

Meeting Date 2/21/18

TO: Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board

FROM: Bruce Ambo, Principle Planner, (879-6801, bruce.ambo@chicoca.gov)

RE: Certified Local Government Program 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 Annual Reports

SUMMARY

As part of the maintenance of Certified Local Government (CLG) programs, the State Office of Historic Preservation requires all local historic preservation boards or commissions review annual reports prior to being submitted to the State Office of Historic Preservation. The submittal of both reports would be late due to workload constraints and staffing changes, but still in compliance with the CLG reporting content requirements. Staff recommends that the Board review the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 Annual CLG Reports, recommend any suggested changes, and authorize staff to forward the reports to the State Office of Historic Preservation.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. 2015-2016 Annual Certified Local Government Program Report (Draft)
- 2. 2016-2017 Annual Certified Local Government Program Report (Draft)

DISTRIBUTION

ARHB members
Brendan Vieg, Deputy Director – Community Development
Leo DePaola, Community Development Director

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

INSTRUCTIONS: This a Word form with expanding text fields and check boxes. It will probably open as Read-Only. Save it to your computer before you begin entering data. This form can be saved and reopened.

Because this is a WORD form, it will behave generally like a regular Word document except that the font, size, and color are set by the text field.

- Start typing where indicated to provide the requested information.
- Click on the check box to mark either yes or no.
- To enter more than one item in a particular text box, just insert an extra line (Enter) between the items.

Save completed form and email as an attachment to <u>Lucinda.Woodward@parks.ca.gov</u>. You can also convert it to a PDF and send as an email attachment. Use the Acrobat tab in WORD and select Create and Attach to Email. You can then attach the required documents to that email. If the attachments are too large (greater than10mb total), you will need to send them in a second or third email.

Name of CLG City of Chico

Report Prepared by: Bruce Ambo, Principle Planner Date of commission/board review: 02/21/18

Minimum Requirements for Certification

I. Enforce Appropriate State or Local Legislation for the Designation and Protection of Historic Properties.

A. Preservation Laws

- 1. What amendments or revisions, if any, are you considering to the certified ordinance? Please forward drafts or proposals. **REMINDER**: Pursuant to the CLG Agreement, OHP must have the opportunity to review and comment on ordinance changes prior to adoption. Changes that do not meet the CLG requirements could affect certification status. **None**
- 1. Provide an electronic link to your ordinance or appropriate section(s) of the municipal/zoning code. Chico Municipal Code Chapter 19.37 http://www.ci.chico.ca.us/document_library/municode/Title19.pdf

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

B. New Local Landmark Designations (Comprehensive list of properties/districts designated under local ordinance, HPOZ, etc.)

1. During the reporting period, October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016, what properties/districts have been locally designated?

Property Name/Address	Date Designated	If a district, number of contributors	Date Recorded by County Recorder
799 Hill View Way	5/3/16 (3/16/16 ARHPB)	N/A	N/A

REMINDER: Pursuant to California Government Code § 27288.2, "the county recorder shall record a certified resolution establishing an historical resources designation issued by the State Historical Resources Commission or a local agency, or unit thereof."

2. What properties/districts have been de-designated this past year? For districts, include the total number of resource contributors.

Property Name/Address	Date Removed
618 W. 5 th Street, requested by property owner (Grigg).	Certificate of Demolition approved by ARHPB on 11/18/15. Structure relocated to 1386 Humboldt Avenue with renovation underway. Re-designation pending completion of renovation.

C. Historic Preservation Element/Plan

 Do you address historic preservation in your general plan? ∑ Yes, in a separate historic preservation element. 	☐ No☐ Yes, it is included in another element.
Provide an electronic link to the historic preservation section(s) of http://www.ci.chico.ca.us/document_library/general_plan/	
$\underline{\mathbf{f}}$	
2. Have you made any updates to your historic preservation plangement of the provide of the pro	

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

 $\underline{http://www.ci.chico.ca.us/document_library/general_plan/documents/11.CulturalResources and Historic Preservation Element.pdf$

3. When will your next General Plan update occur? The City conducted the first "Five-Year Review of the Chico 2030 General Plan" during the reporting period. The review included presentations and feedback from all advisory boards and commissions. The review assessed growth trends and analyzed the effectiveness of the General Plan's policy framework through the first five years of Plan implementation. It assessed land availability, forecasted opportunities and challenges in the upcoming five years, and summarized major City planning efforts.

Maintaining active participation and promotion of the CLG program principles is a key Action in the Cultural Resources and Historic Preservation Element. The status of each Goal, Policy and Action item element were reported and summarized. The "Five-Year Review of the Chico 2030 General Plan" concluded that all of the Goals, Policies and Actions set forth in the Cultural Resources and Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan remained in focus and in alignment in protecting and preserving archaeological, historical and other cultural resources.

D. Review Responsibilities

- 1. Who takes responsibility for design review or Certificates of Appropriateness?
 - ⊠ All projects subject to design review go the Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board. *All decisions* for a Certificate of Appropriateness or Certificate of Demolition are determined by the City's Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board (Board). Design review is conducted by the Board and by Staff for minor projects that qualify for an exemption from the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance (HPO).
 - Some projects are reviewed at the staff level without commission review. What is the threshold between staff-only review and full-board review? *Projects that are determined exempt pursuant to Chico Municipal Code 19.37.120 A-C are reviewed at the staff level without Board review.* As defined in the City's HPO, "Minor Alterations", "Exemptions", or projects that comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards can be approved administratively by staff.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

2. California Environmental Quality Act

What is the role of the staff and commission in providing input to CEQA documents prepared for or by the local government? All discretionary decisions made by the Board are subject to CEQA. In most cases, projects fall under a categorical exemption. In rare instances, an initial study/mitigated negative declaration is prepared and processed by staff. Staff makes recommendations and CEQA findings are adopted by the Board, Planning Commission or City Council. All Notice of Exemptions (NOE) or Notice of Determinations (NOD) are filed at the county recorder's office by staff. Input is provided via the Board/public hearing.

What is the role of the staff and commission in *reviewing* CEQA documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? **See above**

3. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

What is the role of the staff and commission in *providing input* to Section 106 documents prepared for or by; the local government? *Projects requiring Section 106 review typically involve staff processing an initial study leading to a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration. Staff makes recommendations to the Board, Planning Commission, or City Council. If the final decision rests with the Planning Commission or City Council, a recommendation by the Board is required. The Board has not yet reviewed a project involving a Section 106 review.*

What is the role of the staff and commission in *reviewing* Section 106 documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? Within the City of Chico jurisdiction, projects requiring Section 106 review are forwarded to the CLG Coordinator to provide comments, or to the Environmental Manager in the Department of Public Works for additional review and comments.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

II. Establish an Adequate and Qualified Historic Preservation Review Commission by State or Local Legislation.

A. Commission Membership

Name	Professional Discipline	Date Appointed	Date Term Ends	Email Address
Thomas Thomson	Architect (semi-retired)	1/13	1/17	tltmat@sbcglobal.net
Sheryl Campbell- Bennet	Architectural Firm (Administrative Assistant)	1/15	1/19	smbchico@sbcglobal.net
Marci Goulart	Interior Designer	1/13	1/17	mlgoulart@sbcglobal.net
Keith Doglio	Civil Engineer	1/15	1/19	kdoglio@rarcivil.com
Rod Jennings	Instrument & Control Systems Field Engineer	2/15	1/19	roddenjames@yahoo.com

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all members.

- 1. If you do not have two qualified professionals on your commission, explain why the professional qualifications not been met and how professional expertise is otherwise being provided. *3 of the 5 members meet CLG requirements.*
- 2. If all positions are not currently filled, why is there a vacancy, and when will the position will be filled? **There are currently no vacancies all positions are filled.**

B. Staff to the Commission/CLG staff

1.	Is the staff to v	our commission t	the same as v	our CLG coordinator?	⊠ Yes	
	io tilo otali to j	001 00111111001011	ino camo ao ,	oai olo ocoi aii iatoi .		

2. If the position(s) is not currently filled, why is there a vacancy? The position is filled

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for staff.

Name/Title	Discipline	Dept. Affiliation	Email Address
Bruce Ambo	Principle Planner	City of Chico Community	Bruce.ambo@chicoca.gov
		Development Department	

C. Attendance Record

Please complete attendance chart for each commissioner and staff member. Commissions are required to meet four times a year, at a minimum. If you haven't met at least four times, explain why not.

Commissioner/Staff	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
Thomas Thomson	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes									
Sheryl Campbell-Bennet	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes		\boxtimes							
Marci Goulart	\boxtimes		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes		\boxtimes	\boxtimes
Keith Doglio	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes			
Rod Jennings	\boxtimes		\boxtimes	\boxtimes								

D. Training Received

Indicate what training each commissioner and staff member has received. Remember it is a CLG requirement is that all commissioners and staff to the commission attend at least one training program relevant to your commission each year. It is up to the CLG to determine the relevancy of the training.

Commissioner/Staff Name	Training Title & Description (including method presentation, e.g., webinar, workshop)	Duration of Training	Training Provider	Date
Thomas Thomson	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sheryl Campbell-Bennet	Nomination to Historical Resources Inventory Process	1 hour	Bob Summerville (CLG Coordinator)	3/7/16

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

Marci Goulart	Nomination to Historical	1 hour	Bob Summerville (CLG	3/7/16
	Resources Inventory Process		Coordinator)	
Keith Doglio	Nomination to Historical	1 hour	Bob Summerville (CLG	3/7/16
	Resources Inventory Process		Coordinator)	
Rod Jennings	Nomination to Historical	1 hour	Bob Summerville (CLG	3/7/16
	Resources Inventory Process		Coordinator)	

III. Maintain a System for the Survey and Inventory of Properties that Furthers the Purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act

A. Historical Contexts: initiated, researched, or developed in the reporting year (excluding those funded by OHP)

NOTE: California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results, including historic contexts, to OHP. If you have not done so, submit a copy (PDF or link if available online) with this report.

Context Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted to OHP
City of Chico Historic	Survey of over 260 properties, with context statement	Implementation of local HPO.	11/29/11 (originally submitted w/CLG Application

B. New Surveys or Survey Updates (excluding those funded by OHP)

NOTE: The evaluation of a single property is not a survey. Also, material changes to a property that is included in a survey, is not a change to the survey and should not be reported here.

Survey Area	Context Based- yes/no	Level: Reconnaissance or Intensive	Acreage	# of Properties Surveyed	Date Completed	Date Submitted to OHP
No new survey during reporting period.						

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

How are you using the survey data? The survey originally submitted with Chico's CLG Application is used in the implementation of the HPO.

C. Corrections or changes to Historic Property Inventory

Property	Additions/Deletions to	Status Code Change	Reason	Date of Change
Name/Address	Inventory	From _ To_		
618 W. 5 th Street	COD approved 11/18/15	Inventory not yet changed	Unofficially – demolition by neglect	Not yet demolished as of date of this report

IV. Provide for Adequate Public Participation in the Local Historic Preservation Program

A. Public Education

What public outreach, training, or publications programs has the CLG undertaken? How were the commissioners and staff involved? Please provide copy of (or an electronic link) to all publications or other products not previously provided to OHP.

Item or Event	Description	Date
N/A		

V. Additional Information for National Park Service Annual Products Report for CLGs (certified before October 1, 2016)

NOTE: OHP will forward this information to NPS on your behalf. **Please read** "Guidance for completing the Annual Products Report for CLGs" located http://www.nps.gov/clg/2015CLG_GPRA/FY2014_AnnualReportGuidance-May2015.docx.

A. CLG Inventory Program

What is the new cumulative number of historic properties in your inventory as of September 30, 2015. How many historic properties did your local government **add** to the CLG inventory? This is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or your best estimate of the number) added to your inventory **from all programs**, local, state, and Federal, during the reporting year. These might include National Register, California Register, California Historic Landmarks, locally funded surveys, CLG surveys, and local designations.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

	F	Program area	Number of Properties added	
	No new properties addreport period	ded to the inventory during the	•	
B. Loca	ıl Register (i.e., Local	Landmarks and Historic Districts) Prog	ıram	
	•	ing period (October 1, 2015-September 3 and/or local districts (or a similar list of des	0, 2016) did you have a local register progr signations) created by local law? ⊠Ye	
		es, then how many properties have been Hill View Way, APN: 003-523-007)	added to your register or designated since (October 1,
C. Loca	I Tax Incentives Prog	ram		
		ing period (October 1, 2015-September 3 $oxed{\boxtimes}$ Yes $oxed{\square}$ No	0, 2016) did you have a Local Tax Incentive	s Program, such
	(The City of Chic	o currently administers (10) Mills Act Con	tracts)	
	2. If the answer is y 2016?	es, how many properties have been adde	d to this program from October 1, 2015 to S	eptember 30,
	Name of Program	Number of Properties Added During 2015-2016	Total Number of Properties Benefiting From Program	

D. Local "bricks and mortar" grants/loan program

None

1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2015-September 30, 2016) did you have a local government historic preservation grant and/or loan program for rehabilitating/restoring historic properties? □Yes ☒No

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been assisted under the program(s) from October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016?

Name of Program	Number of Properties that have Benefited
None	

E. Design Review/Local Regulatory Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2015-September 30, 2016) did your local government have a historic preservation regulatory law(s) (e.g., an ordinance) authorizing Commission and/or staff review of local government projects or impacts on historic properties? ⊠ Yes □ No
- 2. If the answer is yes, how many historic properties did your local government review for compliance with your local government's historic preservation regulatory law(s) from October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016? 1 COD reviewed by the Board. All projects exempt from Board are administratively reviewed by Staff.

F. Local Property Acquisition Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2015-September 30, 2016) did you have a local program to acquire (or help to acquire) historic properties in whole or in part through purchase, donation, or other means?

 Yes

 No
- 2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been assisted under the program(s) from October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016?

Name of Program	Number of Properties that have Benefited	
N/A		

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

VII. In addition to the minimum CLG requirements, OHP is interested in a Summary of Local Preservation Programs

- A. What are your most critical preservation planning issues? It was determined in coordination with OHP CEQA staff that no exemption exists for a simple COD. Adjustments to CEQA to alleviate this regulatory shortcoming should be investigated.
- B. What is the single accomplishment of your local government this year that has done the most to further preservation in your community? The ARHPB reviewed the first COD application. Although approved, it illustrated the success of the City's HPO by requiring a discretionary review process of a historic property rather than issuing a ministerial demolition permit.
- C. What recognition are you providing for successful preservation projects or programs? The City works closely with the Chico Heritage Association in selecting preservation awards on their behalf.
- D. How did you meet or not meet the goals identified in your annual report for last year? A change in City Staff and the CLG coordinator hindered updating the City's existing survey and context statement.
- E. What are your local historic preservation goals for 2016-2017? *Maintain program continuity with change in Staff.*
- F. So that we may better serve you in the future, are there specific areas and/or issues with which you could use technical assistance from OHP? Provide OHP training in an area close to Chico for the benefit surrounding jurisdictions such as Butte County, Town of Paradise, City of Oroville, City of Gridley, etc.
- G. In what subject areas would you like to see training provided by the OHP? How you like would to see the training delivered (workshops, online, technical assistance bulletins, etc.)?

Training Needed or Desired	Desired Delivery Format		
A basic refresher course on the principles and practices of historical preservation to new ARHPB members	On-line webinar of video		
H. Would you be willing to host a training working workshop	in cooperation with OHP?	⊠Yes	□ No

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

I. Is there anything else you would like to share with OHP? Thank you for your assistance, guidance, and ongoing support.

VIII. Attachments

Resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all commission members/alternatives and staff
☐ Minutes from commission meetings
☐ Drafts of proposed changes to the ordinance
☐ Drafts of proposed changes to the General Plan
Public outreach publications

Email to <u>Lucinda.Woodward@parks.ca.gov</u>

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017)

INSTRUCTIONS: This a Word form with expanding text fields and check boxes. It will probably open as Read-Only. Save it to your computer before you begin entering data. This form can be saved and reopened.

Because this is a WORD form, it will behave generally like a regular Word document except that the font, size, and color are set by the text field.

- Start typing where indicated to provide the requested information.
- Click on the check box to mark either yes or no.
- To enter more than one item in a particular text box, just insert an extra line (Enter) between the items.

Save completed form and email as an attachment to <u>Lucinda.Woodward@parks.ca.gov</u>. You can also convert it to a PDF and send as an email attachment. Use the Acrobat tab in WORD and select Create and Attach to Email. You can then attach the required documents to that email. If the attachments are too large (greater than10mb total), you will need to send them in a second or third email.

Name of CLG City of Chico

Report Prepared by: Bruce Ambo, Principle Planner Date of commission/board review: 02/21/18

Minimum Requirements for Certification

I. Enforce Appropriate State or Local Legislation for the Designation and Protection of Historic Properties.

A. Preservation Laws

- 1. What amendments or revisions, if any, are you considering to the certified ordinance? Please forward drafts or proposals. *REMINDER*: Pursuant to the CLG Agreement, OHP must have the opportunity to review and comment on ordinance changes prior to adoption. Changes that do not meet the CLG requirements could affect certification status. *None*
- 2. Provide an electronic link to your ordinance or appropriate section(s) of the municipal/zoning code. <u>Chico Municipal Code</u> Chapter 19.37 http://www.ci.chico.ca.us/document_library/municode/Title19.pdf

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017)

B. New Local Landmark Designations (Comprehensive list of properties/districts designated under local ordinance, HPOZ, etc.)

1. During the reporting period, October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017, what properties/districts have been locally designated?

Property Name/Address	Date Designated	If a district, number of contributors	Date Recorded by County Recorder
None			

REMINDER: Pursuant to California Government Code § 27288.2, "the county recorder shall record a certified resolution establishing an historical resources designation issued by the State Historical Resources Commission or a local agency, or unit thereof."

2. What properties/districts have been de-designated this past year? For districts, include the total number of resource contributors.

Property Name/Address	Date Removed
None	Type here.

C. Historic Preservation Element/Plan

1.	Do you address historic preservation in your general plan?	□ No
	Yes, in a separate historic preservation element.	\square Yes, it is included in another element.
Pr	rovide an electronic link to the historic preservation section(s)	of the General Plan.
ht	tp://www.ci.chico.ca.us/document_library/general_plan/docum	nents/11.CulturalResourcesandHistoricPreservationElement.pd
f		•
_		
2.	Have you made any updates to your historic preservation pl	an or historic preservation element in your community's
	general plan? ⊠ Yes □ No If you have, provide	e an electronic link.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017)

 $\underline{http://www.ci.chico.ca.us/document_library/general_plan/documents/11.CulturalResources and Historic Preservation Element.pdf$

1. When will your next General Plan update occur? The City completed he first "Five-Year Review of the Chico 2030 General Plan"in November, 2016. The review included presentations and feedback from all advisory boards and commissions. The review assessed growth trends and analyzed the effectiveness of the General Plan's policy framework through the first five years of Plan implementation. It assessed land availability, forecasted opportunities and challenges in the upcoming five years, and summarized major City planning efforts.

Maintaining active participation and promotion of the CLG program principles is a key Action in the Cultural Resources and Historic Preservation Element. The status of each Goal, Policy and Action item element were reported and summarized. The "Five-Year Review of the Chico 2030 General Plan" concluded that all of the Goals, Policies and Actions set forth in the Cultural Resources and Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan remained in focus.

D. Review Responsibilities

- 1. Who takes responsibility for design review or Certificates of Appropriateness?
 - ⊠ All projects subject to design review go to the Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board. All decisions for a Certificate of Appropriateness or Certificate of Demolition are determined by the City's Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board (Board). Design review is conducted by the Board and by Staff for minor projects that qualify for an exemption from the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance (HPO) pursuant to Chico Municipal Code (CMC) 19.37.120.
 - Some projects are reviewed at the staff level without commission review. What is the threshold between staff-only review and full-board review? Projects that are determined exempt pursuant to CMC 19.37.120 are reviewed at the staff level without Board review. As defined in the City's HPO, "Minor Alterations", "Exemptions", or projects that comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards can be approved administratively by staff.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017)

2. California Environmental Quality Act

What is the role of the staff and commission in *providing input* to CEQA documents prepared for or by the local government? All discretionary decisions made by the Board are subject to CEQA. In most cases, projects fall under a categorical exemption. In rare instances, an initial study, negative declaration or a mitigated negative declaration is prepared and processed by staff. Staff makes recommendations and CEQA findings are adopted by the Board, Planning Commission or City Council. All Notice of Exemptions (NOE) or Notice of Determinations (NOD) are filed at the county recorder's office by staff. Input is provided via the Board/public hearing.

What is the role of the staff and commission in *reviewing* CEQA documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? **See above**

3. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

What is the role of the staff and commission in *providing input* to Section 106 documents prepared for or by; the local government? *Projects requiring Section 106 review typically involve staff processing an initial study leading to a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration. Staff makes recommendations to the Board, Planning Commission, or City Council. If the final decision rests with the Planning Commission or City Council, a recommendation by the Board is required. The Board has not yet reviewed a project involving a Section 106 review.*

What is the role of the staff and commission in *reviewing* Section 106 documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? Within the City of Chico jurisdiction, projects requiring Section 106 review are forwarded to the CLG Coordinator to provide comments, or to the Environmental Manager in the Department of Public Works for additional review and comments.

II. Establish an Adequate and Qualified Historic Preservation Review Commission by State or Local Legislation.

A. Commission Membership

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017)

Name	Professional Discipline	Date Appointed	Date Term Ends	Email Address
Thomas Thomson	Architect (semi-retired)	1/17	1/21	tltmat@sbcglobal.net
Sheryl Campbell- Bennet	Architectural Firm (Administrative Assistant)	1/15	1/19	smbchico@sbcglobal.net
Georgie Bellin	Economics and Real Estate	1/15	1/21	skycreekranch1@yahoo.com
Dan Irving	Business consultant (Historic Property)	1/15	1/21	danielnirving@yahoo.com
Rod Jennings	Instrument & Control Systems Field Engineer	2/15	1/19	roddenjames@yahoo.com

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all members.

- 1. If you do not have two qualified professionals on your commission, explain why the professional qualifications not been met and how professional expertise is otherwise being provided. *4 of the 5 members meet CLG requirements.*
- 2. If all positions are not currently filled, why is there a vacancy, and when will the position will be filled? **There are currently no vacancies all positions are filled.**

B. Staff to the Commission/CLG staff

1. Is the staff to	your commission the same a	s vour CLG coordinator?	∠ Yes	
--------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-------	--

2. If the position(s) is not currently filled, why is there a vacancy? The position is filled

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for staff.

Name/Title	Discipline	Dept. Affiliation	Email Address
Bruce Ambo	Principle Planner	City of Chico Community	Bruce.ambo@chicoca.gov
		Development Department	-

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017)

C. Attendance Record

Please complete attendance chart for each commissioner and staff member. Commissions are required to meet four times a year, at a minimum. If you haven't met at least four times, explain why not.

Commissioner/Staff	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
Thomas Thomson		\boxtimes	\boxtimes		\boxtimes		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes			\boxtimes
Sheryl Campbell-Bennet	\boxtimes											
Georgie Bellen							\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes			\boxtimes
Dan Irving							\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes		\boxtimes	
Rod Jennings		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes		\boxtimes	\boxtimes	\boxtimes			\boxtimes

D. Training Received

Indicate what training each commissioner and staff member has received. Remember it is a CLG requirement is that all commissioners and staff to the commission attend at least one training program relevant to your commission each year. It is up to the CLG to determine the relevancy of the training.

Commissioner/Staff Name	Training Title & Description (including method presentation, e.g., webinar, workshop)	Duration of Training	Training Provider	Date
Thomas Thomson	Guide for Advisory Bodies	8 hours	Jurassic Parliament	11/02/17
Sheryl Campbell-Bennet	Guide for Advisory Bodies	8 hours	Jurassic Parliament	11/02/17
Georgie Bellen	Guide for Advisory Bodies	8 hours	Jurassic Parliament	11/02/17
Dan Irving	Guide for Advisory Bodies	8 hours	Jurassic Parliament	11/02/17
Rod Jennings	Guide for Advisory Bodies	8 hours	Jurassic Parliament	11/02/17

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017)

III. Maintain a System for the Survey and Inventory of Properties that Furthers the Purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act

A. Historical Contexts: initiated, researched, or developed in the reporting year (excluding those funded by OHP)

NOTE: California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results, including historic contexts, to OHP. If you have not done so, submit a copy (PDF or link if available online) with this report.

Context Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted to OHP
City of Chico Historic	Survey of over 260 properties, with context statement	Implementation of local HPO.	11/29/11 (originally submitted w/CLG Application

B. New Surveys or Survey Updates (excluding those funded by OHP)

NOTE: The evaluation of a single property is not a survey. Also, material changes to a property that is included in a survey, is not a change to the survey and should not be reported here.

Survey Area	Context Based- yes/no	Level: Reconnaissance or Intensive	Acreage	# of Properties Surveyed	Date Completed	Date Submitted to OHP
No new survey during reporting period.						

How are you using the survey data? The survey originally submitted with Chico's CLG Application is used in the implementation of the HPO.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017)

C. Corrections or changes to Historic Property Inventory

Property	Additions/Deletions to	Status Code Change	Reason	Date of Change
Name/Address	Inventory	From _ To_		
618 W. 5 th Street	COD approved 11/18/15	Inventory not yet changed	Unofficially – demolition by neglect	Not yet demolished as of date of this report

IV. Provide for Adequate Public Participation in the Local Historic Preservation Program

A. Public Education

What public outreach, training, or publications programs has the CLG undertaken? How were the commissioners and staff involved? Please provide copy of (or an electronic link) to all publications or other products not previously provided to OHP.

Item or Event	Description	Date
Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board Meeting	The Board provided an overview of its roles and responsibilities to a group of 30 CSU Chico students and interested members of the public	09/06/17

V. Additional Information for National Park Service Annual Products Report for CLGs (certified before October 1, 2016)

NOTE: OHP will forward this information to NPS on your behalf. **Please read** "Guidance for completing the Annual Products Report for CLGs" located http://www.nps.gov/clg/2015CLG GPRA/FY2014 AnnualReportGuidance-May2015.docx.

A. CLG Inventory Program

What is the new cumulative number of historic properties in your inventory as of September 30, 2017. How many historic properties did your local government **add** to the CLG inventory? This is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or your best estimate of the number) added to your inventory **from all programs**, local, state, and Federal, during the reporting year. These might include National Register, California Register, California Historic Landmarks, locally funded surveys, CLG surveys, and local designations.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017)

Program area	Number of Properties added
No new properties added to the inventory during report period	the
B. Local Register (i.e., Local Landmarks and H	listoric Districts) Program
	6 - September 30, 2017) did you have a local register program to create similar list of designations) created by local law? \square Yes \square No
If the answer is yes, then how many proper 2016? <i>None</i>	rties have been added to your register or designated since October 1,
 C. Local Tax Incentives Program 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 201 such as the Mills Act? Yes □ No 	6 - September 30, 2017) did you have a Local Tax Incentives Program,
(The City of Chico currently administers (10)) Mills Act Contracts)
If the answer is yes, how many properties h 2017?	nave been added to this program from October 1, 2016 to September 30,
Name of Program Number of Properties A	•
None	
D. Local "bricks and mortar" grants/loan prog	ram
	16 - September 30, 2017) did you have a local government historic rehabilitating/restoring historic properties? ☐Yes ☒No

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017)

2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been assisted under the program(s) from October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017?

Name of Program	Number of Properties that have Benefited
N/A	

E. Design Review/Local Regulatory Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2016 September 30, 2017) did your local government have a historic preservation regulatory law(s) (e.g., an ordinance) authorizing Commission and/or staff review of local government projects or impacts on historic properties?

 ☑ Yes □ No
- 2. If the answer is yes, how many historic properties did your local government review for compliance with your local government's historic preservation regulatory law(s) from October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017? Approximately 16 projects. All the projects were exempt from Board review pursuant to CMC 19.37.120 and were administratively reviewed by Staff.

F. Local Property Acquisition Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2016 September 30, 2017) did you have a local program to acquire (or help to acquire) historic properties in whole or in part through purchase, donation, or other means? ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been assisted under the program(s) from October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016?

Name of Program	Number of Properties that have Benefited
N/A	

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017)

VII. In addition to the minimum CLG requirements, OHP is interested in a Summary of Local Preservation Programs

- A. What are your most critical preservation planning issues? Adjusting to staff changes to maintain the City's high-quality historic preservation program.
- B. What is the single accomplishment of your local government this year that has done the most to further preservation in your community? *Maintain program continuity by reviewing program details and requirements and establishing 2018 training and outreach goals.*
- C. What recognition are you providing for successful preservation projects or programs? The City works closely with the Chico Heritage Association (CHA) in selecting preservation awards on their behalf.
- D. How did you meet or not meet the goals identified in your annual report for last year? The City met its goals by appointing a new CLG coordinator and maintaining the program's reporting and compliance requirements.
- E. What are your local historic preservation goals for 2016-2017? **Provide on-going training to staff/Board and provide public outreach related to historic preservation.**
- F. So that we may better serve you in the future, are there specific areas and/or issues with which you could use technical assistance from OHP? *Provide OHP training in Chico for the benefit surrounding jurisdictions such as Butte County, City of Biggs, City of Oroville, City of Gridley, etc.*
- G. In what subject areas would you like to see training provided by the OHP? How you like would to see the training delivered (workshops, online, technical assistance bulletins, etc.)?

Training Needed or Desired	Desired Delivery Format
Provide an update on new legislation and requirements as they relate to CLGs and historic preservation. Training for new members and refreshers for existing members on the principals and practice of historic preservation and design review.	Workshops, videos, webinars or on-line training

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017)

	H. Would you be willing to host a training working workshop in cooperation with OHP?	⊠Yes	□ No
	I. Is there anything else you would like to share with OHP? Thank you for your patience	and ongoing	support.
(II. A	ttachments_		
	Resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all commission members/alterna	tives and staff	
	☐ Minutes from commission meetings		
	☐ Drafts of proposed changes to the ordinance		
	☐ Drafts of proposed changes to the General Plan		
	Public outreach publications		

Email to <u>Lucinda.Woodward@parks.ca.gov</u>