

Council Questions

Monday, June 5, 2023

Item 3 - what was the City's return for the quarter and YTD on it's \$200 m invested?

The total interest earnings for the quarter ending 12/31/22 was \$853k. Interest earned fiscal year to date is \$1.4m. Short term interest rates have risen sharply over the past 6 months therefore we anticipate increased investment earnings for the remainder of the year January – June.

Our balanced portfolio contains long- and short-term investments and the short-term portion, which represents 60% of our total portfolio, is currently earning around 5%.

Item 9 - what is the replacement surface paving width for these waterline projects?

It depends on a variety of factors. Generally speaking, the area of disturbance and restoration needed for utility improvements provides the rationale for justifying pavement restoration areas on each project. The City's trench paving standards typically require an extra 3ft of pavement on each side of a new water line (typically a 5-6 ft.-wide trench).

From there, staff evaluates the cost of doing an entire lane or full width of the road/street in conjunction with the project budget and costs for just trench paving. When full street reconstruction is not being implemented, utility improvement projects may involve repair of a full lane width or the entire street section where justified and appropriate.

Additionally, staff coordinates utility work with the project managers for each pavement project. This was and is being done on North McDowell Blvd., Garfield Dr., Howard St., Maria Dr., and other projects.

Item 10 - Did the bad pipe get replaced?

The Ellis Creek outfall pipe has not yet been replaced, although we attempted to do so in 2022. Staff is working to get it replaced during this year's environmental window, which is September 1st – October 15th.

Does the city have in use any more of this piping material and will it create future emergency replacement needs?

The original techite pipe material from the 1970's was not widely used, and it is not anywhere else in our utility system. The outfall was part of the system's original piping that predates construction of the Ellis Creek Water Recycling Facility.

Notably, a separate project for the Oxidation Ponds includes replacement of aging corrugated metal pipes.

Item 12 (LADs) Preamble NOTE:

Tonight's recommended action is to approve the Engineer's Report and set the public hearing date for assessment (with only a COLA). This is generally a standard 3-step annual process/occurrence:

Step 1 – Ask the Engineer to create a report

Step 2 – Recommend approval of the preliminary report and set a hearing date

Step 3 – Approve the report and conduct the public hearing.

Tonight's recommended action only involves Steps 1 and 2.

Item 12 - says of 50 LAD, 43 are active. What is status of other 7?

The table below (from the Engineer's Report, Exhibit A of Attachment 1), highlights (in yellow) the 7 LADs that are not active and are not currently being maintained. None of these are being assessed in FY23/24 (zero assessments for each are highlighted in green).

As part of a thorough review and evaluation of all 50 LADs, staff is looking at the future needs for each LAD and potentially dissolving the nonactive LADs.

City of Petaluma
Landscape Assessment Districts
FY 23-24 Assessment Summary

Engineer's Report
 Exhibit A

# of Parcels Assessed	Project Number	Landscape District	Beginning Balance	Assessments Levied	Total Sources	Maintenance & Admin. Costs	Ending Balance	FY23-24 Net Assessment Per Parcel	FY22-23 Net Assessment Per Parcel	Rate % Increase or Decrease
24	LAD076400	JUDITH COURT	\$ 341	\$ 2,581	\$ 2,922	\$ 5,057	\$ (2,135)	\$ 107.55	\$ 105.44	2.0%
74	LAD076600	ANNA'S MEADOWS	\$ (15,514)	\$ 1,226	\$ (14,289)	\$ 10,515	\$ (24,804)	\$ 16.56	\$ 16.24	2.0%
44	LAD076800	LIBERTY FARMS	\$ (37,925)	\$ 9,220	\$ (28,706)	\$ 15,642	\$ (44,348)	\$ 209.54	\$ 205.43	2.0%
40	LAD076900	CORONA CREEK 2	\$ (638)	\$ 4,416	\$ 3,778	\$ 9,504	\$ (5,725)	\$ 110.41	\$ 108.24	2.0%
100	LAD077000	AMERICANA	\$ 18,085	\$ 4,005	\$ 22,090	\$ 4,807	\$ 17,283	\$ 40.05	\$ 39.26	2.0%
14	LAD077100	KINGSFIELD	\$ (8,710)	\$ 773	\$ (7,937)	\$ 2,273	\$ (10,210)	\$ 55.20	\$ 54.12	2.0%
151	LAD077200	CASA DEL ORO	\$ 6,782	\$ 4,199	\$ 10,981	\$ 7,314	\$ 3,667	\$ 27.80	\$ 27.26	2.0%
185	LAD077500	MCNEAR LANDING	\$ (26,276)	\$ 15,100	\$ (11,176)	\$ 11,862	\$ (23,037)	\$ 81.18	\$ 79.59	2.0%
41	LAD077600	FAIRWAY MEADOWS	\$ (30,272)	\$ 9,053	\$ (21,219)	\$ 17,081	\$ (38,300)	\$ 220.82	\$ 216.49	2.0%
83	LAD077700	GLENBROOK	\$ (6,493)	\$ 4,477	\$ (2,016)	\$ 8,734	\$ (10,750)	\$ 53.95	\$ 52.89	2.0%
177	LAD077900	MEADOW PARK	\$ 87,599	\$ 22,483	\$ 110,082	\$ 33,759	\$ 76,323	\$ 127.02	\$ 127.02	0.0%
44	LAD078000	TWIN CREEKS	\$ (13,584)	\$ 10,930	\$ (2,653)	\$ 16,071	\$ (18,724)	\$ 248.42	\$ 243.55	2.0%
82	LAD078100	PARK PLACE	\$ 5,218	\$ 2,781	\$ 7,999	\$ 4,704	\$ 3,295	\$ 33.92	\$ 33.25	2.0%
59	LAD078200	WOODSIDE VILLAGE	\$ 8,089	\$ 3,527	\$ 11,615	\$ 6,128	\$ 5,487	\$ 59.77	\$ 58.60	2.0%
110	LAD078300	SHELTER HILLS	\$ (17,898)	\$ 2,252	\$ (15,647)	\$ 2,728	\$ (18,375)	\$ 20.47	\$ 20.07	2.0%
78	LAD078400	SPRING MEADOWS	\$ (5,063)	\$ 3,272	\$ (1,791)	\$ 4,647	\$ (6,438)	\$ 41.96	\$ 41.13	2.0%
19	LAD078500	ST JAMES ESTATES	\$ 2,955	\$ 3,147	\$ 6,102	\$ 4,181	\$ 1,921	\$ 165.61	\$ 162.36	2.0%
71	LAD078600	VILLAGE EAST	\$ 13,061	\$ 1,960	\$ 15,020	\$ 5,156	\$ 9,865	\$ 27.60	\$ 27.06	2.0%
79	LAD078700	VILLAGE MEADOWS	\$ 11,403	\$ 10,296	\$ 21,699	\$ 11,474	\$ 10,225	\$ 124.05	\$ 124.05	0.0%
200	LAD078800	CROSS CREEK	\$ 13,343	\$ 10,824	\$ 24,168	\$ 8,605	\$ 15,563	\$ 54.12	\$ 53.06	2.0%
167	LAD079000	WESTRIDGE	\$ 2,968	\$ 14,214	\$ 17,182	\$ 9,592	\$ 7,589	\$ 85.11	\$ 83.44	2.0%
445	LAD079100	SONOMA GLEN SF	\$ 30,468	\$ 27,700	\$ 66,320	\$ 22,481	\$ 42,403	\$ 91.42	\$ 89.63	2.0%
		SONOMA GLEN TH	\$ -	\$ 8,153	\$ -	\$ 1,435	\$ -	\$ 57.41	\$ 56.29	2.0%
180	LAD079200	MOUNTAIN VALLEY	\$ 12,800	\$ 12,060	\$ 24,860	\$ 17,060	\$ 7,800	\$ 67.00	\$ 67.00	0.0%
117	LAD079300	KINGSMILL	\$ (7,218)	\$ 13,417	\$ 6,199	\$ 16,798	\$ (10,599)	\$ 110.88	\$ 108.71	2.0%
75	LAD079400	COUNTRY CLUB ESTATES	\$ 10,759	\$ 7,900	\$ 18,659	\$ 11,153	\$ 7,506	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	0.0%
124	LAD079500	CADER FARMS	\$ 27,014	\$ 27,606	\$ 54,620	\$ 32,150	\$ 22,470	\$ 222.63	\$ 222.63	0.0%
53	LAD079501	CADER FARM HIGHLAND	\$ (24,220)	\$ 7,171	\$ (17,049)	\$ 8,102	\$ (25,151)	\$ 135.30	\$ 132.65	2.0%
21	LAD079600	CRANE GLEN	\$ (3,618)	\$ 1,678	\$ (1,940)	\$ 3,914	\$ (5,854)	\$ 79.92	\$ 78.36	2.0%
30	LAD079700	HILL VIEW OAKS	\$ (3,127)	\$ -	\$ (3,127)	\$ -	\$ (3,127)	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
3	LAD079800	TATUM	\$ 201	\$ -	\$ 201	\$ -	\$ 201	\$ -	\$ 15.92	0.0%
203	LAD079900	GRAYSTONE CREEK	\$ 20,233	\$ 20,300	\$ 40,533	\$ 22,813	\$ 17,720	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	0.0%
12	LAD092600	MAGNOLIA TERRACE	\$ 4,199	\$ -	\$ 4,199	\$ -	\$ 4,199	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
28	LAD092700	WISTERIA	\$ 3,685	\$ 1,855	\$ 5,540	\$ 4,511	\$ 1,029	\$ 66.24	\$ 64.95	2.0%
42	LAD092900	WESTVIEW ESTATES	\$ 2,736	\$ 4,753	\$ 7,489	\$ 11,531	\$ (4,043)	\$ 115.93	\$ 113.66	2.0%
236	LAD093000	WILLOW GLEN	\$ (5,621)	\$ 33,209	\$ 27,588	\$ 33,558	\$ (5,969)	\$ 140.72	\$ 137.96	2.0%
19	LAD093100	STONERIDGE	\$ 6,352	\$ 734	\$ 7,086	\$ 3,751	\$ 3,335	\$ 38.64	\$ 37.89	2.0%
97	LAD093200	LANSDOWNE	\$ 6,657	\$ 7,497	\$ 14,154	\$ 9,606	\$ 4,548	\$ 77.29	\$ 75.77	2.0%
37	LAD093500	WASHINGTON CK VILLAG	\$ 20,191	\$ 12,839	\$ 33,030	\$ 14,726	\$ 18,305	\$ 347.00	\$ 347.00	0.0%
78	LAD093600	TURNBRIDGE	\$ 8,558	\$ 10,815	\$ 19,373	\$ 13,344	\$ 6,029	\$ 138.65	\$ 135.93	2.0%
92	LAD093700	STRATFORD PLACE	\$ (11,300)	\$ 11,847	\$ 546	\$ 14,864	\$ (14,318)	\$ 128.77	\$ 128.77	0.0%
216	LAD093800	SOUTHGATE	\$ 91,213	\$ 60,500	\$ 151,713	\$ 37,021	\$ 114,692	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	0.0%
59	LAD093900	RIVERVIEW	\$ 17,921	\$ 3,478	\$ 21,399	\$ 7,856	\$ 13,542	\$ 55.20	\$ 54.12	2.0%
9	LAD100110	SEQUOIA ESTATES	\$ (274)	\$ -	\$ (274)	\$ -	\$ (274)	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
45	LAD100120	SYCAMORE HEIGHTS	\$ 13,386	\$ 1,705	\$ 15,091	\$ 2,569	\$ 12,521	\$ 37.89	\$ 37.15	2.0%
326	LAD100130	ADOBE CREEK	\$ (100)	\$ -	\$ (100)	\$ -	\$ (100)	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
	LAD100140	BENSON ESTATES	\$ 966	\$ -	\$ 966	\$ -	\$ 966	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
	LAD100150	FACTORY OUTLET	\$ 2,436	\$ -	\$ 2,436	\$ -	\$ 2,436	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
21	LAD150100	AVILA RANCH	\$ 20,646	\$ 12,619	\$ 33,265	\$ 12,263	\$ 21,001	\$ 600.90	\$ 600.90	0.0%
0	LAD150200	OAKS AT SUNNYSLOPE	\$ 50	\$ 15,447	\$ 15,497	\$ 5,034	\$ 10,463	\$ 858.17	\$ 858.17	0.0%
4,410		TOTALS	\$ 252,461	\$ 444,017	\$ 696,478	\$ 506,375	\$ 190,103			

Do parties receive direct mail notice of the meeting?

No, and this has not been done in prior years either.

Since the City is not technically increasing assessment rates as defined in the Streets and Highways Code, just publishing and posting the resolution in the *Argus* and at City Hall is sufficient. (Streets and Highways Code Section 22626).

Additionally, direct notification is not necessary as the original formation included authority for annual CPI adjustments, which were voted in as part of the LAD formation, and with this action the City is only implementing already approved CPI adjustments.

*Do parties get an opportunity to comment on the adequacy of the maintenance efforts?
How is customer satisfaction confirmed?*

LADs are assessed to provide benefits as prescribed in the Engineer's Report at the time they are formed. Each property gets assessed an amount that is in proportion to the benefit received per the report. The Engineer's Report takes into account cost of living adjustment (COLA)/inflationary adjustments. However, over time the costs of providing the original scope of services for many LADs has outpaced the 2% COLA adjustments contained in the Engineer's Reports.

Residents are always welcome to reach out to discuss issues and service levels or problems with their LADs. Staff from the Public Works and Utilities department as well as Parks and Recreation routinely field questions from the community regarding maintenance activity within the LADS.

The Superintendent of Parks and Facilities Maintenance is responsible for coordinating with the LAD landscaping contractor to evaluate and ensure compliance. Given the size and scope of the over forty plus individual LADs, management of the contract, community interface, and maintenance requires coordination from multiple staff in several divisions.

It is important to note that staff acknowledges and shares myriad concerns about the service levels in many of our LADs. As a result, staff is embarking on a thorough review and evaluation of all 50 LADs, involving extensive research and assessment of service needs for each LAD with the intention of creating revised engineering reports (scope of services). This is a serious undertaking and will involve hiring staff (a management analyst and/or project manager in Public Works) dedicated to the effort (included in the proposed FY23/24 budget). This staff will play a key role in managing and championing LAD projects/program management in tandem with the Parks Dept and our contractor.

This evaluation project also involves consideration of how to implement an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) following its adoption by Council, which will have major impacts on scope of work requirements for LADs.

Lastly, this effort will include evaluation of nonactive LADs that can be dissolved.

Are all LAD's in compliance with the proposed IPMP and is any associated cost or service level being considered communicated to the parties?

All City staff and contractors are complying with the existing IPMP requirements (adopted in 1999), however statutory limitations prohibit LADs from being assessed beyond the 2% annually without a voter approved majority of the parcels. For the past several years, the city has placed a voluntary ban on the use of glyphosate extending to the LAD contractor. The proposed changes to the IPMP are expected to be presented to Council this fall, following consideration and recommendation by the Recreation, Music and Parks Commission. Staff will need to evaluate the material costs and labor requirements of the draft IPMP and provide a recommendation to City Council which includes the impacts to the scope and costs of maintaining landscapes within LADs.

Item 14 - *Is Petaluma receiving the maximum amount of SB1 that it is eligible for?*

Yes, the city is receiving the maximum amount of SB1 money. The money is distributed equally to cities and counties based on a formula that is largely based on population (i.e., this is a formulaic grant).

Does the City have a balance owed to it from SB1 re the "NO use it or lose it" comment?

SB1 funds are distributed to the City and lumped into the Street Maintenance fund for CIP paving projects.

The staff report attempts to explain that unused dollars can carry forward. In other words, there are no "use it or lose it" requirements for SB1 within any one year. So, if the City chooses to save three years' worth of SB1 funds to pay for a large paving project, it can do so.

The staff report says recommending McDowell and Garfield but the table includes Maria - please explain.

McDowell, Garfield, Maria are three projects that are in Design or Construction and could use funding. Maria Drive was inadvertently omitted in the staff report list.

These are all projects that are eligible uses for SB1 funds.

How much SB1 funding is being assigned to each project?

Once SB1 is distributed to the city, it ultimately ends up in the Streets budget to be used for paving projects. The budgets for each project may not specifically identify the portion of SB1 funding, since funds are used to supplement the overall Streets fund budget.

The link to the City web site references documents generated in 2019 prior to passage of Measure U. A new 5 year plan should be provided on the website.

We are in the process of revamping the 5-year list in the next few months and once complete, it will be shared with Council and the community for input. It will also be shared on the City's website for feedback.

Exhibit A shows Casa Grande and Howard St being "completed" in FY23/24. Is this accurate?

No. Exhibit A is intended to show the project listed for Pavement Restoration through 24/25. The Construction Complete column needs be revised to reflect completion in FY24/25.

Item 11 - Alley way to be given to homeowners.

Reason and end goal not well stated in reports. Backstory?

In 1979, Council approved a resolution to *partially* vacate the easement. Vacating the easement in 1979 eliminated through access from Dana Street to English, creating a dead-end alley.

The alley is not used by any utilities, emergency responders, or garbage collection.

Do we get some benefit?

Yes, the City benefits from the vacation because the City is no longer responsible for maintenance or liabilities arising from the easement.

Additionally, the City benefits if an ADU is built on the land since that adds an additional housing unit to the City's RHNA.

The item has us giving up land to a homeowner and also his neighbors, increasing the value of their houses. Are they paying us?

The City is actually not giving up any land per se; but rather vacating a public access easement.

It is likely that the public access easement was conditioned as part of the initial subdivision, which was commonly done. However, with the 1979 partial vacation, the easement no longer provides through access for the public.

The City sought an appraisal of the easement, but the City did not hire the appraiser as the appraiser informed the City that the costs for an appraisal would likely exceed the appraisal value. The value to the City is likely negligible due to the easement no longer providing through access for the public (since 1979). As described above, the City is actually benefitting via a potential ADU and reductions in maintenance and liability costs.

In Google Earth the alley way still looks like it could be driven through even though the 1979 vacation gave up land to the adjacent homeowners.

Is it still drivable to go through or did some of the 1979 homeowners already build into the ally?

The alleyway is no longer drivable and some property owners from the 1979 partial vacation have already built onto what was the public access easement.

Was there a plan submitted for construction or property change, new fence to be built?

No plans have been submitted for construction of new fences. If the vacation is approved by Council and is recorded at the County, the adjacent property owners would need to apply for a building permit to extend/ build a new fence to the centerline of the alley or to make other improvements.

Seems the city is responsible for the alley, but probably not maintained in years. I grew up with alley behind us and it was used by the garbage truck and some of the owners who had garages off the alley. We took care of the area behind our house since we had a gate to the alley as did all other houses.

Just curious about what the neighbors are going to do.

Item 12 - A Councilmember made observations and inquired about the long-term viability of the LADs and how we can best re-assess the assessment revenues versus needed expenditures to ensure sustainability.

Staff acknowledges these concerns. As part of a thorough review and evaluation of all 50 LADs, staff has been researching and reviewing our LADs and is actively reviewing the needs for each LAD with the intention of creating revised engineering reports (scope of services) for each. This is a serious undertaking and will involve hiring staff (a management analyst and/or project manager in Public Works) dedicated to the effort (included in the proposed FY23/24 budget). This staff will play a key role in managing and championing LAD projects/program management in tandem with the Parks Dept and our contractor.

This evaluation project also involves consideration of how to implement an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) following its adoption by Council, which will have major impacts on scope of work requirements for LADs.

Lastly, this effort will include evaluation of nonactive LADs that can be dissolved.

Item 14 - The proposed list only has three for this year and two for the following year. Those are high priority, but could the lists be a little longer so we are not limiting ourselves? Suspect cities only get a couple of these funded each year in this grant/budget process so limiting it may be good efficiency of use of staff time to keep this list limited. We may need to remind public we have a priority list for all the streets in Petaluma, so they know we are doing work elsewhere. A comprehensive list of every street and planned paving along with underground pipe replacement would also be nice to have someday soon - maybe part of the 20-year General Plan update.

The list of projects provided in Attachment A were three representative projects that are slated to be in construction for that fiscal year, and are thus excellent candidates for SB1 Funding.

SB 1 projects can be updated in the future if priorities change or if additional funds become available. In this case, additional projects or street segments can be added. Staff is currently working on an update of our 5-year program utilizing new traffic and crash data in conjunction with revised scoring/prioritization criteria and synchronization with proposed utility improvement projects.

As explained during our budget presentation, this plan will be provided later this year for comments and review by Council and the community.

On the mobile home item, I was curious what the percentage is of residents that need financial need?

Staff do not know the answer to this question. However, Appendix A of our Housing Element says that at the time of the enactment of the mobile home rent stabilization ordinance in 1993, “a survey of mobile home park tenants reported that just over half of the respondents reported they paid more than 30% of their income for housing expenses. About 40% reported paying more than 35% of their income for housing. Here is also a table from our Housing Element that shows the cost burden of housing for the City at large and does not distinguish between mobile home tenants. Anecdotally from our stakeholder meetings, the amount of income tenants pay for their rent is the biggest concern of tenants.

Table A8: Housing Problems for Lower Income

Household Income and Housing Problem	Seniors	Large Families	Renters	Seniors	Large Families	Owners	Total (Owner & Renter)
Extremely Low (<=30% AMI)	665	185	1,390	385	50	735	2,125
% with any housing problems	57.1%	81.1%	65.7%	85.7%	100.0%	83.0%	71.8%
% Cost Burden >30%	57.1%	81.1%	65.7%	85.7%	100.0%	82.9%	71.7%
% Cost Burden >50%	45.9%	73.0%	56.3%	74.0%	100.0%	76.2%	63.3%
Very Low (> 30% to < 50% AMI)	420	70	995	535	50	920	1,915
% with any housing problems	72.6%	100.0%	85.4%	78.5%	30.0%	73.4%	79.6%
% Cost Burden >30%	69.0%	64.3%	80.9%	78.5%	30.0%	79.2%	80.1%
% Cost Burden >50%	45.2%	21.4%	60.8%	36.4%	30.0%	50.5%	55.9%
Low Income (> 50% to < 80% AMI)	340	205	1,065	720	130	1,300	2,365
% with any housing problems	75.0%	80.5%	77.0%	38.9%	80.8%	52.3%	63.6%
% Cost Burden >30%	66.2%	75.6%	70.4%	38.9%	53.8%	49.6%	59.2%
% Cost Burden >50%	33.8%	29.3%	34.3%	20.8%	46.2%	28.8%	31.5%
Moderate/Above (>80% AMI)	260	465	4,225	3,905	750	11,560	15,785
% with any housing problems	67.3%	48.4%	27.9%	21.8%	40.7%	22.7%	24.1%
% Cost Burden >30%	65.0%	44.1%	25.5%	21.8%	26.5%	21.5%	22.6%
% Cost Burden >50%	7.3%	2.2%	2.2%	5.0%	3.2%	3.7%	3.3%
Total Households	1,685	925	7,975	5,545	980	14,530	22,505
% with any housing problems	66.2%	65.9%	47.3%	33.9%	48.5%	31.6%	37.1%
% Cost Burden >30%	63.1%	60.0%	44.6%	33.9%	34.1%	30.7%	35.6%
% Cost Burden >50%	37.3%	23.8%	23.2%	14.9%	15.2%	12.5%	16.3%

Sources: HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS); based on ACS (2014-2018) 5-Year Estimates

How difficult is it to change the zoning/density for mobile home park to apartments or condos?

Amending our Zoning Code would require a recommendation from the Planning Commission and approval by the City Council with findings of conformance with the City’s General Plan and that the amendment is consistent with the necessity, convenience, and general welfare. Currently, the City has its own “mobile home” land use designation, that only allows mobile homes in these districts. However, “A Mobile home park... shall be deemed a permitted land use on all land planned and zoned for residential land use...” (Government Code Section 65852.7) So, if the City were to amend our Code, we would not be able to allow condominiums and apartments but preclude Mobile home parks as apartments and condominiums are residential uses.

Chapter 8.34 of the Petaluma Municipal Code provides procedures that a park owner would need to comply with before they convert an existing Mobile home park to another use or close down a Mobile home park. Pursuant to this chapter a park owner must prepare a report on the impact of the change on displaced tenants. The report must address the availability of adequate replacement housing and provide replacement costs. This impact report is filed with City Council and must be approved with City Council. City Council may impose conditions on the conversion to help mitigate any adverse impacts on the displaced tenants.

How many tenants choose the month to month, protected by the rent stabilization caps?

Below is the park data that shows how many of the total units in each park are protected under the City's Ordinance. However, with Assembly Bill 2782, long term leases entered after February 13, 2020, are no longer exempt from mobile home rent stabilization ordinances and on January 1, 2025, all leases including long-term leases will be subject to the City's rent stabilization ordinance.

Below is a summary of data from the mobile home parks annual compliance reporting between 2019-2022, it is a snapshot of four years of trends for each mobile home park:

Cottages MHP – of 178 total spaces, 145-148 spaces are exempt from rent stabilization through long-term leases.

Park-owned spaces have increased from 11 to 19. The total number of exempt spaces has increased from 159 to currently 164.

Capri Villa MHP - of 69 total spaces, 68 spaces are exempt from rent stabilization through long-term leases.

There is one park owned space, thus all 69 spaces are exempt from rent stabilization.

Youngstown MHP – of 103 total spaces, between 19 – 22 spaces are exempt from rent stabilization through long-term leases.

Park-owned spaces have increased from 7 to 11, bringing the total of exempt spaces from 29 to currently at 32.

Leisure Lake MHP – of 134 total spaces, between 29- 38 spaces are exempt from rent stabilization through long-term leases.

Park-owned spaces have increased from 1 to 4. The total number of exempt spaces has decreased from 39 to currently at 32.

Petaluma Estates MHP - of 215 total spaces, between 83 -160 spaces are exempt from rent stabilization through long-term leases.

It's worth noting that there has been an increase in spaces protected by rent stabilization over the 4-year period.

There is one park-owned space, the total number of exempt spaces is 84.

Royal Oaks MHP – of 94 total spaces, between 12-17 are exempt from rent stabilization through long-term leases. There are 5 park-owned spaces, bringing the total number of exempt spaces from 22 to a total of 17 currently.

Littlewoods MHP – of 78 total spaces, all spaces appear to be protected by the RSO with no long-term leases reported. There is currently 1 exempt park-owned space.

This data shows a trend of park owners purchasing vacant spaces and then entering long term leases with their tenants.

How often is there a “lawfully vacant space”?

Currently the City does not have a mechanism to track vacancies from “lawful space vacancy”. However, City Council may desire to amend the Ordinance to require park owners to provide notice to the City when a “lawful space vacancy” occurs to better track and enforce the City’s Ordinance.

***Agenda item 7**– Is the airport going to receive a recycling or compost recovery container in their picnic area?*

Currently, there isn't a plan to include receptacles for the airport through this grant. However, we can work with Recology to get compost and recycling containers out there independently from this grant.

We have compost and recycling available in the terminal. Staff will consider improved location for signage, which might be better than adding service.

From: [Brady, Dylan](#)
To: [Flynn, Peggy](#); -- City Council
Cc: [Shimizu, Karen](#); [Wolf, Sarah](#); [Danly, Eric](#); [Bolt, Christopher](#); [Cochran, Brian](#); [Eichstaedt, Ken](#); [Benedetti-Petnic, Gina](#)
Subject: RE: Responses to City Council questions on 6.5 agenda items
Date: Monday, June 5, 2023 4:32:58 PM

Staff also received a request to provide a table showing what 75% of the CPI would be for the past 20 years in regards to the Mobilehome ordinance. Below is that table.

Year	100% CPI	75% CPI
2022	5.7	4.275
2021	3.7	2.775
2020	1.6	1.2
2019	2.7	2.025
2018	4.3	3.225
2017	3.0	2.25
2016	3.1	2.325
2015	2.6	1.95
2014	3.0	2.25
2013	2.0	1.5
2012	2.8	2.1
2011	2.9	2.175
2010	1.0	.75
2009	.02	.015
2008	4.2	3.15
2007	2.6	1.95
2006	3.8	2.85
2005	2.2	1.65
2004	1.2	.9
2003	1.4	1.05
2002	1.3	.975
2001	5.1	3.825

Dylan Brady

Assistant City Attorney
 City of Petaluma | City Attorney
 office: (707) 778-4497 |
DBRADY@cityofpetaluma.org

