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"Coming of Age in South Park" is about my involvement in an urban renewal project for the physically decaying, lower income, multi-racial neighborhood of South Park, in the city of Santa Rosa where I live.

I trace my personal involvement in the project from what I originally thought to be only a one semester project for a class that I was taking, through my continued involvement which led to a full two and a half year commitment on my part in which I became deeply involved in the neighborhood.

During this time I became a fully participating member of the local South Park Project Area Committee (PAC) which is a citizens group that advises the Santa Rosa City Council and the Housing and Redevelopment Agency in regards to the neighborhoods urban renewal project.

While a member of this committee, I volunteered to work for two days per week without pay at the Housing and Redevelopment Agency to gain experience in the urban renewal and public housing fields. I hoped to use this training and experience to find a professional position in this area in the San Francisco Bay Area.

After approximately four months of working primarily as an administrative assistant I was hired as a part time
employee with the title of maintenance man (although I rarely
did this type of work) because it was explained to me that
this was the only position open at that time. This job was
later expanded into a full time position with the same title.

I worked (at the previously mentioned position) for
about three months hoping to achieve a professional level
position that was being created under the Housing Authority.
What happened next completely shocked and surprised me.

The executive director of the Agency requested that
I resign from the neighborhood committee or resign from my
job because the Agency's attorney believed that I could be
in a conflict of interest. Because I did not agree with
this allegation I refused to resign from either post, and I
was subsequently fired from my job. Several weeks after my
termination I discovered what appeared to be a conspiracy by
both the executive director and the PAC Chairman to make it
appear that I had actually resigned.

About eight months after being terminated I resigned
from the PAC because of changes in the committee By-laws
which allowed the PAC Chairman unprecedented power to maneu­
er the organization virtually as a one-man ruler.

The contentions outlined in this Preface are sup­
ported in the thesis as the author traces his experiences,
first in a description of the South Park neighborhood to the
original federal urban renewal program for the neighborhood;
then its evolution into the Community Development program; and further into the actual social structuring of the Project Area Committee (as viewed within its own neighborhood, as well as by other neighborhoods, and by local political figures); and finally a summation of my personal convictions as I evolved from being a novice in the arena of neighborhood and small town politics to my present personal position of being wary of the naivety that makes up so many grass roots political organizations.
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Chapter 1

SOUTH PARK

The South Park neighborhood is a 133 acre community located in the city of Santa Rosa about one mile south of Santa Rosa's downtown area. Geographically it is bounded on the north by Bennett Valley Road, on the east by Hendley Street and the Sonoma County Fairgrounds, on the west by Petaluma Hill Road which serves as South Park's commercial center, and on the south by the southern-most property lines of Aston Avenue. (See Appendix No. 1.)

As an older residential neighborhood South Park is characterized by narrow streets with no curbs or sidewalks, open drainage ditches, and poor street lighting. Many of the homes are in dire need of repair or replacement. South Park also has some of the smallest lots in the city as well as a number of lots that are one-half acre to an acre in size.

Although South Park is surrounded by urban development, it is very common to see many vegetable gardens as well as chickens, ducks, and an occasional goat, cow or horse in several of the backyards. There are many large shade trees in the neighborhood that tend to diminish the harshness of it's most obvious problem which is physical decay.
Along with this physical decay South Park faces many other problems. Drugs, crime, racial barriers, language barriers, and juvenile delinquency are present in South Park. All these problems tend to compound the need to rehabilitate South Park which is known to many who live outside of the neighborhood and to some that live in the neighborhood as a "slum" or "ghetto."

Few neighborhoods in Santa Rosa has as great of need for the redevelopment of its housing stock as does South Park. In the Executive Summary of the Housing Action Plan for the city of Santa Rosa it was found that:

The one area in the city requiring the installation of major public improvements is the South Park neighborhood. Its lack of adequate storm drainage, sanitary sewers, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, and standard roadways makes it a prime target for such activities.

Although much work has been accomplished to date providing improvements as noted above, it is important for the potential developers within the area and the existing residents of the community to have continuing public off-site improvements if new construction activities are to be feasible.

Already it can be seen that South Park is in very poor physical shape. The lack of decent streets, sidewalks, curbs, gutters, etc., tell about this aspect but mention nothing of the social conditions that exist in the neighborhood.

Information on this subject is provided in the "Community Profile Section of the Social Element of the city of Santa Rosa," which was compiled by utilizing the statistical quartile method and uses a comparative tract grid analysis. This method divides various areas in the city of
Santa Rosa by census tract and compares them one to another. The rating system provided, ranks the most favorable conditions as "number one;" whereas the least favorable conditions is "number four."

Of the approximately twenty census tracts that are totally or partially in the city, South Park (Census Tract 1514) showed to have the least favorable conditions in the combined areas of: Income, Employment, Housing, and Crime. Three other census tracts showed a similar rating, but South Park was the only area which presents the least favorable conditions in all four of the mentioned areas when taken individually.

Additional information about the people of South Park was collected from the 1975 Mid-Decade Census (See Appendix No. 2) conducted by the county of Sonoma for the California State Department of Finance. This Mid-Decade Census was conducted by the state due to the obsolescence of information provided in the 1970 federal census. The rapid increase in population which has occurred in many parts of California, such as Sonoma County, in the five years following the 1970 federal census. The main concern of the states census was to gather data concerning population and housing statistics. These statistics are necessary to insure that the state of California can make the necessary decisions on revenue sharing and funding programs provided by the federal government and be assured that it gets its fair share of these resources.
Questions which were asked on the survey addressed the following areas: employment status, occupation, transportation, housing cost, ethnicity, income, and residence migration. These questions and the answers received are a valuable tool in understanding the people who make up the community of South Park.

This census survey was conducted in the fall of 1974. There were 447 responding households. Appendix No. 3 shows the types of housing that were found in the survey area and Appendix No. 4 shows the age breakdown on the people living in South Park.

The following are the eight questions asked on the survey with comparisons of South Park to Santa Rosa and Sonoma County in the areas of race and income. Percentages are rounded off to the nearest hundredth.

Question No. 1

To what area does the primary wage earner commute?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>0. No response</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>1. Santa Rosa</td>
<td>73.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2. Petaluma</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3. Healdsburg, Cloverdale, north county</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4. Sebastopol, river area, west county</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5. Sonoma, east county</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6. Rohnert Park, Cotati, Penn-grove</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7. Marin County</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8. Napa, Vallejo</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>R. Computer reject</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statistics demonstrate that 73% of those who answered work in Santa Rosa while approximately 8% work elsewhere in the county and 3% work out of the county.

Question No. 2

What is the occupation of the secondary wage earner?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0. No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1. Professional, technical and kindred workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>2. Managers and administrators except for farm workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3. Sales workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4. Clerical and kindred workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>5. Operatives including transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>6. Other blue collar workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>7. Farm workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>8. Service workers other than private service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>9. Private service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>86.35</td>
<td>B. Blank—no secondary wage earner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty-six percent reported no secondary wage earner which is about 11% higher than the 75% average in the city of Santa Rosa, which may be due to the higher number of single heads of household in South Park.

Question No. 3

To what area does the secondary wage earner commute?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0. No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>1. Santa Rosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2. Petaluma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3. Healdsburg, Cloverdale, north county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>4. Sebastopol, river area, west county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>5. Sonoma, east county</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Question No. 4
What is the primary means of transportation for adult members of this household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>0. No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>68.01</td>
<td>1. Private auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>2. Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3. Bicycle or walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4. Combination of auto and bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>5. Combination of auto and bicycle or walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>6. Combination of bus and bicycle or walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>7. Car pooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>8. Cab or jitney (mini-bus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>9. Handicapped with no available means of transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>R. Computer reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question No. 5
Has this household moved within the last 5 years? If yes, from what area did you move?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>0. No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>48.77</td>
<td>1. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>2. Elsewhere in Sonoma County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>3. Marin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4. Napa/Solano County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>5. San Francisco/Alameda County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>6. Other South Bay Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>7. Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>8. Other California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>9. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>R. Computer reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question No. 6

Do you own or rent? Which category best describes the total monthly rent or house payment? (Include mortgage, tax, and insurance; exclude maintenance and utilities.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>0. No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>1. Rent-less than $100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>30.42</td>
<td>2. Rent-$100 to $149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>3. Rent-$150 to $199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>4. Rent-$200 to $249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>5. Rent-$250 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>6. Own-$150 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>7. Own-$150 to $200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>8. Own-$200 to $250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>9. Own-$250 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>R. Computer reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As demonstrated above, 60% of the people in South Park are renters and of those that rent, 43.39% pay less than $150 per month, 14.52% pay from $150 to $199, and only 2.25% rent for more than $200. Surprising to me was the fact that of those who are purchasing homes (21.47%) almost 17% are paying $150 or less per month and only 4.69 are paying more than $150 per month for their mortgages.

Question No. 7

Which category best describes the racial or ethnic identity of this household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>0. No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>59.95</td>
<td>1. White/Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>2. Black/NEGRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>3. Chicano/Mexican-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>4. Other Latin American (includes Porto Rican, Cuban, Central and South American)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
South Park is generally acknowledged to have a high percentage of minorities living in the community. When compared to the entire population of Sonoma County and to the total population of the city of Santa Rosa, it is clear that the South Park neighborhood has the highest concentration of ethnic minorities in the county of Sonoma. No other city or incorporated area in Sonoma County has as high a percentage of blacks as does South Park. Of the total population (approximately 1,220 people) 11.85% are Blacks. In contrast, the city of Rohnert Park, which has the next highest percentage of Blacks per total population, has only 1.61% of its population identified as being Black. The racial comparison of South Park to Santa Rosa and Sonoma County is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>South Park</th>
<th>Santa Rosa</th>
<th>Sonoma County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>59.95%</td>
<td>84.66%</td>
<td>84.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Negro</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Mexican-American</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question No. 8

Which category of income best describes this household's total income from all sources in 1974?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>49.44</td>
<td>0. No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>1. $2,500 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>2. $2,500 to $4,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>3. $5,000 to $7,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>4. $8,000 to $10,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5. $11,000 to $14,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>6. $15,000 to $19,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>7. $20,000 to $24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>8. $25,000 to $49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>9. $50,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>R. Computer reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately half of the respondents chose not to answer this personal question. However of those that did answer, a large portion (14.10%) have annual incomes of $2,500 or less, 21.92% have incomes from $2,500 to $8,000 per year, whereas only 13.21% have an income of more than $8,000 per year. The comparison of income levels of South Park to Santa Rosa and Sonoma County are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>South Park</th>
<th>Santa Rosa</th>
<th>Sonoma County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>49.44%</td>
<td>36.03%</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 or less</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 to $8,000</td>
<td>21.92%</td>
<td>15.99%</td>
<td>18.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,000 or more</td>
<td>13.21%</td>
<td>41.16%</td>
<td>41.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above South Park has double the combined percentage of Santa Rosa and Sonoma County together for people who have $2,500 or less income per year. While South Park has a larger percentage of its population in the $2,500 to $8,000 per year range, it had two-thirds less percentage wise in the $8,000 per year or more categories.
There is no current information available that shows what percentage of the population of South Park receives its income from retirement pensions, social security, or public assistance of some sort, but the number must be fairly high when 36% of the neighborhood's total (responding) population have incomes of $8,000 or less per year.

Low incomes, large numbers of minorities living in delapidated housing and the conditions found in these areas like high crime, drugs, and overcrowding all have contributed to conditions in South Park that show a need to rehabilitate the neighborhood.

One development along this line happened in 1970 when a group of property owners and residents of the South Park neighborhood approached the city of Santa Rosa to get the city to start an urban renewal project in South Park. The ensuing chapters tell of this process and the program that eventually came about.
The South Park Improvement Committee was made up of a group of people who were residents and property owners involved or interested in upgrading the housing conditions in South Park. The committee and other people in the neighborhood were concerned about the future of South Park and its continuing deterioration. Members of this group of people approached City Hall during the summer of 1970 seeking advice about whether or not South Park could become involved in some type of an urban renewal program similar to the one that was currently being carried out in the downtown area at that time.

On February 2, 1971, a meeting at City Hall was held between city officials and the committee. The purpose of the meeting was a discussion of the possibility of a renewal project for South Park with some 15 officials from the federal government Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) who had also been invited to attend.

The group took an extensive tour through the South Park neighborhood and came away with the opinion that South Park had the potential to become a revitalized area. Weilan Potts, HUD's equal opportunity specialist, said that from
his tour of South Park he saw "north Richmond, west Berkeley, and a little of Watts." All of these areas had similar problems to South Park's and at that time those areas were all involved in various urban renewal projects. The HUD officials stated that with a successful renewal effort South Park "could become a showplace of what the city and community leaders can accomplish through cooperation, exchange of ideas, good planning and timing." Because two-thirds of South Park was at that time in the county and one-third in the city, it would be difficult to have a total neighborhood redevelopment project. Julian Fitzhugh, a program director for the HUD San Francisco office discussed several possible ways that the entire South Park neighborhood could become involved in a renewal project. He proposed the immediate annexation by the city of Santa Rosa of that part which was in the county, or for the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors to declare themselves (or one of their departments) a redevelopment agency. Such action by the county would primarily be a paper term only. This declaration would then legally permit the county to sign a joint powers agreement with the city of Santa Rosa to in effect carry out the redevelopment project. If the second route was chosen, such an agreement would allow Santa Rosa to make an application to HUD for a 100% federally funded feasibility study of South Park. The study's purpose would be to analyze the needs, problems, and the costs of a redevelopment program for the neighborhood. Such a study
would be undertaken by a federally paid consultant who would submit the findings to the San Francisco HUD office for its review and analysis. HUD's findings would then be made available to Santa Rosa and Sonoma County public officials to study and to make the decision locally whether to become involved in an urban redevelopment project in South Park.8

Upon the acceptance of a redevelopment program by local officials, South Park would be eligible for funding for new public improvements such as streets, curbs, sidewalks, gutters, new sewer and water mains, etc. The possibilities of subsidized housing was also discussed.

More specifically, according to Horace Hansen, a housing rehabilitation expert with HUD, following an on-site inspection of the residential structures in the South Park area, 30% to 40% of the homes would be in a questionable category when it came to rehabilitating them. Many would have to be removed and the occupants relocated. Of those that could be rehabilitated, Mr. Hansen stated that "We'll come from HUD with 3% loans to a maximum of $17,000 and outright gifts of $3,500, non-repayable for the rehabilitation of homes."9

A renewal project in the South Park neighborhood would also require a federally mandated Project Area Committee (PAC) consisting of project residents and property owners. The purpose of which would be to allow maximum participation by neighborhood residents in the planning of the project. An office would be located within the project
boundaries to provide contact with the residents and to hold FAC and other related meetings. There was the possibility that a separate staff might even be hired by the FAC to maintain the office and be paid for out of project funds. 10

Because the County Board of Supervisors chose not to participate in a renewal project for South Park, it was left up to the city to annex the neighborhood if a renewal project was to succeed. City officials explained to the South Park group that they would help them, but it was up to the property owners and residents to decide by the electoral process whether they would become part of the city of Santa Rosa.

Faced with the fact that if they were not annexed into the city there would be no redevelopment project for them, a group of residents who wanted the project decided to make an all out effort to be annexed. Led by Quincy King Sr., a longtime South Park resident, the group decided to develop a preliminary redevelopment plan with the help of the City Planning Department and Urban Renewal Agency staffs. The plan would show how the group would like to see South Park upgraded in the areas of housing, public improvements, and other area features. The plan would be presented to the people of South Park showing them what could be accomplished if the area was annexed into the city of Santa Rosa and became a redevelopment project. Since city officials as well as San Francisco HUD officials committed themselves to a redevelopment project, it was explained to the people of...
South Park that a vote for annexation would in essence be a vote for a project that would entail the rehabilitation of housing, streets, curbs, sidewalks, and other physical amenities that was promised the neighborhood.

An application for the annexation of South Park was made to the Sonoma County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) by the city of Santa Rosa. LAFCO is the official county agency that regulates the formation of all special assessment districts in the county as well as all annexations by existing cities of county governed properties. This process allows the county to determine if an annexation of a given area will adversely affect the remaining areas special districts.

As an example, Oak Park is a neighborhood in a larger area known as Acorn Village, which is located adjacent to the city of Oz. Acorn Village received fire protection from the XYZ special fire district. Oak Park pays for 80% of the financing of that district through property taxes. If Oak Park were then annexed to the city of Oz, which has its own municipal fire district, and would then serve Oak Park too, then Acorn Village would lose its fire protection because of its inability to make up the 80% that Oak Park had formally been paying.

The decision that an agency such as LAFCO would have to make would be, if it was to allow Oak Park to be annexed into the city of Oz, how would Acorn Village then maintain its fire protection? Possible solutions might be for Acorn
Village's fire district to combine with, or contract to, another fire district for fire protection, or else to pay the city of Oz to provide fire protection. Another possible decision would be it may not be beneficial at this time for Acorn Village to allow Oak Park to be annexed to Oz.

On the matter of Santa Rosa's proposal to annex South Park, and how it would affect South Park's special districts, C. Lawrence Andrew, the Executive Officer of Sonoma County's IAFCO, wrote to his agency board members on January 28, 1972, this following comment:

The city of Santa Rosa has applied for this (South Park) annexation in order that this area may be eligible for HUD Neighborhood Development Program funds. Present federal regulations prohibit the funding of this type of program in unincorporated areas. The Neighborhood Development Program differs from other redevelopment projects, which are often characterized by the razing of an entire area before construction begins, in that an inventory of existing residences is compiled with the result that those structures which met building codes and are deemed acceptable living quarters, are retained. Structures not conforming to building codes may be either rehabilitated with federal funds or removed, to be replaced by the construction of low cost housing. The use of this type of redevelopment program, in conjunction with the present availability of existing vacant land suitable for immediate housing construction, will result in a minimum need for relocation of those who presently reside in this area.

Mr. Andrew also stated that a result of the South Park annexation into the city of Santa Rosa would be a financial loss to the four special districts now serving the area.
South Park's contribution to the following special districts by a percentage of their total separate tax bases are as follows: 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special District</th>
<th>Percent of Tax Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roseland Fire Protection District</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue Fire Protection District</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park Sanitation District</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park Lighting District</td>
<td>36.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even with the financial loss to the above mentioned districts, Mr. Andrew felt that the overall benefits to be gained by the South Park community brought about by a rehabilitation project would be an overriding factor in his recommendation that the city of Santa Rosa be allowed to annex South Park. The IAFCO board agreed with Mr. Andrew and this decision opened up the way for South Park to become a part of the city of Santa Rosa and have an urban renewal program provided the annexation was voted in by the residents of South Park.

Because there was no objection from IAFCO, the Santa Rosa Planning Commission placed South Park in a "S" (Study) District which is a pre-zoning classification for areas to be annexed by the city. The "S" zoning which had a one year limitation, gave the Planning Department time to study South Park and upon annexation, the Planning Department would make a final zoning recommendation to the city council. The Planning Commission also gave its staff permission to help the residents of South Park prepare a general master plan for the area that would contain existing and proposed land uses and precise zoning plans for the neighborhood.
After working for three and a half months with the assistance of the Planning Department and the Urban Renewal Agency, neighborhood residents after having formed a Project Area Committee (PAC) completed a preliminary neighborhood development proposal during the last week of May 1972.

The annexation election was set for June 14, 1972, and an all out effort by the PAC and Urban Renewal staff was made to present the general (master) plan to the residents of South Park. The plan covered all of South Park including the area which was already located in the city limits. The plan showed a low density residential use for the neighborhood's core area, a strip of commercial use along Petaluma Hill Road, a park on Hendley Street between Pressley Street and Aston Avenue and a horseshoe-shaped band of medium density residential use along Bennett, Aston and Rutledge Avenue. (See Appendix No. 5.)

A successful voter registration drive concluded with in getting approximately 450 people registered. Seminars were held explaining the proposed plan and block captains were elected to help assure that every registered person voted.

At a meeting just prior to the election, residents again heard presentations by various city staff and PAC members describing the benefits of rehabilitation. Besides the low interest rehabilitation loans, and outright grants, other benefits would be derived according to spokespersons. New streets, sidewalks, curbs, gutter, etc., would be
constructed without an area assessment district. Already the city had earmarked $200,000 for work in those areas if annexed. Residents would be protected by the Santa Rosa Police Department and placed on a regular patrol "beat" rather than the sporadic protection offered by the County Sheriff's office. Neighborhood residents could save from $40 to $50 per year on their fire insurance premiums because they would be living within city limits which would make them eligible for lower rates. The city's leash law for dogs would become effective for controlling loose dogs. Also the city would introduce its annual weed abatement program and would encourage residents to clean up their litter as well. Members from a Sacramento PAC were also at the meeting and told the residents of South Park how their Neighborhood Development Project (NDP) had helped them to revitalize their neighborhood.

The annexation vote held on June 14, 1972, drew a 42% voter turnout (South Park's highest until the 71% turnout for the June 1976 primary) and 81% voted for annexation. The people who had worked for several years to get a renewal project for South Park were overjoyed. Finally, financial help was coming for their neighborhood. The city of Santa Rosa proceeded with the application to HUD for the neighborhood study and a redevelopment project was initiated in South Park in the summer of 1972. Final acceptance of the redevelopment plan
came in October of 1972 with passage of ordinance number 1604 by the Santa Rosa City Council and the Urban Renewal Agency Resolution Number 601.

The city drew up and submitted an application to the HUD Area Office in San Francisco, and what happened next was a surprise to everyone. It was learned that even though NDP's were being phased out nationally at that time, the HUD officials assured Santa Rosa that there would be funding for an NDP in South Park. Following HUD's acceptance of the application, the San Francisco office received word from the main office in Washington, D.C. that there wouldn't be any further money available for any new NDP's!

To say the least the South Park neighborhood were shocked and disappointed. During 1971 and 1972, all Categorical Redevelopment Programs (NDP's, Model Cities, Urban Renewal) were frozen on a national level to be replaced by the soon to be enacted Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The purpose of this was to give more control to local governments.

Gerald Poznanovich, an ex-mayor of Santa Rosa and a councilman at that time who had served as the council liaison to South Park, wrote a letter to the Washington D.C. HUD office expressing his view that Santa Rosa was being treated unfairly by being denied NDP money for South Park after it had been promised funding. HUD stated no funds would be forthcoming and all hope seemed lost. South Park
might have to wait possibly one or two years for the new Community Development Act to take effect in order to get any money for a neighborhood development project.

As luck would have it 1972 was an election year. George Romney, then Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, was campaigning for President Richard M. Nixon in Napa, California, and was persuaded by former Santa Rosa Mayor Reyerson, (then chairman of the Sonoma County Central Republican Committee) to come to Santa Rosa and give a brief noon time speech. Poznanovich met with Secretary Romney to discuss the situation about the South Park NDP to him. Because Romney did not have enough time to talk to him, Poznanovich insisted that he drive with Romney to the county airport north of Santa Rosa where Secretary Romney was to catch a flight to the Bay Area. During this time Poznanovich put (some not too subtle) pressure on Secretary Romney to commit himself to the funding of the South Park project. Finally Romney said that HUD would fund South Park. Not satisfied Poznanovich pressed for a date that the funding would be officially announced. Mr. Romney said that Jim Price from the San Francisco HUD office would announce it. With the help of United States Republican Congressman Donald Clausen, Poznanovich and other Santa Rosa officials pursued the funding matter. On January 15, 1973, about three months after the Romney promise, city officials were notified by Congressman Clausen that Santa Rosa had been awarded a grant of $400,000 for the NDP project. Although
this amount was about half of what was originally requested, the acceptance of the project by the federal government assured the project that it would get additional funding under the new law which provided for the continuation of funding for projects that were not completed. South Park was one of a very limited number of new NDt's to be funded in 1973 which was the last full year of NDt funding. (See Appendix No. 6 for summary.)

The $400,000 first year grant combined with the required "local share" (in the form of promised new physical improvements) from the city, county, and the county water agency allowed for the development of the master plan, the start up administration costs, and the first year NDt activities.

The first Target Area for redevelopment in South Park involved the extension of Hendley Street from Frazier Street to Aston Avenue which would allow motorists to drive around the residential heart of the neighborhood substantially decreasing traffic through this area.

Street improvements along Petaluma Hill Road's commercial strip were paid for by the county, the city, and the county water agency. This project involved the undergrounding of all overhead utility lines, and the widening of the entire street from where it joins Santa Rosa Avenue (on the north) to the city limits on the south. Sidewalks were constructed on both sides of the street and new street lighting was installed. Funds were also included for the acquisition
of several substandard residential non-conforming dwellings in a commercial zone and as well as substandard dwelling units along the north side of Aston Avenue which would make way for federally subsidized senior citizen development of 47 units.

In addition a park was developed along Hendley Street which was connected to Petaluma Hill Road by a pedestrian and bicycle path on a street right of way that was never used. (See Appendix No. 7.)

The NDP was created by the federal government under the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. This was one of several "Great Society" programs in the urban renewal field associated with the Johnson Administration. The NDP was considered a relatively new program in 1972 as there were not very many of such programs in the state of California even though it was several years after the inception of the program in 1968.

The aim of an NDP was a neighborhood wide improvement program which would conserve as much of the original community as possible while at the same time upgrading it. The way in which this would be achieved would be to improve the physical and social conditions in the neighborhood by increasing the supply of sound housing, providing new infrastructures and by creating job opportunities whenever possible for the neighborhood residents. The NDP, through efforts of the PAC and Urban Renewal Agency staff, would also cooperate with other programs in the neighborhood, with city and
county agencies like the Housing Authority and county welfare, to more effectively approach the many problems facing South Park.

It was thought that the NDP project for South Park would take about five years through continual funding by the federal government to complete. An application for funds was to be resubmitted each year with the understanding that no new funds would be given unless the previous years funds were spent and that portion of the project completed.

Neighborhood surveys that were completed prior to the final adoption of the plan in October of 1972 showed that out of the 303 families interviewed by the Urban Renewal Agency staff, a substantial portion of the South Park neighborhood's population derived incomes from pensions or some type of public assistance.

This information has importance because it shows the level of how bad off a community is which often determines the amount of financial assistance it can receive from the federal government.

It is believed that the survey done by the Urban Renewal Agency staff and PAC members was considered to be the most complete survey ever done in South Park. However it should be pointed out that the worst points of the neighborhood were "promoted" more than it's good points, for perhaps obvious reasons.

For an example according to Stephen H. Watry, Director of the Santa Rosa Housing and Redevelopment Agency,
a "game" that communities were forced to play in order to get funding from the federal government was the one where "our area is worst than your area" game. This "game" was played because under the NDF law communities had to compete against each other for the available federal funds.

Decisions regarding how much an area would get were made in Washington D.C. Funding allocations that came into the regional office located in San Francisco for the northern part of the state of California were then divided into different areas for various projects.

In each of these areas there were still smaller areas that competed against each other for the available funds. As noted, communities (or neighborhoods) would be forced into playing the "mine is worse than yours is" game in order to get an allocation to finance their neighborhood projects.

Watry mentioned that during his employment with the Redevelopment Agency of Sacramento, California, where several NDF programs were going on, he had personally known of cases where newspaper clippings of muggings, stabbings, and robberies were routinely sent in along with applications for NDF funding to show the HUD area how bad things were.

Once the NDF programs were phased out on a national level South Park's NDF was officially closed out in May of 1976. Funding for the continuing redevelopment of the South Park project would have to come from the money received by
the city of Santa Rosa through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) process. The "close out" of the NDP has affected the redevelopment project in many ways both good and bad.

As previously mentioned South Park got its funding under the NDP by competing with other neighborhood programs in nearby cities and by convincing the HUD officials in San Francisco that it was at least as bad if not in worse condition than other neighborhoods. The way that the new Community Development (CD) program works is: the HUD office in San Francisco would grant a determined amount of funds to a city (such as Santa Rosa) which would set priorities as to what part of the city may have the highest needs.

Under CD funding, South Park competes against other neighborhoods or individual projects in Santa Rosa for funding. So far this process has worked well for South Park because it has been able to convince the people involved in the priority establishing process that South Park has the greatest need. Also city hall has backed up this claim along with the fact that local officials have reiterated that they feel committed to complete the South Park project.

South Park has received the largest portion of 3 years of CD funding, when compared to other projects. However when city hall or the other Santa Rosa neighborhoods drop their support for South Park, it could receive far less funding than it has in the past 3 years or possibly none at all.
Under NDF, funds could only be spent in the South Park neighborhood if its application for funding was accepted, each year by HUD. As far as the actual redevelopment plan for South Park is concerned, the change over of funding sources has not affected it at this date. Most of the things that could have been done under NDF funding can also be accomplished under CD funding.

The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program opened up a whole new way of doing things for South Park as well as the city of Santa Rosa.

Lawsuits by the score have been filed against the city of Santa Rosa because of the way the city originally intended to administer the CD funds.

Community groups that were never heard of before started to appear from out of nowhere in order to get a piece of the CD pie. Several of these groups that didn't receive any CD funds or received a smaller amount than they felt they deserved, threatened to sue the city. A rival shopping center developer and former mayor of Santa Rosa sued the city in a number of lawsuits also because of its attempts to use CD money to complete the downtown urban renewal project, which the developer felt was unfair competition.

Altogether the emergence of the CD Block Grant has produced some of the most exciting and challenging time for South Park and Santa Rosa. Locals grass roots politics are becoming very active in the CD process. Neighborhood groups that could never get people to talk to each other now have
these same people working on committees to seek CD funds to help improve their neighborhoods. Citizens are no longer as reluctant to remain quiet, and speak out about how city hall is planning for their future. It is now an accepted conclusion that a person can have some input into the governmental process, and help make it work for you instead of against you.

The ND program was a good start, however, it didn't reach out far enough to involve large numbers of people. Still the CD program has enabled a larger number of citizens to participate and become part of local government.
During the early 1970's many cities and counties, which were receiving funding from the federal government for various types of redevelopment projects, became aware that both HUD and Congress were working on a new type of legislation to replace (with a single program) the seven categorical grant-in-aid programs.* The details of the legislation were not known until a draft was published in the federal register during August, 1974. The Official publication of the new law (in November of 1974) was entitled "The Housing and Community Development Act (HCD) of 1974." According to a Summary of the Housing and Community Development Act, the primary objective of its Community Development section, which is the section that would continue to fund the South Park Redevelopment project, was:

...the development of viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities principally for persons of low and moderate income. This objective is to be achieved through the elimination of slums and blight and detrimental living conditions, conservation and expansion of housing and

---

housing opportunities, increased public services, improved use of land, increased neighborhood diversity, and preservation of property with special values. It is also the purpose of this title to further development of a national growth policy by consolidating certain programs into a system which
1) provides assistance annually with maximum certainty and minimum delay, 2) encourages community development activities consistent with local and area wide planning, 3) furthers achievement of the national housing goal, and 4) provides for coordination and mutually supportive housing and community development activities.

Passage by Congress of the new Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 significantly altered the federal government's role in a wide range of housing and community development activities. The new law contained these eight separate titles (sections):

Title I - Community Development (CD)
Title II - Assisted Housing
Title III - Mortgage Credit Assistance
Title IV - Comprehensive Planning
Title V - Rural Housing
Title VI - Mobile Home Construction and Safety Standards
Title VII - Consumer Home Mortgage Assistance
Title VIII - Miscellaneous

The type of redevelopment that existed in Santa Rosa, prior to adoption of the CD Act such as the Downtown Center project and the South Park NDP, would be funded under the CD portion of the new law through a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) which would be funded over a six year period according to provisions in the HCD Act. Practically all activities which were formally eligible under the categorical programs can be carried out under the CDBG funds.
The primary difference between the programs is that under the block grant program funding would go directly to the general-purpose local government (city or county) which is most responsible to the electorate and which has the broadest authority to deal with community development.

Instead of a local public entity making a separate application to the HUD area office for each project, just one combined application would be sent each year during the period that entity was funded under CD. Also the new law was different as it guaranteed that the entity would receive a certain amount of funding based on a formula to be discussed later. Knowing the amount of funding they were to receive enabled a local government to better plan programs for the future.

The formula referred to above is the object federal formula system which is a system under which all cities over 50,000 population (and most counties over 200,000) are entitled to a prescribed amount of funding based on a formula that takes into account population, overcrowding and poverty (weighed twice). In addition to this, cities that have already been involved in Urban Renewal and Model Cities Projects (regardless of size) would be entitled to complete their existing programs. There would also be a determined amount of money set aside on a national level to be divided between the different regional areas for all other cities under 50,000 in population, which would be distributed on a competitive basis.
The idea behind this approach was to take some of the pressure off the federal government and increase the responsibility of local governments particularly with respect to program planning, evaluation, and management. In addition the HCD Law was designed to increase a local government's flexibility in setting up priorities and carrying out CD funded activities, which could be designated anywhere within their jurisdiction to serve the needs of moderate and low income people or to meet other urgent CD needs.

One portion of the Act which local public entities particularly liked was there would be no contribution required by local or state governments as a condition to receive CD funds. The block grants would cover up to 100% of the eligible grant activities.

The funds were distributed on an 80/20 split with metropolitan areas (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area-SMSA) receiving 80% and non-metropolitan areas getting 20%. This split was further disseminated into two sections, "formula" funds and "hold-harmless" funds.

Formula funds, based on the objective federal formula of population, overcrowing, and poverty (weighted twice) would go to metropolitan cities according to their needs measured against those of other cities. These formula funds could exceed the amounts received under prior programs, but if the amount was more it would be phased in over a three year period. Urban counties would also be entitled to these funds (based on their needs) but only if they had
power to undertake essential CD and housing assistance activities by themselves or by agreement with another local government.

In addition to the formula funding that all metropolitan cities and urban counties would be entitled to, the cities and counties, which had been receiving a higher level of funding from programs prior to CD, would continue to receive that higher amount and be held harmless during the first three years of CD funding. Over the last three year period the excess would be phased out by one-third each year.

Cities and counties which had been receiving grants under the Model Cities Program would receive the full amount of any previous grant and would be held-harmless long enough to give the project the equivalent of five action years under that program. They would then receive a decreasing percentage of 80%, 60%, and then 40% of the full amount over a 3 year period after the project's fifth action year under the HCD Act.

Smaller communities that have Model Cities, Urban Renewal (including NDP) or code enforcement programs would receive the same hold-harmless designation even if they did not qualify for a formula entitlement.17

Under the above federal formula, Santa Rosa was entitled to $675,000 in CD funding each year for the six year period. Because Santa Rosa had both the downtown Urban Renewal project and the South Park NDP, it was entitled to additional funds under the hold-harmless rule. The total amount of funding that Santa Rosa would receive under the
first year of CD was $1,821,000. This was computed on the $675,000 entitlement, based on population, overcrowding, and poverty (weighted twice), plus an amount equal to the average of the funds spent under the previous categorical programs on the downtown project (for over a five year period) and the first year NDP funding for South Park.

Because Santa Rosa was to receive a higher allocation than its formula amount based on the hold-harmless clause, it would receive $1,821,000 for the first three years of the program with the amount then reduced to $1,430,000 (80%) for the fourth year, $1,056,000 (60%) the fifth year, and $673,000 (40%) the last year. Had it not been for South Park and the Downtown Project's, Santa Rosa would have received only the formula base amount of $675,000 per year for each of the six years. The additional CD funds allocated to Santa Rosa by these two projects, amounts to $8,630,000 for the six year period (compared to the $4,140,000 which Santa Rosa would have received without either of the projects.)

Citizen participation in the Community Development process is an inherent part of the Housing and Community Development Act. Inclusion of the citizen participation in the Act was intended by Congress to promote citizen input and interest in CD activities. It was hoped that citizen participation would enable the people most affected by CD projects to have a say in the planning stages of these
projects. These were the people who would be living in the project areas and would know better what would or wouldn't work in their communities.

A study financed by the Office of Policy Development and Research, US Department of Housing and Urban Development was concerned with determining to what extent citizen participation was already a part of local government in regards to the CD process. Two concerns were covered in the study as they related to citizen participation. The first concern was whether or not some type of citizen participation mechanism was already in existence in the cities surveyed and second was the actual level of citizen involvement in the decision making process. The study found that 95% of the formula entitlement cities (and 91% of the hold-harmless cities) currently had designated bodies established to provide citizen input through an advisory role in a variety of programs. However, it was found that "the fact that CD groups are designated does not necessarily mean that such groups are effective in determining program content or policy."20

During the first year of CD funding, 1975-76, the city of Santa Rosa developed a CD task force of city employees to make recommendations to the city council to set project priorities for the CDBG. The task force was made up of people from the city departments of Management, Planning, Attorney, Finance, Public Works, and the Urban Renewal Agency. No attempt was made at this time to include citizen
groups in the process except through several public hearings. The city felt that the majority of CD funds should go towards the completion of projects already under way, such as the Downtown Urban Renewal project and the South Park NDP. Members of the city council felt strongly that since these two projects brought Santa Rosa extra CD funds, then funding from the CD program in amounts equal to the amounts already being spent under the old programs on the projects should be allocated from the 1975-76 CD money.

It is possible the city may have felt that completion of the downtown project would be in jeopardy if a citizens committee was given the task of dividing up the CD money on a city wide basis. However to be fair, the council may have felt that since they were elected at large, they were truly the best representative group in Santa Rosa. This could be one reason why they took it upon themselves to appoint city staffers to a task force to make recommendations to the council for CD funding priorities for the 1975-76 CDBG.

The Community Development Task Force recommended $550,000 of the first year funding go to the downtown project for the acquisition, and demolition of buildings, as well as for the relocation of the residents, to be replaced by an already planned new shopping center. The Task Force also recommended that the South Park NDP receive $410,000 to carry on with its neighborhood redevelopment projects. Other projects were recommended to the council for funding
(up to the $1,821,000 limit) but none of which received a singular allocation which amounted to either the downtown or South Park project allocations.

Several public hearings were held by the CD Task Force to obtain citizen input. In time the meetings became somewhat heated with criticism being focused on why the city and its Task Force were not really involving citizen input except in a minimal way at these public hearings. The criticism was generated because the city decided to allocate $550,000 to the Downtown Project, which prompted several citizen organizations (as well as rival shopping center developer and former Santa Rosa mayor, Hugh Coddington) to file lawsuits against the city in order to prevent the CD funds from being spent on the Downtown Project. The citizen's groups didn't want the money to be spent downtown because they felt that the CD's primary purpose was to help moderate and low income people, and not to build shopping centers. Coddington didn't want the money spent downtown because he felt that the city was using federal tax dollars to unfairly subsidize southern California shopping center developer Ernest Hahn, who had been chosen by the city to build the downtown shopping center on the cleared urban renewal land. Altogether seventeen separate lawsuits were filed to stop the downtown project. As of this date the majority of the suits had either been dismissed or won by the city. However, two or three are undergoing court appeal at this time.
The 1975-76 CDBG funding recommendations by the CD Task Force were approved by the city council on May 13, 1975, and were subsequently submitted to the HUD Area Office in San Francisco for its review and approval. HUD granted approval of the application on June 27, 1975.

Implementation of the 1975-76 CDBG program would have begun in July of that year but, because of litigation which included a restraining order that prohibited the city and HUD from processing the application it was delayed one year. It is significant to note that because of this litigation, funding was frozen for more than a year delaying the projects. Once final court action was concluded on March 22, 1976, HUD and the city of Santa Rosa began to implement its 1975-76 CD program. Following is a list of the projects funded and a summary of the progress for each project approved as of the latest progress report on CD activities.

Status Report of the Community Development Block Grant Program for 1975-76 ($1,821,000)

A. Housing

1. Housing Action Plan ($40,000) - This plan was intended to provide updated information to the city of Santa Rosa about the city's housing conditions and needs and also to provide information on alternative types of programs to meet the identified needs. The Housing Action Plan was prepared by the Bartman-Aschman consulting firm. The plan was officially accepted on February 20, 1977, by
the council after having been circulated among city departments for review and comments. To date no action has been taken on any of the recommendations of the study.

2. **Housing Activities Administration ($40,000)** - Staff time of the Housing and Redevelopment Agency has been contracted to assist in expediting the development of new housing in the low and moderate income areas.

3. **Develop New Housing Sites ($200,000)** - This money was reallocated in the spring of 1976 along with additional funds from the 1975-76 CD budget by the city council to provide full street improvements along Aston Avenue in South Park. These improvements were needed to provide the necessary facilities to support the development of a 47 unit senior citizens low and moderate apartment complex.

B. **Planning**

1. **Community Services Delivery Plan ($50,000)** - This plan is supposed to assist the city in determining its social services role as well as develop programs (or coordinate efforts) to carry out these programs. This plan, which has been completed, was reviewed by the Community Relations Commission and will become part of the updated Santa Rosa General Plan.

C. **Neighborhood Studies**

1. **Junior College Neighborhood ($60,000)** - Funds have been set aside to implement traffic improvements as recommended
by neighborhood residents. These improvements may include improved pedestrian traffic through the development of walkways, traffic diverters, and traffic signals.

2. Burbank Gardens Neighborhood ($50,000) - A traffic signal was installed at the neighborhood's request at Tupper and E Streets. A pedestrian bike-way has also been constructed connecting Brown and Sonoma Avenues.

3. Westside Neighborhood ($20,000) - A neighborhood crosswalk signal was installed at the intersection of Dutton Avenue and Trowbridge Street.

D. South Park NDF

1. Acquisition of Substandard Properties including relocation and demolition activities ($410,000)

Acquisition of substandard, non-conforming structures is presently in progress by the Housing and Redevelopment Agency. Some of the properties have already been purchased and the people who lived in them have been relocated. As of this report there are approximately six individuals and eight families remaining in the 14 structures yet to be acquired.

E. Santa Rosa Center Project (Downtown Urban Renewal)

Acquisition, Relocation, Demolition Phase III ($550,000)

Updated appraisals were required due to the delay caused by the court injunction brought by the lawsuits. Acquisition of the property in the Phase III area of the downtown project has not been started yet because funds have not been available.
F. Citizens Participation ($40,000)

A Citizens Committee for Community Development was added to the 1976-77 CD process and this money was used to administer the CD program.

G. Handicap Workshop ($50,000)

This workshop was originally determined by HUD to be ineligible for CD funding from 1975-76 CDBG funds. The decision was appealed by Redwood Empire Industries and it became eligible again. By this time the organization moved its operations out of the city limits which made it ineligible again. They are now trying to get the property where they are now located annexed to the city.

H. Community Services Coordinator ($20,000)

The city hired a woman named Pat McWhorter for this position. The funds also include related office support expenses.

I. Day Care Center - Westside ($30,000)

The center has not yet come about because the residents of the area have not been able to obtain a location or agree on how it will be operated after the initial funding is gone.

J. Senior Service Center ($150,000)

The former South Park Elementary School which had been closed because it did not meet earthquake standards has been purchased for a senior center. An architect has been selected to prepare plans to renovate and upgrade the building.
K. Community Development Plan ($65,000)

This is a collection of information on environmental hazards such as flood areas, drainage, slides, earthquake faults, etc. This base data is being computerized and will be available as a planning tool.

L. Administration ($25,000)

These funds have been allocated to the Housing and Development Agency to administer the 1975-76 CD program.

M. Contingency ($41,000)

Originally $106,000 had been allocated to this item but portions of it were reallocated to other activities like the Aston Avenue street project and the citizens participation process.

N. Housing Assistance Plan (-0-)

This plan provides for the identification by the city of Santa Rosa of an annual goal of what it will seek in the way of housing assistance. The first year the city determined that it needed 275 units of the federal section 8 housing subsidy program. In South Park, 50 units are to be new construction (47 are now being built for seniors), 200 units are for subsidized existing rental units (135 were granted by HUD) and 25 units are to be rehabilitated (none have been to date).

Santa Rosa has sold municipal bonds in order to get money to complete the clearing of the land to provide space for the development of the new shopping center. Delays in the completion of the center is costing the taxpayers of
Santa Rosa $10,000 a day in increased construction costs and lost sales taxes according to Jim Burns, Executive Director of the Housing and Redevelopment Agency. Construction is planned to begin within two years if all goes right.

As stated above the number of lawsuits that were generated against the city, the council decided to change the method of allocating CD money to include more citizen input.

The new system which is called the Citizens Committee for Community Development has taken the place of the city staff Task Force in making recommendations for CD fund allocations.

The second year (76-77) and third year (77-78) CD recommendations by the committee have not yet been challenged by lawsuits. With a few exceptions the city has accepted the Citizens Committee recommendations. The Citizens Committee which acts in an advisory capacity to the council and does not have final say in CD funding matters has not recommended funding of the downtown project of any amount in its two years of existence.

In the first year of its existence the Citizens Committee for Community Development (CCCD) contained twenty-two organizations made up from a broad spectrum of the community. Low and moderate income neighborhoods were represented as well as such diverse organizations as the Associated Building Industry and Sonoma County Tomorrow, an environmental group.
City staff invited various organizations to participate while others asked to join. The CCCD held many work sessions from September 1975 to January 1976 to decide which of the projects presented by members of the committee, citizens at large and other groups not on the committee were to be funded. Many of the projects presented were not eligible under CD guidelines. The most difficult thing for the committee to do was to decide which programs would be recommended for funding under the Block Grant program of $1,821,000 (for that year) whereas over $6,000,000 in requests had been submitted.

The following list is the makeup of that committee as well as the number of representatives in each group:

1. Westside Neighborhood Committee (2)*
2. South Park Project Area Committee (2)
3. Burbank Gardens Neighborhood (2)
4. Junior College Neighborhood (2)
5. Westside Action Committee (1)
6. NAACP (1)
7. Handicap Organization (1)
8. Mayors Youth Council (1)
9. Chamber of Commerce (1)
10. Lincoln Manor (1)
11. National Indian Cultural Exchange (1)
12. Sonoma County Board of Realtors (1)
13. North Bay Human Development Corporation (1)
15. Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity (1)
16. Sonoma County Council on Aging (1)
17. Sonoma County Tomorrow (1)
18. United Community Development Corporation (1)
19. Apartment Owners Association (1)
20. Sonoma County American Indian Council (1)
21. League of Woman Voters (1)
22. Financial Sector (1)

The following is the list of projects and a summary of their progress for first year of citizens participation

*Neighborhood committees were allowed two representatives.
in the CCCD which was unanimously approved by this body for recommendation to the city council to be funded under the 1976-77 CDBG program funding. With little exception the council approved this request on April 6, 1976, and submitted it to the San Francisco HUD office for review and approval. HUD notified the city of July 6, 1976, that the application had been approved.

1976-77 Community Development Block Grant ($1,821,000)

A. Housing ($700,000)

The actual appropriation of these funds is to be determined by the city council in accordance with the policy they adopt regarding the Housing Action Plan which was funded under the first year CD application.

B. Facilities and Social Services

1. Burbank Gardens Neighborhood Park Land ($70,000)

This project is in the environmental review process. The appraisals will be ordered when this review is completed.

2. Westside Multipurpose Center ($340,000)

The environmental review has been completed and HUD has released the funds for this project. Problems have developed because the land was being donated by a bank which then rescinded the offer. Finally after political pressure by the city of Santa Rosa, the bank decided to donate the land again. Construction could begin anytime.
3. **Senior Center Equipment ($35,000)**

   This money is to equip the Senior Center that was funded by the 1975-76 CDBG.

C. **Planning**

1. **Citizen Participation Plan ($40,000)**

   These funds were used to implement and administer the 1977-78 Citizens Participation program.

D. **Area Improvements**

1. **Humboldt Street Park at Pacific Avenue ($30,000)**

   Currently in the environmental review process, appraisals will be ordered upon completion of the review.

2. **Foot Bridge at Kind Street ($15,000)**

   This project is in the construction process through the Public Works Department.

3. **Coordination and Utilization of Existing Public Facilities (-0-)**

   This project, which was approved as part of the application required no funds and there hasn't been any activity to date.

E. **Other**

1. **South Park Neighborhood Development Project (Community Development Project) ($460,000)**

   A portion of these funds was used to help reconstruct Aston Avenue. There has been no other activity to date under this year's funding, as an Environmental Impact Report has not been written yet, which is required for the total NDP project even though some portions could be done separately without the report.
F. Housing Assistance Plan

The goal for the 1976-77 CD year of 299 units of various types is as follows:

(1) 50 Section 8 - New Construction Rental Units
(2) 25 Section 8 - Rehabilitation of Rental Units
(3) 200 Section 8 - Existing Rental Units
(4) 24 Units of new single family homes for low and moderate income persons, (possibly under the FHA-235 program.)

It is possible that additional homes may be rehabilitated under the $700,000 allocated to the Housing Section, Part A of 1976-77 CDBG. This will depend on the council acting on its statement of February 20, 1977, about the rehabilitation of existing houses receiving the highest priority.

The Citizens Committee for Community Development for the 1977-78 CDBG year was expanded to include additional low and moderate income groups which were inadvertently overlooked in the first year of the CCCD. Several other groups also asked to be added to the committee. The expanded list of organizations and the number of their representatives are as follows:

1977-78 Citizens Committee for Community Development (CCCD)

1. Burbank Gardens Neighborhood (2)
2. Junior College Neighborhood (2)
3. Central District Neighborhood (2)
4. South Park Project Area Committee (2)
5. Valley Oak Park and Northwest Neighborhood (2)
6. Apartment Owners Association (1)
7. Lincoln Manor Homeowners Association (1)
8. National Indian Cultural Exchange (1)
9. Sonoma County Board of Realtors (1)
10. Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity (SPECO) (1)
With all present and voting for the 1977-78 CDBG projects, the committee made the following recommendations. Under programs where there is no funding, the city council chose not to fund them against the committees recommendations. An Environmental Impact Report on the recommendations was prepared and submitted by Don Laidlow and Associates, a consulting firm. Acceptance of this report is expected and implementations of these projects should begin in July, the beginning of the 1977-78 CDBG year.

1977-78 CDBG Recommendations ($1,821,000)

A. Public Improvements

1. South Park Neighborhood
   a) Grand Avenue full street improvement ($402,223)
   b) Complete storm drain system for neighborhood ($124,000)
2. Julliard Park Neighborhood storm drain* -0-
3. Westside water mains ($116,350)

B. Parks and Open Space
1. Northwest Community Park ($265,000)
2. Burbank Neighborhood-Rae Street Park ($44,000)
3. Olive Park security lighting -0-
   (to be done by Parks Department)

C. Facilities
1. Santa Rosa Multipurpose Senior Center ($169,110)
   (Rehabilitation and expansion)
2. Lincoln Manor/Westside Facility** -0-
   (Permanent equipment)
3. Lincoln Manor/Westside Facility -0-
   (Expansion for Native Americans, Seniors,
   and others)

D. Housing ($330,000)

E. Economic Development/Planning/Citizen Participation/Other
1. 1977-78 Citizens Participation Process ($25,000)
2. General Administration ($30,000)
3. Coordination of existing facilities ($200)
4. Downtown Neighborhood Study ($15,000)
5. Acquisition of substandard properties on ($120,375)
   Fetaluma Hill Road (in the South Park
   neighborhood)

*The council directed the Public Works Department to
look into the flooding problem in this area and report back
to the council with their recommendations.
**The council put $50,000 into the Contingency fund
earmarked for this item which may be funded after further
study by the council.
6. South Park Neighborhood-Coordinator/Coordinator/ PAC Office

7. Contingency ($179,742)

One of the two areas where the council differed from the committee recommendation was on a request by the South Park Project Area Committee (PAC) for funds to hire a full time coordinator and a part time receptionist/secretary, and for operating expenses of a PAC office. This was to be a one time only request with funding for subsequent years received through grants written by the coordinator. The original request made by the PAC to the CCCD was for $35,000. The committee trimmed the request to $22,242, which was the amount presented to the council. The council declined to allocate any of the requested money, because they again felt that they would be setting a precedent which would encourage other community groups to seek funding to staff their programs.

This action upset the PAC because it felt that it was in a position to begin to do things for and by itself. It had recently (October 1976) become incorporated as a non-profit corporation under the laws of the State of California, which legally enabled it to seek grant money as well as other types of public and private funds to assist with the redevelopment of the South Park neighborhood. (Other PAC's in the state had been able to get as much money through grants as they did through the CD process enabling them to expand their activities.) In order for South Park to do this, it would need a full time coordinator who could write
such grant requests. By denying South Park this money many of the PAC members felt that city hall was not as committed to helping them as they had been led to believe.

The city council did assure the PAC that city staff would continue to support their neighborhood project and provide assistance in terms of helping the PAC obtain grants and other funding. To date such assistance has not been provided.

The CCCD has been an improvement over the City Staff Task Force, however, there are still areas where it could be improved. An inspection of the committee's organizations and the areas where CD funds have been allocated indicates that practically all of the funds for projects have been allocated to organizations or neighborhoods that are members of the committee itself. Several other groups presented proposals which were CD eligible, but did not receive any funding. Obviously groups with representatives on the committee were in a better position to lobby for their projects. A better system should be worked out in fairness to those groups not on the committee that submit CD funding requests.

It should be noted that for the third year, the CCCD recommended that a large sum of money ($330,000) be allocated under the general heading of "Housing". This amount combined with the 1976-77 CCCD request of $700,000 for housing adds up to $1,030,000 under the category of housing. This amount is almost one fifth of the total first three years of CD funds made available to the city of Santa Rosa. This shows that during the past two years the CCCD
has identified the provision of new housing opportunities for both low and moderate income groups to be the major priority for CDBG funding.

The city council, while accepting the recommendations from the citizens committee and including them in the CDBG application, has taken a "go slow" approach on any type of housing assistance other than a rehabilitation program for homes, as well as a continuance of the federally subsidized rent programs already in existence.

Barton-Aschman, the consulting firm which did the Housing Action Plan for the city recommended that the council adopt these three programs which could be funded out of the $700,000 designated for housing from the second year CDBG:

1) $350,000 for the rehabilitation of housing.

2) $300,000 for a Housing Opportunities Fund that would be used to stimulate the development of housing for low and moderate income families, and "seed money" for non-profit groups to attract federal and state low cost housing grants.

3) $50,000 for a housing information referral service to help people find low and moderate income housing. The program would also provide counseling on renting houses and home ownership.25

In regards to the last two programs members of the city council became hesitant. Councilwoman Donna Born said of these recommendations: "Rehabilitation should be the number one priority and we should move more slowly on the
other two." She also said "I'm not convinced that we should be heavily involved in some of these other programs." Mayor Poznanovich agreed with her statements.

According to this same article in the Press Democrat there are now 629 families on the waiting list at the Santa Rosa Housing Authority who qualify for subsidized rent and an additional 1,000 households county wide that qualify. Considering the attitude of the present council and at the slow pace the council has decided on (in regards to housing programs), it will take years to house the people already on the waiting lists, to say nothing about the 1700 houses in Santa Rosa that need rehabilitating at this time.

This attitude will adversely affect the redevelopment of the South Park area, where (according to a redevelopment agency structural survey which was done in 1972) 43% of the homes in South Park were substandard and another 13% were questionable as to whether it would be economically feasible to rehabilitate them. This means that 56% of all the housing stock in South Park is in need of replacement.

An interesting side to the CD process is the name changes that the original Urban Renewal Agency has gone through in the last two years.

The Santa Rosa Urban Renewal Agency was created by the city of Santa Rosa in the early 1960's to redevelop a portion of the downtown area where city hall and the downtown banks are now located. This original redevelopment project is now called Phase I because a second and third
phase has been added west of the original development. This area was extensively damaged by the 1969 earthquake and it is the location where the new shopping center will be built.

The Urban Renewal Agency was and is not a city department in its new form. It operates under a contract with the city and is somewhat independent of city hall. Its board, however, is appointed by the city council and they always do what the council asks.

When the H/CD Act was passed in 1974 it changed somewhat the functions of the Urban Renewal Agency. The old programs were combined under the CD Title section and in addition housing activities (formally under an older housing law) were combined to become Title II of the H/CD Act. Since the city had a small housing authority operating separately from the Urban Renewal Agency the council decided to combine the two because they were now funded under the same source.

This happened in late 1975 and in January of 1976 the Urban Renewal Agency became the Santa Rosa Community Development Commission with the city of Santa Rosa's Housing Authority part of that agency. (The Santa Rosa Housing Authority also administers the County Housing Authority by contract.) While this was taking place Governor Brown approved Senate Bill Number 1127 on September 9, 1975, which stated "This bill would require the inclusion of two housing authority tenants, as prescribed, on the commission of a county or a city housing authority, including the governing
body of a county or city acting as such a commission, and on any community development commission. 30

This bill was to become effective on January 1, 1976, and would have required the inclusion of two tenants, one who must be at least 62 years of age, on the board of the Community Development Commission (CDC). These two tenant commissioners would have the same power as any of the other commissioners and could have voted for or against anything the CDC was involved in including the downtown shopping center.

The city council was caught by surprise when it discovered this. They were not informed of this law because someone on the staff of the CDC had not done their homework and was not even aware of the passage of the bill.

The council decided to break up the CDC which was only in existence for a few months and change it into two separate legal entities with two boards of commissioners. One board (Redevelopment) would deal with all urban renewal type activities and would contain the same five board members of the Community Development Commission, and another board (Housing) would contain these same five plus the required two tenants to handle all housing activities. This all came about with the establishment of the new Santa Rosa Housing and Redevelopment Agency in June of 1976. So within a six months time period the original Urban Renewal Agency
was changed to the Community Development Commission and then to the Housing and Redevelopment Agency all to avoid citizen input.

The Community Development process has allocated $1,516,598 to South Park over the first three years of the CDBG. (This amount almost equals the total of the first years CD grant of $1,821,000.) So far South Park has been fortunate because each year it has received as much and more than the original $400,000 that it received under NDP funding.

As previously noted the amount of CDBG money that was granted to Santa Rosa was $1,821,000 per year for the first three years and then under the hold-harmless formula, it is to receive $1,430,000 the fourth year, $1,056,000 the fifth year, and $673,000 the sixth and last year.

The following chart shows the funding that South Park received in the first three CD years (which is about 25%), and how much South Park may possibly get for the last three years if it continues to be funded at the previous level it has been receiving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDBG</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL GRANT</th>
<th>SOUTH PARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>75/76</td>
<td>$1,821,000</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd &quot;</td>
<td>76/77</td>
<td>1,821,000</td>
<td>460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd &quot;</td>
<td>77/78</td>
<td>1,821,000</td>
<td>646,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th &quot;</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td>1,430,000</td>
<td>359,500*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th &quot;</td>
<td>79/80</td>
<td>1,056,000</td>
<td>264,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th &quot;</td>
<td>80/81</td>
<td>673,000</td>
<td>168,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,630,000</td>
<td>$2,358,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Approximately 25% of the funding

It is unlikely that South Park will get as high a percentage for the last three years of the CDBG program because other citizens groups are becoming more involved,
and as the citizen participation committee grows, more groups will demand a share of the dwindling CD funding allocation.

It is hoped by many of the people involved in the CD process that President Jimmy Carter and the Democratically controlled Congress will put additional funds into the CD pot to maintain its present level (i.e. $1,821,000 per year for Santa Rosa for the three final years) or even increase it due to rising costs and inflation.

What may happen so far as the future of CDBG is concerned is uncertain at this time. However, if President Carter is like any of the other recent Democratic presidents, it seems likely that he will at the minimum extend CDBG and maybe even increase it.
Originally Project Area Committees (PAC) were set up under the Neighborhood Development Program (NDP) law to encourage resident participation in neighborhood projects and to provide for citizen input in the planning and development of those projects. Furthermore, the Federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) made it a requirement for all Local Public Agencies (LPA) such as the Urban Renewal Agency of Santa Rosa to include project area residents in this process. This differed from former federal urban redevelopment laws in that there had not been any provision for citizen participation.

The LPA Management Policies section of the HUD/NDP Handbook states that "During the preparation of the Urban Renewal Plan, the LPA must consult with the residents of each proposed urban renewal area involving residential rehabilitation with respect to proposed boundaries and activities to take place in the area." 31

The duty of the LPA was to help establish a PAC in an urban renewal area that was going to become involved in residential rehabilitation. The LPA would furnish the PAC with "relevant and timely information and with adequate technical assistance." 32 An effort would be made by the LPA to help
an existing neighborhood organization within the project area to become a PAC in cooperation with other local neighborhood groups and residents and to help that group adapt itself to meet PAC requirements. The PAC would represent a fair cross section of the project area residents and would become a forum for all other neighborhood organizations and individuals who wanted to participate in the redevelopment process for their neighborhood.33

For a PAC to become an effective working community organization, HUD regulations allowed local urban renewal agencies involved in NDR projects to make funding requests to establish and maintain a PAC. Costs could include:

1. Providing of office space and equipment, technical assistance, administrative and secretarial staff for a Project Area Committee (PAC).

2. The costs of contracts with the PAC for employing project residents to perform necessary work in the project area in the planning and execution of the NDR project.

3. Advising the neighborhood residents of project activities and to encourage resident participation by advertising and promoting such activities in the local media.34

There were other requirements mandated by California state law which were similar to federal regulations. The state also provided for the inclusion of residents effected by a neighborhood redevelopment project by requiring a PAC
for such areas. The state guidelines mentions that the PAC should include, along with residents and property owners, businessmen as well as members of non-business organizations. The LPA regulating the neighborhood project must consult with the PAC for input into the planning of the possible replacement of homes that would be removed as part of the NDP project. The LPA would consult with the PAC on any matter that may affect the residents of the project area. Funding for the operation and staffing of the PAC was also included in the state law.35

Both the federal and state guidelines required citizen input on neighborhood development projects through the concept of Project Area Committees in areas where residential rehabilitation was to occur. The PAC's were to keep the neighborhood informed about redevelopment activities, and in turn as representatives of such a neighborhood, advise the LPA concerning the planning of the project.

The South Park PAC was an outgrowth of another neighborhood organization known as The South Park Improvement Committee. Several of the committee members became charter members of the South Park PAC. Once the PAC was organized, it elected Quincy W. King Sr. as its first chairman. He had been heavily involved in The Neighborhood Improvement Committee and was especially effective in the effort to get South Park annexed to the city of Santa Rosa, as well as setting up the subsequent redevelopment program.
Officially the South Park PAC was created on March 1, 1973, when the Urban Renewal Agency of the city of Santa Rosa entered into a contract with HUD in order to receive financial assistance for the South Park NDR. The PAC had actually existed prior to that time and was involved in the development of a master plan for redevelopment of the South Park neighborhood. The Urban Renewal Agency of the city of Santa Rosa defined the PAC duties in a written agreement which also listed the obligations of the PAC and of the Urban Renewal Agency in regards to the redevelopment project in South Park.

One portion of this contract made it the duty of the South Park PAC to inform project residents about renewal and redevelopment activities in the neighborhood and to encourage the residents to participate in the urban renewal process. The PAC was also to provide information to the Urban Renewal Agency on the views of the residents of the project area.

Other PAC responsibilities would be to assist the Agency in the following activities:

1. Review, recommend, and monitor equal opportunity activities within the project area;
2. Make available a list of unemployed and underemployed residents of the project area;
3. Obtain and maintain a list of qualified contractors;
4. Obtain housing resources for displaced families;
5. The relocation of displaced individuals and families which shall include PAC input as to relocation policy matters;
6. The recruitment of persons to purchase property within the project area;
7. Organize and coordinate neighborhood clean-up programs in the Project Area which includes but is not limited to, the use of garbage debris bins;
8. Attend seminars and informational meetings related to the program and report back to the community (i.e., NAHRO meetings, relocation workshops, conferences, etc.);

9. Participate in learning experience programs as deemed appropriate;

10. The PAC shall keep and maintain minutes of PAC meetings; make quarterly verbal reports and recommendations during joint Agency/PAC meetings regarding the program objectives and accomplishments; make, when deemed appropriate, verbal progress reports to the Santa Rosa City Council; and publish an annual report brochure for the Urban Renewal Agency and the South Park community summarizing the NDF program goals and objectives, along with the accomplishments for that action year;

11. Recommend the names of new streets, avenues, parks, or other public facilities which may be developed."

Due to the amount of activities and responsibilities outlined in the contract for the South Park PAC, it appears that there would be the possibility for this organization to develop into a very powerful, community oriented group of citizens in terms of local politics.

What has happened in the neighborhood since the contract was signed by the PAC is that few if any of the items listed on the contract have been actively carried out. In the four years of existence of the project little attempt has been made by either the former Urban Renewal Agency (now the Housing and Redevelopment Agency) or the South Park PAC to carry out the activities and responsibilities in the majority of the eleven items listed.

As an example, of the three different major reconstruction projects that have occurred in South Park since 1973, no one from the neighborhood has been directly recruited by the city or the PAC to work on these projects,
which would have been in accordance with the previously men-
tioned contract. The Community Development Act also makes a
similar stipulation. An attempt was made to develop a list
of unemployed persons during the summer of 1975. The list
did not materialize not only because of the inexperience of
the people on the FAC, but also because they did not receive
any technical assistance from the Urban Renewal Agency in
order to develop such a list.

The FAC probably could have carried out activities
such as compiling this list if they had had their own office
and staff, as was provided for in both the state and federal
regulations. The Santa Rosa Housing and Redevelopment
Agency (hereafter referred to as the Agency) handled all the
administrative chores for the FAC. The Agency stated that
the activities the FAC was involved in had not reached the
point where it required full time staffing, nor was the FAC
capable of activities that would warrant such funding for an
office and staff.

This decision made by the Agency was never challenged
by the FAC. In the very beginning the statement by the
Agency may have been true, but as time has past more people
on the PAC have since become better informed on redevelop-
ment activities.

The FAC has become too dependent on the agency's
staff and a lot of necessary work involved in this project
which the PAC could have done has not materialized. This
Dependency cost the PAC some of its flexibility once the agency staff was allowed to run the program, they became reluctant to relinquish any of their roles.

Another important factor has been the control of information. The PAC has relied on the Agency for all of its information and PAC members have not sought any of their own resources. There have been instances where important information was not supplied to the PAC because either the Agency simply neglected or forgot to inform the PAC. Interpretation of events and information supplied to the PAC by the Agency has presented a problem because, theoretically, the PAC as an independent thinking body, is supposed to inform and consult with the Agency about decisions affecting the neighborhood. What actually has happened is the PAC has received information and decisions from its one and only source, the Agency. However, the PAC was actually supposed to inform and advise the Agency prior to any such occurrences. Based on one-sided information, the decisions the PAC made at times would of course, be the same as those the Agency would have made and wanted the PAC to make.

As a neighborhood wide organization, the PAC actually has a very small number of people supporting it. In the two elections that have been held to elect PAC members, from the neighborhood itself, 61 people voted in the November 26, 1974 election, and only 45 people voted in the February 4, 1976 election (out of a total population in South Park of approximately 1220 people). Apparently there is not a great
amount of interest in the PAC as a neighborhood organization by neighborhood residents.

The PAC has been successful, however, in appearing as a viable neighborhood organization to the rest of the community because it has been recognized as such by city hall. This is an important aspect of neighborhood political structures not only in Santa Rosa, but in actuality all over the United States. Local politicians choose which organization that they will recognize as spokesman for a neighborhood. Usually the organization is a group that has proven their "worth" to the politicians by doing what they were told and not making any trouble. Usually this recognized group will receive special attention from city hall which is in turn picked up by the local media. Such a group then becomes known to other decision makers who feel they can only deal with that one group when it comes to contact with the particular neighborhood.

Thus a city hall approved organization is in a powerful position within a neighborhood even if it has little real support by that neighborhood. Decisions affecting the lives and property of neighborhood residents are then made by a very small percentage of the neighborhoods population. Decisions regarding the spending of thousands, sometimes millions of dollars and the kinds of projects the money will be spent on are made by this small group.

Generally the PAC has shared a cozy relationship with the city council and the Housing and Redevelopment
Agency. However, the PAC has never presented itself as a problem to either of these groups in the five years of the PAC's existence. Individual PAC members have had a falling out from time to time with either the council or the Agency, but collectively the PAC has never challenged or opposed either of those groups.

Politically speaking this may be a good position for the PAC, because the council controls the funds for the redevelopment project. Ethically however this may present a problem because the PAC may be forced to cater to the council's wishes which might not be in the best interest of the neighborhood or what the neighborhood residents actually want.

For an example in the spring of 1975 when the controversy arose over the first year CD funding allocation of $550,000 recommended by the city hall Task Force for the downtown project, there was considerable opposition to the decision by many low and moderate income groups in Santa Rosa, which felt the money should go to social programs like housing.

William Barone, Chairman of the South Park PAC, at a public CD Task Force hearing, verbally supported the allocation of the funds for the downtown project over housing needs of the South Park neighborhood. He later read a statement about his views at a PAC meeting held on February 25, 1975, a few days after the Task Force hearing.

To summarize his statement, he stated that the Community Development Coalition, an organization which had
recently been formed by several low and moderate income groups in opposition to the funding of the downtown project, was trying to control the CD money by threats of lawsuits against city hall.

Mr. Barone further stated that the South Park program was under threat of being cut off due to the efforts by the Coalition to stop CD funding of the downtown center. He supported city hall and its decisions because they had been working very hard over the last three years to try and rebuild the South Park neighborhood and that none of the Coalition members were involved in any way in the work that had been done. He then charged that "The Coalition would rather govern as non-elected tyrants who control by threat, and would thereby remove those elected representative who are working for the good of the entire city rather than just the narrow views of the coalition."  

Mr. Barone indicated that his statement was his alone as a PAC member and not as its chairman but asked the PAC to support his statement. A vote of support was taken which was passed with no opposition by PAC members present.

At the next meeting held on March 19, 1975, PAC member Fred Boyle, who had been absent at the meeting when the vote was taken, protested Mr. Barone's statement. He expressed some dismay over the downtown center and felt issues such as food and housing were the most critical needs of the people of South Park and the Coalition was seeking the CD money for such things.
Mr. Boyle also stated that in the past, the PAC had remained neutral on all city hall matters and that it was his belief it should continue to remain so. Boyle went on to say that it was difficult for the chairman of any group to speak at a meeting just as an individual as it was probable that those hearing a chairman's statement may not be able to separate the individual person from his official position.

Nothing was done to withdraw Mr. Barone's statements even though Boyle received support from some of the FAC members present.

Later when the city was sued by the Community Development Coalition, the money was held up for South Park. The Coalition issued several statements saying that they did not want to hold up any money for any neighborhood projects especially not South Parks. An attempt was made to separate the CD funds involved in the lawsuit and thereby just challenge funds for the downtown project, but the judge hearing the case declined to do so.

Although the lawsuit was later won by the city, the first years CD funding for South Park was held up for approximately one year. An interesting side note is that the whole CD process was changed starting with the second year of CD because of the efforts by the Coalition to get city hall to include more citizen participation in the process. Mr. Barone was on the first CD citizen committee (second year CD) and was narrowly elected its chairman. Several of the persons on the Coalition were also on the CD committee and gave Mr. Barone a hard time by questioning everything he did.
(perhaps because they felt they could not trust him due to his previous statements). Many of the Coalition members considered Mr. Barone an advocate for city hall and downtown interests.

The PAC has enjoyed considerable influence, in general, and among other neighborhood groups in Santa Rosa, because it has been viewed as a really successful neighborhood organization due to the amount of funding it has received from the NDF and CD programs. Because the PAC had a head start over other groups in such programs, it had gained more knowledge of the NDF/CD processes, and has been able to use this knowledge in order to come across as a really "together" organization during the first year of the citizen participation process (CP). In the second year of CP, the PAC again came across very successfully, but other groups were catching up and were gaining experience in CD matters. It will be interesting to see how the third year of CP goes for South Park (which has been able to receive a good share of the CDEG money in the past).

The PAC originally started with 18 people who helped develop the master plan for South Park and worked on other related activities such as annexation. Before they were officially an NDF PAC recognized by HUD, 3 people dropped out which left 15 people. Out of these original 15 people, 7 are still on the PAC after five years. These seven are:

William Barone, Chairman; Charles Madsen, Vice Chairman; Rhoda Lawson, Secretary; Iride Boren; Vince Gleason; Leo Gonzales; Wallace Wilson.
In addition to those listed above there are ten other people as of March 1, 1977, who make up the present PAC. They are:

John Gaspari, Treasurer; Roger Stephenson, Parliamentarian; Gladys Barnes; Mildred Buckley; Robert Burgermyer; Edward Flood; Pearl Flood; Charlotte Harris; Thomas McLain; Evelyn Ross.

The PAC which now has 17 members was expanded in November of 1974 from the original 15 members to increase representation in the neighborhood.

Of the present 17 members, 13 are white, 3 are black, and 1 is of Indian/Mexican-American descent. The percentage of minority representation on the committee is, therefore, 23.5%. This compares to a minority percentage of 26% for the entire neighborhood which is considered to be a fair minority representation by the PAC.

The age factor on the PAC does not reflect the age breakdown in South Park, including those 18 years and older which is the minimum age to vote in a PAC election or to be on the PAC. Out of the 17 PAC members, 15 are around 50 years old, and two members are younger than 50. While these 15 older members make up 88.2% of the PAC, they represent only 20.8% of the population of the South Park Neighborhood. (See Appendix No. 2.)

One category that is not represented on the PAC is that of renters. Although 60% of the people who live in South Park are renters, there are none represented on the PAC. All PAC members are property owners in South Park, although four live outside the neighborhood.
A valid breakdown of individual incomes of PAC members does not exist, however, eight individuals are considered to be in an income category of less than $5,000 per year (from such sources as pensions and disability payments). Presently only two PAC members have full time jobs, whereas, three individuals are in semi-retirement, three are housewives, and one is currently unemployed.

In summary, the PAC is clearly not representative of South Park in the areas of age and property owner verses renter, but it is representative of the neighborhood in the areas of race and income.

Younger people and renters have not become involved in the PAC and the redevelopment project in this neighborhood. Everybody is welcome at the open public meetings which are advertised, and anyone who wants to run for a seat on the PAC during the elections can do so. It may be that many renters and younger people consider South Park only a temporary stop-over until they can afford better living conditions.

At times younger people have come to PAC meetings, but soon stop coming as it appears not much is happening at the meetings. The PAC meetings (at times) tend to have a social club atmosphere for older people. This also may detract the interest of younger participants, who may feel out of place in a setting that is mainly older people.

PAC meetings are held on the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month and usually start at 7 PM. An agenda is usually mailed to PAC members a few days in
advance of the meeting along with the minutes of the previous meeting. The agenda is made up by the recording secretary who is a staff member of the agency. Items on the agenda range from use permit requests, which the FAC is the first to review, to matters such as subcommittee reports, upcoming activities and expenditure authorizations for such things as information flyers.

At times it seems that decisions on more important matters such as use permits have already been made beforehand by the agency staff and the FAC Chairman. Little discussion takes place on these items except by the Chairman, who usually comes out early in his discussion either for or against a particular agenda item. Some questions are asked by a few members who really want to find out about the subject, and then the Chairman calls for a vote, with a motion being made either to accept or reject the agenda item request. The motion is usually always made to favor the chairman's views by one of the PAC members who is usually an ardent supporter of the Chairman. Many times the result of the vote is unanimous in favor of the motion.

At times when there has been a disagreement over a subject that needed a vote, those who were against the position of the chairman would usually not vote on the matter. They would not abstain but would just sit there and not vote. This situation arose because the Chairman would verbally cut down the opposition remarks prior to a vote plus make a comment after unanimous votes such as, "That's the way I like to do business!"
In the three years that William Barone has been chairman of the PAC he has pretty much controlled all the decisions made by the PAC. When someone would oppose him, he would first belittle them by making snide remarks, and would then call for a vote once he knew he would win (as the members of the PAC would support him because of his position as chairman). This has been a particular problem to the younger PAC members, (which have numbered only four under the age of 35) in the five years of the PAC. The older people would side with the chairman because of their suspicion of the younger members who would be viewed as troublemakers since they were not willing to "just go along".

The chairman has always been the most powerful member of the PAC since its beginning because of support from city hall and from the old regulars on the PAC. Few other members of the PAC have had as much impact on the group as the chairman. Other PAC members who have repeatedly disagreed with the chairman have been worn down and finally left after one or two years, because it was hard to get support from the other PAC members to do something different than what the chairman wanted, even though the Chairman is only one vote out of a total of 17.

In the five years of the South Park PAC's existence, there has never been a vote on any item where the chairman's view has not been on the winning side. There has not been a vote with an outcome that was almost tied either. This clearly shows the influence such a person can have when
supported by city hall and a few die-hard supporters on a committee which is supposed to represent a neighborhood of some 1220 people.

During February, 1976, when the close out of the South Park NDF was being discussed at a PAC meeting, the subject of the PAC's legal standing was brought up because it was set up under a previous federal law which had been replaced by the new Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 which no longer had provisions for Project Area Committees. At the request of the PAC, the agency staff looked into the matter and discovered that PAC's were still required under the state law which remained unchanged.

Discussions took place regarding what would happen if the state law should change and the PAC maybe left with no legal standing which was necessary for its existence. A suggestion was brought up by a PAC member that the PAC should incorporate as a non-profit corporation under state and federal laws, and evolve into a community based service organization like several PACs in the United States had done.

After considerable discussion about what a non-profit corporation was able to do, it was decided to seek an attorney who would explain the legal ramifications of becoming a non-profit corporation.

Peter Trombetta, an attorney-at-law in Santa Rosa, came to the March 3, 1976, PAC meeting and informed the PAC what a tax exempt non-profit corporation would entale. He explained the legal requirements that the PAC would have to
fulfill and offered to do this portion of it for just his expenses which would be about $200 for his office costs plus another $150 for all the filing fees and corporate seal. He mentioned most attorneys charge from $800 to $900 to form such a corporation. He mentioned that "...the FAC's becoming a corporation would not affect its status of being eligible for future CD funds and that it could even be a vehicle through which the FAC could step beyond CD funds only."

Some of the advantages of being a corporation were that the FAC could legally own property and seek additional funding for various new activities from public, as well as private, funding sources.

As a non-profit corporation the FAC could become more financially independent and seek other funds to redevelop the neighborhood and, thereby, not be dependent only on CD funds which were to be cut off in three years when the CD program ends. Getting money from other sources would allow for the continuation of the South Park redevelopment project.

A problem in the scheme to incorporate was where would the FAC get the approximately $350 to incorporate? There was no provision in its NDF budget, which was about to be closed out, that would allow money to be spent for the purpose of incorporating. The agency staff, at the FAC's request wrote a letter to the San Francisco HUD office requesting the use of budget money to incorporate. Word
came back from Julian Fitzhugh, HUD official, on June 8, 1976, that the PAC could use some of its budget money to incorporate as a tax exempt, non-profit corporation. 42

The PAC decided to go ahead and incorporate with the official filing of the papers taking place on October 25, 1976. They decided to seek a permanent site within the project area for an office and to go seek such funding for a staff. After several months of negotiations, a building in the neighborhood park was provided to the PAC by the Santa Rosa Parks and Recreation Department as a permanent PAC office.

It was mentioned in the previous chapter that the city council turned down the CCCD request to fund the PAC out of the 1977/78 CD funds. Since the PAC was still committed to getting its own staff, it arranged for a person in the neighborhood to write a CETA grant in order for the PAC to get a full time coordinator position and a part time secretary/receptionist position funded. This grant was approved on March 9, 1977, by CETA board members. The hiring of both staff persons is expected to be completed by June, 1977, (which is one month before the 1977/78 CD activities are to start for that fiscal year).

Some of the projects that PAC, Inc. is already involved in or anticipate to start in the summer of 1977 are:
1. Neighborhood Alert and Property I.D. programs
2. Homeowners Association
3. Recreation program for South Park youth in cooperation with the Santa Rosa Police Department
4. Adult reading clinic
5. Children’s reading clinic
6. Property maintenance program in cooperation with the South Park Homeowners Association
7. Help develop job opportunities for residents
8. Start a neighborhood newsletter
9. Establish a home rehabilitation loan fund
10. Establish and maintain an emergency food stockpile for families in need
11. Maintain an information center for social service referrals for neighborhood residents

With a full time coordinator the PAC as a non-profit corporation will be able to initiate the above activities utilizing neighborhood residents, as well as PAC members, to administer the programs. One other activity that the coordinator could become involved in is the securing of additional funds (through grant writing) to do physical improvements like housing rehabilitation in the neighborhood.

The advantage of receiving funds from sources other than local government is that the neighborhood could carry on programs without the dependency on local politicians and their influence, insuring more self control over the neighborhood redevelopment by the neighborhood residents themselves.

It is believed that the reason the city council turned down the CCCD funding request for PAC staff was that they feared it may set a precedent, and other neighborhoods
would request staff funding for their projects also. If each one of the neighborhoods represented on the CCCD secured funding for a full time staff it would upset the way politics are played in Santa Rosa. Neighborhood organizations would become powerful political forces because they would be in closer contact with and have greater influence over the voters.

There is now in existence a citizens group in Santa Rosa called the Committee for Neighborhood Representation started by local attorney Dan Beck along with Pat Wofford who is working to have a ballot measure which would permit the citizens of Santa Rosa the opportunity to vote on district representation for a city council election.

This measure is much like proposition T that was passed by the voters of San Francisco which did away with representative at large and installed 11 separate districts in San Francisco that would make up the Board of Supervisors for the city and county of San Francisco.

If a measure like this was passed in Santa Rosa, it would mean an end to the election of a business oriented council who all live in the upper middle class section of Santa Rosa. The costs to run a campaign would also decrease because the area a candidate would be elected from would be smaller. In a smaller area, a candidate could knock on every door in the district, something that is almost impossible to do in Santa Rosa with the current "at large" system, as the city of Santa Rosa covers such a large area.
Some people fear that a district type system in Santa Rosa would be dominated by a political machine like the one that exists in Chicago. What these individuals don't realize is there are better examples of cities that have district representation than Chicago. There are many cities in the New England states, as well as upper state New York, that have district representation. One doesn't hear much about these examples because they have worked well over many years and they are not as newsworthy as systems that are believed to be corrupt.

Of course a district representative type of government in Santa Rosa could turn into a political machine type of system in an individual district if the voters of a district let it happen due to the lack of their participation in the district politics, or because the voters do not keep informed of the issues.

This situation has developed in South Park. When the PAC was first formed the meeting room was always filled by people from the neighborhood who took the time to become active in their neighborhood affairs. What kept people interested was the issue of how would redevelopment affect them. One of the questions asked the most was: would the house someone living in be torn down? Once this fear subsided, people began to lose interest, and now 5 years after the PAC's inception, there may be only one or two people at a meeting that are not PAC members, and it has recently been increasingly harder to get at least 9 PAC members (a quorum) to attend meetings out of 17 members.
A lack of participation by people in the neighborhood has allowed the chairman of the FAC to run the committee almost as a one man show. Even though one or two FAC members didn't go along with this dominance by one person, nothing has changed because of lack of support by neighborhood residents to pressure the FAC to be more responsive.

Chairman Barone has used the incorporation of the FAC as an excuse to significantly change the original By-laws of the FAC to better his position as the controlling personality of this committee. Changes that he has suggested in the By-laws which were backed by several of his supporters, on the PAC, were passed by a majority of the FAC. These changes allow him almost complete control of the business affairs of the corporation.

For instance, while the original By-laws required a 30 day residency in South Park (or ownership of property) to enable a person to run for a seat on the FAC (or vote in a PAC election) the new By-laws require a 90 day period of residence.

Although the county can only legally require a 30 day period for its elections, there is no such provision in the state election code that would require this same time period in a neighborhood election. In fact there are no restrictions whatsoever for a neighborhood election because such elections are not covered by the state law. This
enables a so called neighborhood organization such as the PAC to set its own requirements of who can vote and when an election will be held.

The original term of office for PAC members was for two years with one half of the membership up for election every year. The first election was in November of 1974 and the next one should have been held exactly one year after that. The next election however, was not held until February, 1976, four months after it was supposed to be held according to the by-laws of the PAC.

This happened because the PAC Chairman kept postponing the election first; because it was too close to the Christmas holidays, and after that due to a variety of excuses, until several FAC members insisted on the election. The third election should have been held in November, 1976, or at the latest one year after the second election which would have been in February, 1977.

Because the by-laws were changed, the next election will not be held now until March of 1980! Mr. Barone convinced most of the PAC members that since they were now a corporation they needed time to develop and organize their programs and that an election at this time would disrupt this process. He felt that the PAC should keep the committee as it has been because the existing PAC members had developed certain expertise in the neighborhood redevelopment project and this would be lost if they were not re-elected.
It was also decided to change the membership terms to three years instead of two. The new corporation by-laws set the first election for corporate board members (PAC members are also corporate board members) in March, 1980, which is three years after the adoption of the new by-laws. Half of the FAC, Inc. board members would be up for election at that time. Names of all FAC members would be placed in a hat and the first nine drawn out would run for election with the remaining eight up for election in another eighteen months. This would mean that a FAC member who has already been on the FAC for five years (there are seven who qualify) and have been re-elected in one of the two past elections could serve until 1983 if he or she should happen to be lucky enough not to have his or her name drawn to run for election in 1980. This particular person would then have been on the FAC for eleven consecutive years and only faced re-election one time. The current Chairman could be such a person.

The election provisions in the new by-laws do not seem to belong to the type of organization that truly represents the people of a neighborhood (such as South Park) but that of an organization of self-serving individuals.

Another area of concern is the increasing power of the FAC chairman. According to the first sentence of the corporation by-laws "The corporation shall have one class of members only, and the voting, and other rights, interests
and privileges of each member shall be equal. But upon
closer inspection of the by-laws one can see that the chair-
man is in a class all by himself.

On page 5 of the corporate by-laws the position of
the chairman is stated, "The chairman shall be the chief
executive officer of the corporation and shall, subject to
the control of the Board, supervise and control the affairs
of the corporation. He shall perform all duties incident to
his office and such other duties as provided in these By-laws
as may be prescribed from time to time by the Board of
Directors." 

According to the above quote, it would seem that the
entire Board could exercise some control over the chairman.
Further investigation of the By-laws reveals that the chair-
man actually controls the Board. The following passage from
the by-laws explains: "The officers of the corporation
(there are five officers) constitute an Executive Board and
are responsible for the conduct of the daily business of the
corporation, the implementation of policies established by
the Board of Directors and the execution of personnel
policies. The Chairman of the Corporation is also the Chair-
man of the Executive Board, and may at his discretion add
members of the Board of Directors to the Executive Board."

Out of the five people who are currently officers of
the corporation, the Chairman can count at all times on
three concurring votes including his own. One other member
tends to support him although he will vote his own
conscience, and the fifth member is a swing vote. Evidently if something should happen where the Chairman loses his majority, he can simply appoint another one or two of his supporters to the Executive Board until he regains the majority of voters.

Since there is to be no election for three years, the Chairman, in effect, will be a one man ruler of the corporation for that length of time.

Besides a provision in the By-laws that allows the Chairman to appoint all subcommittee chairpersons, as the Chairman of the corporation and as the Chairman of the Executive Committee, he also controls all employees of the corporation. Provisions in the PAC, Inc. personnel policy list these duties of the Executive Board:

1. Recommend to the Board of Directors the establishment, review and revision of policies annually;
2. Evaluate salaries and make recommendations for changes to the Board of Directors annually;
3. Render annually a performance evaluation of the Director and of other professional employees in cooperation with the Director;
4. Maintain current and accurate job descriptions;
5. Receive and resolve grievances submitted by the Director and from the staff regarding working conditions, and recommend to the Board of Directors their choice for the Director and other professional staff as required.

As can be seen, the Chairman of the PAC, Inc. is in a very powerful position. He not only is accepted and endorsed by the people downtown, he also controls the community corporation.

The author believes that the PAC at this time is facing an uncertain future due to some weaknesses that exist in its structure. The PAC's present system of government,
which is a virtual one man rule, depends on that one person (the chairman) to hold the organization together.

Should something happen where this person could no longer serve on the committee, the committee would probably come apart due to its overdependence on this one individual.

Another factor that could bring on the demise of the PAC would be the emergence of another neighborhood organization that would challenge the legitimacy of the PAC's claim to represent the South Park neighborhood because it cancelled elections for three years and that the PAC membership is not representative of either renters or the age breakdown of the South Park neighborhood.

A new organization could show what little support the PAC has as evidenced in the voter turnout for PAC elections and request of the Citizens Committee for Community Development for the two seats that the PAC now holds on that committee. Of course the new organization would have to demonstrate that it has more support in the neighborhood through such means as a petition drive, etc.

Another possibility could be that CCCD could itself refuse to seat the PAC's representatives at the formation of this years Community Development meetings because the CCCD could also feel the PAC no longer represents the neighborhood.

Due to these points and along with the possibility of the PAC's power base eroding due to no real support from
the neighborhood and the drastic changes in the By-laws which no longer supported the original purpose of the PAC, the author resigned from the PAC on March 16, 1977. The next and final chapter will discuss this writer's personal role in the redevelopment process of South Park.
Chapter 5

PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT

I became aware of the South Park Project Area Committee (PAC) in October of 1974 when a leaflet containing information regarding the first PAC election, to be held on November 26, 1974, was delivered to my residence.

Although I realized that the street I lived on, Aston Avenue, was part of the South Park neighborhood, which was involved in a renewal project, this was the first time I knew of the existence of a local citizens group that was involved in the redevelopment process in South Park.

This information was important because at that time I was enrolled in a graduate program at Sonoma State College and one of my classes required each student in the class to become involved in some type of community activity as a semester project.

Together with another student from the same class, Jim Haight, who also lived on Aston Avenue, I decided to attend the next PAC meeting which was a "meet the candidates" night for the election for South Park.

We learned at the meeting that eight seats on the committee of 15 members were up for election with only nine people on the ballot. We decided to run as write-in
candidates to inject a bit more competition into the race. After listening to the short speeches of the candidates on the ballot, both of us made brief presentations about our respective ideas and why we would like to represent the neighborhood and help with the redevelopment project. Then we announced that we would be running as write-in candidates.

Several times before the election (which was to be held in two weeks) both of us campaigned throughout the South Park neighborhood by knocking on doors and talking to people. We were surprised that many people did not know about the PAC or the neighborhood urban renewal project and many professed that they did not think they would participate in the election.

When the election was held, 61 individuals out of approximately 300 registered voters participated in the election. Three incumbents were re-elected to serve two year terms on the PAC along with five other persons who appeared on the ballot. (I received 17 write-in votes whereas Jim received 16, neither enough to be elected.)

After the election, I continued to attend PAC meetings and became interested in the physical planning aspects of the South Park renewal project and the PAC itself as a local, neighborhood organization.

My first impressions of the PAC and the way it functioned led me to believe that one particular Urban Renewal Agency staff member and the chairman of the committee ran the organization. A lot of discussion was taking
place in front of the audience between the chairman and the agency representative at voice levels that were not audible to the rest of those in attendance at the PAC meetings.

Several of the newly elected members became quite active in the group discussions that were taking place at the meetings which addressed the neighborhood and its future under the renewal program. Fred Boyle, (who has been mentioned in a previous chapter) was one of the new members and he asked very pointed questions of the chairman about what was being done in regards to the promises that had been made to the neighborhood when the issue of annexation was proposed.

When there was a question from the audience that the chairman could not answer, he would defer to the agency staff member to answer for him or the staff member would whisper a response to the chairman, which would then be repeated to the audience.

At first most of the people on the PAC felt uneasy with Mr. Boyle's and my appearance at the meetings and viewed these two younger individuals as "long haired trouble makers" due to the many questions they asked and their skepticism in regards to some of the information that was given to the PAC by agency staff. After a few months several of the people on the committee, especially ones with children our age, accepted the two new comers and became involved in some of the projects we were trying to do in the neighborhood such as starting a community garden and the registration of voters.
Even though it appeared that the PAC, or at least the chairman, was controlled by the Urban Renewal Agency, it was inconceivable to me at that time that the PAC was under control of city hall politicians. All previous involvement in the political scene of Santa Rosa was nonexistent, and I believed that things like political subterfuge could not happen in a town the size of Santa Rosa.

Fred began to attend PAC meetings less frequently because of the time he spent at his occupation as a commercial fisherman, while I hardly ever missed a meeting. I also became more involved in the PAC and volunteered for many projects that other PAC members were reluctant to become involved in.

The chairman of the committee began to rely on me to help him handle some of the day to day housekeeping chores like letter writing and obtaining information from the agency to relay to people in South Park who had requested it.

Tensions at the PAC meetings lessened. I became a person that the chairman and the PAC could depend on. Upon Fred Boyle's resignation from the PAC, as he sold his house in the neighborhood which disqualified him to be a representative on the committee, I was appointed (in August of 1975) by the PAC to fulfill Fred's unexpired two year term.

Gradually my attitude changed from my first impressions that the PAC was being manipulated by city hall interests (through the agency) to the attitude that the agency wasn't doing as much as it could but it was trying to help
the people of the South Park neighborhood. I began to go downtown to agency board meetings and drop into the agency office from time to time to discuss the NDP project with staff members and to gather information on the physical planning aspects of the NDP and the downtown project.

I no longer posed a threat to agency staff members who attended PAC meetings, and at times could be depended on to clarify some of the discussion at the meeting because my questions had taken on more of an informational seeking tone instead of an accusatory nature, as were some of my initial responses when I first attended the committee meetings. I became attracted to city hall's "glamour", the intricacies of city government operations, and the various personalities in the different city departments and agencies.

I became so involved that in October, 1975, I volunteered to work at the Urban Renewal Agency two days a week as an unpaid intern employee. This proposal was presented to the agency's Executive Director James Burns who allowed me to become a trainee in the redevelopment field as Burns had been at one time when he was beginning his career. A training program was worked out between Burns and myself whereby I would devote a certain amount of time each week learning the different departments or divisions that made up the Santa Rosa Urban Renewal office. These divisions were Administration, Real Estate, Finance, and Relocation. Also
located in a different office were the Housing Authorities of the city of Santa Rosa and Sonoma County which the Urban Renewal Agency operated by contract for both these government entities.

A certificate of training was to be issued to me by the agency upon completion of the training program. I hoped to use this certificate, along with the experience gained, to apply for a full time position with a redevelopment or housing authority agency in the San Francisco Bay Area.

From October until the end of December, I worked at the agency for two days a week and still continued as a PAC member. I assisted the chairman of the PAC both as an unpaid agency staff member and as a PAC member. At this time there was apparently no inconsistency recognized by either the agency or the PAC in my dual capacity.

In January of 1976, Steven Watry, Deputy Director of the agency, proposed that I accept the vacant part time Maintenance Man I position at the agency. He explained to me that if I accepted this position, I would only be required to do a very minimal amount of maintenance type work when needed and that the job would actually be more like an administrative assistant. At any rate, I would then be paid for doing the work I now did for free.

I accepted the position but had some reservations at being called a maintenance man. I felt that such titles, although only supposed to be temporary, usually had a way of becoming permanent and hard to break out of once one was stuck with such a title. Watry assured me that it would
only be temporary and that I would be considered for a full time, professional position when one became available in the spring or summer of 1976 when a new and expanded subsidized housing program was to be put into affect by the city council.

Because of the increased work of the agency gearing up for the new housing program, my position was reclassified from part time to full time in March of that year. I was again, hesitant about accepting this new classification because it seemed my fears were coming true. Where I once was a part time maintenance man, I now became a full time one in title only. My responsibilities and duties had remained the same, as I still primarily did research, report writing, and assisted other staff in helping them perform their various duties. Again, I was reassured that this would be only temporary and that I could apply for one of several new positions that were to open up. When I balked at accepting this new reclassification, I was given a pep talk by Watry reminding me that jobs were hard to get in Sonoma County, and that I was lucky to have this opportunity to work for the agency and prove my loyalty and demonstrate my abilities. Another advantage pointed out to me was that I would probably be hired over other applicants that may have more experience simply because I was known to the agency and they liked my work.

Because of the pressure of being close to getting a professional position in a field that was interesting to me and wanting to keep the boss happy so that I would be hired
for one of the new positions, I accepted the reclassification for a position whose job description only required an eighth grade education. (See Appendix No. 8.)

Everything went along fairly well from March until June, 1976. During this time I was involved in various research projects for the Director of Housing and developing management and project tracking systems for Burns, the Executive Director of the Agency. I also directed the visual, exterior inspection of 8,200 buildings in the older sections of Santa Rosa for the city's Housing Action Plan. I completed this enormous task one week ahead of schedule saving the agency staff time and related support expenses that were utilized on other projects.

On June 10, 1976, I was called into Burns personal office for a conference. Watry was also in attendance. This seemed to be the occasion that I had been waiting for. I anticipated that I was about to be offered a new position with the agency. What happened next came as a complete surprise.

Burns handed me a copy of a memo from Richard Maxwell, the General Counsel for the agency. This memo dated June 10, 1976, was in response to a request by Watry to Maxwell, the agency's attorney, to research the possibility that I might be in conflict of interest because of my dual role as an employee of the Community Development Commission (the agency) and as a member of the South Park Project Area Committee (FAC).
According to this memo it was Maxwell's opinion that
Under the California Political Reform Act of 1974
(Government Code §87100) 'no public official... shall...
attempt to use his official position to influence a
governmental decision in which he knows or has reason
to know he has a financial interest.' While I do not
believe they have adopted any final regulations, the
Fair Political Practices Commission had indicated its
intention to include within the definition of 'public
official' members of advisory committees. Government
Code §87103) which defines a 'financial interest'
includes 'any source of income... aggregating $250 or
more....' and 'any business entity in which the public
official is an... employee....'

He further stated "Under the above sections of the
Political Reform Act it could be argued that Mr. Burgermyer
had a financial interest in any recommendation made by the
PAC to the commission because of his status as a regular
employee of the Commission." \(48\) (See Appendix No. 9.)
Maxwell further stated that he felt Mr. Burgermyer should
resign from the PAC.

Because this came as a complete surprise to me, I
said that I needed a few days to digest the situation and
would report back to Burns within a few days. As I walked
out of the office, several things began to go through my
mind. After analyzing what had just happened, I began to
realize that maybe his position on the PAC was indeed a "big
deal" to Burns and Watry, or Burns would have let Watry
handle this personnel problem as was the custom at the
agency. Only personnel problems of a serious nature were
ever brought to Burns who was the type of administrator that
did not like to deal with personnel matters.
Upon leaving the office, I immediately went upstairs to the city hall attorneys law library and looked up the state statute that Maxwell quoted which supposedly could apply in this circumstance. I found that the government code from which Maxwell quoted was much more involved and extensive than what had been used in the memo. Maxwell had changed the meaning of the statute by only quoting small pieces of the original code that is several paragraphs in length. (See Appendix No. 10 for the entire statute.)

What really shocked me was that this particular government code did not even apply in my case as Maxwell suggested. The law had no provision whatsoever for determining what would constitute a conflict of interest for someone elected to serve on a neighborhood advisory committee.

The statute titled Applicability of Article §87200 stated that:

This article is applicable to elected state officers, members of the Public Utilities Commission, members of the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, members of the Fair Political Practices Commission, members of the California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission, members of the board of supervisors and chief administrative officers of counties, mayors, city managers, chief administrative officers and members of city councils of cities, members of each of the six regional coastal zone conservation commissions, and to candidates for any of these offices at any election.

An amendment to this statute added "...judges of record..." and "...district attorneys." I believe that in no way did this statute relate to me and that it seemed the agency, through its attorney, was trying to intimidate me.
It might not have been a coincidence that two days prior to my receiving the memo, I asked Watry a question about the funding of the South Park project at a PAC meeting that embarrassed Watry. Or the fact that on Tuesday, a day before the PAC meeting (acting as a spokesperson for the non-management employees at a yearly salary negotiation meeting) I got into a very heated discussion with Burns over employee benefits. Because of these two incidents, I believed that I perhaps was becoming an irritant to Burns and Watry, and they possibly were trying to "gain control of me" first by getting me to voluntarily resign from the PAC and then by setting me up to be laid off from my employment with the agency by reasoning that they no longer needed a full time maintenance man and that I was not really qualified for either of the two new positions being created in the Housing Authority.

The situation was even more peculiar, because both Burns and Watry were well aware that I was on the PAC at the time when they hired me. I knew both of them from the PAC meetings for approximately one year prior to being employed by the Agency. I even proposed to Burns the idea of my working at the agency as an unpaid employee during a PAC meeting.

Believing that the two incidents, which led to the attorney's memo regarding a possible conflict of interest, meant to me that I would shortly be out of a job even if I did resign from the PAC, I arranged to take my four vacation days entitlement which I had accumulated and went back East on personal business.
Several days had passed since the first memo incident, and while I was driving to California from Michigan, Burns wrote a memo dated June 18, 1976. In that memo, he again insisted that I resign from the PAC, or to resign from my employment with the agency.\(^{51}\) (See Appendix No. 11.)

I responded to Burns with a memo that outlined my views regarding Burns' request for me to resign from the PAC or the agency. My memo said in part:

> To me, a conflict of interest is a serious matter that cannot be taken lightly, because it implies a possible act of wrong doing on my part. For me to make a decision to either terminate my employment with the Commission or to resign from the PAC would be an admission on my part that I was in fact participating knowingly in such a wrongful act as this conflict of interest implies and I therefore am not able to make such a decision as is being requested of me in this matter.\(^{52}\) (See Appendix No. 12.)

Burns responded with another memo that same day (June 25, 1976) that concluded with "I regret that the matter cannot be further delayed. I have no alternative but to advise you that your employment with the Commission will be terminated effective Friday, July 2, 1976, at 5 P.M. unless the matter has been resolved prior to that time."\(^{53}\) (See Appendix No. 13.)

The only way that the matter could be resolved, according to Burns, was for me to resign from the PAC or from my employment with the agency. I, again, reiterated that I could not do either one because I felt that there was a principle involved in the agency's having hired me fully aware that I was a member of the South Park PAC. Believing that I was being fired because I would not make the
decisions asked of me by Burns, I worked on July 2, believing it to be my last day. At noon a luncheon was held in my honor at a local restaurant as a going away present to me by other office staff members. All attended except for Watry who dropped in to wish me "good luck." Burns could not attend supposedly because of a prior engagement.

There were no real hard feelings on my part at the time of my termination of employment with the agency. I understood that the agency may be a little "gun shy" because of the numerous lawsuits that had been filed against the agency to halt construction of the downtown shopping center. I reasoned that the agency could have feared that someone might possibly magnify the fact that an agency employee was also supposedly an independent advisor to it in his capacity as a member of the South Park PAC. Understandably a lawsuit could hold up financing of the downtown shopping center project, while there was a legal ruling whether or not that employee could serve in both capacities.

Also the agency knew there were HUD regulations and policies existing at that time that encouraged the employment of project area residents. Even though I was sure the agency was aware of the regulations, the agency could have had legitimate concerns and fears regarding another lawsuit even if they felt they could win the case.

I left the agency with the attitude that although I didn't agree with Burns decision to terminate my employment over the possibility of a conflict of interest, I could
see that Burns, while being responsible for the urban renewal projects for the entire city of Santa Rosa, felt that he could not permit any possible "leverage" for someone to use against the city to stop the downtown project. Burns did what he believed was in the best interest of the city of Santa Rosa. It just so happened that I was expendable in this situation because I refused to accommodate Burns.

The fact remains that this same condition existed for approximately six months prior to my termination. If the agency felt that this was the case, it should have made my employment contingent upon my resignation from the FAC. This was not done, nor was it even suggested that it might be requested of me in the future.

There was no proof as far as I was concerned that the agency was not indeed trying to do what had just been described. The feelings I had about the possibility that I had upset Burns and Watry enough to want to get rid of me from both the FAC and the agency's employment were true feelings. However, I was not sure whether my feelings were correct or not, and I was not about to confront Burns and Watry with allegations that were not easy to substantiate.

What happened next completely startled me and convinced me that Burns and Watry did want to get rid of me after all.

About one week after I no longer worked for the agency, I received a letter from Burns stating that he was
sorry that I had followed up my announced decision at a staff meeting to resign from the agency and thanked me for my services. (See Appendix No. 14.)

The staff meeting that was referred to was held several days prior to my last day at work, and several days after I had received the June 25, 1976, memo from Burns saying my employment was to be terminated. I believed that I had been fired and announced at this particular meeting to the entire staff that Friday, July 2, would be my last day and thanked them for the experience of working with them and hoped to continue to work with the staff as a PAC member.

What puzzled me was why Burns would write such a letter since Burns had actually fired me. I had also met privately with various staff members to explain to them my side of the "termination of employment" matter prior to my last day at work.

I replied with a letter to Burns that I did not resign and that if my employment had not been terminated, I would return to work on a certain date unless I was notified that I was in actuality terminated. (See Appendix No. 15.)

I received a reply from the agency's attorney, Maxwell, that seemed to say in very confusing, legal double talk that I had resigned from the agency because I chose to remain with the PAC and therefore my employment was terminated by the agency. (See Appendix No. 16.)

Although I thought that I had made it clear in my letter to Burns that I had not resigned, Burns, through the
the Agency's attorney, insisted that this was the case! I thought that it was very strange that Burns insisted that I had resigned whereas Burns had fired me.

This mystery was further complicated when I went to file for unemployment insurance and was denied unemployment insurance benefits partly due to a letter that PAC chairman Barone had written to Burns with a copy being sent to the State Unemployment Office by Burns along with several of the memos that had been written between Burns and myself.

The Barone letter dated July 1, 1976, addressed the matter of my either resigning from the PAC or the Agency (as requested of me by Burns) due to the possible conflict of interest on my part. The letter said in part:

I have discussed this matter with Bob and I will tell you what I have told him. I, as Chairman of the South Park FAC, feel that Bob would provide greater service to the FAC and to the community if he would remain in the employment of the Commission rather than electing to discontinue his employment with the Commission and to continue as a FAC member. (See Appendix No. 17.)

What's very interesting about this letter is that I did have a conversation with Barone about what Burns had asked me to do approximately two weeks before my last work day. At no time did I tell Barone or anyone of the FAC that I was resigning from the Agency. In fact I told Barone that I would not resign from the Agency because I believed a conflict of interest did not exist. I even showed Barone a copy of the state code and explained how it could not apply in this particular case.
Another very interesting fact about this same letter written by Barone is that it was dated July 1st, one day before I had to give Burns my decision about resigning from the PAC or the agency. What is incredible is how could Barone have known in advance whether I had supposedly decided to resign from the agency or not?

I was not even aware of this letter until I attended an appointment on August 5, 1976, with an unemployment insurance interviewer. A copy had not been sent to me, which was not the usual custom when the PAC chairman wrote a letter regarding another PAC member.

When I confronted Barone with this fact at a PAC meeting, Barone offered several excuses why he had forgotten to send me a copy. When Barone was asked how he could have known one day in advance what I had until the next day to decide, he did not answer.

Other PAC members who were Barone's supporters began to verbally assault me by making statements like "You don't really care about the neighborhood or you would quit the PAC," "You should do what Burns wants because he has been good to the PAC," "The PAC got you the job and you should be thankful."

None of the responses from PAC members ever mentioned that perhaps the PAC could look into the matter and do some independent investigation, or even suggested the possibility that I could be right.
Two of the committee members I considered allies sat there during this verbal barrage and said nothing in my defense nor did they try to get the meeting back under control.

Watry, who was also at this particular meeting stated that he felt I was "letting down the neighborhood" because I "would not resign from the PAC."

Why this might have been done, I can only speculate. I believe that it may have been because the agency was afraid that it might get in trouble with HUD for firing a project resident while HUD encourages urban renewal agencies to hire residents. Someone from the agency could have written the letter with Barone's consent or Barone could have signed it at the request of someone from the agency.

As mentioned earlier, I believed that my unemployment claim was initially disqualified partially because of the Barone letter. The interviewer ruled to disqualify the claim because according to the unemployment office's notice of determination, I violated the California Unemployment Insurance Code Section 1256 which stated "An individual is disqualified if the Department finds he voluntarily quit his most recent work without good cause or was discharged for misconduct from his most recent work."

NOTE: It is my personal belief that it is possible that the Barone letter was written after I had been fired and predated to look as though it were in the agency's office before July 2.
The interviewer for the unemployment department ruled that:

You were discharged because you would not resign from your membership on the South Park project Area Committee. The request was reasonable since your membership on the Committee presented a conflict of interest with your position as an employee of the Santa Rosa Community Development Commission. It therefore is held that you were discharged for actions that injured, or tended to injure your employee's interests. 56

An appeal to this decision was filed on August 19, 1976, and a hearing was held on September 27, 1976, before Administrative Law Judge James S. Eddy of the State of California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board at the local Santa Rosa Unemployment Office.

Represented by an attorney, I presented documents testifying to the fact that HUD regulations encouraged the employment of project residents by local public agencies (such as the Community Development Commission) involved in residential rehabilitation, as well as proof that the agency was aware that I was a FAC member when I was hired. No official representative from the agency came to protest the appeal although they were notified they could do so.

The judge reversed the ruling by the interviewer and awarded unemployment benefits to me with this decision:

The evidence shows that the employer believed that a disabling conflict of interest existed because the claimant was an elected member of a local action committee as well as being an employee of the commission. Further evidence was received that the claimant did not think so.

However, and without resolving this difference of opinion, the evidence shows that the claimant was a committee member at the time of hire and that this was well-known to the employer when the hiring
took place. It would be manifestly unfair to characterize the claimants' status as a committee member as misconduct when this fact was known to the employer at the time of hire. If the conflict of interest existed, this was as much a fault of the employer as of the claimant and the employer is estopped to assert that this status of the claimant was misconduct even if such were the case.

Under all the circumstances it is found that the claimant was discharged for reasons other than misconduct within the meaning of section 1256 of the code. 

The question of a possible conflict of interest has never been answered satisfactory one way or the other as far as I am concerned. The only way this question could be answered would probably be through a lawsuit of some kind. At one time, I did contemplate such an action because I felt my professional reputation had been damaged due to the cloud hanging over me of a possible "conflict of interest," casting doubt as to my honesty and integrity. It could render me undesirable as a future employee for someone that would consider hiring me.

A suit against the agency with the purpose of regaining my position would make me a loser even if I won. If I did win such a case and got my job back, I would probably be delegated to perform only the duties of a maintenance man which was the official title I was hired under although I did very little of that type of work. Also the probable ill feelings by the employer who had been forced to hire me back would probably make life miserable for me until I resigned.

I decided that although I believed an injustice had been done to me, it would not be worth the time and effort
to pursue the matter due to the legal expenses that would be involved.

Some important experiences had been gained by me throughout my involvement in the South Park Project Area Committee and my subsequent hiring and firing by the Agency.

One of the most important lessons I learned is that people will not always back a person up in public as they would in a "one on one" situation. For example, several PAC members, who do not particularly care for the way that the chairman was running the organization or thought that the PAC should be more involved in the neighborhood on a social-economical level, would talk like real tigers when speaking with me privately. However, when it came to bringing these subjects up at a PAC meeting they would never say a word. They would only get involved if they or their property was being directly affected by some PAC decision.

The vast majority of the PAC members were over fifty and their concern with maintaining the status quo of the committee allowed the chairman to become firmly entrenched in the organization.

With their non-involvement attitude it became increasingly clear to me that the majority of the people on the PAC were not really interested in or committed to the idea of changing the South Park neighborhood. If they had been, they would have been willing to challenge city hall a
few times in order to remind downtown of the promises that were made to the people of South Park when it was annexed to the city of Santa Rosa.

Also if members of the FAC were really intent on improving the neighborhood they could have demanded from the agency funds for separate staff, office space, and equipment to become more autonomous and carry on the work themselves as a non-profit corporation.

A bill that was passed in the California State Assembly would even allow the FAC to hire an attorney to represent them against the agency if need be. This law, Assembly Bill Number 3673, was adopted on May 4, 1976, and stated in part "This bill would authorize the employment of a legal counsel by the committee to present a position substantially different from the agency." 58

It is the author's belief that the FAC should retain an attorney to represent them in all cases where the FAC is asked to sign a written agreement with the agency. In the past this has never been done although the agency always had their private counsel to look after the best interests of the agency. It is time the FAC did likewise.

The above will not happen until there are some basic changes in the FAC system. The first thing that needs to be done is to hold an election where all FAC members not re-elected in the spring of 1976 FAC election would have to run for re-election (this would include the present chairman) and hopefully this would bring new people into the FAC. Changes
in the FAC, Inc. by-laws are necessary to remove favoritism for the chairman's position and to insure that all FAC mem-
bers are equal and that the chairman again becomes responsible to the entire committee instead of a few handpicked support-
ers.

Greater emphasis should be placed on the recruitment of neighborhood residents to become involved in both the FAC and the neighborhood, in matters that are common needs such as the establishment of a food and consumer co-op as well as day care and health care facilities located within the South Park Neighborhood.

More people in the neighborhood would become inter-
ested in the neighborhood if a greater emphasis was placed on social program and needs. It should be the responsibility of all FAC members to walk about the neighborhood and to talk to the residents to solicit ideas and information and to encour-
age others to join in neighborhood activities.

The Project Area Committee is already in a position to do many of the things listed. It already has "name identi-
fication" throughout Santa Rosa. It is already a non-
profit community corporation that has the capability to attract funding from sources other than city hall, and it has an office, which is very important because it can be a focal point for neighborhood activities.

If the FAC does not become more involved in the neighborhood on a personal level, it may lose the little support that it has within South Park, and it may be pushed
aside by another group that could be formed by residents who are more interested in the people of South Park than remaining in a favorable light with city hall officials.

As mentioned at the end of the fourth chapter, the author, who had been a member of the South Park Project Area Committee for two years, resigned because of personality conflicts, which evolved over the period of time I served on the PAC with several members of the PAC (most notably the chairman) that culminated when the PAC by-laws were changed so significantly that they no longer resembled the original by-laws of the organization whose original purpose was to upgrade the South Park neighborhood and make it a better place for all the resident to live.

What has happened in South Park is similar to what has happened to larger public establishments. A few people become entrenched in the organization and they find ways to consolidate and maintain their power resulting in a reluctance on their part to relinquish that power or to step aside for a newer group of individuals.

I have seen that this can happen to any organization no matter how small and insignificant it may be. The only way to prevent this is through a continuing effort to bring new individuals into the organization and by limiting terms of office.

The experience gained through the personal involvement in community level politics has become invaluable to me. Working with the residents of South Park has been at
times both rewarding and frustrating for me. In addition, I learned many things about small grass roots types of political associations that exist in Santa Rosa through my work on the FAC, the Housing and Redevelopment Agency and the 1977-78 Citizens Committee for Community Development.

Political change in the form of a more honest and open government will come out of the neighborhoods of Santa Rosa (and all across the nation) when they get organized and decide to do something about situations in their own neighborhoods. The power to change is in the hands of people who will vote. I led a voter registration drive in the South Park neighborhood for the June 1976 primary election and on one day I registered 51 voters in South Park. The results for that election showed that 71% of those registered in South Park voted which was the highest turnout of voters in South Park history as well as the highest percentage of voter turnout in any precinct in the city of Santa Rosa.59

Another factor that I realized is that change comes very slowly at times. Many well worked plans and good intentions have come to nothing because people involved were either reluctant or afraid to change.

I found that personal and continued contact must be made with each member of a committee or organization in order for those persons to formulate confidence and trust in an individual who would like to lead them. I also found
that this process was a never ending job and that it consumed vast amounts of time and energy with the results sometimes not what was hoped for.

The personal growth that resulted out of my involvement far outweighes what I had hoped to gain in the way of experience in a community involvement activity for a one semester college course.

When involving myself in political activity in the future, I will remember lessons that I learned in my dealing with community groups, governmental agencies, and the personal conflicts that occur. I will be reminded of my naivety and innocence in these matters when I first became involved in these activities and my eventual emergence into the realities of my coming of age in South Park.
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South Park is in census tract 1514. Census tracts are broken into smaller portions called "areas." The majority of South Park is in area 3 which includes all of South Park except the southern half of Aston Avenue which is in area 5. The areas are further divided into "blocks." The southern part of Aston Avenue is block 501. The census is broken county wide into separate incorporated areas and combined unincorporated areas. The information for block 501 (which contains the forty residences of the southern half of Aston Avenue) was combined with block 504 which is outside the eastern boundary of South Park. Block 504 contains only eight residences. Since the information for block 501 and block 504 could not be separated, it had to be combined with the total number of blocks in area 3 in South Park to get accurate data of the entire area. Upon inspection of the statistics of block 501 and 504 and upon comparison with area 3, which is only South Park, the information was very similar. Upon visual inspection of the eight residences of block 504 outside South Park, it was determined that since the area was physically comparable to South Park, inclusion of this data would not upset the validity of the study.
APPENDIX NO. 3

COMBINED CENSUS SUMMARIES

FOR HOUSING TYPES IN SOUTH PARK

Tract 1514
Area 5
(Blocks 501 and 504)
Area 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Vacant Units</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Household Population</th>
<th>Population per Household</th>
<th>Group Quarters</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,222*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Single Family Resident
2-4 = Duplex, triplex, or fourplex
5+ = Apartment Complex w/5 or more units

Source: Sonoma County Mid-Census Computer Printout

*The total population figures in Appendix's No. 3 and 4 are different by five persons. This data has been checked out and it is not a misprint. This error in the original data represents a factor of less than half of one percent, which does not upset the validity of this study.
### APPENDIX NO. 4

#### AGES AND MEDIAN

**21 YEARS AND UNDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Sex Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Sex Unknown</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medians</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County of Sonoma Mid-Decade "Report"  
Special Census 1975  
by Sonoma County Planning Department 12/75

*See Appendix No. 3 for explanation on difference in total population.*
APPENDIX NO. 5

PC (PLANNED COMMUNITY) DEVELOPMENT PLAN MAP ZONING

SOUTH PARK NL
SANTA ROSA, SONOMA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Diagram of zoning areas:
- Medium Density
- Low Density
- Commercial Areas

Legend:
- Bennett
- South Park School
- Rotary Park
- Flower Avenue
- Colgan Avenue
- Milton Avenue
- Grand Avenue
- Rail Avenue
- Avenue
- Street
- Temporary

Map details include street names and zoning designations.
The following information is a summary taken from the Redevelopment Plan for the South Park NDP area which is a 70 page document of procedures and policy statements for the South Park NDP Plan.*

The objectives of the Plan were broken down into four main areas. They are (1) Community-wide facilities, (2) traffic and pedestrian circulation, (3) natural environment, and (4) physical design.

Objectives of the first area, community wide facilities, were to buy the old South Park Elementary School, unused because it did not meet earthquake standards, and transform it into a South Park Community Center. Another objective was to develop a full compliment of both active and passive recreation and park facilities through the development of the Rotary Park site which would be the main park in the South Park neighborhood as well as some mini-parks situated closer to all residential areas and designed for walk-in use for both seniors and young people.

Another objective was to encourage the additional development of convenience shopping and neighborhood related services along Petaluma Hill Road for South Park residents.

*Redevelopment Plan South Park Area: Target Area I, by the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of Santa Rosa, July 6, 1972.
The goal of the housing objectives was to provide housing that is safe, decent, sanitary, and constructed according to building codes. The housing should be affordable to a broad range of incomes and should be of all types of structures including single family detached dwellings as well as multiple units where appropriately zoned.

In traffic and pedestrian circulation, the second category, it was the intent to divert vehicular traffic from the center of the lower density residential areas by the development of a circular traffic pattern around the neighborhood. An integral part of this circulation pattern would be the construction of safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle routes throughout the neighborhood.

To preserve as much of the natural environment, the third objective, as possible during redevelopment, existing trees, whenever possible would be left standing and the planting of street trees, smaller scale trees, on all interior residential streets and the planting of larger trees on all of the peripheral streets would be encouraged.

The last objective, physical design, was to provide for the maximum amount of usable open space through the utilization of residential development patterns such as zero lot lines and cluster development and by encouraging variable setbacks and housing designs on interior residential streets.

Several other goals of this last objective were to provide adequate outdoor living space for each dwelling unit, to reduce conflicts between yards, playgrounds, private outdoor activities, and commercial and public areas by heavy
landscaping and fencing, or by facing private outdoor living spaces away from heavier traveled streets and public activity areas, and to preserve the amenities of the lower density residential neighborhood areas where they are adjacent to higher density uses by the use of adequate landscaping and setbacks.

Standards used to help meet these last objectives consisted of the following criteria: (1) residential height was set at 35 feet for two stories with minimum lot sizes of 6,000 square feet on interior lots and 7,000 square feet on corner lots with a minimum frontage of 60 feet. Exceptions to the 60 foot minimum lot frontage may be allowed on lots that have a minimum of 40 feet with a use permit required. This variance will be for only the rehabilitation, reconstruction, and new construction of single family dwellings.

The maximum coverage of a lot by any residential building would be set at 50 percent for medium density areas and at 40 percent for low density. However, the overall density for residential development will not be more than 5 units per gross acre.

Minimum front yards would be 20 feet for carports and garages and 15 feet for main buildings. Rear yards would be set at not less than 5 feet for single story buildings and 15 feet for 2 story buildings. Side yards would be set at a maximum of 15 feet or one half the height of the building or 5 feet if the building is only one story but less than 15 feet in height. Exceptions to these yard requirements can be made by a use permit for cluster development,
zero lot line type buildings, and to orientate living area away from heavily traveled peripheral streets.

Parking requirements for residential units would be one carport or garage per single family unit and one half parking spaces with a minimum of one covered space per unit in a multiple unit residential building. Parking for all other types of buildings would be in accordance with Article 16, Chapter 4 of the city of Santa Rosa Zoning Ordinance.

All repairs or rehabilitation to existing structures that are a non-conforming use or are on a substandard size lot will be allowed to be repaired but only to the amount of 50 percent of the current assessed valuation in any 12 month period. Repairs over that amount in that time span will require a use permit. In addition a use permit will be required for rehabilitation, repair, or expansion on any commercial building.

The following uses will be allowed in a low density residential area as shown on Appendix III. These uses are single family dwellings, duplexes on standard corner lots, churches, child nurseries, public or private schools, public buildings and community centers, public utility structures, parking lots, home occupations, temporary subdivision sales office, public parks, private recreation facilities, and health care facilities. All uses other than single family dwellings will require a use permit.

All the uses allowed in the lower density residential area will be allowed in the medium density residential areas as well as apartments, condominiums, group dwellings, lodging
and boarding houses. There would only be allowed one dwell­ing unit per 4300 square feet of land area not to exceed 10 units per net area. An exception is made for duplexes on a standard lot. Again all uses in this zoning will require a use permit with the exception of a single family dwelling.

In the commercial zoned area these examples of businesses would be allowed, and all uses would require a use permit. They are retail stores, professional and other types of offices, businesses and shops whose activities are conducted entirely within a building like food stores, restaurants, bars, furniture stores, newsstands, banks, refreshment stores, and service establishments. Uses that would be considered obnoxious to the area residents would not be allowed unless contained within a building like auto body repair garages.

Building heights in this zoning area would be set at three stories or 45 feet except where a building would be adjacent to or facing a residential area, then it would be 35 feet or two stories.

There would be no minimum lot size or maximum lot or yard size. Each would be set in the use permit according to the individual business.

Parking will be set according to the requirements in the Santa Rosa Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 4, Article 16.

The lighting and commercial signs would be required not to generally be visible in a residential area.
To help insure that what is being built is to the standards set by the South Park neighborhood, all uses requiring permits will have to be reviewed by the South Park Project Area Committee (PAC).
Job Description:

Under general supervision, performs basic unskilled and semi-skilled maintenance and labor work related to properties leased or owned by the Commission.

Examples of duties include: Keeping project areas clear of weeds and debris; policing and controlling automobile parking on project property; minor electrical repairs; minor plumbing repairs; carpentry work; painting structures; construction, placement, and maintenance of project signs; and performs other tasks as required.

Education and experience:

Completion of eighth grade. Must have some experience as handyman or maintenance worker.

Knowledges, Skills, and Abilities:

Ability to do manual work of a maintenance nature; operate light motorized equipment; learn new tasks quickly and easily; follow oral and written instructions.

License:

Must have possession of valid California Driver’s License.
MEMORANDUM

TO: STEVE WATRY, Assistant Executive Director
FROM: RICHARD B. MAXWELL, General Counsel
RE: Robert Burgermeyer; Conflict of Interest; Membership
    South Park Project Advisory Committee

You have asked for the opinion of this office as to whether
there is a conflict of interest or inconsistency in Robert Burgermeyer's membership on the South Park Project Advisory Committee and his employment by the Santa Rosa Community Development Commission.

It is my understanding that Mr. Burgermeyer is employed by the Commission under the category of "maintenance man" although, because of his unusual talents, his services are used widely in connection with the functions of the Commission. It is my further understanding that Mr. Burgermeyer is a member of the South Park Project Area Committee and also a property owner on Aston Avenue within the project area.

Under the California Political Reform Act of 1974 (Government Code §87100) "no public official . . . shall . . . attempt to use his official position to influence a governmental decision in which he knows or has reason to know he has a financial interest." While I do not believe they have adopted any final regulations the Fair Political Practices Commission has indicated its intention to include within the definition of "public official" members of advisory committees. Government Code §87103 which defines a "financial interest includes "any source of income . . . aggregating $250.00 or more. . . within twelve months prior to the time when a decision is made" and "any business entity in which the public official is an . . . employee . . . ."

Under the above sections of the Political Reform Act it could be argued that Mr. Burgermeyer had a financial interest in any recommendation made by the PAC to the Commission because of his status as a regular employee of the Commission.

But disregarding the possible violation of the California Political Reform Act it would appear that Mr. Burgermeyer's employment
by the Commission is inconsistent with his position as a member of the PAC. The purpose of the PAC is to serve as an "independent" advisory body to the Commission. As an employee of the Commission Mr. Burgermeyer has a duty to carry the policies set by the Commission and its management staff. This duty would appear to be inconsistent with his responsibilities as a member of an independent advisory body to the Commission.

Accordingly, it would be my recommendation that Mr. Burgermeyer be advised that he should not continue his membership on the South Park Project Advisory Committee.

Respectfully submitted

RICHARD B. MAXWELL

RBM:er
Excerpts from Chapter 7, Article 1:

§87100. When influencing governmental decision prohibited
No public official at any level of state or local government
shall make, participate in making or in any way attempt to
use his official position to influence a governmental
decision in which he knows or has reason to know he has a
financial interest.

Added by initiative measure adopted June 4, 1974.

§87101. Exception to §87100 where participation in govern­
mental decision required by law
Section 87100 does not prevent any public official from making
or participating in the making of a governmental decision to
the extent his participation is legally required for the action
or decision to be made. The fact that an official's vote is
needed to break a tie does not make his participation legally
required for purposes of this section.

Added by initiative measure adopted June 4, 1974.

§87102. Applicability of Articles 2 and 3: Applicability
of Chapter 11
The requirements of Section 87100 are in addition to the
requirements of Articles 2 and 3 of this chapter and any Con­
flict of Interest Code adopted thereunder. No provision of
Chapter 11 of this title is applicable to this article except
the provisions of Section 91003. The remedies provided in
that section may be sought against any public official other
than an elected state officer, and those remedies are the
exclusive remedies for a violation or threatened violation
of Section 87100.

Added by initiative measure adopted June 4, 1974.

§87103. When official "has a financial interest" within §87100
An official has a financial interest in a decision within the
meaning of Section 87100 if it is reasonably foreseeable that
the decision will have a material financial effect, distin­
guishable from its effect on the public generally, on:
(a) Any business entity in which the public official has a
direct or indirect investment worth more than one thousand
dollars ($1,000);
(b) Any real property in which the public official has a direct or indirect interest worth more than one thousand dollars ($1,000);
(c) Any source of income, other than loans by a commercial lending institution in the regular course of business, aggregating two hundred fifty dollars ($250) or more in value received by or promised to the public official within twelve months prior to the time when the decision is made; or
(d) Any business entity in which the public official is a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or holds any position of management.

For purposes of this section, indirect investment or interest means any investment or interest owned by the spouse or dependent child of a public official or by a trust in which he has a substantial interest. A business entity is controlled by a public official if the public official, his agents, spouse and dependent children hold more than fifty percent of the ownership interest in the entity. A public official has a substantial interest in a trust when the official, his spouse and dependent children have a present or future interest worth more than one thousand dollars ($1,000).

Added by initiative measure adopted June 4, 1974.

Excerpt from Chapter 7, Article 2:

§87200. Applicability of article
This article is applicable to elected state officers, members of the Public Utilities Commission, members of the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, members of the Fair Political Practices Commission, members of the California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission, members of the board of supervisors and chief administrative officers of counties, mayors, city managers, chief administrative officers and members of city councils of cities, members of each of the six regional coastal zone conservation commissions, and to candidates for any of these offices at any election.
TO: Bob Burgermyer, Maintenance Man I
FROM: Jim Burns, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Employment with Community Development Commission and Member of Project Area Committee
DATE: June 18, 1976

This memo is to clarify my position as it relates to the recent discussions we have been having.

You have been a member of the Project Area Committee for some time and certainly have been a welcome addition to the Committee because you bring a lot of new ideas and a lot of expertise that the Committee did not have.

More recently you became employed by the Community Development Commission on a sort of interim basis in that you agreed to work for the Commission without receiving any compensation. It was our feeling that the training would be of some value to you in the future, and we agreed that we would be willing to spend some time in training you in return for your working for the Commission without receiving compensation.

Following that, you became an employee of the Community Development Commission mainly in the capacity of a Maintenance Man. You functioned in the capacity of a Maintenance Man for some time, and then we discussed the possibility of your spending a certain amount of time as a Maintenance Man and as an intern with the Commission.

This recent change in your duties caused me some concern because I could see you doing some fact gathering on data that we, in turn, could use in the South Park Project Area Committee meetings. At this point I felt it best to check with our Legal Counsel to see if there could, in fact, be a potential conflict of interest in your new capacity along with your membership on the Project Area Committee. As you know, as a
Bob Burgermyer
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public agency we certainly do not want to create any conditions that would cause the public to feel uncertain about the professionalism and trustworthiness of our organization.

In any event, based upon Mr. Maxwell's legal opinion, Mr. Watry and I met with you to discuss the opinion and our feelings as administrators of the Commission. You requested a day or two to review the opinion, and we offered the services of the Commission's Legal Counsel to you to review his opinion. It is my understanding that you have met with Legal Counsel and it is still his opinion that a potential conflict of interest could exist, and it was his recommendation that you either terminate your employment with the Commission or resign from the Project Area Committee.

Based on that opinion and our discussions, I asked you for an early decision, and you indicated we would receive an early decision from you.

On Friday, June 18, 1976, I again reminded you that I wanted an early decision on this matter, and you indicated that some unusual circumstances had arisen and that you had to go back East to drive your sister to California, but that immediately upon your return, you would give us your decision.

The purpose of this memo is to make sure that both you, Mr. Watry, our Legal Counsel, and myself all understand the circumstances as they have existed in the past and the status of the present situation. If for some reason you have any disagreement with anything in this memo, I would appreciate your bringing it to my attention as soon as possible.

James K. Burns
Executive Director

JKB:mk

CC: General Counsel Maxwell
Deputy Director Watry
TO: James K. Burns, Executive Director
FROM: Robert L. Burgermyer, Commission Employee
SUBJECT: EMPLOYMENT WITH COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
AND MEMBER OF THE SOUTH PARK PROJECT AREA COMMITTEE
DATE: June 25, 1976

It appears that I am being requested to make a decision to either terminate my employment with the Commission or resign from my appointment to an elected position with the South Park Project Area Committee, because of the concern about a possible conflict of interest by my serving in both capacities.

Although I share your concern about how our Commission as a public agency may appear to the citizens of our community due to the appearance of a possible conflict of interest on my part, I personally believe that my serving as a Commission employee and as a member of a neighborhood advisory committee (such as the South Park Project Area Committee) does not in any way reflect on our Commission as being unprofessional or untrustworthy.

I have the greatest respect for Mr. Maxwell, both as a person and as an attorney, but I feel that because he has been employed by the Commission to serve in its own best interest, that he cannot impartially advise me as to my best interest when it involves a possible conflict between the Commission and myself.

I feel that in all fairness to me, the Commission, which initiated the question of a possible conflict of interest, with which I do not agree, should be willing to retain legal counsel who can be more objective about this matter and in whom I can place my full confidence.

To me, a conflict of interest is a serious matter that cannot be taken lightly, because it implies a possible act of wrong doing on my part. For me to make a decision to either terminate my employment with the Commission or to resign from the P.A.C. would be an admission on my part that I was in fact participating knowingly in such a wrongful act as this conflict of interest implies and I therefore am not able to make such a decision as is being requested of me in this matter.
Please do not read any disrespect into this reply from me. I know that your responsibilities as our Executive Director are constantly in the public eye and it is because of this, and perhaps the public's criticism of government in general, that requires you to be careful in matters such as this one with me. However this situation ultimately gets resolved, please remember that it will have no effect on my respect for you and for your difficult position as Director.

Robert L. Burgernyer
MEMORANDUM

TO: ROBERT L. BURGERMYER, Commission Employee
FROM: JAMES K. BURNS, Executive Director
RE: Inconsistency Between Employment with Community Development Commission and Membership on the South Park Project Area Committee; Termination of Employment
DATE: June 25, 1976

This memorandum will confirm our past discussions and communications concerning the inconsistency between your status as an employee of the Commission and your membership on the South Park Project Area Committee. In the memorandum received from the General Counsel for the Commission he points out the inconsistency of the two positions and also indicates a possible conflict of interest arising under the terms of the Political Reform Act of 1974. It is my understanding that you have had an opportunity to personally discuss the matter with Mr. Maxwell.

In your memorandum of June 25th, 1976, you requested that the Commission employ independent legal counsel to advise you concerning this matter. I am aware of no authority which would allow the Commission to spend public funds for this purpose.

You also indicated in your memorandum of June 25th, 1976 that you were not able to make a decision as to whether to retain your employment with the Commission or your membership on the Project Area Committee.

I regret that the matter cannot be further delayed. I have no alternative but to advise you that your employment with the Commission will be terminated effective Friday, July 2, 1976 at 5:00 P.M. unless the matter has been resolved prior to that time.

Sincerely,

JAMES K. BURNS,
Executive Director
July 8, 1976

Mr. Robert L. Burgermyer
P. O. Box 11315
Santa Rosa, California 95406

Dear Bob:

I was sorry to see you leave the employment of this Commission, although I recognize that you had to make a decision between working for the Commission and serving on the South Park Project Area Committee because of a legal opinion indicating there could be a conflict of interest.

I now recognize that you followed through with your announced decision at the staff meeting to stay on the PAC instead of continuing to work for the Commission. Obviously, this removes any possibility of a conflict of interest, and we will certainly continue working with you as a member of the PAC.

I personally want to thank you for your work while you were with the Commission and especially for the several months you worked without any compensation prior to becoming an employee. That is an admirable trait, and I am sure because of this attitude and your background, you will do well in the future.

Best of luck in your future endeavors.

Sincerely,

Executive Director

JKB: mk
July 11, 1976

James K. Burns, Executive Director
Santa Rosa Community Development Commission
P.O. Box 1678
Santa Rosa, California 95403

Dear Jim:

Frankly I am confused by your letter of July 8, 1976 in which you stated that you regretted the decision that I had made to resign from my employment with the Commission because of the legal opinion of the Commission's attorney that I was in conflict of interest due to my membership on the PAC and my status of being employed by the Commission.

In your memo to me of June 18, 1976 you had asked me to make a decision to resign from the PAC or to resign from my employment with the Commission because of that opinion.

My memo to you dated June 25, 1976 stated: "To me, a conflict of interest is a serious matter that cannot be taken lightly because it implies a possible act of wrongdoing on my part. For me to make a decision to either terminate my employment with the Commission or to resign from the PAC would be an admission on my part that I was in fact participating knowingly in such a wrongful act as this conflict of interest implies and therefore I am not able to make such a decision as is being requested of me in this matter." I still stand by that statement.

To further clarify this statement, I believe that a conflict of interest which is a crime punishable by law must be legally proven and that one legal opinion is not reason enough to ask a person to resign from their job or to resign from a publicly elected position. To do so would cast that one legal opinion as the lone judge and jury in this matter and this is something that I cannot accept.

What I said at the June 30, 1976 staff meeting was that I would no longer be working for the Commission and that I hoped to continue working with the staff as a PAC member. It was my way of saying goodbye to the staff and nothing more. I did not then or ever say that I was resigning from my job to continue to work only with the PAC. At that time, I believed that my employment had been terminated as of the coming Friday, June 2, 1976, if I did not resign from the PAC by that date as stated in your memo to me of June 25, 1976.

As I have already stated, at no time did I resign from my employment with the Santa Rosa Community Development Commission. I did not submit a letter of resignation to my employer as is the customary practice when one resigns from their employment with a public agency, nor did I verbally tell anyone that I was resigning.
Since I did not resign and if my employment was not terminated, am I still an employee of the Commission? If I am not and my employment was indeed terminated, I would like a written explanation as to the reason or reasons why.

If I do not receive a letter of termination within five days of receipt of this letter, I will assume that I am still employed with the Commission and I will gladly return to work at 8AM on July 21, 1976. Perhaps we can set down alone together and discuss a possible solution that I have that would enable me to work with the Commission and still remain as a PAC member. I will make myself available prior to July 21, 1976 to meet with you if you so desire.

Sincerely,

Robt. L. Burgermyer

P.O. Box 11315
Santa Rosa, California  95406

CC:  General Counsel Maxwell
July 14, 1976

Mr. Robert L. Burgermyer
P. O. Box 11315
Santa Rosa, California 95406

Re: Termination of Employment with Redevelopment Agency of the City of Santa Rosa

Dear Mr. Burgermyer:

Your letter of July 11, 1976 addressed to Mr. James Burns, Executive Director, has been referred to this office for response.

Contrary to your letter, no one, to my knowledge, has suggested that you were guilty of any "wrong doing" or that you were "participating knowingly" in any wrongful act. What was pointed out to you was the potential conflict of interest and inconsistency in your status as an employee of the Agency and your membership on the South Park Project Area Committee.

The Executive Director clearly advised you that this potential conflict and inconsistency had to be resolved without further delay. When you indicated in your memorandum of June 25, 1976 that you were unable to make a decision as to whether to retain your employment with the Commission or your membership on the Project Area Committee the Executive Director had no alternative but to advise you that your employment would be terminated effective Friday, July 2, 1976 unless the matter had been resolved prior to that time.

It is my understanding that you elected to retain your membership on the Project Area Committee and thus your employment with the Agency was terminated on July 2, 1976 pursuant to the prior memorandum from the Executive Director.
Mr. Robert L. Burgormyer  
July 14, 1976  
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If you have any questions concerning this matter, I would be pleased to discuss them with you at your convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD B. MAXWELL, for  
Maxwell and Allen  
General Counsel for Redevelopment  
Agency of the City of Santa Rosa

cc: Mr. James K. Burns,  
Executive Director  

RBM:elm
July 1, 1976

Community Development Commission
100 Santa Rosa Avenue
Santa Rosa, California 95404

Attention: Mr. James K. Burns
Executive Director

Dear Mr. Burns:

It has come to my attention that Robert Burgermeyer is terminating his employment with the Community Development Commission. It is my understanding that the question of a possible conflict of interests has arisen and that it has been your determination, based on legal advice, that the possibility of a conflict of interest does exist as a result of Mr. Burgermeyer being both an agency employee and a member of the South Park Project Area Committee. I understand also that you have requested Bob to choose between remaining as a staff member or as a member of PAC.

I have discussed this matter with Bob and I will tell you what I told him. I, as Chairman of the South Park PAC, feel that Bob would provide greater service to the PAC and to the community if he would remain in the employment of the Commission rather than electing to discontinue his employment with the Commission and continue to serve as a PAC member.

Having worked closely this past year with numerous citizens' groups in the Citizens Participation Process for Community Development, it is easy for me to see the potential charges that could be levelled against the Commission as a result of Bob continuing to work in both capacities. I also tried to point this out to him, but he has elected to continue in his choice of terminating his employment with the Commission.

I hope that the Commission will be able to replace Bob's position with somebody from the South Park Neighborhood who may also be afforded the opportunity to learn and gain
experience in the Commission's programs as Bob has been able to do.

I intend to discuss this matter with the PAC at our next meeting and it is my feeling that many of the PAC members will share my view that we had hoped that Bob would remain as an employee of the Commission.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH PARK PROJECT AREA COMMITTEE

Bill Barone
Chairman
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