Trf to Capital 6122 - Street Maintenance	\$ 90,913	138,125	200,000	120,000
Trf to Capital 6130 - Dorsey Drive	-	-		-
Trf to Capital 6133 - Street Rehab	15,287	6,679	465,000	735,000
Trf to Capital 6330 - E. Main / Murphy	42	-		-
Trf to Capital 6334 - NE Sidewalk	-	-		-
Trf to Capital 6363 - Annual Sidewalks	-	17,952	50,000	40,000
Trf to Capital 6367 - Brunswick / E. Main Signal	-	-		-
Trf to Capital 6369 - E. Main / Hughes Sidewalk	-	-		-
Trf to Capital 6370 - Race Street Sidewalk	-	-		-
Trf to Capital 6136 - Storm Drain Mtc	-	33,427	150,000	175,000
Trf to Capital XXXX - Wolf Creek Trail	-	-		-
	<b>\$ 106,242</b>	<b>196,183</b>	<b>865,000</b>	<b>1,070,000</b>

**City of Grass Valley**  
**Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget**  
**Traffic Safety Fund (Fund 112)**

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
<b>Revenues:</b>				
Parking Citation Revenue	\$ 56,840	39,637	35,000	35,000
Transfer In - Gas Tax Fund	150,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Expense Reimbursements	-	25,000	25,000	-
Interest Earnings	(29)	1,284	100	100
	<u>\$ 206,811</u>	<u>165,921</u>	<u>160,100</u>	<u>135,100</u>
<b>Expenditures:</b>				
Utilities Costs	\$ 112,457	123,399	125,000	120,000
Professional Services / Contracts	58,173	80,347	50,000	30,000
Parking Citations	1,166	1,001	2,000	2,000
	<u>\$ 171,796</u>	<u>204,747</u>	<u>177,000</u>	<u>152,000</u>
Excess (deficit) of revenues over expenditures	\$ 35,015	(38,826)	(16,900)	(16,900)
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 21,596	56,611	17,785	17,785
Ending Fund Balance	<u>\$ 56,611</u>	<u>17,785</u>	<u>885</u>	<u>885</u>

**City of Grass Valley**  
**Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget**  
**Developer Impact Fee Fund (Fund 118)**

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
<b>Revenues:</b>				
Local Drainage Impact Fees	\$ 36,492	29,155	-	7,746
Fire Services Impact Fees	37,937	32,532	-	21,458
Police Services Impact Fees	17,226	13,019	-	8,663
Admin / General Facilities Impact Fees	20,516	15,338	-	11,815
Subdivisin Map Act (SMA) Fees	-	33,450	-	-
Regional Circulation Impact Fees	-	-	-	-
Regional Storm Drainage Impact Fees	-	-	-	-
Parks / Recreation Impact Fees	121,818	76,031	-	72,644
GV Transportation Improvement Impact Fees	34,268	177,220	-	43,211
GV Transportation Administrative Fees	6,309	1,603	-	2,968
McKnight Way Recapture Impact Fees	-	5,311	-	-
Interest Earnings	20,956	86,185	15,000	50,000
	<u>\$ 295,522</u>	<u>469,844</u>	<u>15,000</u>	<u>218,505</u>
<b>Expenditures:</b>				
Police Department Capital Outlay	\$ 91,164	-	-	-
Fire Department Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
City Hall / Park Impvmts Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-
Transfers Out - General Fund	38,229	-	-	-
Transfers Out - Capital Projects Fund	92,049	360,166	1,145,000	1,345,000
	<u>\$ 221,442</u>	<u>360,166</u>	<u>1,145,000</u>	<u>1,345,000</u>
Excess (deficit) of revenues over expenditures	\$ 74,080	109,678	(1,130,000)	(1,126,495)
Beginning Fund Balance	\$ 2,821,570	2,895,650	3,005,328	3,005,328
Ending Fund Balance	<u>\$ 2,895,650</u>	<u>3,005,328</u>	<u>1,875,328</u>	<u>1,878,833</u>

**Capital Expenditure Detail**

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
<b>Capital Expenditures</b>				
Trf Capital 6103 - Ridge / SC / MR Drainage	\$ -	-	-	-
Trf Capital 6110 - Storm Drain Plan	-	-	150,000	150,000
Trf Capital 6330 - East Main Street Impvmt	12,022	-	800,000	800,000
Trf Capital 6331 - Pickle Ball Courts	-	75,426	-	-
Trf Capital 6342 - City Hall Security Project	-	178,368	-	-
Trf Capital 6375 - Playground Maintenance	-	100,100	-	-
Trf Capital 6377 - McKnight Analysis	80,027	3,272	-	-
Trf Capital 6397 - E Main Improvements	-	3,000	-	-
Trf Capital 6382 - Matson Creek Phase I	-	-	170,000	170,000
Trf Capital 6384 - WM/S/C Ped Impvmets	-	-	-	-
Trf Capital 6387 - GVTIF Update	-	-	-	-
Trf Capital 6336 - Wolf Creek Trail	-	-	25,000	225,000
	<u>\$ 92,049</u>	<u>360,166</u>	<u>1,145,000</u>	<u>1,345,000</u>

**City of Grass Valley**  
**Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget**  
**Developer Impact Fee Fund (Fund 118)**

**Fund Balance Detail**

<u>Capital Expenditures</u>	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
Reserve for Parking In Lieu	\$ 71,486	73,001	73,001	73,001
Reserve for Local Circulation	449,058	458,439	158,439	158,439
Reserve for Local Drainage	189,923	223,219	49,917	57,663
Reserve for Police Services	120,078	10,526	10,526	19,189
Reserve for Fire Services	-	32,727	32,727	54,185
Reserve for Admin / General Facilities	62,642	23,315	23,315	35,130
Reserve for Regional Circulation	761,822	774,428	274,428	274,428
Reserve for Regional Drainage	146,698	149,762	3,064	3,064
Reserve for Parks and Recreation	369,265	275,232	250,232	122,876
Reserve for SMA Map Act Fees	-	33,576	33,576	33,576
Reserve for GVTIF	726,828	917,600	917,600	960,811
Reserve for GVTIF Administration	15,371	17,307	17,307	20,275
Reserve for Glenbrook Basin	3,613	3,691	3,691	3,691
Reserve for Glenbrook Basin Administration	102	102	102	102
Reserve for McKnight Recapture	4,620	10,050	10,050	10,050
Unobligated Fund Balance	(25,856)	2,353	17,353	52,353
	<u>\$ 2,895,650</u>	<u>3,005,328</u>	<u>1,875,328</u>	<u>1,878,833</u>



**City of Grass Valley**  
**Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget**  
**Capital Projects Fund (Fund 180)**

	Actual FY 2017-18	Actual FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
<b>Revenues:</b>				
STIP Regional Improvement Program Revenue	-	-	-	-
Federal Aid / FEMA	34,585	-	-	-
Misc. Intergovtl Revenue (LTF / NCTC)	474,156	86,966	200,000	2,060,088
Quimby Act Revenues / SMA (Gen Fund Trf)	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous Grants	74,243	-	-	911,226
Expense Reimbursements	13,820	-	-	-
CMAQ / SRF / Misc Grant Revenues	21,320	19,437	1,111,600	2,275,590
Insurance Reimbursements / Payments	1,692,020	307,980	-	-
Interest Earnings	7,587	(10,390)	-	-
Transfers In - General Fund	202,996	442,276	511,250	686,250
Transfer In - Measure N Fund	1,084,653	9,996	2,990,000	6,900,000
Transfer In - Gas Tax Fund	106,241	196,184	865,000	1,070,000
Transfers In - Mitigation Fee Fund	92,050	360,166	1,145,000	1,345,000
Transfers In - Spl Proj Fund (FEMA / FHWA)	-	202,057	-	-
Transfers In - Water Fund	-	126,372	21,875	141,875
Transfers In - Sewer Fund	-	244,087	21,875	126,875
Proceeds of Debt	-	-	-	-
	<u>3,803,671</u>	<u>1,985,131</u>	<u>6,866,600</u>	<u>15,516,904</u>
<b>Capital Projects Expenditures:</b>				
6110 - Storm Drain Plan	-	-	150,000	150,000
6122 - 2009 Street Maintenance Projects	90,166	137,565	200,000	120,000
6133 - Annual Street Rehabilitation	300,923	240,733	465,000	1,910,282
6136 - Annual Storm Drain Maintenance	40,438	83,427	50,000	100,000
6141 - Public Education / Outreach Project	7,629	7,791	10,000	10,000
6261 - NCTC Planning	3,204	2,875	-	7,500
6324 - CABY Wolf Creek WS	92	-	-	-
6326 - Storm Damage / Repairs	1,619,332	788,109	-	-
6327 - Peabody Creek Restoration	3,022	4,792	510,000	550,000
6330 - E Main / Murphy Improvements	170,976	-	-	-
6331 - Pickle Ball Project	56,097	190,552	-	-
6334 - NE Sidewalk	19,785	500,763	-	-
6335 - Wolf Creek Trail Project Study Report	271	5,448	256,000	256,000
6336 - Wolf Creek Trail Phase I	-	636,102	-	-
6337 - Condon Connector	-	6,978	395,600	365,600
6338 - Grass Valley Entrance Sign	-	160,295	-	-
6342 - City Hall / GVPD Security	-	366,736	-	-
6343 - South Auburn Parking Lot	-	106,346	-	-
6344 - Mill Street Parking Lot	-	6,033	-	300,000
6345 - McCourtney Road Ped Imp	-	8,964	-	685,000
6357 - Richardson Street Line Replacement	-	-	150,000	1,625,000
6363 - Annual Sidewalk Repairs / Maintenance	6,503	18,310	100,000	40,000
6374 - Florance Avenue Project	-	192,188	-	-
6375 - Playground Maintenance Projects	4,692	221,698	50,000	50,000
6377 - McKnight Analysis Project	458	3,177	-	-
6382 - Maston Creek Phase I	-	-	170,000	170,000
6384 - WM/S/C Pedestrian Improvements	-	-	-	-
6385 - B/S/NCH Rehabilitation	1,084,626	9,618	1,200,000	2,940,000
6389 - N Church RW	113,867	-	-	-
6397 - E Main Improvements	97,926	3,000	800,000	800,000
6695/96 - Wolf Creek Trail - Phase I	13,036	60,886	375,000	700,000
6410 - Lyman Gilmore Field	-	-	-	1,600,000
XXXX - Park Bathrooms	-	-	-	-
XXXX - Pavement Management Plan	-	-	50,000	50,000
XXXX - Aerial Survey Update	-	-	175,000	175,000
6413 - Measure E Park Projects	-	-	900,000	900,000
6414 - Minnie Park Project	-	-	560,000	560,000
6412 - Grass Valley Charter Field	-	-	300,000	300,000
Transfers Out to General Fund	-	-	-	-
	<u>3,633,043</u>	<u>3,762,386</u>	<u>6,866,600</u>	<u>14,364,382</u>
Excess (deficit) of revenues over expenditures	170,628	(1,777,255)	-	1,152,522
Beginning Fund Balance	(801,737)	(631,109)	(2,408,364)	(2,408,364)
Ending Fund Balance	<u>(631,109)</u>	<u>(2,408,364)</u>	<u>(2,408,364)</u>	<u>(1,255,842)</u>

**City of Grass Valley**  
**Fiscal Year 2019-20 Mid-Year Budget**  
**Special Projects Fund (Fund 182)**

	Actuals FY 2017-18	Actuals FY 2018-19	Adopted Budget FY 2019-20	Mid-Year Budget FY 2019-20
<b>Revenues:</b>				
Intergovernmental Revenue	-	-	-	695,000
RTMF Reimbursements	2,162,965	123,354	-	-
Interest Earnings	(16,663)	62,181	44,000	40,000
	<u>2,146,302</u>	<u>185,535</u>	<u>44,000</u>	<u>735,000</u>
<b>Expenditures:</b>				
Streets Materials Costs	-	9,250	-	-
Purchase of Property	221,269	-	-	1,006,178
Capital Outlay - Mill Street Parking Lot	-	3,760	-	-
Capital Outlay - Parking Lot Construction	-	106,323	430,000	325,000
Capital Outlay - Entrance Sign	-	91,974	120,000	73,000
Capital Outlay - Broadband Study	-	-	-	-
	<u>221,269</u>	<u>211,307</u>	<u>550,000</u>	<u>1,404,178</u>
Excess (deficit) of revenues over expenditures	<u>1,925,033</u>	<u>(25,772)</u>	<u>(506,000)</u>	<u>(669,178)</u>
Beginning Fund Balance	126,477	2,051,510	2,025,738	2,051,510
Ending Fund Balance	<u>2,051,510</u>	<u>2,025,738</u>	<u>1,519,738</u>	<u>1,382,332</u>



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

**Council Meeting Date:** April 14, 2020

**Date Prepared:** April 8, 2020

**Prepared by:** Timothy M. Kiser, City Manager

**Title:** Local Financial Emergency Proclamation (COVID-19) and Notification of Personnel Layoffs

**Recommended Motion:** That Council approve the Resolution proclaiming a local financial emergency and the necessity to layoff multiple city employees to mitigate the economic impacts of COVID-19.

**Agenda:** Administrative

**Background Information:** On March 5, 2020 the City Manager, acting as the Director of Emergency Services for the City of Grass Valley and the Disaster Council (Vice Mayor Aguilar and Councilmember Arbuckle), declared a local State of Emergency to ensure emergency personnel could obtain equipment and resources in the most timely and effective manner. City Council confirmed the declaration on March 5, 2020.

Despite efforts to prevent the negative effects of COVID-19, it remains a real threat. Our local businesses have experienced substantial loss as a result of the economic impacts of COVID-19 and the City has experienced a drop in economic activity due to the closure of various establishments, which has greatly impacted the City's General Fund revenues. The City has suffered an estimated \$290,500 drop in General Fund Revenues (Sales Tax, Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT), etc.) for FY2019-20, and anticipates continued declines in Sales Tax and TOT revenues for FY2020-21 to amount to an additional \$650,000. Based on the current financial status and revenue projections, the City Council is recommended to make findings that it is necessary to layoff multiple city employees and proclaim a local financial emergency. In response to Council's recommendation, staff is proposing to freeze 7 vacant positions (1- Maintenance Worker I, 1-Mechanic, 1- City Clerk, 1- Police Officer, 3 – Firefighters) and layoff 4 employed positions (1- Assistant Engineer, 1- General Ledger Accountant, 1 – Senior Accountant (part-time), 1 – Senior Administrative Clerk). These actions are necessary to mitigate the expected General Fund losses. Those employees laid off through this reduction in workforce will be placed on a re-employment list pursuant to the City Charter, Civil Service Rules and respective employee Unit MOUs. Respective Bargaining Unit Representatives have been notified of these actions.

Staff is requesting Council approve the attached Resolution proclaiming a local financial emergency and the necessity to layoff multiple city employees to mitigate the economic impacts of COVID-19.



**City of Grass Valley  
City Council  
Agenda Action Sheet**

**Council Goals/Objectives:** This action executes portions of work tasks towards achieving/maintaining Strategic Plan – Productive and Efficient Workforce.

**Fiscal Impact:** The Fiscal Impact is anticipated at more than \$940,000 over the rest of this Fiscal Year and Fiscal Year 2020-21, but due to the constantly changing impacts of COVID-19 the actual fiscal impact may change.

**Funds Available:** N/A

**Account#:** N/A

**Reviewed by:** \_\_\_\_ City Manager

**RESOLUTION NO. 2020-\_\_**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRASS VALLEY  
PROCLAIMING A LOCAL FINANCIAL EMERGENCY  
AND RECOGNIZING THE FINANCIAL HARDSHIP FACING THE  
CITY IN FISCAL YEARS 2019-20 AND 2020-21.**

WHEREAS, conditions of extreme peril to the safety of persons or property have arisen within the City of Grass Valley as a result of the spread of the COVID-19 virus throughout the State of California; and

WHEREAS, the Governor of California declared a Statewide state of emergency due to the COVID-19 virus on Wednesday, March 4; and

WHEREAS, the Disaster Council proclaimed the existence of a local emergency within the City of Grass Valley on the 5th day of March 2020; and

WHEREAS, the City Council confirmed the declaration of a local emergency due to the existence or threatened existence of conditions of disaster or of extreme peril to the safety of persons and property within the City of Grass Valley on March 10, 2020; and

WHEREAS, despite sustained efforts, the virus remains a threat, and further efforts to control the spread of the virus to reduce and minimize the risk of infection and otherwise mitigate the effects of COVID-19 are needed; and

WHEREAS the economic impacts of COVID-19 have been significant, and businesses are experiencing substantial losses; and

WHEREAS, the City is facing a continued decline in General Fund revenues and limited or no growth in other revenues; and

WHEREAS, the City is anticipating total General Fund revenue to decline in the current Fiscal Year 2019-20 below budget estimates; and

WHEREAS, the City has experienced a drop in economic activity as evidenced by the decline in economic activity and closure of establishments due to COVID-19, thereby reducing the revenues for FY2019-20 with similar trends projected for FY2020-21; and

WHEREAS, the City has experienced a drop in General Fund Revenues (Sales Tax, Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT), etc.) estimated at \$290,500 for FY2019-20 and continued declines in Sales Tax and TOT revenues are projected at \$650,000 more for FY2020-21.

WHEREAS, the City's Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with employee bargaining units require the City Council to make certain findings that a reduction in services is necessary due to lack of work, reorganization or lack of funds before the City may reduce its workforce.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED AND ORDERED that the City Council hereby proclaims a local financial emergency due to the existence or threatened existence of conditions relating to COVID-19 and associated economic impacts within the City of Grass Valley; and

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED AND ORDERED that based on the current financial status and revenue projections, the City Council must make findings that it is necessary to layoff city employees; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that City Manager of the City of Grass Valley is the authorized representative of the City of Grass Valley for the purpose of processing, negotiating, and implementing the layoffs of City employees, and processing, and coordinating all inquiries and requirements necessary to obtain any available State and Federal assistance.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED due to the financial hardship facing the City, the City Manager is authorized to proceed with budget development that includes a reduction in force and other reductions that may be implemented to meet the financial limitations of the City and to be incorporated into the FY2020-21 budget.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Grass Valley at a regular meeting of the City Council held the 14th of April 2020, by the following vote:

- AYES:
- NOES:
- ABSENT:
- NOT VOTING:

---

Lisa Swarthout, Mayor  
City of Grass Valley

ATTEST:

---

Andy Heath, Acting City Clerk  
City of Grass Valley

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

---

Michael G. Colantuono, City Attorney  
City of Grass Valley