

**AGENDA
CITY OF UNION CITY
CITY COUNCIL/REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING
Tuesday, October 10, 2006
7:00 P.M.**

**COUNCIL CHAMBERS
34009 ALVARADO NILES ROAD**

I. CALL TO ORDER

- I.a Pledge of Allegiance
- I.b Roll Call

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None.

III. PROCLAMATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

- 3.a Proclamation in Recognition of the Visit of an Official Delegation of Public Officials and Educators from the Kingdom of Thailand, City of Chiang Rai on October 10, 2006

IV. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Comments from the audience on non-agenda items will be accepted for a period of 30 minutes. Speakers are limited to three minutes each. Persons wishing to speak must complete a speaker card available at the rear of the Council Chamber or from the City Clerk. If the number of speakers exceeds the time allotment, cards will be shuffled and 10 speakers chosen at random. The remaining speakers may speak under Section XI of the agenda.

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters listed on the Consent Calendar are considered routine in nature and will be enacted by one motion. If discussion is required on a specific item, it will be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately.

- 5.a Motion to Waive Further Reading of Proposed Ordinance (This permits reading the title only in lieu of reciting the entire text of any proposed Ordinance)
- 5.b Approval of Minutes - Work Session of August 1, 2006, Special Meetings of September 26, 2006, and Regular Meeting of September 26, 2006
- 5.c Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance reimbursing members of City Boards, Commissions and Committees (Introduced September 26, 2006)
- 5.d Second reading and adoption of an Ordinance amending Title 18, Zoning, of the Municipal Code to provide further clarification on Industrial Planned Unit Developments, findings for Administrative Site Development Review and Site Development Review, expansion of non-conforming single-family residences and senior housing parking standards (Introduced on September 26, 2006)
- 5.e Resolution Approving Contract Change Order No. 17 and Review change orders 1 through 23; Union City Sports Center Project, City Project No. 02-12

- 5.f Resolution of the City Council adopting the National Incident Management System (NIMS), Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) and Incident Command System as the standard practice for all emergency responses
- 5.g Adopt Resolution Authorizing Reclass of Personnel Specialist to Personnel Analyst I
- 5.h Resolution of the City Council of the City of Union City Authorizing Revision to the Employee Housing Assistance Program (EHAP)
- 5.i Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2005-06 concerning sources and uses of Development Fees pursuant to Government Code Section 66006, et seq

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 6.a Public Hearing and Resolution to consider adoption of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan. Pursuant to CEQA, a Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project.

VII. CITY MANAGER REPORTS

- 7.a Adopt a resolution setting the reimbursement rate for use of Council Member's personal vehicles for City business at \$100.00 per month or as documented by the Council Member

VIII. REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY – None.

IX. AUTHORITIES AND AGENCIES – None.

X. CITY COMMISSION/COMMITTEE REPORTS

- 10.a Report and Recommendations from the Parks and Recreation Commission Regarding Possible Names for the Park Located at Williams and Davis Streets
- 10.b Report and Recommendations from the Park and Recreation and Youth Commissions Regarding Priorities for Possible Expansion of Youth Serving Programs in Union City

XI. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

XII. SCHEDULED ORAL COMMUNICATION – None.

XIII. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

- 13.a Oral reports by Councilmembers on meetings of County or Regional Boards and Commissions

XIV. GOOD OF THE ORDER

XV. CLOSED SESSION

Closed Session - Conference with Real Property Negotiators

Pursuant to Section 54956.8 of the Government Code

Property: Block bounded by D St., E St., 2nd St., and Mission Blvd.

(APN 486-0002-028-00, 486-003-029-00, 486-0003-035-00, 486-003-030-00, 486-0003-034-01, 486-0003-034-01)

Agency negotiators: Mark Leonard, Mark Evanoff

Negotiating party: The Olson Company

Under negotiation: Price and terms

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

A complete agenda packet is available for review at City Hall or our website www.ci.union-city.ca.us

Assistance will be provided to those requiring accommodations for disabilities in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Interested person must request the accommodation at least two working days in advance of the meeting by contacting the City Clerk at (510) 675-5348.

**PROCLAMATION OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF UNION CITY**
In Recognition of
**THE VISIT OF AN OFFICIAL DELEGATION OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND
STUDENTS
FROM THE KINGDOM OF THAILAND
CITY OF CHIANG RAI
ON OCTOBER 10, 2006**

WHEREAS, the City of Union City is proud to have the City of Chiang Rai, Thailand as its newest Sister City; and

WHEREAS, the City of Union City is very pleased to be visited by an official delegation of municipal officials, students and educators from the City of Chiang Rai, Thailand; and

WHEREAS, said official delegation includes the following members

Mr. Wanchai Chongsuttanamanee - Mayor of City Municipal
Mrs. Ratana Chongsuttanamanee - Chief Executive of the PAO
Mr. Somsak Wiangosot - Chairman of the Municipal Council
Mrs. Bang-on Malidin - Vice Chairman of the Municipal Council
Mr. Sirikhan Prabphan - Member of the City Municipal Council
Mr. Chaiporn Sompramai - Deputy Municipal Clerk
Miss Kritsana Trisiri - Director of Bureau of Education
Mr. Pichit Phanphitpayapheat - Head of Education Superior
Mr. Sunate Butsan - Director of Municipality School 6
Mrs. Anurak Butsan - Sub-Director of Municipality School 7
Miss Pith Chaipolngam - Teacher
Mr. Ratasart Chongsuttanamanee - Student
Mr. Wit Umbua - Student
Mr. Kasiti Laksukthom - Student
Miss Kamoltip Kamyod - Student
Miss Chanyanuj Chawarangoon - Student
Miss Thaksaphorn Butsan - Relative
Mr. Thadchapon Butsan - Relative
Mr. Pongphop Chongsuttanamanee - Relative
Mr. Kasidit Chongsuttanamanee - Relative; and

WHEREAS, the City of Union City is particularly pleased to host the students and their teacher for an educational exchange that will give them a first-hand experience in attending the award-winning schools of the New Haven Unified School District; and

WHEREAS, the City of Union City looks forward to many more years of cooperation, cultural and economic exchanges with the City of Chiang Rai, Thailand that will strengthen the already strong ties between our two great nations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Union City, hereby expresses its sincere honor in receiving the official delegation of municipal and education officials from the City of Chiang Rai, Thailand, and pledges its support to improve the relationships between the City of Union City and the Kingdom of Thailand.

Dated:

MARK GREEN, Mayor

RICHARD VALLE, Vice Mayor

CAROL DUTRA-VERNACI, Councilmember

MANUEL FERNANDEZ, Councilmember

JIM NAVARRO, Councilmember

MINUTES

CITY OF UNION CITY SPECIAL MEETING AND WORK SESSION Tuesday, August 1, 2006, 7:00 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS 34009 ALVARADO NILES ROAD

- I. CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Green called the meeting to order at 7:12 pm
- 1.a Pledge of Allegiance: Mayor Green led the flag salute
- 1.b Roll Call: Present: Councilmembers Dutra-Vernaci, Fernandez, Navarro,
Mayor Green
Absent: Vice Mayor Valle
- II. PROCLAMATION**
- 2.a A proclamation in recognition of a visit of the HangZhou Youth & Children's Activity Center Delegation to the City of Union City, July 17 – August 2, 2006
- Mayor Green read the proclamation in its entirety; Council presented the proclamation and a key to the City to the HangZhou delegation and welcomed everyone that visited.
- Meiling Zhou, Principal of the Union City's United Youth Enrichment School, thanked the host families, teachers, City Council and the City of Union City; presented a book made of silk to the City Council, and expressed how much she loved Union City and the City Council.
- Mayor Green accepted their gift on behalf of the City Council and stated they are looking forward to their next visit to the United States and especially to Union City. Mayor Green thanked the host families and everyone for their hospitality.
- III. WORK SESSION**
- 3.a Transit Alternatives Study
- Transit Manager Lee presented the staff report, explained the purpose of the study and stated staff is looking for direction from Council. He also introduced Nathan Landau of AC Transit should Council have any questions.
- Bonnie Nelson of Nelson Nygaard presented an overview of the Briefing Book "*Union City Transit Alternatives Study.*" Bonnie Nelson and staff responded to Councilmember's questions relating to demographics, increased ridership, modified routes to other areas, modified schedules for summer, incentive programs, and route maps in other languages.
- Sarabjit Cheema requested extending routes 3 and 4 to Fremont, more stops on Mission Boulevard, and wanted the transit map in different languages.

Ram Singh stated he would like the transit service extended to other areas such as Fremont, service running the whole week, and focus on the centers, seniors, and churches. He thinks UC Transit is a good idea but noted it is not reaching the population.

Pritam Singh requested Council consider cost and time as two important factors for ridership and stated he would like to reinforce the statements of the previous two speakers.

Daljit Kaur (Sarabjit Cheema translated) asked Council for a pedestrian crossing on Alvarado and bus service to Sikh Temple everyday.

A resident of Hayward, Raj Deep, suggested the idea of reduced fares, transferable fares between Fremont, service to Newark, and servicing seniors as a way for increased ridership.

Charlie Cheema of Livermore informed Council he's the president of a senior organization of about 8,000, stated most of the members are in situations like himself, and requested Council's help for additional bus service.

Kenneth Ryan stated he is a retired senior who depends on the bus service Union City provides. He also questioned noticing of this meeting and suggested Council consider the time of the meeting so everyone could attend. He urged Council to add in the concept of driver pay, think of the future, look into Paratransit service that is already going to Fremont, and to think about a spine service (on-call service with a 2 hour window) like the one in Durango, Colorado which is about the same size as Union City.

Barry Ferrier spoke of BART parking problems, busses running during peak hours, having a consistent starting time, and suggested 1A and 1B be a single express system. He mentioned in reference to the Dumbarton Express, Transit should have schedules available in the City Hall lobby.

Sarbjit Cheema recalled the use of bus passes used in India as a student, which she explained worked out well and suggested Union City do the same, but not during peak hours since busses are usually full. She stated she wanted to stress the importance of teenagers getting into the habit of using the bus system.

Bonnie Nelson reported they will be developing alternatives through the summer and will return to Council in September.

Council discussion included streamlining ways of getting people from the west side to BART, considering half fare days, appreciation days, youth passes, routes to other outside areas such as south Hayward and north Fremont as well as border areas such as Quarry Lakes, summer flexibility routes, smaller busses in the neighborhood areas, maps translated in different languages, and the Transit Schedule broadcasted on the City's cable channel on a regular basis.

Mayor Green spoke about the need for a greater distribution on the bus system, and suggested starting the meeting one hour earlier at the next meeting.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor Green adjourned the meeting at 8:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cassie Castain
Administrative Assistant

**MINUTES
CITY OF UNION CITY
CITY COUNCIL/REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING
Tuesday, September 26, 2006
7:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
34009 ALVARADO NILES ROAD**

I. CALL TO ORDER – Mayor Green called the meeting to order at 7:19 p.m.

- a. Pledge of Allegiance – Mayor Green lead the flag salute.
- b. Roll Call – Present: Councilmembers Dutra-Vernaci, Fernandez, Navarro, Vice Mayor Valle, Mayor Green.

Mayor Green announced that the City Council had, in Closed Session and by a unanimous vote, approved the City Manager's appointment of Police Captain Greg Stewart to the position of Chief of Police, effective December 23, 2006. Captain Stewart expressed his appreciation for the appointment and acknowledged the support of family and staff. City Manager Cheeves thanked Councilmember's for supporting his selection and noted Captain Stewart would be working closely with current Police Chief Randy Ulibarri over the next several months to insure a smooth transition.

Mayor Green read aloud the rules of conduct for the meeting.

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

III. PROCLAMATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

- a. Introduction of New and Promoted Employees

City Manager Cheeves introduced the item and department directors. Deputy City Manager Acosta introduced City Clerk Renee Elliott. Police Chief Ulibarri introduced Police Officer Sean Mace, Police Lieutenant Tom Haselton, Police Corporal Jared Rinetti, and Police Corporal Tom Gorrie. Public Works Director Cheng introduced Civil Engineer Michael Nguyen. Economic & Community Development Director Leonard introduced Chief Building Official Diana Rapposelli. Maintenance Worker II Ken Furman was unable to attend due to a family illness.

- b. A Proclamation of the City Council of the City of Union City Proclaiming September 2006 as National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month in Union City

A representative was unable to attend the meeting, so the Proclamation will be sent under separate cover.

- c. Proclamation proclaiming October 8-14 as Fire Prevention Week

Mayor Green presented the Proclamation to Division Chief/Fire Marshall Laura Mapes. Mayor Green suggested regularly including fire prevention safety reminders in the Leisure Services Guide.

- d. *Aging -The Ultimate Adventure*, a presentation by Dr. Ray Grimm, Human Services Department, City of Fremont

Dr. Ray Grimm, representing the Tri-City Elder Coalition, presented a report on a community plan for improving the quality of care for older adults in Union City, Newark, and Fremont. Dr. Grimm requested Councilmembers endorse the strategic plan; that Senior Commission Member Irene Wolfe serve on the board; that a staff member be assigned to participate on board; and, that Council select a representative to meet annually with the Tri-City Elder Coalition to review ongoing services in the community. Mayor Green stated Council would not be able to take immediate action, but staff would agendize the requested action for consideration at a future Council meeting.

IV. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Comments from the audience on non-agenda items will be accepted for a period of 30 minutes. Speakers are limited to three minutes each. Persons wishing to speak must complete a speaker card available at the rear of the Council Chamber or from the City Clerk. If the number of speakers exceeds the time allotment, cards will be shuffled and 10 speakers chosen at random. The remaining speakers may speak under Section XI of the agenda.

Mattie Rousseau spoke about traffic concerns at Aptos Court and Ascot Way, and on Almaden and Bainbridge.

Hugh McNamara expressed appreciation for the police department's assistance with a festival on September 23-24, and spoke about a Senior's Night Out on the 4th Wednesday of the month.

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

All matters listed on the Consent Calendar are considered routine in nature and will be enacted by one motion. If discussion is required on a specific item, it will be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately.

Item 5.e was removed from the Consent Calendar for separate consideration.

- a. Waived Further Reading of Proposed Ordinance (This permits reading the title only in lieu of reciting the entire text of any proposed Ordinance)
- b. Approved Minutes for the Regular meetings of May 23, 2006, June 13, 2006, July 25, 2006, September 12, 2006, and for the Special Meetings of March 28, 2006 and September 12, 2006
- c. Adopted **Ordinance No. 677-06** Amending Title 18, Zoning, of the Union City Municipal Code AT-04-06, to clarify text and amend the requirements of Title

18.33, Affordable Housing of the Union City Municipal Code and bring it into compliance with the City's 2002 General Plan (Introduced September 12, 2006)

- d. Adopted **Resolution No. 3249-06** approving sale of a City owned undeveloped residential lot at 4015 Marsten Ave.
- f. Adopted **Resolution No. 3251-06** authorizing the purchase of Flowronex Booster Pump and Aeration System from John Deere for Civic Center Park Lagoon and Irrigation System, City Project No. 05-19*

*It was noted that the city project number was listed incorrectly on the agenda and should be changed as follows: City Project No. 4-10 should read City Project No. 05-19.

- g. Adopted **Community Redevelopment Agency Resolution No. 339-06** authorizing the Executive Director to Execute the Purchase Agreement for 4995 Horner Street, APN 482-0020-009
- h. Adopted **Resolution No. 3252-06** accepting improvements for 2005-06 Wheelchair Ramps, City Project No. 05-64
- i. Adopted **Resolution No. 3253-06** releasing property from further obligation in accordance with the Agreement between Haas Brothers and the City of Union City executed July 9, 1969 (33233 Central Ave.)
- j. Rejected Claim No. 680, filed by Tereese Sanders, as recommended by the City's Claims Administrator
- k. Adopted **Resolution No. 3254-06** Amending a Policy Governing Expenses of the Council; introduced an Ordinance amending Chapters 2.20, 2.21, 2.24, 2.25, 2.26, 2.27 and adding Chapter 2.19 of the Union City Municipal Code relating to the reimbursement of expenses for members of City Commissions and Committees; and, adopted **Resolution No. 3255-06** establishing a policy regarding reimbursement of expenses for member of City Commissions and City Committees
- l. Adopted **Resolution No. 3256-06** Adopting an Ex Parte Communication Policy for the City Council and the Planning Commission

It was moved by Vice Mayor Valle, seconded by Councilmember Fernandez, to approve Consent Items 5.a through 5.d and Items 5.f through 5.l as recommended by staff. Motion carried unanimously.

Consideration of Item 5.e removed from Consent Calendar.

- e. Adopt a resolution appropriating supplemental funds from State Gas Tax Fund (Fund 3100) in the amount of \$150,000 and Awarding Contract to DeSilva Gates Construction for 2005-06 Overlay Program, City Project No. 05-66

Public Works Director Cheng responded to questions from Councilmembers related to the timing of the repairs. Director Cheng noted that if inclement weather caused a delay in the contractor's work schedule, that city staff would be available to fix pot holes until the final repairs are completed. City Manager Cheeves noted prior bids had been quite high, and a way to hold costs down was to permit the contractor some flexibility with scheduling. There were no speakers on the matter.

It was moved by Mayor Green, seconded by Vice Mayor Valle, to adopt **Resolution No. 3250-06** appropriating supplemental funds from State Gas Tax Fund (Fund 3100) in the amount of \$150,000 and Awarding Contract to Desilva Gates Construction for 2005-06 Overlay Program, City Project No. 05-66. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- a. Public hearing to consider the adoption of a resolution approving modification of Tentative Tract Map 7668 and Site Development Review, SD-04-05, to create a five building, 16 unit residential condominium project with common area, where 15 units were approved on November 22, 2005. The project is initiated by Paul Bunton and the site is located at 4312 Dyer Street at the intersection of Dyer Street and Meteor Drive.

Assistant Planner Avalon Evans presented the staff report and responded to questions from Councilmember's seeking clarification of landscaping, color scheme, and parking dimension requirements.

Architect Paul Bunton responded to a question from Councilmember Fernandez regarding slope, acknowledging the drawing is incorrect. Mr. Bunton also thanked the Mayor and Council for their advice and support regarding the addition of a 16th unit.

Mayor Green opened the public hearing. Hugh McNamara expressed concerns about sufficient guest parking. There were no other speakers on the matter. Mayor Green closed the public hearing.

It was moved by Mayor Green, seconded by Vice Mayor Valle, to adopt **Resolution No. 3257-06** approving Modified Site Development Review (SD-04-05) and Tentative Tract Map No. 7668. Motion carried unanimously.

- b. Introduction of Ordinance approving Zoning Text Amendment AT-05-06, to establish more specific findings for Administrative Site Development Review and Site development Review (Chapters 18.72 and 18.76), establish a Variance process for additions of more than 50% of the existing square footage to nonconforming single-family residences (Chapter 18.16), re-establish a senior housing parking standard in the Residential Districts chapter (Chapter 18.32), and modify the Planned Unit Development chapter (Chapter 18.44) to include industrial planned unit developments

Assistant Planner Avalon Evans presented the staff report and responded to questions from Councilmember's regarding senior housing standards.

Mayor Green opened the public hearing. There were no speakers on the matter. Mayor Green closed the public hearing.

It was moved by Councilmember Dutra-Vernaci, seconded by Councilmember Fernandez, to accept the Planning Commission's recommendation to amend the Municipal Code as reflected in Exhibit A, and introduced an Ordinance to Implement Zoning Text Amendment AT-05-06, which updates Title 18, Zoning, of the Municipal Code. Motion carried unanimously.

- c. Adopt a resolution approving 2006-2007 Union City Chamber of Commerce contract

Economic Development Director Mark Leonard presented the staff report.

Union City Chamber of Commerce Chairperson Donna Mize thanked Councilmembers for their continued support, and included a request for an additional \$2,000 of funding to be used as seed money for a special program for at-risk youth. Ms. Mize introduced Ron Michael who spoke about an 'Evening of Champions' event, held to raise money for the Olympian Clinic to work with and coach youth on track-and-field sports.

Chairperson Mize responded to questions from Councilmembers and provided an update on new location efforts, recruitment for an executive director, and fundraising activities including increased membership and building reserves. Ms. Mize pledged quarterly status updates for the Council.

Mayor Green opened the public hearing. Barry Ferrier acknowledged the efforts of Community Development staff and importance of recognizing Union City businesses. Hugh McNamara spoke in favor of the additional \$2,000 for the Champion event. There were no other speakers on the matter. Mayor Green closed the public hearing.

It was moved by Mayor Green, seconded by Councilmember Navarro, to adopt **Community Redevelopment Agency Resolution No. 340-06** authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a contract with the Union City Chamber of Commerce for 2006/07 Business Retention Program, plus the additional \$2,000 requested. Motion carried unanimously.

Council recessed to a break at 9:15 p.m. and reconvened at 9:38 p.m.

VII. CITY MANAGER REPORTS

- a. Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan - Review of Draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan with special focus on the Project List and Project Prioritization

Planning Manager Joan Malloy presented the staff report and responded to questions from Council. It was noted that if New Haven Unified School District does close Cabello and Barnard-White schools, that two new schools may replace the ones being closed in the Safe Route to Schools section. Councilmembers provided comment.

J.J. Amaya suggested having air or repair stations along the bike paths.

Staff will return at the October 10 meeting when a revised master plan will be considered for adoption.

- b. Fiscal Year 2005-06 4th Quarter Fund Report on Budget to Actual Results and Quarterly Disbursement Report April 1, 2006 - June 30, 2006

Administrative Services Director Digre presented the staff report, noting revenues are exceeding budget estimates and expenses are lower than anticipated. There were no speakers on the matter. Staff responded to questions from Councilmembers.

It was moved by Mayor Green, seconded by Councilmember Dutra-Vernaci, to accept the report and proposed corrective action, and adopt **Resolution No. 3258-06** Amending Expenditure Appropriations and Revenue Estimates for Fiscal Years 2005/06 and 2006/07. Motion carried unanimously.

- c. Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee of the City Council to Review a Police Department Complaint

City Manager Larry Cheeves presented the staff report, recommending City Council appoint an Ad Hoc committee of two of its members to review the determinations made by the City Manager regarding the complaint, and to report its findings to the City Council during a future closed session.

J.J. Amaya expressed various concerns about the incident in question. City Attorney Riback cautioned that the details of the incident are a personnel matter which should not be discussed in open session. There were no other speakers on the matter.

It was moved by Mayor Green, seconded by Councilmember Navarro, to appoint Mayor Green and Councilmember Navarro to an Ad Hoc committee to review the determinations made by the City Manager regarding this complaint, and to report its findings to the City Council during a future closed session. Motion carried unanimously.

- d. Report and Recommendations Regarding Obtaining Community Feedback for Project Funding Priorities

Deputy City Manager Tony Acosta presented the staff report and responded to questions from Councilmembers.

Barry Ferrier stated it would be important to hear from new people in order to gain new perspectives, and suggested promoting involvement by advertising on the cable channel and the city's website. There were no other speakers on the matter.

Councilmembers discussed the pros and cons of holding a Town Hall meeting as well as the potential value of conducting a broad-based poll to gather input

about issues important to residents.

Deputy City Manager Acosta stated staff would research options for a telephone poll that could be conducted, and formulate a list of potential questions to be asked, noting the entire process would take between 3-5 months.

It was moved by Mayor Green, seconded by Vice Mayor Valle, that staff would return with options and costs for Council to consider at a future meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

VIII. REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY - None

IX. AUTHORITIES AND AGENCIES - None

X. CITY COMMISSION/COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

XI. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Barry Ferrier suggested that, if closed by NHUSD, Cabello and Barnard-White schools be considered as a prospective site for a new library.

J.J. Amaya spoke about a hypothetical scenario questioning a city policy.

XII. SCHEDULED ORAL COMMUNICATION - None

XIII. ITEMS REFERRED BY COUNCIL

- a. Oral reports by Councilmembers on meetings of County or Regional Boards and Commissions

Vice Mayor Valle noted he and Councilmember Fernandez would be having a joint meeting with the School District on October 16, and suggested Police Chief Ulibarri introduce Captain Stewart at that meeting.

XIV. GOOD OF THE ORDER

Councilmember Fernandez requested reconsideration of the business incubator program. Director Leonard noted the business loan program had been discontinued due to cost, and stated SBA loan programs could be utilized. Councilmember Fernandez will follow-up with Director Leonard about exploring possibilities to encourage businesses to come to Union City.

Councilmember Navarro expressed concern about a brown fence ready to fall at a bus stop at Dyer and Alvarado-Niles.

Councilmember Dutra-Vernaci and Mayor Green expressed concern about the poor sound quality (low volume) experienced by viewers when watching council meeting broadcasts. City Manager Cheeves noted staff will work with the cable company to investigate what the problem might be.

Vice Mayor Valle inquired about the progress of finding a retail tenant at Mission Gateway. Director Leonard stated the owners of Mission Gateway were negotiating with a coffee shop to open after the new year.

Vice Mayor Valle inquired about the signage at Whipple and 2nd street and the removed City entrance sign at Mission and Tamarack. City Manager Cheeves noted the signs serve two separate purposes. Director Leonard will check the conditions of approval for the Mission Gateway project to see if it was required to provide a City entrance sign.

Vice Mayor Valle inquired whether a neighborhood could pay for street sweeping signage. City Manager Cheeves noted that any changes to the current sweeping schedule would require an increase in personnel, resulting in increased costs.

Vice Mayor Valle requested a copy of the list of funding priorities identified by the Youth Commission. City Manager Cheeves stated staff would provide the list as an informational item for Council, but noted staff's recommendation would be for Council not to act until the list could be considered with other budgetary needs.

Mayor Green announced board and commission vacancies, noting applications were due in the City Clerk's Office by 12 o'clock noon on Friday, October 13, 2006.

Mayor Green suggested forwarding information about new streets to be added to future editions of maps.

Mayor Green inquired about City Hall being used as a remote voting site for the upcoming election. It was suggested that pictures and plaques of incumbents be removed from the lobby and council chambers on the days when early voting will occur. City Manager Cheeves noted staff will take down any related pictures and plaques.

XV. CLOSED SESSION – None.

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor Green adjourned the meeting at 11:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Renee Elliott, City Clerk

**MINUTES
CITY OF UNION CITY
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING
Tuesday, September 26, 2006**

**City Council Conference Room
34009 Alvarado-Niles Road**

- I. CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Green called the special meeting to order at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Conference Room.
- II. ROLL CALL:**
- Present: Councilmembers, Fernandez, Navarro, Valle, Mayor Green
Absent: Councilmember Dutra-Vernaci
- III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:** None
- IV. CLOSED SESSION – PUBLIC EMPLOYEE APPOINTMENT**
Pursuant to section 54957.6 of the Government Code
Title: Police Chief
- V. ADJOURNMENT:** Mayor Green adjourned the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Renee Elliott
City Clerk

Minutes

CITY OF UNION CITY SPECIAL MEETING

Tuesday, September 26, 2006

City Council Conference Room
34009 Alvarado-Niles Road

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Green called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present:

Councilmembers Dutra-Vernaci, Fernandez, Navarro, Vice Mayor Valle,
Mayor Green.

III. DISCUSSION OF LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES WITH ELLEN CORBETT, CANDIDATE FOR CALIFORNIA STATE SENATE, 10TH DISTRICT

Candidate Ellen Corbett responded to questions from Councilmembers and discussed legislative priorities impacting the region, including matters related to:

- Universal health care
- Transportation issues: traffic, grade separation, high speed rail, Bay transport
- Port of Oakland
- Retention of Redevelopment powers by municipalities
- Funding for libraries
- Youth programs: DARE, School Resource Officers, GREAT (Gang Resistance Education and Training), gang intervention, juvenile justice programs
- Budget: revenues, reserves, tax expenditures, FEMA and CERT funding allocations

Ms. Corbett acknowledged the development success in Union City, and expressed her ongoing commitment to representing the needs of the district.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

Barry Ferrier commented about incentives for transportation hubs to be seen as destinations.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Green adjourned the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Renee Elliott, City Clerk



Agenda Item

DATE: October 10, 2006
TO: City Council
FROM: Richard Digre
SUBJECT: Second Reading and adoption of Ordinance reimbursing members of City Boards, Commissions and Committees.

BACKGROUND

This item is brought before the City Council for the second reading amending City Municipal Code Chapters 2.20, 2.21, 2.24, 2.25, 2.26, 2.27 and adding Chapter 2.19 of the Union City Municipal Code relating to the reimbursement of expenses for members of City Commissions and Committees.

DISCUSSION

On September 26, 2006, the City Council unanimously approved enacting amendments and additions to the City's Municipal Code to reimburse City Commissions and Committees for expenses incurred on behalf of the City.

FISCAL IMPACT

Fiscal impact will be minimal and will only involve out-of-pocket expenses incurred by members of City Commissions and Committees.

RECOMMENDATION.

It is recommended that the City Council conduct the second reading, waive the reading of the ordinance in its entirety and adopt the applicable sections of the Municipal Code.

Prepared by:
Richard Digre
Director of Administrative Services

Approved by:
Larry Cheeves
City Manager

ORDINANCE NO. ____

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF UNION CITY
AMENDING CHAPTERS 2.20, 2.21, 2.24, 2.25, 2.26, 2.27
AND ADDING CHAPTER 2.19 OF THE UNION CITY MUNICIPAL CODE
RELATING TO THE REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES FOR
MEMBERS OF CITY COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES**

The City Council of the City of Union City does hereby ordain as follows:

Section 1. *Amendment of Chapter 2.20.* Chapter 2.20 of the Union City Municipal Code is amended to add the following:

“2.20.110 Reimbursement.

Members of the Parks and Recreation Commission shall be entitled to reimbursement for expenses as the Council may approve by resolution.”

Section 2. *Amendment of Chapter 2.21.* Chapter 2.21 of the Union City Municipal Code is amended to add the following:

“2.21.090 Reimbursement.

Members of the Youth Commission shall be entitled to reimbursement for expenses as the Council may approve by resolution.”

Section 3. *Amendment of Chapter 2.24.* Chapter 2.24 of the Union City Municipal Code is amended to add the following:

“2.24.100 Reimbursement.

Members of the Planning Commission shall be entitled to reimbursement for expenses as the Council may approve by resolution.”

Section 4. *Amendment of Chapter 2.25.* Chapter 2.25 of the Union City Municipal Code is amended to add the following:

“2.25.100 Reimbursement.

Members of the Human Relations Commission shall be entitled to reimbursement for expenses as the Council may approve by resolution.”

Section 5. *Amendment of Chapter 2.26.* Chapter 2.26 of the Union City Municipal Code is amended to add the following:

“2.26.100 Reimbursement.

Members of the Senior Citizens Commission shall be entitled to reimbursement for expenses as the Council may approve by resolution.”

Section 6. *Amendment of Chapter 2.27.* Chapter 2.27 of the Union City Municipal Code is amended to add the following:

“2.27.070 Reimbursement.

Members of the Public Art Review Board shall be entitled to reimbursement for expenses as the Council may approve by resolution.”

Section 7. *Addition of Chapter 2.19.* Chapter 2.19 is added to the Union City Municipal Code as follows:

“2.19 City Committees.

2.19.010 Reimbursement of City Committee Members.

Members of City Committees shall be entitled to reimbursement for expenses as the Council may approve by resolution.”

Section 8. *Severability.* In the event any section or portion of this ordinance shall be determined invalid or unconstitutional, such section or portion shall be deemed severable and all other sections or portions hereof shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 9. *Savings Clause.* All code provisions, ordinances, and parts of ordinances in conflict with the provisions of this chapter are repealed. The provisions of this chapter, insofar as they are substantially the same as existing code provisions relating to the same subject matter shall be construed as restatements and continuations thereof and not as new enactments. With respect, however, to violations, rights accrued, liabilities accrued, or appeals taken, prior to the effective date of this ordinance, under any chapter, ordinance, or part of an ordinance shall be deemed to remain in full force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or other proceedings, with respect to any such violation, right, liability or appeal.

Section 10. *Effective Date.* This Ordinance shall take effect and be enforced thirty (30) days following its adoption.

Section 11. *Posting.* The City Clerk of the City of Union City shall cause this Ordinance to be posted in at least three (3) public places in the City of Union City in accordance with Section 36933 of the Government Code of the State of California.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY the City Council of the City of Union City, on this ____ day of _____ 2006, by the following votes:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

858793-1



DATE: OCTOBER 10, 2006

TO: CITY COUNCIL

FROM: MARK LEONARD, ECONOMIC & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: SECOND READING AND ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE
FOR ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT, AT-05-06

The City Council conducted a public hearing on September 26, 2006 to consider AT-05-06, to provide further clarification on Industrial Planned Unit Developments, findings for Administrative Site Development Review and Site Development Review, expansion of non-conforming single-family residences and reduced parking for senior housing. The Council introduced the ordinance at the September 26th meeting. This is the second reading of the Ordinance.

DISCUSSION

At the September 26, 2006 meeting, Staff presented a report to the Council that outlined the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance. The Council reviewed the amendments and unanimously approved the item, introducing the Ordinance.

FISCAL IMPACT

There are no fiscal impacts associated with the proposed Text Amendment.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council hold the second reading, waive the full reading of the text, and adopt the Ordinance, as introduced on September 26, 2006. The Ordinance will become effective 30 days from the date of adoption.

Prepared by: Avalon Evans, Assistant Planner

Submitted by: Mark Leonard, Economic & Community Development Director

Approved by: Larry Cheeves, City Manager

Exhibit A: City Council Ordinance with Exhibit A

CITY COUNCIL ORDINANCE NUMBER # -06

**ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF UNION CITY
AMENDING TITLE 18, *ZONING*, OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE**

**THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF UNION CITY DOES ORDAIN AS
FOLLOWS:**

SECTION 1. Pursuant to Section 18.64 of the City of Union City Municipal Code, the City Council of the City of Union City does hereby find the textual change embodied in the zoning ordinance necessary and desirable to achieve the purposes of Title 18, *Zoning*, of the Municipal Code of the City of Union City and to promote the public health, safety, morals, comfort, convenience, and general welfare of the residents of the City of Union City,

SECTION 2. The amendments to Title 18, *Zoning*, of the Municipal Code of the City of Union City, are hereby created as shown in Exhibit A, attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference, a copy of which is available in the office of the City Clerk,

SECTION 3. The proposed Municipal Code Text Amendment has been deemed exempt from CEQA, subject to Sections 15061(b)(3). No further environmental review is required.

18.16.050 Repairs—Alterations.

A. A nonconforming building which is nonconforming as to lot coverage or all or substantially all of which is designed or intended for a use not permitted in the district in which it is located, shall not be added to or enlarged in any manner unless such nonconforming building and the use thereof, including all additions and enlargements thereto, is made to conform to all the regulations of the district in which it is located.

B. A nonconforming building or structure may not be altered unless the resulting building or structure conforms to the requirements of the district in which it is located, except as follows:

1. Ordinary repairs and alterations may be made to a nonconforming building or structure, provided that no structural alterations shall be made in or to a building or structure all or substantially all of which is designed or intended for a use not permitted in the district in which it is located, except those required by law or except to make the building or structure and use thereof conform to the regulations of the district in which it is located.

2. Single Family Home Additions. A nonconforming building which does not conform to the regulations of the district in which it is located shall not be added to or enlarged unless:

a. The floor area of the addition is no more than fifty percent (50%) of the square footage of the existing building or structure; and

b. No new nonconformity will be created and no existing nonconformity will be increased, except as provided for in Section 18.24.050.C regarding first floor additions to single family homes with existing legal non-conforming side yard setbacks; [or](#)

[c. A variance permit is granted for the nonconforming portion\(s\) of the existing building or structure and proposed addition to the nonconforming building or structure.](#)

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline

CHAPTER 18.44 PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD)

18.44.020 Location--Permit required.

A planned unit development may be located in any R district or the 511 Area district upon the granting of a permit in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

A permit may also be granted for a planned unit development in the CC, Community Commercial and CS, Specialty Commercial Districts for mixed-use (residential and commercial) uses, within the Old Alvarado area (boundaries of which are defined in the Old Alvarado Design guidelines) and along the Mission Boulevard corridor (between Decoto Road and the Hayward City limits), when located aboveground floor commercial uses.

A permit may also be granted for an industrial planned unit development in an industrial zoning district, including condominium conversions of existing buildings and new industrial condominium projects.

(Ord. 55.286-87 § 2 Exh. A § 2, 1987: Ord. 55-64 § 9.1, 1964)

18.44.040 Site area.

The minimum site area for a planned unit development shall be five (5) acres, ~~except that planned unit developments for mixed-use (residential and commercial) projects located in the CC, Community Commercial and CS, Specialty Commercial districts within Old Alvarado and the Mission Boulevard neighborhoods~~ and industrial planned unit development projects shall be allowed when minimum site area standards for the district in which the planned unit development is located are met. (Ord. 55-64 § 9.3, 1964)

Deleted: . E

Deleted: a

Deleted: shall be allowed

CHAPTER 18.08 DEFINITIONS

18.08.490 Planned unit development.

A "planned unit development" is a tract of land with approved development standards which do not conform in all respects with the land use pattern designated on the zoning map or the district regulations provided by the zoning ordinance, and may include a combination of different dwelling types and/or a variety of land uses which complement each other and harmonize with the existing and proposed land uses in the vicinity. Planned unit developments may be permitted in any residential district, any industrial district, the 511 district, and in the specialty commercial and community commercial districts for mixed-use (residential and commercial) projects within the Old Alvarado area and Mission Boulevard corridor. Industrial condominium conversions and new industrial condominium projects are also considered planned unit developments. (Section 18.44 – Purpose) (Ord. 457-95 § 2 (part), 1995: Ord. 55-64 § 2.1 (part), 1964)

CHAPTER 18.40 INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS

MG

18.40.130 Conditional uses permitted.

Industrial planned unit development, consistent with the requirements of Chapter 18.44;

ML

18.40.230 Conditional uses permitted.

Industrial planned unit development, consistent with the requirements of Chapter 18.44;

MS

18.40.330 Conditional uses permitted.

Industrial planned unit development, consistent with the requirements of Chapter 18.44;

CHAPTER 18.72 ADMINISTRATIVE SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

18.72.070 Findings for approval.

A. All of the following findings are required for approval of an administrative site development review.

- 1. ~~Approval of this application is consistent with the general plan and any applicable specific plans;~~
- 2. ~~Approval of this application is consistent with the purposes of this title and the requirements of the district in which the site is located;~~
- 3. ~~Approval of this application is consistent with the purpose of administrative site development review as outlined in Section 18.72.010.~~

B. An administrative site development review may be revocable, and may be granted subject to such conditions as are necessary to support the above findings.

C. The above findings are also required for any approval on appeal, or approval of a modification to an administrative site development review.(Ord. 513-98 Exh. A-5 (part), 1998)

Deleted: The proposed use and structures meet the requirements, purpose and intent of this chapter.¶

Deleted: The project conforms to any applicable design criteria specified in the district regulations of the project.

Deleted:

Deleted: , may be granted for a limited time period,

CHAPTER 18.76 SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

18.76.045 Findings for approval.

~~A. All of the following findings are required for approval of a site development review.~~

- 1. ~~Approval of this application is consistent with the general plan and any applicable specific plans;~~
- 2. ~~Approval of this application is consistent with the purposes of this title and the requirements of the district in which the site is located;~~
- 3. ~~Approval of this application is consistent with the purpose of site development review as outlined in Section 18.76.010.~~

~~B. A site development review may be revocable and may be granted subject to such conditions as are necessary to support the above findings.~~

~~C. The above findings are also required for any approval on appeal, or approval of a modification to a site development review.~~

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.13"

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.13"

Formatted: Font: Bold

18.76.080 Planning Commission Recommendation.

The Planning Commission shall transmit a written recommendation to the City Council that the application be approved, conditionally approved or denied, based on compliance with the ~~findings~~ set forth in Section 18.76.~~045~~.

Deleted: purposes

Deleted: 010

18.76.090 City Council Decision.

A. The City Council may grant an application for a site development review as applied for or in modified form, if on the basis of the application and the evidence submitted, the Council finds that the application ~~complies with the findings set forth in Section 18.76.045~~. The City Council may adopt additional conditions of approval as the facts warrant.

B. The City Council may deny an application for site development review.

Deleted: is consistent with the general plan, applicable specific plans, and

Deleted: purposes

Deleted: 010

18.32.160 Off-street parking.

F. All parking spaces required for dwelling units shall be located on the same zoning lot as the dwelling served. Parking spaces for all other uses shall be located on the same zoning lot as the use served except as otherwise provided in Chapter [18.04](#). Off-street parking shall be provided according to the following ratios:

1. Church, School, College, and Other Institutional Auditoriums. One (1) parking space shall be provided for each five (5) seats based upon maximum seating capacity;

2. Dwellings. One (1) covered parking space shall be provided for each dwelling unit, and one (1) additional parking space which may be uncovered shall be provided for each two (2) units located on the zoning lot, except that for single-family residences, including dwelling groups, both spaces shall be covered and enclosed; one (1) additional parking space, which may be uncovered, shall be provided for a secondary unit on a single-family lot;

~~3. Senior Housing. One half (.5) of a covered parking space shall be provided for each bedroom, and one quarter (.25) of a parking space shall be provided for each unit for guest parking. The number of parking spaces required for senior housing may be decreased by the Planning Commission if it is found that a specific use will not create as great a need for off-street parking.~~

~~4. Hospitals. One (1) parking space shall be provided for each three (3) hospital beds, plus one (1) parking space for each two (2) employees, plus one (1) parking space for each doctor assigned to the staff;~~

Deleted: 3

~~5. Libraries, Art Galleries and Museums—Public. One (1) parking space shall be provided for each one thousand (1,000) square feet of gross floor area;~~

Deleted: 4

~~6. Recreation Buildings or Community Centers. One (1) parking space shall be provided for each two (2) employees, plus spaces adequate in number to serve the visiting public and as determined by the City Planning Commission;~~

Deleted: 5

~~7. Public Utility and Public Service Uses. One (1) parking space shall be provided for each two (2) employees on maximum shift, plus spaces adequate in number to serve the public as determined by the City Planning Commission. Where such uses are unmanned, no spaces need be provided;~~

Deleted: 6

~~8. Sanitariums, Convalescent Homes and Nursing Homes. One (1) parking space for each six (6) beds, plus one (1) parking space for each two (2) employees, plus one (1) parking space for each doctor assigned to the staff;~~

Deleted: 7

~~9. Schools—Nursery, Elementary, Junior and Senior High. One (1) parking space for each two (2) employees, plus one (1) parking space for each ten students in the senior high school.~~

Deleted: 8



Agenda Item

DATE: OCTOBER 10, 2006

TO: CITY COUNCIL

FROM: MINTZE CHENG, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: APPROVE CONTRACT CHANGE ORDER NO. 17 AND REVIEW CHANGE ORDERS 1 THROUGH 23; UNION CITY SPORTS CENTER PROJECT, CITY PROJECT NO. 02-12

BACKGROUND:

The City Council, at their September 27, 2005 meeting awarded the construction contract of the Union City Sports Center to Zolman Construction & Development, Inc. for \$10,765,000, and established a construction contingency fund of \$1,000,000. At the meeting, City Council gave the authority to City Manager to approve contract change orders within this contingency, provided the Council would be informed of any change orders in excess of \$75,000.

Change Orders 1 through 23 have been reviewed by the City's construction management firm, Anchor Engineering recommended for approval, and forwarded to the Public Works Department.

DISCUSSION:

Construction Contract Change Order No. 17 was to install the audio/visual (AV) system for the project site. This work was one of the bid alternates that was not awarded to the Contractor previously. At the time of bidding, Zolman did not obtain a viable bid from their subcontractor for the AV system, so the bid submitted was a conservative figure (plug number) at \$150,000. Recently, at the Council direction, staff gave Zolman the opportunity to revise their proposal and the Contractor agreed to perform the work in the amount of \$101,908.17. In order to facilitate the installation work in a timely fashion, this change order was authorized for the contractor to proceed.

A summary of Change Orders 1 through 23 can be found attached as Exhibit A.

Currently, this project is about 75% complete. Weather permitting, the project completion will be achieved before end of January 2007.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This project has been funded by a combination of Capital Facility Improvement Fund, Capital Project Fund, and Special Parks Fund. The added/credited work to date (change orders 1 through 23) totaled \$428,304.15. This is about 42% of the established contract contingency funds. There is no additional budget impact at this time.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the City Council adopt a resolution approving Contract Change Order No. 17 in the amount of \$101,908.17 and approve Change Orders to date in the cumulative amount of \$428,304.15 to the contract with Zolman Construction & Development, Inc.

Prepared by:
Philip Sachs
Public Works Superintendent

Submitted by:
Mintze Cheng
Public Works Director

Approved by:
Larry Cheeves
City Manager

RESOLUTION NO.

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF UNION CITY
FOR APPROVAL OF CONTRACT CHANGE ORDER NO. 17 AND REVIEW
CHANGE ORDERS 1 THROUGH 23; UNION CITY SPORTS CENTER PROJECT,
CITY PROJECT NO. 02-12**

WHEREAS, the City of Union City Public Works staff and the Construction Management firm for said project, upon review of Contract Change Order No. 17 with Zolman Construction & Development, Inc. recommend approval in the amount of \$101,908.17 for the Audio and Visual system for the Union City Sports Facility, City Project No. 02-12;

FURTHERMORE, Let it be know the change orders 1 through 23 having been reviewed by the City of Union City Public Works staff and the Construction Management firm for said project are accepted;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Union City, that Staff recommends that the City Council adopt a resolution approving Contract Change Order No. 17 to the contract with Zolman Construction & Development, Inc. in the amount of \$101,908.17 and approving Change Orders to date in the cumulative amount of \$428,304.15.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor of the City of Union City is hereby authorized and directed to execute the hereinabove mentioned Change Order in the name of the City of Union City.

UNION CITY SPORTS CENTER PROJECT
SUMMARY OF CHANGE ORDERS 1 THROUGH 23

- CCO #1: Revised sewer pipes from 4" to 6". Cost of the change was **\$5,997.02**
- CCO #2: Credit for concrete masonry block fence. Cost of the change was a credit of **<\$6,488.24>**
- CCO #3: Unforeseen underground obstructions, expose, and stockpile. Cost of the change was **\$26,637.27**
- CCO #4: Revised Joint Trench, cost of the change was **\$15,431.82.**
- CCO #5: Outside agencies requirements PG&E trench, winterize site, FRP panels/epoxy flooring, and mechanical couplers. Cost of the change was **\$49,615.47**
- CCO #6: More extensive site winterization. Cost of the change was **\$41,602.40**
- CCO #7: Off-haul, & dispose surplus soil; additional curbs and 16" masonry blocks. Cost of the change was **\$42,847.31**
- CCO #8: Removal & replacement of unsuitable landscape soil; additional welding to structural steel beam. Cost of the Change was **\$29,056.74**
- CCO #9: Credit for toilet partition substitution. Cost of the change was a credit of **<\$1,500>**.
- CCO #10: Credit for operable partition substitution. Cost of the change was a credit of **<\$1,000>**.
- CCO #11: Credit for painted roll up doors. Cost of the change was a credit of **<\$15,000>**.
- CCO #12: Extend water service line, extra reinforcing for fire line. Cost of the change was **\$9,952.87.**
- CCO #13: Additional backfill for storm drain; additional fire related insulation; provide roof access; add threaded studs. Cost of the change was **\$17,633.02**
- CCO #14: Recessed entry slab; re-fabricating embeds; stabilize tube steel beams; support plate for tube steel column. Cost of the change was **\$10,539.05.**
- CCO #15: Credit for concrete masonry block coring work not performed. Cost of the change was a credit of **<\$2,620>**.
- CCO #16: Extra layers of Gyp board; extension of glass at parapet; revised metal embeds; three additional door frames; add 2-doors, sill flashing. Cost of the change was **\$21,438.14.**
- CCO #17: Add Audio/Visual System. Cost of the change was **\$101,908.17.**
- CCO #18: Core drill embeds, install heat tracer wire, add security door contacts, additional stucco at aerobics room. Cost of the change was **\$22,275.47.**
- CCO #19: Trash Enclosure Roof per Health Dept. requirement. Cost of the change was **\$28,423.34.**
- CCO #20: Change precision hardware to #2800 series, install plywood for stucco at Aerobics room. Cost of the change was **\$18,792.15.**
- CCO #21: Credit for shorter concrete foundation piles. Cost of the change was a credit of **<\$8,000>**.
- CCO #22: Credit for delete colonial siding , delete wood parapet, delete T-bar ceiling in alcove. Cost of the change was a credit of **<2,367>**.
- CCO #23: Authorized Saturday work on 6/24, 7/1, 7/8; additional waterproofing, additional ceiling insulation. Cost of the change was **\$23,129.95.**

Total change \$428,304.15



Agenda Item

DATE: October 10, 2006

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Carlos Rodriguez, Fire Chief

SUBJECT: National Incident Management System (N.I.M.S.) Compliance

Beginning October 1, 2006, all federal preparedness funding for the City of Union City will be conditioned upon full compliance with the “National Incident Management System” (NIMS).

Background

On February 28, 2003, the President of the United States issued Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD)–5, Management of Domestic Incidents, which directs the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop and administer a National Incident Management System (NIMS). This system provides a consistent nationwide template to enable Federal, State, local, and tribal governments and private-sector and nongovernmental organizations to work together effectively and efficiently to prepare for, prevent, respond to, and recover from domestic incidents, regardless of cause, size, or complexity, including acts of catastrophic terrorism. The ICS700 document establishes the basic elements of the NIMS and provides mechanisms for the further development and refinement of supporting national standards, guidelines, protocols, systems, and technologies.

Discussion

Under specific direction from the City Manager, in September 2006, all full time Union City employees attended an 8 hour federally approved and mandatory training on the National Incident Management System. Attendance of this course and successful completion of a mandatory federal exam has placed the City of Union City in federal compliance under “Homeland Security Presidential Order -5”.

NIMS compliance should be considered and undertaken as a community-wide effort. The benefit of NIMS is most evident at the local level, when a community as a whole prepares for and provides an integrated response to an incident.

With the formal implementation of NIMS, the City of Union City will be able to:

- Ensure common and proven incident management doctrine, practices, and principles are used to plan for, protect against, respond to, and recover from emergency incidents and pre-planned events.
- Maintain a response operation capable of expanding to meet an escalating situation and the ability to integrate resources and equipment from intrastate and interstate mutual aid agreements, state-provided assistance, and federal government response.
- Order and track response assets using common resource typing and definitions, and draw on mutual aid agreements for additional assistance.
- Establish staging and allocation plans for the re-distribution of equipment, supplies, and aid coming into the area from other localities, states, or the federal government through mutual aid agreements.
- Conduct situational assessments and establish the appropriate ICS organizational structure to effectively manage the incident.
- Establish communication processes, procedures and protocols that will ensure effective interoperable communications among emergency responders.

2006 – 2007 Action Plan

- Complete NIMS (ICS 700) by September 29, 2006
- Adopt NIMS, ICS and SEMS policy
- Explore unifying with the New Haven School District. Establish a NIMS Advisory Committee to explore a joint venture to include the current CERT Program.
- Provide guidelines and Incident Command System (ICS) training for elected officials by the end of 2006
- Develop a long range strategy for emergency preparedness that meets all local, state and federal mandates, including the special needs of the disabled and citizens using English as a secondary language.
- Use NIMS and ICS for all incidents
- Create a preparedness, planning and training action plan that will reach all of our citizens and business community
- Update plans, Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) with NIMS
- Incorporate NIMS, SEMS and ICS into all training and exercises
- Participate in all-hazards exercise programs based on NIMS
- Inventory community assets using resource-typing
- Ensure NIMS standards are incorporated into acquisition procedures
- Create a comprehensive plan for CERT and attach it as a functional Division of the Fire Department
- Exhaust all possibilities for FEMA and Homeland Security grants

Conclusion

The official adoption of the National Incident Management System (NIMS) by the City of Union City will not only meet federal compliance, but will also catapult the organization into a proactive and organized vision to meet the needs of a diversified community base.

Recommendation

Adopt resolution accepting the National Incident Management System (NIMS), and Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS), and Incident Command System (ICS), as the standard practice for all emergency responses.

Prepared and Submitted by:
Carlos Rodriguez, Fire Chief

Approved by:
Larry Cheeves
City Manager

RESOLUTION NO.

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF UNION CITY ADOPTING THE
NATIONAL INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (NIMS),
AND STANDARDIZED EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (SEMS),
AND INCIDENT COMMAND SYSTEM (ICS)
AS THE STANDARD PRACTICE FOR ALL EMERGENCY RESPONSES**

WHEREAS, the President in Homeland Security Directive-5, directed the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to develop and administer a National Incident Management System, which would provide a consistent nationwide approach for federal, state, local, and tribal governments to work together more effectively and efficiently to prevent, prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters, regardless of cause, size, or complexity; and

WHEREAS, California local and state government pioneered the development of standardized incident management systems to respond to a variety of catastrophic disasters, including fires, earthquakes, floods, and landslides; and

WHEREAS, in the early 1970s, the California fire service, in partnership with the federal government, developed the seminal emergency incident command system that has become the model for incident management nationwide; and

WHEREAS, in 1993, California was the first state to adopt a statewide Standardized Emergency Management System for use by every emergency response organization, and implemented a system involving local and state agencies to ensure the continual improvement of the Standardized Emergency Management System; and

WHEREAS, California local and state emergency management professionals have contributed their expertise to the development of the new National Incident Management System; and

WHEREAS, it is essential for responding to disasters and securing the homeland that federal, state, local, and tribal organizations utilize standardized terminology, standardized organizational structures, interoperable communications, consolidated action plans, unified command structures, uniform personnel qualification standards, uniform standards for planning, training, and exercising, comprehensive resource management, and designated incident facilities during emergencies or disasters; and

WHEREAS, the California Standardized Emergency Management System substantially meets the objectives of the National Incident Management System; and

WHEREAS, the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks (9-11 Commission) recommended adoption of a standardized Incident Command System nationwide; and

WHEREAS, the Union City Fire Department has provided training to all City Employees in the National Interagency Management System;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT REOLVED, that the City Council hereby approves the following for adoption to be the standard practice for the City of Union City for all emergency responses:

- National Interagency Management System (NIMS)
- Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS)
- Incident Command System (ICS)

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Union City at a regular meeting held on the _____ day of _____, 2006 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

MARK GREEN
Mayor

ATTEST:

RENEE ELLIOTT
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney



Agenda Item

DATE: October 10, 2006

TO: City Council

FROM: Richard Digre, Administrative Services Director

SUBJECT: Resolution Authorizing Reclassification of Personnel Specialist to Personnel Analyst I

BACKGROUND

The City Council previously approved in the Fiscal Year 06/07 budget, the Personnel Specialist at a total compensation level of \$5,260-\$6,247/month.

DISCUSSION

This is a request for the City Council to approve the new Personnel Analyst I classification in the Personnel Office, changing the current title from Personnel Specialist to Personnel Analyst I and, to give authorization to change the total compensation. This request is being submitted in accordance with the Personnel Rules and Regulations, Rules III and IV which refer to setting Classifications and Compensation.

Although Council approved the position with the above total compensation, a title change and salary adjustment is being recommended based on the increased responsibilities of the position and a recent Compensation Study of our eight comparable agencies.

FISCAL IMPACT

The total compensation being proposed for the Personnel Analyst I is \$5,588-\$6,649/month. This increase in compensation will be covered under the Administrative Services Division budget with no additional funds required.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council adopt the attached resolution entitled "A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Union City amending Classification Plan, Compensation Plan and

Authorized Staff Positions List.”

Submitted by:
Richard Digre
Administrative Services Director

Approved by:
Larry Cheeves
City Manager

Attachments:

- Resolution
- Personnel Analyst Job Specification
- City of Union City Compensation Plan for 2006/2007
- Personnel Allocations FY 2006/2007

RESOLUTION NO.

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF UNION CITY
AMENDING THE CITY'S AUTHORIZATION, COMPENSATION AND
CLASSIFICATION PLANS**

WHEREAS, the Personnel Rules and Regulations require that the City Council adopt an Authorization, Compensation, and Classification Plans for all authorized Positions;

WHEREAS, the City Council previously approved the position of Personnel Specialist as listed in the Compensation Plan for Fiscal Year 06/07

WHEREAS, this item may be amended by the City Council as a direct result of budgetary approval, or the labor negotiations process, and upon recommendation of the City Manager, and

WHEREAS, it is recommended that the following personnel action would be beneficial to the organization and result in enhanced service delivery:

Upgrade the position of Personnel Specialist to Personnel Analyst I; and change the total compensation 6.4%; and approve the new classification as stated

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Union City to amend the Compensation Plan, to change the above mentioned position.



34009 ALVARADO-NILES ROAD
UNION CITY, CA 94587
(510) 471-3232

PERSONNEL ANALYST I

DEFINITION

Under general supervision, performs varied technical and administrative tasks in the operation of a centralized personnel system; provides information to employees and the public on services and activities of the Personnel Department; assists in various program phases; maintains records and processes personnel forms; performs related duties as required.

DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS

Incumbents in this class provide varied administrative and technical support in the administration of personnel programs. Incumbents are required to have an in-depth and comprehensive knowledge of the policies and procedures necessary to achieve program results. Assignments may include technical personnel tasks to be performed under the general supervision of a personnel professional.

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES

Duties may include but are not limited to, the following:

- Ø Assists in the administration of the City's compensation and classification plans, safety program, recruitment and examination program, and benefits program.
- Ø Participates in job analyses, the selection and construction of testing procedures and examination materials, determination of appropriate screening activities.
- Ø Prepares recruitment schedules, contacts appropriate recruitment sources, drafts job announcements and advertisements.
- Ø Schedules facilities, arranges for oral board raters, obtains necessary materials, scores examinations, notifies applicants of test results.
- Ø Organizes and maintains a variety of automated and manual personnel record systems.
- Ø Provides information on employee benefits to current, new and terminating employees.

PERSONNEL ANALYST I

EXAMPLES OF DUTIES (continued)

- Ø Prepares/composes letters, reports, memoranda and other written material as directed or on own initiative.
- Ø Prepares routine reports required of the City by other government agencies.
- Ø Conducts surveys to obtain necessary data for various purposes, such as classification and compensation.

QUALIFICATIONS

Knowledge Of:

The English language including spelling, punctuation and grammar; mathematics including basic statistics; personnel laws and regulations; personal and mainframe computer operation and applications for records management, generation of correspondences and statistical information storage and retrieval; theories, principles and practices of public personnel administration.

Skill in:

Operating standard office equipment including personal computers, typewriters' and copy machines; composing correspondence from brief oral or written instructions; making arithmetic calculations with speed and accuracy.

Ability to:

Learn policies, procedures and laws pertaining to the work; use independent judgement within established guidelines; deal tactfully and effectively with the public and other City employees; handle written and verbal confidential information; type 40 words per minute, corrected; interpret written materials; maintain accurate records; coordinate assigned duties with others; communicate effectively with others.

OTHER QUALIFICATIONS

EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE

Education - Completion of the twelfth grade, or its equivalent. Two years of college course work in personnel/business administration, or a related field is desirable.

Experience - A typical way of gaining the knowledge, skills, and abilities outlined above is completion of two years of college with a major work in business, public or general administration or a related field, and two years of responsible office administrative support experience. Additional experience as outlined above may be substituted for the college course work on a year-for-year basis.

LICENSE Must possess a valid California Driver's license and have a satisfactory driving record.

CITY OF UNION CITY
PERSONNEL ALLOCATIONS (Section 1)
FY 2005/06 and FY 2006/07

(All numbers shown below represent full-time equivalents - FTE's)

	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	Difference
CITY COUNCIL			
10010 - Mayor	1.00	1.00	-
10020 - Councilmembers	4.00	4.00	-
TOTAL	5.00	5.00	-
CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE			
20010 - City Manager	1.00	1.00	-
20020 - Deputy City Manager	1.00	1.00	-
20065 - Assistant to the City Manager	1.00	1.00	-
20070 - Waste Recycle Coordinator	1.00	1.00	-
TOTAL	4.00	4.00	-
CITY ATTORNEY			
N/A - Contractual City Attorney	-	-	-
TOTAL	-	-	-
CITY CLERK			
20030 - City Clerk	1.00	1.00	-
50525 - Administrative Assistant II	1.00	1.00	-
60010 - PT Office Specialist I	0.50	0.50	-
TOTAL	2.50	2.50	-
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES			
20090 - Management Analyst III	1.00	1.00	-
20120 - Supervising Personnel Analyst	1.00	1.00	-
20130 - Personnel Specialist	1.00	-	(1.00)
20140 - Personnel Analyst I	-	1.00	1.00
20270 - Administrative Services Director	1.00	1.00	-
20310 - MIS Manager	1.00	1.00	-
20350 - Supervising Accountant	1.00	1.00	-
30020 - Sr. Accountant	1.00	1.00	-
30060 - Accountant	1.00	1.00	-
30260 - Sr. Systems Analyst	2.00	2.00	-
50090 - Finance Specialist II	2.00	2.00	-
50100 - Finance Specialist III	1.00	1.00	-
50110 - PT Central Services Assistant	0.40	0.40	-
50510 - Office Specialist III	1.00	1.00	-
50520 - Administrative Assistant I	1.00	1.00	-
TOTAL	15.40	15.40	-

CITY OF UNION CITY
PERSONNEL ALLOCATIONS (Section 2)
FY 2005/06 and FY 2006/07

(All numbers shown below represent full-time equivalents - FTE's)

	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	Difference
ECONOMIC & COMM. DEVELOP.			
50255 - Administrative Assistant II	2.00	2.00	-
30230 - Associate Planner	1.00	1.00	-
30250 - Assistant Planner	1.00	1.00	-
50255 - Building Permit Technician	1.00	1.00	-
50290 - Building/Code Comp. Inspector	2.00	2.00	-
20580 - Chief Building Official	1.00	1.00	-
20515 - Econ. & Comm. Dev. Director	1.00	1.00	-
20630 - Economic Development Coord.	1.00	1.00	-
20540 - Housing & Comm. Dev. Coord.	1.00	1.00	-
20100 - Management Analyst III	1.00	1.00	-
20510 - Neigh. Preservation Coord.	1.00	1.00	-
50200 - Neighborhood Preservation Spec	-	1.00	1.00
20560 - Planning Manager	1.00	1.00	-
50255 - PT Administrative Assistant II	0.50	0.50	-
20620 - Redevelopment Agency Manager	1.00	1.00	-
30055 - Sr. Building Inspector	1.00	1.00	-
30235 - Sr. Planner	1.00	1.00	-
TOTAL	17.50	18.50	1.00

FIRE DEPARTMENT			
25001 - Fire Chief	1.00	1.00	-
25008 - Division Chief/Fire Marshall	1.00	1.00	-
25009 - Assistant Fire Chief	1.00	1.00	-
25010 - Fire Battalion Chief	3.00	3.00	-
25012 - EMS Coordinator	1.00	1.00	-
25015 - Fire Captain	12.00	12.00	-
25025 - Fire Engineer	12.00	12.00	-
25030 - Firefighter	17.00	17.00	-
50525 - Administrative Assistant III	1.00	1.00	-
50525 - Administrative Assistant II	1.00	1.00	-
30050 - Hazardous Materials Inspector	2.00	2.00	-
60005 - PT Fire Inspector	1.00	1.00	-
TOTAL	53.00	53.00	-

CITY OF UNION CITY
PERSONNEL ALLOCATIONS (Section 3)
FY 2005/06 and FY 2006/07

(All numbers shown below represent full-time equivalents - FTE's)

	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	Difference
LEISURE/TRANIST			
20450 - Leisure Services Manager	1.00	1.00	-
50120 - Recreation Supervisor	3.00	4.00	1.00
50160 - Recreation Program Coordinator	2.50	3.50	1.00
50510 - Office Specialist III	1.00	1.00	-
50520 - Administrative Assistant I	2.00	2.00	-
50525 - Administrative Assistant II	1.00	2.00	1.00
60010 - PT Office Specialist I	2.38	2.38	-
60610 - PT Office Specialist III	0.38	1.13	0.75
60071 - PT Leisure Services Program Mgr	6.70	6.70	-
60072 - PT Program Coordinator	1.85	1.85	-
60231 - PT Recreation Aide I	2.98	2.98	-
60232 - PT Recreation Aide II	3.10	3.10	-
60233 - PT Recreation Leader	19.01	19.01	-
60234 - PT Sr. Recreation Leader	16.60	21.60	5.00
60570 - Project Specialist	2.09	2.09	-
TOTAL	65.59	74.34	8.75

POLICE DEPARTMENT			
20500 - Intervention Counselor I	1.00	1.00	-
20505 - Intervention Counselor II	1.00	1.00	-
40010 - Police Chief	1.00	1.00	-
40020 - Police Captain	2.00	2.00	-
40030 - Police Sergeant	12.00	12.00	-
40040 - Police Lieutenant	3.00	4.00	1.00
40050 - Police Officer	55.00	56.00	1.00
40070 - Dispatcher Clerk	17.00	17.00	-
40090 - Community Services Aide	1.00	1.00	-
40100 - Property Clerk	1.00	1.00	-
40110 - Public Services Officer	1.00	1.00	-
40120 - PT Prisoner Transportation Ofc.	1.20	1.20	-
40130 - Police Corporal	6.00	6.00	-
40140 - Police Office Assistant	4.00	4.00	-
40230 - Police Dept Office Coordinator	1.00	1.00	-
50505 - Office Specialist II	1.00	1.00	-
50530 - Administrative Assistant III	1.00	1.00	-
60120 - PT Animal Control Cadet	0.60	0.60	-
60120 - PT Parking Control Cadet	1.20	1.20	-
60120 - PT Police Cadet (Prop/Patrol/Rec)	2.25	2.25	-
60130 - PT Police Reserve	6.00	6.00	-
TOTAL	119.25	121.25	2.00

CITY OF UNION CITY
PERSONNEL ALLOCATIONS (Section 4)
FY 2005/06 and FY 2006/07

(All numbers shown below represent full-time equivalents - FTE's)

	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	Difference
PUBLIC WORKS			
20090 - Management Analyst II	2.00	2.00	-
20710 - Public Works Director	1.00	1.00	-
20711 - Environmental Programs Mgr	0.50	-	(0.50)
20712 - Environmental Programs Coord.	0.50	1.00	0.50
20730 - Public Works Superintendent	3.00	3.00	-
20810 - City Engineer	1.00	1.00	-
20860 - Principal Civil Engineer	1.00	1.00	-
20912 - Transit Manager	1.00	1.00	-
30120 - Engineer III (Civil)	3.00	3.00	-
50291 - Public Works Inspector	2.00	2.00	-
50292 - Sr. Public Works Inspector	1.00	1.00	-
50320 - Maintenance II Streets	3.00	3.00	-
50321 - Veh. Heavy Equipment Mech.	2.00	2.00	-
50322 - Fleet Parts Specialist	1.00	1.00	-
50323 - Lead Heavy Equipment Mech.	1.00	1.00	-
50330 - Maintenance I Streets	6.00	6.00	-
50331 - Facilities Technician	1.00	1.00	-
50341 - Street Sweeper Operator	2.00	2.00	-
50342 - Maint. II Building & Grounds	5.00	5.00	-
50351 - Building Maintenance Worker	2.00	2.00	-
50360 - Maint. I Building & Grounds	15.00	15.00	-
50370 - Public Works Maintenance II	1.00	1.00	-
50510 - Office Specialist III	1.00	1.00	-
50530 - Administrative Assistant III	2.00	2.00	-
60570 - Project Specialist	2.98	2.98	-
60600 - Intern	0.06	0.06	-
TOTAL	61.04	61.04	-
GRAND TOTAL	343.28	355.03	11.75

CITY OF UNION CITY
Salary Compensation Plan
FY 2006/2007

Effective: July 1, 2006
Amended: October 10, 2006

CITY OF UNION CITY
Salary Compensation Plan - FY 2006/2007

<u>Bargaining Unit</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Classification Title</u>	<u>Step 1</u>	<u>Step 2</u>	<u>Step 3</u>	<u>Step 4</u>	<u>Step 5</u>	<u>Step 6</u>
FULL-TIME (monthly rates shown; except where noted otherwise)								
City Council	10010	Mayor	1,425					
City Council	10010	Mayor (eff. 12/01/06)	2,211					
City Council	10020	Councilmember	950					
City Council	10020	Councilmember (eff. 12/01/06)	1,474					
City Manager*	20010	City Manager	17,894					
			Minimum	←	Range	→		Maximum
Dept. Heads*	20270	Aministrative Services Director	11,920					14,347
Dept. Heads*	20020	Deputy City Manager	12,230					14,726
Dept. Heads*	20515	ECD Director	11,934					14,366
Dept. Heads*	25001	Fire Chief	12,628					15,210
Dept. Heads*	40010	Police Chief	13,200					15,906
Dept. Heads*	20710	Public Works Director	12,149					14,627
Management*	20065	Assistant to the City Manager	7,118	7,441	7,780	8,135	8,509	
Management*	20580	Chief Building Official	9,725	10,177	10,653	11,152	11,677	
Management*	20030	City Clerk	8,605	9,002	9,418	9,855	10,314	
Management*	20810	City Engineer	10,359	10,844	11,353	11,887	12,447	
Management*	20630	Economic Dev. Coord.	8,296	8,708	9,120	9,526	9,939	
Management*	25012	EMS Coordinator	9,494	9,935	10,399	10,886	11,397	
Management*	20712	Env. Programs Coordinator	7,118	7,441	7,780	8,135	8,509	
Management*	20711	Env. Programs Manager	9,232	9,659	10,108	10,580	11,078	
Management*	25010	Fire Battalion Chief	9,815	10,273	10,753	11,258	11,790	
Management*	25009	Assistant Fire Chief	10,493	10,984	11,499	12,039	12,609	
Management*	25008	Division Chief/Fire Marshall	10,212	10,689	11,189	11,715	12,268	
Management*	20540	HCD Coordinator	8,889	9,300	9,732	10,185	10,660	
Management*	20500	Intervention Counselor I	5,238	5,467	5,707	5,959	6,224	
Management*	20505	Intervention Counselor II	6,061	6,330	6,613	6,911	7,224	
Management*	20450	Leisure Services Manager	8,740	9,144	9,568	10,013	10,481	
Management*	20080	Management Analyst I	5,813	6,070	6,340	6,624	6,922	
Management*	20090	Management Analyst II	7,118	7,441	7,780	8,135	8,509	
Management*	20100	Management Analyst III	8,665	9,065	9,485	9,926	10,388	
Management*	20310	MIS Manager	10,374	10,859	11,368	11,903	12,465	
Management*	20510	Neigh. Pres. Coord.	8,296	8,708	9,120	9,526	9,939	
Management*	20140	Personnel Analyst I	5,588	5,835	6,093	6,364	6,649	
Management*	20560	Planning Manager	9,038	9,457	9,896	10,357	10,842	
Management*	20860	Principal Civil Engineer	9,287	9,718	10,171	10,647	11,145	
Management*	20730	Public Works Superintendent	9,038	9,457	9,896	10,357	10,842	
Management*	20620	RDA Manager	8,964	9,379	9,814	10,271	10,751	
Management*	20350	Supervising Accountant	8,086	8,457	8,846	9,255	9,684	
Management*	20170	Supervising Personnel Analyst	7,192	7,489	7,790	8,086	8,383	
Management*	20912	Transit Manager	8,740	9,144	9,568	10,013	10,481	
Police Mgmt.*	40020	Police Captain	11,243	11,772	12,327	12,909	13,521	
Police Mgmt.*	40040	Police Lieutenant	9,534	10,000	10,490	11,008	11,552	
IAFF	25015	Fire Captain	6,605	6,935	7,282	7,645	8,028	8,172
		56 hour (hourly rate)	27.2184	28.5783	30.0082	31.5041	33.0824	33.6758
		40 hour (hourly rate)	38.1058	40.0096	42.0115	44.1058	46.3154	47.1462
IAFF	25025	Fire Engineer	5,857	6,149	6,458	6,780	7,119	7,246
		56 hour (hourly rate)	24.1360	25.3393	26.6126	27.9396	29.3365	29.8599
		40 hour (hourly rate)	33.7904	35.4750	37.2577	39.1154	41.0712	41.8038
IAFF	25030	Firefighter	5,482	5,758	6,046	6,346	6,664	6,785
		56 hour (hourly rate)	22.5907	23.7280	24.9148	26.1511	27.4615	27.9602
		40 hour (hourly rate)	31.6269	33.2192	34.8808	36.6115	38.4462	39.1442

CITY OF UNION CITY
Salary Compensation Plan - FY 2006/2007

<u>Bargaining Unit</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Classification Title</u>	<u>Step 1</u>	<u>Step 2</u>	<u>Step 3</u>	<u>Step 4</u>	<u>Step 5</u>	<u>Step 6</u>
UCPOA	40220	Community Relations Officer	5,143	5,400	5,670	5,954	6,252	
UCPOA	40090	Community Service Aide	4,403	4,599	4,805	5,022	5,251	
UCPOA	40070	Dispatch Clerk	4,868	5,001	5,227	5,465	5,714	
UCPOA	40170	Dispatch Clerk Trainee	4,215					
UCPOA	40130	Police Corporal	7,572					
UCPOA	40230	Police Dept. Office Coord.	4,431	4,653	4,886	5,130	5,387	
UCPOA	40140	Police Office Assistant	4,039	4,241	4,453	4,676	4,910	
UCPOA	40050	Police Officer	5,773	6,040	6,313	6,581	6,913	
UCPOA	40150	Police Officer Recruit I	4,626					
UCPOA	40160	Police Officer Recruit II	5,159					
UCPOA	40060	Police Records & Dis. Super.	5,143	5,400	5,670	5,954	6,252	
UCPOA	40030	Police Sergeant	7,163	7,476	7,803	8,152	8,515	
UCPOA	40120	Prisoner Transportation Officer	4,403	4,599	4,805	5,022	5,251	
UCPOA	40100	Property Clerk	4,403	4,599	4,805	5,022	5,251	
UCPOA	40110	Public Services Officer	4,474	4,698	4,933	5,179	5,438	
SEIU 790	50520	Administrative Assistant I	3,787	3,961	4,143	4,337	4,535	
SEIU 790	50525	Administrative Assistant II	4,143	4,337	4,535	4,747	4,967	
SEIU 790	50530	Administrative Assistant III	4,535	4,747	4,967	5,199	5,444	
SEIU 790	50351	Building Maint - Worker	4,106	4,291	4,484	4,691	4,902	
SEIU 790	50250	Building Permit Clerk	3,573	3,741	3,915	4,099	4,293	
SEIU 790	50255	Building Permit Technician	4,250	4,463	4,678	4,894	5,108	
SEIU 790	50290	Bldg./Code Comp. Insp.	5,331	5,578	5,833	6,101	6,380	
SEIU 790	50201	Bldg./Code Comp. Insp. - Trainee	4,792	5,016	5,245	5,486	5,737	
SEIU 790	50331	Facilities Technician	4,484	4,691	4,902	5,126	5,360	
SEIU 790	50080	Finance Specialist I	3,525	3,682	3,860	4,041	4,230	
SEIU 790	50090	Finance Specialist II	3,860	4,041	4,230	4,433	4,643	
SEIU 790	50100	Finance Specialist III	4,230	4,433	4,643	4,864	5,097	
SEIU 790	50322	Fleet Parts Specialist	3,573	3,741	3,915	4,099	4,293	
SEIU 790	50323	Lead Veh. Heavy Eqpt. Mech.	4,933	5,157	5,394	5,634	5,896	
SEIU 790	50360	Maint I - Building & Grounds	3,776	3,954	4,138	4,332	4,538	
SEIU 790	50330	Maint I - Streets	3,776	3,954	4,138	4,332	4,538	
SEIU 790	50342	Maint II - Building & Grounds	4,154	4,350	4,552	4,766	4,992	
SEIU 790	50320	Maint II - Streets	4,154	4,350	4,552	4,766	4,992	
SEIU 790	50350	Maint. Trainee - Streets	3,218	3,367	3,525	3,688	3,860	
SEIU 790	50200	Neighborhood Pres Specialist	5,032	5,265	5,505	5,758	6,022	
SEIU 790	50500	Office Specialist I	2,906	3,039	3,173	3,315	3,465	
SEIU 790	50505	Office Specialist II	3,173	3,315	3,465	3,624	3,787	
SEIU 790	50510	Office Specialist III	3,465	3,624	3,787	3,961	4,143	
SEIU 790	50291	Public Works Inspector	5,195	5,487	5,753	6,031	6,322	
SEIU 790	50370	Public Works Maintenance II	4,154	4,350	4,552	4,766	4,992	
SEIU 790	50160	Rec. Program Coord.	4,239	4,446	4,665	4,896	5,136	
SEIU 790	50120	Recreation Supervisor	4,885	5,114	5,353	5,605	5,866	
SEIU 790	50292	Senior Public Works Inspector	5,640	5,918	6,202	6,501	6,812	
SEIU 790	50380	Special Projects Coordinator	3,965	4,152	4,345	4,549	4,765	
SEIU 790	50341	Street Sweeper Operator	4,106	4,291	4,484	4,691	4,902	
SEIU 790	50321	Veh. Heavy Eqpt. Mech.	4,404	4,604	4,814	5,032	5,265	
SEIU 790	50324	Veh. Heavy Eqpt. Mech. - Trainee	3,275	3,447	3,629	3,820	4,022	

CITY OF UNION CITY
Salary Compensation Plan - FY 2006/2007

<u>Bargaining Unit</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>Classification Title</u>	<u>Step 1</u>	<u>Step 2</u>	<u>Step 3</u>	<u>Step 4</u>	<u>Step 5</u>	<u>Step 6</u>
Professionals	30060	Accountant	5,311	5,481	5,748	6,042	6,342	
Professionals	30250	Assistant Planner	4,939	5,185	5,443	5,716	6,002	
Professionals	30230	Associate Planner	5,769	6,056	6,358	6,677	7,009	
Professionals	30150	Engineer I (Civil)	4,847	5,087	5,342	5,611	5,891	
Professionals	30130	Engineer II (Civil)	5,529	5,804	6,088	6,398	6,715	
Professionals	30120	Engineer III (Civil)	6,391	6,710	7,040	7,393	7,763	
Professionals	30050	Haz. Materials Inspect.	5,704	5,982	6,283	6,596	6,924	
Professionals	30020	Senior Accountant	6,104	6,414	6,735	7,068	7,417	
Professionals	30210	Senior Planner	6,742	7,097	7,471	7,863	8,277	
Professionals	30260	Senior Systems Analyst	7,764	8,169	8,576	8,980	9,386	
Professionals	30055	Sr. Building Inspector	6,362	6,697	7,049	7,418	7,810	
Professionals	30300	Waste/Recycling Coordinator	4,359	4,767	5,175	5,584	5,991	

PART-TIME (hourly rates shown)

		<u>Minimum</u>	← <i>Range</i>	→ <u>Maximum</u>
Fire Part-Time	60005 Fire Inspector (PT)	26.06		39.10
UCPOA Part-Time	40070 Dispatcher Clerk (PT)	28.09	28.85 30.16	31.53 32.97
UCPOA Part-Time	40120 Transportation Officer (PT)	25.40	26.53 27.72	28.97 30.29
Unrep. Police PT	60120 Police Cadet	11.46	12.01 12.63	
Unrep. Police PT	60130 Police Reserve	10.42		
SEIU 790 PT	60071 L/S Program Manager	14.42	15.13 15.89	16.67 17.50
SEIU 790 PT	50500 Office Specialist I (PT)	16.77	17.54 18.30	19.12 19.99
SEIU 790 PT	50532 Program Coordinator (PT)	18.42	19.35 20.32	21.34 22.41
SEIU 790 PT	50531 Senior Recreation Leader	11.84	12.45 13.07	13.72 14.42
Unrep. Gen. PT	60069 L/S Program Manager	13.20	13.86 14.55	15.27 16.03
Unrep. Gen. PT	60072 Program Coordinator (PT)	16.87	17.72 18.61	19.54 20.52
Unrep. Gen. PT	60231 Recreation Aide I	6.75	7.09 7.44	
Unrep. Gen. PT	60232 Recreation Aide II	7.44	7.81 8.20	
Unrep. Gen. PT	60233 Recreation Leader	8.44	8.87 9.32	9.79 10.55
Unrep. Gen. PT	60234 Senior Recreation Leader	10.85	11.40 11.97	12.57 13.20
		<u>Minimum</u>	← <i>Range</i>	→ <u>Maximum</u>
Unrep. Gen. PT	60600 Intern	10.93		54.64
Unrep. Gen. PT	60570 Project Specialist	10.93		54.64

* - Includes costs for Medical, Dental, Flexible Benefit, Disability Insurance and a portion of Vacation Leave.



Agenda Item

DATE: October 10, 2006

TO: City Council

FROM: Richard Digre, Administrative Services Director

SUBJECT: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Union City Authorizing Revision to the Employee Housing Assistance Program (EHAP)

BACKGROUND

On July 13, 1999, the City Council established an Employee Housing Assistance Program (EHAP) through resolution 9593-99. Council established the EHAP because it recognized that:

- a. the housing market in the Bay Area was such that the acquisition and retention of employees was greatly enhanced by providing housing assistance for said employees;
- b. it was of great benefit both to the City government and to the community at large to have its employees and their families living in Union City;
- c. that the duties of such employees could be performed with greater dispatch and efficiency if those employees resided within the City; and
- d. the Bay Area housing market made it difficult for such employees to find appropriate and reasonable housing within the City of Union City without City assistance.

Since establishment in 1999, the EHAP has not been revised. The following discussion will recommend needed program revisions.

DISCUSSION

The original EHAP was established with the following provisions:

1. Positions covered: all full-time employees
2. The purpose of the loan is to permit the employee to purchase housing within Union City.
3. The amount of the loan available shall be capped at \$300,000 or 75% of the purchase price of the real property, whichever is lower.
4. All loans shall be secured by a Deed of Trust encumbering the real property which must be the principal place of residence of the employee and shall be located within the City of Union City.
5. The term of the loan shall be no greater than 15-25 years, shall be fully amortized and shall accelerate and be completely due and payable upon sale of the property or 180 days following the termination of the employment relationship or the employee's change of actual principal place of residence.

Council Report –Revision to the Employee Housing Assistance Program (EHAP)

Page 2

6. The loan shall bear a variable rate of interest of the same rate as City fund deposited with the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF).
7. The City Manager is herein authorized to execute the loan documents upon approval of the Administrative Services Director and the City Attorney.
8. The total amount of Employee Housing Assistance Program loans shall not exceed 10% of the City's investment portfolio.

While the provisions of the EHAP have not changed since program establishment in 1999, the value and sales price of homes within the Bay Area have greatly appreciated since that time. From 2004 to 2005 alone, median sales prices within Union City increased from \$488,000 to \$617,500; a 26.54% increase¹. Thus, staff recommends raising the loan cap on a first deed of trust from \$300,000 to \$600,000 or 75% of the purchase price of the real property, whichever is lower. Raising the loan cap for the EHAP will allow the City to better meet the needs of employees attempting to purchase Union City homes in a housing market that is significantly more expensive than the one that existed in 1999. Currently, there are two (2) City employees with EHAP loans.

Furthermore, staff recommends funding the EHAP from the commingled available cash within the City's investment portfolio and not the investment funds specifically limited to the City's General Fund. Such an adjustment will allow the City to more fully meet the housing needs of its employees and will have little fiscal impact since the loan interest rates for the EHAP mirror the returns that the City receives on the funds it invests in the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF). The City has a majority of its available funds invested in LAIF.

FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed changes should make the EHAP more attractive to City employees and thus, the City could begin to see more housing loan receivables on its balance sheet. However, for reasons given in the preceding discussion, the proposed changes should have little to no fiscal impact on the City.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council accept this report and proposed revisions to the EHAP contained within.

Prepared by:
Will Fuentes, Management Analyst

Submitted by:
Richard Digre, Administrative Service Director

Approved by:
Larry Cheeves
City Manager

¹ *DataQuick Real Estate News*, DataQuick Information Systems - <http://www.dqnews.com/ZIPCAR2005.shtm>
(Retrieved: 10/02/2006)

RESOLUTION NO.

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF UNION CITY AUTHORIZING REVISION TO THE EMPLOYEE HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (EHAP)

WHEREAS, the City Council finds and declares that the housing market in the Bay Area is such that the acquisition and retention of employees is greatly enhanced by providing housing assistance for said employees; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds and declares that it is of great benefit both to the City government and to the community at large to have its employees and their families living in Union City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Union City finds and declares that the duties of such employees can be performed with greater dispatch and efficiency if those employees reside within the City; and

WHEREAS, the Bay Area housing market makes it difficult for such employees to find appropriate and reasonable housing within the City of Union City without City assistance; and

WHEREAS, an Employee Housing Assistance Program (EHAP) was established by Council approved resolution 9593-99 on July 13, 1999 with the following provisions:

1. Positions covered: all full-time employees
2. The purpose of the loan is to permit the employee to purchase housing within Union City.
3. The amount of the loan available shall be capped at \$300,000 or 75% of the purchase price of the real property, whichever is lower.
4. All loans shall be secured by a Deed of Trust encumbering the real property which must be the principal place of residence of the employee and shall be located within the City of Union City.
5. The term of the loan shall be no greater than 15-25 years, shall be fully amortized and shall accelerate and be completely due and payable upon sale of the property or 180 days following the termination of the employment relationship or the employee's change of actual principal place of residence.
6. The loan shall bear a variable rate of interest of the same rate as City fund deposited with the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF).
7. The City Manager is herein authorized to execute the loan documents upon approval of the Administrative Services Director and the City Attorney.
8. The total amount of Employee Housing Assistance Program loans shall not exceed 10% of the City's investment portfolio.

and;

WHEREAS, the value and sales price of homes within the Bay Area have greatly appreciated since the Employee Housing Assistance Program was originally approved; and

WHEREAS, City staff recommends raising the loan cap on a first deed of trust recorded by the County Auditor-Controller/Recorders Office from \$300,000 to \$600,000 or 75% of the purchase price of the real property, whichever is lower; and

WHEREAS, City staff recommends funding the Employee Housing Assistance Program from the commingled available cash within the City's investment portfolio and not the investment funds specifically limited to the City's General Fund; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Union City authorizes revision to the Employee Housing Assistance Program to include the amendments proposed above.



34009 ALVARADO-NILES ROAD
UNION CITY, CALIFORNIA 94587

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

DATE **October 10, 2006**

TO **City Council**

FROM **Richard Digre, Administrative Services Director**

SUBJECT: **Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2005-06 concerning sources and uses of Development Fees pursuant to Government Code Section 66006, et seq**

BACKGROUND

The City is authorized under State Law to require development applicants to contribute fees toward off-site improvements which are needed as a result of the new development. The attached report provides information related to the status of these funds from July 1, 2005 through June 30 2006 pursuant to Government Code Sections 66002, 66006 and 66008 (AB 1600).

DISCUSSION

The law requires the City to review on an annual basis the status of the development mitigation fees collected. In the event that any fees remain unexpended for more than five years, the City Council must adopt a Resolution making certain findings. In the event that findings are not made to support the retention of the funds, the unexpended fees must be returned to the current owners of the subject property.

Separate Funds have been established for each of the City's Development Impact Fees. The information presented in the attachments identifies the activities, status and cash balances of the developer contributions.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no financial impact as a result of this report.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the City Council accept the Annual Financial Report of Development Fees for Fiscal year 2005-06.

Prepared by:
Richard Digre
Director of Administrative Services

Approved by:
Larry Cheeves
City Manager

CITY OF UNION CITY
Annual Report of Development Impact Fee
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006

TABLE INDEX

		<u>Page</u>
Table A	511 Area Development Fund	1
	Exhibit (a1)	2
	Exhibit (a2)	3
Table B	Capital Facilities Improvement Fund	4
	Exhibit (b1)	5
	Exhibit (b2)	6
Table C	DIPSA Development Fund	7
	Exhibit (c1)	8
	Exhibit (c2)	9
Table D	Traffic Signalization Fund	10
	Exhibit (d1)	11
	Exhibit (d2)	12

TABLE A

**DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE DISCLOSURE
511 AREA DEVELOPMENT FUND
For Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006**

Government
Code Section
66006 (b)

(A) *A brief description of the type of fee in the fund:*

A development impact fee imposed by Ordinance No. 314.89 upon a single family development project in the 511 Plan Area to finance the 511 Specific Plan Area Public Amenities and Infrastructure Improvements.

(B) *The amount of the fee:*

a)	Union City Blvd Improvement Fee	\$ 18,080.00	per dwelling unit
b)	Police Vehicles and Radios Fee	103.00	per dwelling unit
c)	Fire Pumper Truck Fee	104.00	per dwelling unit
d)	Public Works Vehicles Fee	20.00	per dwelling unit
e)	Planning, Engineering & Cost of Formation of the Financing Program Fee	292.00	per dwelling unit
f)	511 Area Specific Plan Fee	223.00	per dwelling unit
g)	School Impact Contribution	476.00	per dwelling unit

(C) *Beginning balance of the Fund - 7/01/05* \$ 493,686

(D) *Revenue:*

<i>Amount of fees collected for the fiscal year:</i>	\$	-	
<i>Interest Earned for the fiscal year:</i>	\$	16,221	\$ 16,221
<i>Less: Expenditures (Detailed in Exhibit a1)</i>			\$ (36,300)
<i>Ending Balance of the Fund - 6/30/06</i>			<u>\$ 473,607</u>

(E) *Identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended;
Amount of expenditures on each improvement;
Total percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fees.
(Please see Exhibit a1)*

(F) *Approximate date by which the construction of incomplete public improvements to be financed with the fees will commence.
(Please see Exhibit a2)*

(G) *Description of interfund transfers or loans made from the fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loaned fees will be expended; case of of interfund loans, the date on which the loan will be repaid, and the rate of interest that the fund will receive on the loans.* None

(H) *Amount refunds made pursuant to Section 66001 (e)* None

Amount of allocations pursuant to Section 66001 (f) None

Exhibit a1

City of Union City
511 Area Improvements Fund
Statement of Expenditures Funded by Fees
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006

	Amount	% Funded with Developer Fee	Total Cost for the Year
Fire Truck Lease Payment*	\$ 36,300	20.48%	\$ 177,245
Total Expenditures	<u>\$ 36,300</u>		<u>\$ 177,245</u>

* Lease Term: 2/11/01 through 2/11/10

Exhibit a2

City of Union City
511 Area Improvements Fund
Incomplete Public Improvements to be Financed with Fees

	Commencement Approximate Date
WORK-IN-PROGRESS: Fire Truck Lease Payment	Jul-04

NEW PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS:
None

TABLE B

**DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE DISCLOSURE
For CAPITAL FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT FUND
For Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006**

Government
Code Section
66006 (b)

- (A) *A brief description of the type of fee in the fund -*
Capital facilities fee imposed on each new residential development in the City based on, and in proportion to, the capital facility needs generated by such development.
- (B) *The amount of the fee -*
Amended fee per dwelling unit (effective August 8, 2004))
- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----|--------|
| 1) Single-family | \$ | 12,231 |
| 2) Single family, secondary dwelling | \$ | 8,624 |
| 3) Multi-family | \$ | 8,624 |
- (C) Beginning balance of the Fund - 7/01/05 \$ 4,404,193
- Revenue:
- | | | | |
|--|----|-----------|---------------------|
| Fees collected for the fiscal year | \$ | 1,969,631 | |
| Interest Earned for the fiscal year: | \$ | 146,841 | \$ 2,116,472 |
| Less: Expenditures (<i>detailed in Exhibit b1</i>) | | | \$ (4,686,011) |
| Ending Balance of the Fund - 6/30/06 | | | <u>\$ 1,834,654</u> |
- (D) *Identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended;
Amount of expenditures on each improvement;
Total percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fees.
(Please see Exhibit b1)*
- (E) *Approximate date by which the construction of incomplete public improvements to be financed with the fees will commence.
(Please see Exhibit b2)*
- (F) *Description of interfund transfers or loans made from the fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loaned fees will be expended; case of of interfund loans, the date on which the loan will be repaid, and the rate of interest that the fund will receive on the loans.* None
- (G) *Amount refunds made pursuant to Section 66001 (e)* None
- (H) *Amount of allocations pursuant to Section 66001 (f)* None

City of Union City
 Capital Facilities Improvement Fund
 Statement of Expenditures Funded by Fees
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006

	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% Funded with Developer Fee</u>	<u>Total Cost for the Year</u>
Fire Truck Lease Payment*	\$ 63,808	36	\$ 177,245
Civic Center Entry Door Replacement	11,482	100	11,482
Leisure Services Passenger Busses	177,462	100	177,462
Construct Emergency Operating Center	10,052	100	10,052
Police CAD/RMS System	16,872	100	16,872
Shorty Garcia Park Storage Bldg.	75,054	100	75,054
Seabreeze Park Storage Facility	28,168	100	28,168
Vehicle Analysis Equipment	4,556	100	4,556
Union City Gymnasium	4,231,975	55	7,637,570
Kennedy Center Rehab	15,942	100	15,942
Fire Stations Rehab	50,640	100	50,640
	<u>\$ 4,686,011</u>		<u>\$8,205,043</u>

* Lease period from 2/11/01 through 2/11/10

City of Union City
 Capital Facilities Improvement Fund
 Incomplete Public Improvements to be Financed with Fees

Description	Commencement Approximate Date
WORK IN-PROGRESS:	
Fire Truck Lease Payment	February 2001
Leisure Services Auto/Road Equip.	November 2005
Police CAD/RMS	November 2003
Construct Emergency Operating Center	September 2004
Union City Gymnasium	March 2005
Fire Stations Rehab.	September 2005
NEW PROJECTS	
Civic Center Remodel & Council Chambers Renov.	January 2007
Ogden Swim Complex Pool Covers	January 2007
Union City Library HVAC	October 2006
Union City Library Roof	January 2007
Replacement of Metal Doors at Park Restrooms	January 2007
Corp. Yard Roof Replacement	January 2007
Holly Community Center Renovations & Upgrades	November 2006
Kennedy Community Center HVAC repairs	January 2007
Kennedy Community Center Security Lighting	January 2007
Senior Center Door & Window Replacement	October 2006
Civic Center Computer Room Upgrade	December 2006

**DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE DISCLOSURE
DIPSA DEVELOPMENT FUND
For Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006**

Government
Code Section
66006 (b)

(A) *A brief description of the type of fee in the fund:*

DIPSA Development Impact Fee imposed on new developments situated within the geographic area of the City's Decoto Industrial Park Study Area (DIPSA)

(B) *The amount of the fee:*

a)	Infrastructure Improvements - to be paid by all new residential development in the DIPSA area		
	Single Family Residential Development	\$ 3,162.00	per unit
	Attached Townhouse Development of up to 17 units per acre	2,576.00	per unit
	Multi-Family Development over 17 units per acre	1,757.00	per unit
b)	Paving of Mission Boulevard - to be paid by all new residential development in Sub-areas 1, 2a, 2b, and 2c as defined in the DIPS Specific Plan	352.00	per unit

(C)	<i>Beginning balance of the Fund - 7/01/05</i>		\$ 4,979,475
(D)	<i>Revenue:</i>		
	<i>Amount of fees collected for the fiscal year:</i>	\$ 501,785	
	<i>Interest Earned for the fiscal year:</i>	\$ 107,810	\$ 609,595
	<i>Less: Expenditures (Detailed in Exhibit c1)</i>		\$ (850,374)
	<i>Ending Balance of the Fund - 6/30/06</i>		<u>\$ 4,738,696</u>

(E) *Identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended;
Amount of expenditures on each improvement;
Total percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fees.
(Please see Exhibit c1)*

(F) *Approximate date by which the construction of incomplete public improvements to be financed with the fees will commence.
(Please see Exhibit c2)*

(G) *Description of interfund transfers or loans made from the fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loaned fees will be expended; case of of interfund loans, the date on which the loan will be repaid, and the rate of interest that the fund will receive on the loans.
(Please see Exhibit c1)*

(H) *Amount refunds made pursuant to Section 66001 (e)* None

Amount of allocations pursuant to Section 66001 (f)

None

Exhibit c1

City of Union City
 DIPSA Development Fund
 Statement of Expenditures Funded by Fees
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006

	Amount	% Funded with Developer Fee	Total Cost for the Year
Police Equipment			
Police Dictaphone	\$ 13,990	100%	\$ 13,990
Police Training - Other Equipment	\$ 14,790	100%	\$ 14,790
Police Traffic - Other Equipment	\$ 5,618	100%	\$ 5,618
Police Swat Team-Other Equipment	\$ 35,054	100%	\$ 35,054
Radios, Shotguns, Rifles, Riot Control Equipment, and Swat and Hostage Negotiator Specialized Equipment	\$ 7,054	100%	\$ 7,054
Fire Equipment			
CERT Emergency Prep	\$ 7,539	100%	\$ 7,539
Fire Investigation Van	\$ 11,330	100%	\$ 11,330
Fire Prevention Program	\$ 24	30%	\$ 71
Fire-Misc Equipment	\$ 33,221	100%	\$ 33,221
Fire Truck Lease Payment	\$ 77,137	43.52%	\$ 177,245
FEMA-Rescue Equipment	\$ 23,768	100%	\$ 23,768
800Mhz Radios	\$ 27,920	100%	\$ 27,920
Blackberry Server	\$ 12,558	100%	\$ 12,558
New Fire Station #3	\$ 12,550	100%	\$ 12,550
Upgrade Fire Station #1	\$ 43,095	100%	\$ 43,095
11th Street Extension	\$ 461,975	100%	\$ 793,579
Financial System Upgrade	\$ 60,000	30%	\$ 200,000
Mission Blvd Undergrounding	\$ 2,751	20%	\$ 13,756
 Total Expenditures	 <u>\$ 850,374</u>		 <u>\$ 1,433,137</u>

City of Union City
DIPSA Development Fund
Incomplete Public Improvements to be Financed with Fees

	<u>Commencement Approximate Date</u>
WORK-IN-PROGRESS:	
Police Dictaphone	Jul-04
11th Street Construction	Jul-04
Purchase of Additional Police Portable Radios; Replace Shotguns; Replace Rifles: Riot Control Equipment for Sworn Personnel; and Swat and Hostage Negotiator Specialized Equipment	Jul-04
Replace Fire Rescue Tool (Jaws)	Jul-04
Route 84	Jul-04
Underground Utility-Mission Blvd	Jul-05
Construction of Fire Station # 3	In design process
CERT Supply Cache	Jul-05
NEW PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS:	
Replacement of Ladder/Tiller Fire Truck	Jul-06

**DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE DISCLOSURE
TRAFFIC SIGNALIZATION FUND
For Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006**

Government
Code Section
66006 (b)

(A) *A brief description of the type of fee in the fund:*
Development Impact Fee imposed on new developments for the purpose of traffic signal installation

(B) *The amount of the fee:*

a)	Zoning RS 5000 (Single Family)	\$ 700.00	per acre
b)	Zoning RM 2500 (Duplex)	1,403.00	per acre
c)	Zoning RM 1500 (Condos, apartments, townhouses)	2,103.00	per acre
d)	Zoning Commercial	2,103.00	per acre
e)	Zoning Industrial	1,052.00	per acre
f)	Zoning Mobile Home	700.00	per acre

(C) *Beginning balance of the Fund - 7/01/05* \$ 209,662

(D) *Revenue:*

<i>Amount of fees collected for the fiscal year:</i>	\$ 138,375	
<i>Interest Earned for the fiscal year:</i>	<u>\$ 10,269</u>	\$ 148,644
<i>Less Expenditures (detailed in Exhibit d1)</i>		<u>\$ (21,413)</u>
<i>Ending Balance of the Fund - 6/30/06</i>		<u><u>\$ 336,893</u></u>

(E) *Identification of each public improvement on which fees were expended;
Amount of expenditures on each improvement;
Total percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fees.*
(Please see Exhibit d1)

(F) *Approximate date by which the construction of incomplete public improvements to be financed with the fees will commence.*
(Please see Exhibit d2)

(G) *Description of interfund transfers or loans made from the fund, including the public improvement on which the transferred or loaned fees will be expended; case of of interfund loans, the date on which the loan will be repaid, and the rate of interest that the fund will receive on the loans.* None

(H) *Amount refunds made pursuant to Section 66001 (e)* None

Amount of allocations pursuant to Section 66001 (f) None

Exhibit d1

City of Union City
Traffic Signalization Fund
Statement of Expenditures Funded by Fees
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006

	<u>Amount</u>	<u>% Funded with Developer Fee</u>	<u>Total Cost for the Year</u>
Upgrade Traffic Signal System	\$ 9,087	7%	\$ 129,810
Install Signal System @ Alvarado-Niles and Hartnell Street	12,327	20%	\$ 61,635
Total Expenditures	<u>\$ 21,414</u>		

Exhibit d2

City of Union City
Traffic Signalization Fund
Incomplete Public Improvements to be Financed with Fees

	<u>Commencement Approximate Date</u>
WORK-IN-PROGRESS:	
Purchase 170E Traffic Signal Controllers	Jul-04
Demo Project on Smart Crosswalk	Jul-05
Upgrade Traffic Signal System	Jul-05
Install Signal System @ Hartnell Street	Mar-06

NEW PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS:

None



DATE: OCTOBER 10, 2006

TO: CITY COUNCIL

**FROM: MARK LEONARD, ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**SUBJECT: PUBLIC HEARING - DRAFT PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE
MASTER PLAN**

On September 26, 2006 the City Council reviewed the draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan and provided staff with comments. These comments were incorporated into the final draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan that is now before the Council for final consideration and adoption. The Parks and Recreation Commission, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), Planning Commission, Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA) staff and Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA) staff have also provided comments. Comments received prior to the October 1, 2006 printing deadline have been incorporated. The significant modifications are outlined below. Any final comments from the Planning Commission meeting of October 5 will be reported to the City Council at the public hearing for their consideration. Staff is now seeking final comments from the Council and adoption of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (attached resolution). Copies of the Final Draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan are on file with the City Clerk for public review.

DISCUSSION

Updates

Since the September 26 City Council meeting, the following updates have been incorporated:

1. A trail has been added to the top of Turk Island for bicycle and pedestrians (Figures 5.2 and 5.3). It has also been added to the high priority list of projects.
2. A bridge has been added to Alameda Creek to connect the Bay Trail to the Coyote Hills Regional Park (Figures 5.2 and 5.3). It has also been added to the mid-term priority project list. The final alignment/location has not yet been established for the bridge or the Bay Trail.
3. The Dyer Street Extension has been added to both the bicycle and pedestrian network (Figures 5.2 and 5.3). It has also been added to the project list.
4. The Teen Workshop Bike Shop has been added to Figure 5.3, Bicycle Network.
5. A discussion regarding rubberized sidewalks for future use has been incorporated.

6. Text has been added to encourage the provision of bicycle pump stations where bicycle lockers are located.
7. The discussion of the Countywide Bicycle Plan in Chapter 3 has been updated to reflect the County's current planning efforts.
8. Construction estimates have been updated by 50% to reflect the sharp rise in construction costs over the past two years. These costs provide a general guide. At the time of a project's application, a more detailed cost estimate would be prepared.
9. A summary discussion has been added to describe the criteria used for ranking the projects.
10. Figures 5.2 and 5.3 have been updated to include project numbers for cross referencing project locations to the project priority list.

Staff is continuing to incorporate additional comments that were received after the printing deadline. These comments include:

1. Identify possible funding sources for each high priority project.
2. Provide a summary of assumptions and costs for each high priority project.
3. Consider including additional pedestrian statistics that are in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan.
4. Consider including language regarding current pass through funding.

The above lists include the major modifications that have been made or will be made to the draft Master Plan. Several minor modifications to address general cleanup and clarification of the text are still underway.

No changes have been made to the Safe Routes to School project list as a result of future school closures, including Cabello Elementary and Barnard-White Middle School. Staff felt that there were ample projects to choose from regarding Safe Routes to School funding opportunities and to revise this section with new school visits would delay the adoption of the Master Plan for several months.

CEQA Review

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Negative Declaration has been prepared. The adoption of the Master Plan would not have a significant effect on the environment. Further, as each project moves forward towards implementation, a specific environmental review would be carried out to assess any environmental impacts. No further environmental review is required at this time.

FISCAL IMPACTS

There are no fiscal impacts in adopting the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan. The Council may consider incorporating specific projects into the City's Capital Improvement Plan. As such, there may be a fiscal impact at that time.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council consider and discuss the final draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan and provide comments to staff and incorporate any final changes or modifications. Staff further recommends that the City Council adopt the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan and adopt the attached resolution confirming this action.

Prepared by: Joan Malloy, Planning Manager

Submitted by: Mark Leonard, Economic and Community Development Director

Approved by: Larry Cheeves, City Manager

Attachments: Draft Negative Declaration
Resolution to Adopt the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan
Final Draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan

City of Union City

Economic & Community Development Department

34009 Alvarado-Niles Road
Union City, CA 94587
Telephone No.: 510-675-5319
FAX No.: 510-475-7318

Draft Negative Declaration

Project Title: City of Union City Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan

Project Description: The City of Union City has prepared a Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan (Plan) which identifies existing and proposed pedestrian and bicycle trails and routes within Union City. The Plan also provides a list of improvement projects to provide a complete pedestrian and bicycle network within the City and serves as a guide for prioritization of future pedestrian and bicycle projects. Lastly, the Plan provides background information regarding existing conditions relating to pedestrian and bicycle facilities, overview of policy context, and a needs analysis for pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The Plan will assist the City in obtaining regional, state, and federal funding for construction of the projects identified in the plan

Project Location: City-wide

Finding: City of Union City staff has reviewed the Initial Study for the project, and based upon substantial evidence in the record, including the attached Initial Study, the City finds that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment.

Carmela Campbell
Senior Planner

Date

Copies of the Initial Study supporting the above findings are available at the City's Economic and Community Development Department, or by calling (510) 675-5319.

Attachment: Initial Study

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- INITIAL STUDY

Project Title: City of Union City Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan

Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of Union City
Planning Division
34009 Alvarado-Niles Rd.
Union City, Ca 94587

Lead Agency Contact Person:

Carmela Campbell, Senior Planner
(510) 675-5316

Project location:

Citywide

Description of project:

The City of Union City has prepared a Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan which identifies existing and proposed pedestrian and bicycle trails and routes within Union City. The plan also provides a list of improvement projects to provide a complete pedestrian and bicycle network within the City and serves as a guide for prioritization of future pedestrian and bicycle projects.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

None

I. BACKGROUND

The City of Union City has prepared a Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan (Plan) which identifies existing and proposed pedestrian and bicycle trails and routes within Union City. The Plan also provides a list of improvement projects to provide a complete pedestrian and bicycle network within the City and serves as a guide for prioritization of future pedestrian and bicycle projects. Lastly, the Plan provides background information regarding existing conditions relating to pedestrian and bicycle facilities, overview of policy context, and a needs analysis for pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The Plan will assist the City in obtaining regional, state, and federal funding for construction of the projects identified in the plan.

None of the future potential projects are currently being proposed for implementation. The projects will be built as funding and other opportunities become available and will require additional environmental review at that time. This Initial Study evaluates the projects on a programmatic level; additional CEQA review will be more detailed as construction level plans are developed for the projects listed in the Plan.

All applicable federal, state and local regulations would apply to the design and construction of any facilities when actual projects are proposed.

The majority of the improvement projects listed in the Plan enhances existing City roadways and intersections by providing adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The main categories of improvements include: intersection improvements to facilitate pedestrian crossings, improvement of pedestrian corridors along existing City roadways, installation / enhancement of existing / proposed Class 1, 11, 111 bicycle facilities along existing roadways and installation / enhancement of existing / proposed off-street pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The Plan also includes development of the Bay Trail along the westerly Union City boundary line. However, discussions with East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD) staff reveal that the alignment of this portion of the Bay Trail has not been finalized and may be moved substantially to the west outside of the Union City boundary line. When the alignment is finalized, EBRPD will be completing any environmental clearance documents necessary for development of this portion of the Bay Trail.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION

Introduction: The following evaluation has been prepared to determine if the project may have a significant impact on the environment and whether a negative declaration or an EIR shall be prepared. For the purposes of this study, a significant impact shall mean a substantial or potentially substantial change in the physical environment.

Evaluations: A “No Impact” rating indicates that based upon the available information, the environmental coordinator has determined that there will be no impact on the environment. A “Less Than Significant Impact” rating indicates that the impact will be insignificant. A “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation” rating indicates that a specific change to the project (mitigation measures) could reduce the impact to a level of insignificance. A “Potentially Significant Impact” rating indicates that the impact may or will be significant.

Discussion: A description of the proposed mitigation measures and the factual data or evidence used to reach conclusions regarding impact significance follows each section under ‘Comments’. The impacts of the project are summarized in Section IV: Determination and Recommendation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
surroundings?				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant aesthetic impacts. The majority of the proposed pedestrian and bicycle facilities listed in the Plan are proposed along existing roadways and intersections within the City. Development of these facilities would not substantially alter the existing built environment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant impacts to agricultural resources. There are two areas within the City that are zoned “Agriculture”. One area is located within the eastern hillsides. The other is located along the southwesterly portion of the City adjacent to the Bay. None of the proposed pedestrian and bicycle facilities listed in the Plan is proposed in these areas except for the Bay Trail. However, the alignment of the Bay Trail has not been finalized. The East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD), who is responsible for the planning of the Bay Trail in this area, is considering relocation of the Bay Trail outside of the Union City limits. When the final trail alignment is determined, EBRPD will prepare an environmental clearance document that will adequately address any potential environmental impacts including those related to agricultural resources, if any.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant impacts to air quality. The Plan provides for a comprehensive pedestrian & bicycle network that will encourage people to walk and bicycle to destinations within the City and beyond and will consequently reduce automobile trips. Any reduction in automobile trips will improve air quality within the City.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CFDG or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant impacts to biological resources. The majority of new pedestrian and bicycle facilities listed in the Plan are proposed along existing roadways and intersections within the City which do not provide habitat for any candidate, sensitive or special status species. As new off-street trail or bridge projects become funded, additional CEQA review will take place prior to development including the preparation of a Biological survey for projects that have the potential to have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community or adversely impact any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species, if any.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant impacts to cultural resources. The majority of new pedestrian and bicycle facilities listed in the Plan are proposed along existing roadways and intersections within the City. As new off-street trail or bridge projects become funded, additional CEQA review will take place prior to development including the preparation of a Cultural Resource Survey for projects that have the potential to have a substantial adverse effect on any historic, archaeological or paleontological resources.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant geologic impacts. The majority of new pedestrian and bicycle improvements listed in the Plan are on-grade pedestrian and bicycle facilities within existing developed areas. Development of any new facilities, including new pedestrian and bicycle bridges, will be evaluated in conformance with all applicable federal, state and local design and construction standards to ensure that all geologic and soil issues are adequately addressed. Additional environmental review may be required for specific projects.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant impacts that involve the use or release of hazardous materials. Furthermore, the project would not interfere with adoption of an emergency evacuation or response plan nor expose people to an increased risk associated with wildland fires.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant impacts to hydrology. The majority of new pedestrian and bicycle facilities listed in the Plan are proposed along existing roadways and intersections within the City. However, the westerly portion of Union City is subject to flooding due to its location adjacent to the San Francisco Bay. Any new pedestrian or bicycle facilities, including bridges, that are located within an area that is subject to flooding will be designed and constructed in conformance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations that assist in reducing the risk of injury or loss from flooding. Additional environmental review may be required when specific projects are proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant land use impacts. The Plan provides a comprehensive pedestrian & bicycle network as required by the Transportation Element of the General Plan.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Discussion: The Project will not impact any mineral resources within the City as no trails or paths are proposed in mineral resource areas.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE: -- Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant noise impacts. The majority of new pedestrian and bicycle facilities listed in the Plan are proposed along existing roadways and intersections within the City. Addition of pedestrian or bicycle facilities in these areas will not result in any substantial increases in ambient noise. Temporary construction noise associated with construction of new facilities may impact adjacent residents and will be addressed, as appropriate, in any project-level environmental review. The City notes that any construction is required to conform to the City's Noise Ordinance, therefore potential noise impacts are not anticipated.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant impacts regarding population and housing. The potential facilities and improvements proposed by the Plan would not result in displacement of existing housing or people nor induce substantial population growth.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?				X
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant impacts regarding public services. The potential facilities and improvements proposed by the Plan would not result in the need for any new or physically altered governmental facilities.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION:				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant impacts regarding recreational resources. The Plan provides additional recreational opportunities for the residents of the City which may result in extending the life of existing neighborhood parks. As projects that are listed in the Plan become funded, additional CEQA review will take place prior to development to adequately evaluate any adverse physical effects on the environment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

Discussion: The Project will not result in any significant transportation / traffic impacts. The Plan provides for a comprehensive pedestrian & bicycle network that will encourage people to walk and bicycle to destinations within the City and beyond and will consequently reduce automobile trips. City staff thoroughly reviewed the Plan in conformance with applicable federal, state and local standards to ensure that the design of new pedestrian and bicycle facilities would not result in any traffic safety hazards. Additional environmental review will also be required as specific projects are proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Discussion: The Project will not impact nor require the construction of any new utilities or service systems.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

The Project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Furthermore, the project will not result in any cumulative impacts nor cause any substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly.

IV. DETERMINATION AND RECOMMENDATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

X	<i>I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</i>	
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	
	<hr/> Carmela Campbell, Senior Planner	<hr/> Date

CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NUMBER __-06

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF UNION CITY
ADOPTING THE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE MASTER PLAN**

WHEREAS, by Resolution Nos. 2108-02 and 2109-02, duly adopted by the City Council of Union City on February 12, 2002, the General Plan of the City of Union City was comprehensively updated; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 2936-05 the City of Union City approved an amendment to the General Plan (AG-01-05) to comprehensively amend the *Transportation Element, Section C, Pedestrians, Bicycles and Trails* to strengthen the goals and policies for pedestrian and bicycle facilities; and

WHEREAS, as part of the Implementation Program of the General Plan, a Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan is to be prepared; and

WHEREAS, the City established a Technical Advisory Committee that included staff from Public Works, Leisure Services, Fire Department, Police Department, Economic and Community Development Department, New Haven Unified School District, and the City Manager's office to oversee the preparation of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, a Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) was established that included representatives from City Commissions and citizens to review and make recommendations on the Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, public workshops were held before the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Planning Commission to identify appropriate pedestrian and bicycle projects; and

WHEREAS, these workshops established the pedestrian and bicycle network that was incorporated into the general plan and became the basis for the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, the draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan has been circulated for public comment among the Parks and Recreation Commission on September 13, 2006, the BPAC on September 25, 2006, the City Council on September 26, 2006, the Planning Commission on October 5, 2006, and Alameda County Congestion Management Agency staff and Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority staff; and

WHEREAS, a draft Negative Declaration has been completed in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, as amended, and that the proposed Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan will not create any significant environmental impact; and

WHEREAS, a duly advertised public hearing was held by the City Council on October 10, 2006; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Union City does hereby approve and adopt the final draft Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan, as amended.



Agenda Item

DATE: October 10, 2006

TO: City Council

FROM: Richard Digre

SUBJECT: **Adopt a Resolution setting the Reimbursement Rate for use of Council Member's personal vehicles for City business at \$100.00 per month or as documented by the Council Member.**

BACKGROUND

Assembly Bill 1234 (2005), requires the City Council, prior to providing reimbursement to members of the City Council, to adopt a policy regarding the reimbursement for expenses incurred by members of the legislative bodies in the performance of official duties. Auto expense is an increasing cost of doing business and one that requires City Council members to use their own vehicles in representing the City at regional and local meetings.

DISCUSSION

In response to the adoption of AB 1234, staff has evaluated the normal cost incurred by City Council members in the course of their work and has determined that the amount of \$100.00 is the minimum cost incurred in the performance of official duties or the actual documented miles reimbursed at the then Internal Revenue Service mileage rate then in effect at the time.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is minimal to no fiscal impact to the City in the adoption of this policy over and above the amount contained in the current budget for the payment of Council members use of their private vehicles in the performance of City business.

RECOMMENDATION.

Staff recommends adoption of the accompanying resolutions setting forth the reimbursement rate and process for Council members.

Prepared by:
Richard Digre, Administrative Services Director

Approved by:
Larry Cheeves, City Manager

RESOLUTION NO. __

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF UNION CITY SETTING THE REIMBURSEMENT RATE FOR USE OF COUNCIL MEMBER'S PERSONAL VEHICLES FOR CITY BUSINESS AT \$100.00 PER MONTH OR AS DOCUMENTED BY THE COUNCIL MEMBER.

WHEREAS, Assembly Bill 1234 (2005), codified at Government Code Section 53232 *et seq.*, requires the City Council, prior to providing reimbursement to members of City legislative bodies, to adopt a policy regarding the reimbursement for expenses incurred by members of legislative bodies in the performance of official duties;

WHEREAS, the City Council has amended City Council Resolution No. 9717-00, which establishes City policy governing expense reimbursement for members of the City Council, to comply with the requirements of AB 1234; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has taken action to determine the cost of private vehicle use and the minimum amount reimbursable for use of Council member's personal vehicles; and

WHEREAS, this Resolution is intended to satisfy the requirements of AB 1234 relating to reimbursement of expenses of for members of City Commissions and City Committees.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Union City does **RESOLVE** as follows:

That members of the City Council in the course of vehicle travel in performing their legislative duties in representing the City, may either be paid a stipulated amount of \$100.00 each month or reimbursed on the actual documented miles traveled multiplied by the IRS mileage rate then in effect at the time.

Effective Date. This Resolution shall take effect December 1, 2006.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED this ____ day of _____ 2006, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk

858791-1



34009 ALVARADO-NILES ROAD
UNION CITY, CALIFORNIA 94587

LEISURE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

DATE **October 10, 2006**

TO **City Council**

FROM **Antonio E. Acosta, Director of Leisure Services**

SUBJECT **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION REGARDING POTENTIAL NAMES FOR THE PARK LOCATED AT WILLIAMS AND DAVIS STREETS (PONDEROSA COVE SUBDIVISION)**

This report is written to forward the recommendations of the Parks & Recreation Commission (PRC) for naming the new public park that was constructed at the corner of Williams and Davis Streets in the Ponderosa Cove subdivision. Staff recommends that the City Council consider the names suggested by the PRC and make a determination as to the most appropriate name for this public park.

BACKGROUND

Council Resolution No. 1137-70 establishes the basic policy for naming parks in Union City. The final responsibility for naming parks rests with the City Council, while the PRC is responsible for reviewing all names suggested for a particular park and advising the City Council of its recommendations.

For neighborhood parks, Resolution No. 1137-70 states that neighborhood parks shall be named in accordance with the following criteria:

- Named for the group or person(s) who donated or dedicated the park to the City, if so requested by the donor;
- Named after groups or individuals who have made outstanding contributions to the development of parks, or parks and recreation facilities, including donations of time and money;
- Named the same as an adjacent school, or consistent with the subdivision name in which the park is located, or another name to complement the area, horticulture, wildlife, and mythological and descriptive names.

DISCUSSION

In this instance, the developer of the property in question, Ponderosa Homes has not requested any specific name for the park in question. Thus, the PRC discussed the options for naming the new park located at Williams and Davis Streets and has come up with four (4) alternatives for the

City Council to consider:

- A. **Gladiola Park**, evoking the Gladiola fields that existed on the park site for many years;
- B. **Leisure Park**, reflecting the passive nature of the park and the activity most typically seen there;
- C. **Rose Park**, after the flowers in the park landscape, both present and future; and
- D. **Willie Wilkins Memorial Park**, evoking the memory of a James Logan High School graduate who became an Oakland Police Officer and was killed in the line of duty several years ago under unfortunate circumstances.

It should also be noted that the PRC discussed the possibility of offering the park as a naming option to the **League of Filipino-American Veterans**, who had requested that a Union City Park be named in honor of all veterans. The City Council may select one of these alternatives or select any name of its choosing for the new park.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact associated with this report.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council consider the naming options forwarded by the Parks & Recreation Commission and select a name of its choosing for the new public park located at Williams and Davis Streets (Ponderosa Cove subdivision).

Submitted by:

Antonio E. Acosta

Leisure Services Director

Approved by:

Larry Cheeves

City Manager



34009 ALVARADO-NILES ROAD
UNION CITY, CALIFORNIA 94587

LEISURE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

DATE **October 10, 2006**

TO **City Council**

FROM **Antonio E. Acosta, Director of Leisure Services**

SUBJECT **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PARKS & RECREATION AND YOUTH COMMISSIONS REGARDING PRIORITIES FOR POSSIBLE EXPANSION OF YOUTH SERVING PROGRAMS IN UNION CITY**

This report is written to forward the recommendations of the Parks & Recreation Commission (PRC) and Youth Commission (YC) for expanding funding to youth and teen programs in the City of Union City. Staff recommends that the City Council consider the recommendations from the PRC and YC and incorporate the recommendations into the Council's budget deliberations for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2007-08 budget.

BACKGROUND

On May 9, 2006 the City Council received a staff report (copy attached) summarizing the various youth program expansion options identified by Leisure Services staff. The City Council directed staff to obtain the input of the YC and return with the joint recommendations of the two commissions.

The YC subsequently met and discussed the youth program options contained in the May 9, 2006 staff report several time, ultimately deciding on the following prioritization:

1. **Club Une Option 3 – Restore Club Une as a free program to low income youth, and**
2. All other programs.

These priorities were approved by the PRC at its regular meeting of August 9, 2006. It should also be noted that support for expansion of the **Teen Workshop Program located on Mission Blvd.** was also expressed by several PRC and YC commissioners, but not to the extent of carrying a motion.

DISCUSSION

Club Une - The joint recommendation of both commissions of Club Une – Option 3 as the top priority for possible funding reflects the belief that this middle school program has been useful and effective in providing after-school activities for scores of 6-8th graders in all three middle schools.

As noted in previous staff reports, Club Une was originally a blended program, with the first 90 minutes of program (featuring homework assistance and general recreational activities) free of charge, and the second 90 minutes of program (featuring enrichment programs such as cooking, sports, photography, etc.) on a fee for service basis. Due to budget reduction mandates in 2003-04, the “free block” for Club Une was eliminated and the entire program became a fee for service program.

Club Une currently serves approximately 90 youth each school day, distributed between the three middle schools as follows:

Barnard-White	15 youth/school day
Cesar Chavez	35 youth/school day
Alvarado	40 youth/school day

It is very important to note that this low enrollment is typical of the first session of the school year. When the weather turns bad, daylight savings time ends, and parent awareness of the Club Une program increases, these enrollments usually double to an average of 170-200 youth per day. The current capacity of the Club Une program is 70 youth per site per day, but this can be expanded if school multi-purpose rooms are used to a maximum of 90-100 youth per site per day. The current annual cost for enrolling a young person in both blocks of Club Une schedule is \$1400 per year.

Option 3 would establish a means test for establishing eligibility for the free Club Une program, using the same criteria as used by the School District for free school meals; the use of federal family income levels used for housing programs (Low, Very Low and Extremely Low) could also be used. It must be noted that staff is unable to project the number of eligible youth who might take advantage of Option 3, although it is likely that the Barnard-White Middle School site would see the greatest number of youth in this category, due to neighborhood demographics and the drop-off in participation experienced when the Club Une program converted to a fee for service program two years ago. And, the recent decision to close Barnard-White Middle School in June of 2008 would also have to be factored into the implementation of Option 3.

FISCAL IMPACT

The potential fiscal impact to the General Fund associated with this report depends upon the degree to which the City Council agrees to any of the program expansion proposals submitted by the PRC. If Club Une Option 3 were approved by the City Council, staff would strongly recommend that a cap be placed on the program in order to manage program costs. For example, a cap of \$70,000 would allow 50 youth to participate in the full Club Une program for one year. Staff will also be discussing with the New Haven Unified School District staff to determine whether or not any of the programs would be eligible for Proposition 49 funding. This funding is available for after-school programs which serve a certain percentage of low-income families.

It is important to remember that the new Sports Center under construction (and scheduled to open in February 2007) will require substantial subsidies from the General Fund for its

first 18 months of operation in order to reach its full revenue potential, at an estimated cost of \$341,000 for FY 2006-07 alone (and \$655,000 for FY 2007-08).

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council consider Club Une Option 3 in conjunction with the formulating the Fiscal Year 2007-08 budget, which will be discussed in Spring of 2007.

Submitted by:

Antonio E. Acosta

Leisure Services Director

Approved by:

Larry Cheeves

City Manager



34009 ALVARADO-NILES ROAD
UNION CITY, CALIFORNIA 94587

LEISURE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

DATE **May 9, 2006**

TO **City Council**

FROM **Antonio E. Acosta, Director of Leisure Services**

SUBJECT **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION REGARDING EXPANSION OF FUNDING TO YOUTH AND TEEN PROGRAMS IN THE CITY OF UNION CITY**

This report is written to forward the recommendations of the Parks & Recreation Commission (PRC) for expanding funding to youth and teen programs in the City of Union City. Staff recommends that the City Council consider the recommendations from the PRC and defer making a final decision on them until staff submits a final staff report with recommendations for adjustment to the adopted Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07 budget.

BACKGROUND

In response to suggestions raised by a concerned citizen at the regular PRC meeting of March 8, 2006, the PRC requested that staff prepare a report outlining current Leisure Services programs for teens and youth, and what budget resources might be required to enhance such programs.

At the regular PRC meeting of April 12, 2006 staff presented a brief report (copy attached) outlining current service levels at the **William May Teen Center** located in Kennedy Park, the **Teen Workshop** located on Mission Blvd. between F and G streets, **Holly Community Center**, the **Alvarado Resource Center** located in the Contempo housing development, and the three program sites for the **Club Une Middle School After-school Program** (Barnard-White, Cesar Chavez, and Alvarado Middle Schools). The staff report also included a recommendation to consider the impact of program expansion and/or restoration in the context of program coordination and management, in the form of an additional **Recreation Coordinator position**.

The presentation of the program enhancement information was accompanied by advisory statements from staff that funding for such program enhancements would have to be identified, and that competing demands for any such funding (such as the new Sports Center under construction) would also need to be considered by the City Council.

The PRC accepted the staff report for recommendation to the City Council and, in response to a suggestion from a community representative, also voted to recommend expansion of weekend

hours at the Teen Center and Teen Workshop. Finally, the PRC agreed to recommend that a **Citizen's Advisory Team** be formed to provide specific feedback to staff regarding the needs of the community and priorities for program expansion and development.

DISCUSSION

The funding restoration proposals forwarded by the PRC may be broken down into four categories: Teen Programs, Alvarado Resource Center (Contempo) Programs, Club Une, and the Teen Coordinator position.

Teen Programs – Union City Leisure Services currently provides teen programming at three locations in Union City: the William May Teen Center located in Kennedy Park, the Teen Workshop located on Mission Blvd., and at Holly Community Center.

- The **William May Teen Center** currently operates an average of **18 hours per week** (see Exhibit One for operating hours), and serves approximately **200 teens each month**. The 975 hours of operation at this facility **cost \$25,000 per year** for Part-time (PT) staffing, which is borne by the General Fund. **All programs are free of charge**. Program coordination and management are provided by existing LS staff who are funded by both the General Fund and by the Recreation Enterprise Fund (REF).

PROPOSAL: expand service hours to 32-40 hours per month, resulting in 3.5 additional hours on most school days (Monday through Thursday) and 2 additional hours per days during the summer. The Teen Center would be **open until at least 8pm during all days of operation** (9pm on Fridays during the school year). No Saturday hours would be provided. New programs would include a **teen employment program** and **after-school tutoring**. **Total additional cost would be \$17,000 per year**.

- The **Teen Workshop** currently operates an average of **15 hours per week** (see Exhibit One for operating hours), and serves approximately **200 teens per month**. Unlike the other two teen program sites, the Teen Workshop is **open on Saturdays during the school year**. The 715 total hours of service at this facility **cost \$20,000 per year** for Part-time (PT) staffing, which is borne by the General Fund. **All programs are free of charge**. Program coordination and management are provided by existing LS staff who are funded by both the General Fund and by the Recreation Enterprise Fund (REF).

PROPOSAL: expand service hours to 33-40 hours per week, resulting in programs being offered all weekdays and Saturdays during the school year, and 2 additional hours each weekday during the summer. The Teen Workshop would be **open until 7pm on most nights** (except Saturday, when it would close at 6pm). Program enhancements would include an expanded **volunteer/community service**

program, and expanded vocational/ROP style programs. Total additional cost would be \$24,000 per year.

- The **Holly Community Center** currently operates an average of **11 hours per week** (see Exhibit One for operating hours), and serves approximately **211 teens each month**. The 548 hours of operation at this facility **cost \$16,000 per year** for Part-time (PT) staffing, which is borne by the General Fund. **All programs are free of charge**. Program coordination and management are provided by existing LS staff who are funded by both the General Fund and by the Recreation Enterprise Fund (REF).

PROPOSAL: expand service hours to 20 hours per week, resulting in 4 additional hours on Fridays during the school year, 1 additional hour per day during the summer and 3 additional hours on Fridays during the summer. The Holly Center would be **open until at least 8pm during all days of operation** (9pm on Fridays during the school year). No Saturday hours would be provided. Program expansion would focus on serving the adjacent **Greenhaven Apartments** and the **Contempo housing development**. **Total additional cost would be \$10,000 per year.**

It should be noted that teen program expansion at Holly Center is limited by space constraints and existing programs (i.e., the Holly Center is just a teen program site, but serves all age groups)

- The **Alvarado Resource Center** located in a converted residential unit in the Contempo housing development offers Park & Playground programs for 8 weeks during the summer and during three school vacation weeks, averaging 20 hours per week during these 11 weeks of the year (see Exhibit One for operating hours), and serves approximately **20 teens each week**. The 220 hours of operation at this facility **cost \$6,000 per year** for Part-time (PT) staffing and supplies, which is borne by the General Fund. **All programs are free of charge**. Program coordination and management are provided by existing LS staff who are funded by both the General Fund and by the Recreation Enterprise Fund (REF).

PROPOSAL: expand service hours to 20 hours per week, resulting in year-round recreation programming for Contempo teens and youth. The Alvarado Resource Center would be **open until 7pm during the school year and until 4pm during vacation periods**. No Saturday hours would be provided. Program expansion would focus on serving the **Contempo housing development**. **Total additional cost would be \$28,500 per year, and could be funded through the RDA.**

- The **Club Une** program serves middle school youth at all three New Haven middle

schools, operating from dismissal (usually **2:05pm**) through **6pm on school days**. When originally created, Club Une consisted of a free program block from 2:05 to 3:30pm and a fee-based program block from 3:30 to 6pm. Due to budget reductions, the program was forced to switch to a totally fee-based model in 2004. The **total cost to enroll a student in both program blocks for an entire school year is \$2100, or about \$4 per hour**. As a result of the switch to a totally fee-based program, **program enrollment at Barnard-White dropped from 80 students per day to 17 students per day**, presumably because many families in the community could not afford the fees.

PROPOSALS – three options have been developed by staff (Note: the staff proposal only discusses Options 1 and 2).

OPTION 1 – Restore Block 1 as a free program at all three sites. This option would **cost an additional \$64,000 per year** and would increase program participation by at least 104 students per day (all three sites combined). Parents who currently pay to enroll their child in Club Une would save \$700 per child per year, and children whose parents who cannot afford to pay any fees would be eligible for 1.5 hours of after-school programming each school day.

OPTION 2 – Make Club Une a free program at all three sites. This option would **cost an additional \$236,430 per year** and would increase program participation by at least 104 students per day (all three sites combined). Parents who currently pay to enroll their child in Club Une would save \$2100 per child per year, and children whose parents who cannot afford to pay any fees would be eligible for 4 hours of after-school programming each school day.

OPTION 3 – Restore Club Une as a free program to children from low income families only, with eligibility determined by either eligibility for free school meals, baseline utility rates, or proof of family income at Low, Very Low or Extremely Low federal housing income levels. This option would **cost an estimated \$63,000-75,000 per year** for both program blocks, or an estimated **\$24,000-28,000 per year for Block 1 only**, although the actual cost is unknown and dependent upon the number of low income families who choose to use Club Une.

- **0.75 FTE Recreation Coordinator Position** – staff also provided information on the costs associated with restoring a 0.75 FTE Teen Coordinator position at an **estimated annual cost of \$50,000 per year**. Such a position would be justified if all of the program expansion and restoration proposals forwarded by the PRC were approved for funding and implementation.

The PRC recommendation for Saturday programming at all program sites has not been evaluated

by staff, and would depend entirely upon the hours of operation provided at each program site. Staff can prepare additional cost projections for City Council consideration if so directed.

FISCAL IMPACT

The potential fiscal impact to the General Fund and RDA funds associated with this report depends upon the degree to which the City Council agrees to any of the program expansion proposals submitted by the PRC. The various fiscal impacts associated with this report are summarized in Table One, attached. Table One also contains staff prioritization of the proposals.

Staff recommends that the City Council establish priorities for the program elements listed in Table One and defer any decision on program funding to the June 2006 budget discussion on amending the adopted FY 2006-07 General Fund budget. **It is important to remember that the new Sports Center under construction (and scheduled to open in late January 2007) will require substantial subsidies from the General Fund for its first 18 months of operation in order to reach its full revenue potential, at an estimated cost (preliminary) of \$280,000 for FY 2006-07 alone.**

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council consider the various proposals for expanding funding to teen and youth programs in Union City and advise staff of its priorities for potential funding. Staff will return in June with a detailed report on the FY 2006-07 General Fund budget, which includes options for budget adjustments which will include any priority items identified by the City Council for teen and youth programs, other Leisure Services-related funding needs such as the Union City Sports Center, and other City departmental needs.

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Antonio E. Acosta
Director of Leisure Services

Larry Cheeves
City Manager

TABLE ONE

CITY OF UNION CITY
TEEN & YOUTH PROGRAM EXPANSION COSTS

PROGRAM	DESCRIPTION	ANNUAL COST	STAFF PRIORITY
TEEN CENTER	Increase operating hours to 32-40 hours per week; open until 8pm (9pm Fridays)	\$17,000	4
TEEN WORKSHOP	Increase operating hours to 33-40 hours per week, open until 7pm (6pm Saturdays)	\$24,000	4
HOLLY CENTER	Increase operating hours to 20 hours per week, open until 8pm (9pm Fridays)	\$10,000	4
ALVARADO RESOURCE CENTER	Provide year-round program, 4 hours per day	\$28,500* *RDA eligible	1
CLUB UNE-OPTION 1	Provide free Block 1 programs at all 3 sites	\$64,000	5
CLUB UNE – OPTION 2	Provide totally free program at al 3 sites	\$236,430	6
CLUB UNE – OPTION 3A	Provide totally free program to low income youth	\$63-75,000	3
CLUB UNE - OPTION 3B	Provide free Block 1 program to low income youth	\$23-28,000	2
TEEN COORDINATOR	Restore 0.75 FTE position	\$50,000	7
ALL SITES	Provide Saturday hours (new or expanded)	Variable	N/A