Gridley City Council – Regular Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, February 17, 2026; 6:00 pm
Gridley City Hall, 685 Kentucky Street, Gridley, CA 95948

"Our purpose is to continuously enhance our community's vitality and overall quality of life. We are committed to providing high quality, cost-effective municipal services and forming productive partnerships with our residents and regional organizations. We collectively develop, share, and are guided by a clear vision, values, and meaningful objectives."

The Public is encouraged to attend and participate in person. Comments from the public on agenda items will be accepted until 4 pm on February 17, 2026, via email to csantana@gridley.ca.us or via the payment/document drop box at Gridley City Hall and will be conveyed to the Council for consideration.

You may view using the following link, ID, and passcode:
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/82265428470?pwd=Q7l0Z8BSxq1dEQSFCPJvHBIRe2Ib9F.1
Passcode:965420

CALL TO ORDER - Mayor Farr

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – Vice Mayor Johnson

PROCLAMATION – None

INTRODUCTION OF NEW OR PROMOTED EMPLOYEES - None

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION FORUM - *Members of the public may address the City Council on matters not listed on the agenda. The City Council may not discuss nor take action on any community participation item brought forward by a member of the community. Comments are requested to be limited to three (3) minutes.*

CONSENT AGENDA - None

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Council Meeting Minutes**

   City Council to review and approve City Council minutes

   Recommended Action(s):

   a. Approve special City Council meeting minutes dated January 29th

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION –

2. Labor Negotiations – Appointment of Designated Labor Negotiator

Council is asked to appoint a designated agent for labor negotiations with the City Administrator. For convenience and efficiency, it is recommended that Deputy City Attorney Landon Little serve in this role.

Recommended Action(s):

a. Appoint Deputy City Attorney Landon Little as the City's designated labor negotiator for negotiations with the City Administrator.

3. Approval of Recreation Manager Job Description and Salary Range

Council to review and consider approving the creation of the Recreation Manager job description and corresponding salary range.

Recommended Action(s):

a. Approve, and adopt the Recreation Manager job description and associated salary range of $4,301 to $5,764 per month, with placement within Steps 1 through 7 of the salary range

b. Authorize staff to proceed with recruitment.

4. Gridley Sports Complex Ph 1 – Amendment #4 for Additional Geotechnical Study for Unsuitable Site Conditions

Council to review the preliminary results from the seven previously approved borings at the Sports Complex and consider authorizing Amendment 4 to Task Order 16-607-402 with Bennett Engineering Services (BENEN) to conduct an additional geotechnical study for the sports lighting foundation design, in the amount of $20,982.50.

Recommended Action(s):

a. Authorize the City Administrator to execute amendment 4 to task order 16-607-402 with Bennett Engineering Services (BENEN) to include Additional Geotechnical Study for the sports lighting foundation design in the amount of $20,982.50.

5. Fencing for 110 Virginia Street – Receivership Property

Council to review and discuss fencing options for 110 Virginia Street, Gridley.

Recommended Action(s):

a. Installation of temporary fencing at 110 Virginia Street, selecting either L&M Rental Fence, Inc. or VSB Systems, ***or***

b. Installation of permanent fencing through Wireman Fence Products and

c. Authorize Public Works director to execute necessary documents and coordinate the installation of fencing, ***or***

d. Delay fencing pending the outcome of the potential sale of the property.

COUNCIL COMMITTEE REPORTS - *Brief reports on conferences, seminars, and meetings attended by the Mayor and City Council members, if any.*

CITY ADMINISTRATOR REPORTS - *Brief updates and reports on conferences, seminars, and meetings attended by the City Administrator, if any.*

DEPARTMENT UPDATE REPORTS

6. Update to Litigation Regarding 110 and 390 Virginia St. – Deputy City Attorney Landon Little

POTENTIAL FUTURE CITY COUNCIL ITEMS - (*Appearing on the Agenda within 30 days*):

Energy Efficiency Contract Review	3/2/2026
Randolph Lot Use Agreement - GUSD	3/2/2026
Steffen Estates Maintenance Assessment District Draft	3/2/2026
FY 2024-2025 Financials Approval	3/2/2026

CLOSED SESSION –

7. Conference with Labor Negotiators Cal. Gov. Code Section 54957.6: Unrepresented Employee: City Administrator Elisa Arteaga.

8. Conference with Legal Counsel - Determination of whether closed session authorized as a result of significant exposure to litigation against the City pursuant to Cal. Gov. Code Section 54956.9(b)(2).

9. Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation. Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 54956.9: 1 case.

10. Public Employment: Title: Public Works Director (Cal Gov. Code Section 54957)

11. Public Employment: Title: Electrical Director (Cal Gov. Code Section 54957)

ADJOURNMENT – adjourning to a regular meeting on March 2nd, 2026

NOTE 1: **POSTING OF AGENDA-** This agenda was posted on the public bulletin board at City Hall at or before 6:00 p.m., February 14th, 2026. This agenda along with all attachments is available for public viewing online at www.gridley.ca.us and at the Administration Counter in City Hall, 685 Kentucky Street, Gridley, CA.

NOTE 2: REGARDING UNSCHEDULED MATTERS – In accordance with state law, it shall be the policy of this Council that no action shall be taken on any item presented during the public forum or on unscheduled matters unless the Council, by majority vote, determines that an emergency situation exists, or, unless the Council by a two-thirds vote finds that the need to take action arose subsequent to the posting of this agenda.

Gridley City Council – Special City Council Meeting Minutes

Thursday, January 29, 2026; 3:00 pm
Gridley City Hall, 685 Kentucky Street, Gridley, CA 95948

"Our purpose is to continuously enhance our community's vitality and overall quality of life. We are committed to providing high quality, cost-effective municipal services and forming productive partnerships with our residents and regional organizations. We collectively develop, share, and are guided by a clear vision, values, and meaningful objectives."

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Mayor Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

ROLL CALL

Present:	Johnson, Calderon, Sanchez
Absent:	Farr (recused himself), Roberts (recused himself)
Arriving after roll call:	None
Staff Present:	Elisa Arteaga, City Administrator Landon Little, Deputy City Attorney Todd Farr, Police Chief Martin Pineda, Finance Director Patricia Taverner, Human Resources Manager Carmen Santana, Deputy City Clerk

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION FORUM

The community forum was opened, and seeing as no one was present to speak, was closed.

CONSENT AGENDA - None

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

1. **Memorandum of Understanding (IBEW)**

   City Council to review and approve the MOU for the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) Local Union 1245

   Recommended Action(s):

   a. Approve Resolution No. 2026-R-002: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Gridley Approving the Memorandum of Understanding Between the IBEW Local Union 1245 and the Gridley City Council

It was noted for the record that Mayor Farr and Councilmember Roberts recused themselves and were not present for any part of the meeting or discussion on the matter.

City Administrator Elisa Arteaga presented the item and advised the Council that revisions to the MOU are still needed and will be reviewed by IBEW. She provided a brief overview of the changes made to date, as well as the tentative salary schedule changes and the budget adjustments that will be required to cover costs not accounted for in the previously adopted budget.

Although additional language updates to the MOU are necessary and the resolution was not ready for adoption at this meeting, staff requested direction to proceed with the previously agreed-upon salary amounts in order to issue retroactive pay to employees before year-end, allowing the amounts to be reflected on W-2s.

ROLL CALL
Motion: Johnson
Second: Sanchez
Action: approve an emergency action to proceed with the tentatively agreed-upon salary schedules in order to issue retroactive pay before the deadline for issuing accurate W-2s.

Ayes: Calderon, Johnson, Sanchez
Noes: None
Absent: Farr, Roberts
Abstain: None
Motion passed, 3-0

CLOSED SESSION - None

ADJOURNMENT

With no further items left to discuss, Vice Mayor Johnson adjourned to the next regular meeting on February 2nd, 2026.

Approve: _____
Elisa Arteaga, City Administrator

City Council Agenda Item #2
Staff Report

X	Regular
	Special
	Closed
	Emergency

Date: February 17, 2026

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Landon Little, Deputy City Attorney

Subject: Appointment of Designated Labor Negotiator

Recommendation
Appoint Deputy City Attorney Landon Little as the City's designated labor negotiator for matters involving the City Administrator.

Background
To ensure efficient and consistent representation in labor negotiations with the City Administrator, the Council is asked to designate a single agent. Deputy City Attorney Landon Little has the experience and knowledge to serve in this role and will act on behalf of the City during negotiations.

Financial Impact
There is no additional financial impact associated with this appointment. Services will be provided as part of the Deputy City Attorney's existing duties.

Attachments
None

City Council Agenda Item #3
Staff Report

Date:	February 17, 2026
To:	Mayor and City Council
From:	Elisa Arteaga, City Administrator
Subject:	Approval of Recreation Manager Job Description and Salary Range

X	Regular
	Special
	Closed
	Emergency

Recommendation
Staff respectfully requests that the City Council review, approve, and adopt the Recreation Manager job description and associated salary range of $4,301 to $5,764 per month, with placement within Steps 1 through 7 of the salary range, and authorize staff to proceed with recruitment.

Background
The City provides a variety of recreation programs, facility rental, and community events that serve residents of all ages. As recreation services have expanded in scope and complexity, the need for dedicated management oversight has become increasingly important.

The proposed Recreation Manager position is intended to provide centralized leadership and coordination of the City's recreation programs, facilities, and community events. The position will report to the City Administrator or designee and will be responsible for program planning and evaluation, staff supervision, budget and grant administration, and community engagement. The Recreation Manager is classified as a mid-management position and is distinguished from coordinator-level positions by its responsibility for independent judgment, policy implementation, and overall program administration.

Financial Impact
The FY 2025–2026 Recreation budget includes sufficient funding to support one full-time position and limited part-time staffing. Implementation of the Recreation Manager position may require adjustments to existing staffing levels and a potential reorganization of departmental resources to stay within the adopted budget. Funds are available to cover this position, a reduction in hours for some current recreation staff may be needed to ensure fiscal sustainability.

Compliance with City Council Strategic Plan or Budget Goals
Approval of the Recreation Manager job description supports the City Council's strategic goals by strengthening recreation service delivery, enhancing community engagement, and ensuring effective management of City resources.

Attachments

- Draft Recreation Manager Job Description

Recreation Manager
(Draft Job Description)
Salary Range: Monthly: $4301 - $5764

DEFINITION
Under general direction of the City Administrator or designee, the Recreation Manager plans, organizes, manages, and evaluates the City's recreation programs, facilities, and community events. The position oversees staff, contractors, volunteers, and program operations; develops and administers the recreation budget and grants; ensures high-quality service delivery; and fosters positive relationships with the community, partner agencies, and elected officials. The Recreation Manager performs administrative, supervisory, and professional duties in support of City goals and policies. This is a mid-management classification responsible for the overall coordination and administration of the City's recreation programs and services. The Recreation Manager is distinguished from coordinator-level positions by responsibility for program planning, budget administration, staff supervision, policy implementation, and community engagement. The incumbent exercises independent judgment within established policies and guidelines.

SUPERVISION RECEIVED AND EXERCISED
Receives: General direction from the City Administrator or designee
Exercises: Direct and indirect supervision of all recreation staff (full-time, part-time, seasonal staff, contracted instructors, and volunteers).

ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
Duties may include, but are not limited to, the following:
Program & Operations Management; plan, develop, coordinate, implement, promote, and evaluate recreation programs and grants, classes, leagues, and special events for all age groups. Assess community recreation needs and recommend program enhancements or new services. Oversee facility scheduling, rentals, and usage to ensure safety, accessibility, and efficient operations. Ensure compliance with City policies, risk management practices, and applicable laws and regulations.

Staff & Contractor Supervision: Train, schedule, supervise, and evaluate recreation staff, seasonal employees, volunteers, and contracted instructors. Provide leadership, coaching, and professional development opportunities. Ensure staff adherence to safety standards and customer service expectations.

Budget & Financial Administration: Assist in the preparation and administration of the recreation budget and grants. Monitor revenues and expenditures; approve program-related purchases. Research, prepare, and administer grants, sponsorships, and donations.

Administrative & Policy Support: Develop, and recommend policies, procedures, and operational guidelines for recreation services. Prepare reports, correspondence, marketing

materials, and presentations. Maintain accurate records related to programs, finances, and facilities.

Community Relations & Interagency Coordination: Respond to public inquiries, concerns, and complaints in a professional and timely manner. Represent the City at meetings and community events. Promote recreation programs through outreach, marketing, partnerships, and maintain, update, and respond to the City's recreation-related social media pages.

Other Duties: Attend evening, weekend, and holiday events as required. Perform related duties as assigned.

Employment Standards

Knowledge of:

- Principles and practices of public recreation administration and program development
- Understand principals, practices, and fundamentals of public recreation programs, major sports, games and other recreational activities and programs suitable for all age groups.
- Personnel supervision, training, and performance evaluation
- Budget development, monitoring, and basic accounting principles
- Facility management, scheduling, and risk management
- Marketing, community engagement, and customer service
- Applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations

Ability to:

- Plan, organize, and manage recreation programs and events
- Supervise and motivate staff and volunteers
- Analyze community needs and develop effective solutions
- Prepare clear and concise reports and correspondence
- Communicate effectively with the public, staff, and elected officials
- Exercise sound judgment and initiative within established guidelines
- Establish and maintain effective working relationships

EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE

Any combination of education and experience that would provide the required knowledge and abilities is qualifying. A typical way to obtain the qualifications would be:

- Education: Preferred bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university with major coursework in recreation administration, public administration, business, or a related field and/or
- Experience: Minimum three (3) years of progressively responsible experience in recreation or community services, including supervisory or lead responsibility

LICENSES AND CERTIFICATIONS

- Valid California Driver's License
- Safe driving record per the City's driving standard policy
- First Aid and CPR certification (must be obtained within a specified probationary period)

TYPICAL PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS AND TYPICAL WORKING CONDITIONS

Work is performed in an office environment and on-site in parks, recreational facilities, or playground/open space. Incumbent sits, stands, walks, kneels, crouches, twists, climbs stairs and inclines, reaches, bends and grasps, pushes, pulls, drags and lifts supplies and equipment weighing 50 pounds or less. An incumbent uses a computer, keyboard and related equipment, drives a vehicle on City business and may walk and stand on slippery and uneven surfaces. Evening, weekend, and holiday work is required to support programs and events. Travel by automobile may be required. This position involves interaction with staff, Council, businesses, civic organizations, and the general public.

City Council Agenda Item #4
Staff Report

Date:	February 17, 2026
To:	Mayor and City Council
From:	Elisa Arteaga, City Administrator
Subject:	Gridley Sports Complex Ph 1 – Amendment #4 for Additional Geotechnical Study for Unsuitable Site Conditions

X	Regular
	Special
	Closed
	Emergency

Recommendation

City staff respectfully recommend that the City Council authorize the City Administrator to execute amendment 4 to task order 16-607-402 with Bennett Engineering Services (BENEN) to include Additional Geotechnical Study for the sports lighting foundation design in the amount of $20,982.50.

Background

Construction field exploration identified high groundwater and loose, sandy, unsuitable soils at planned sports lighting locations, rendering the original foundation design infeasible. To complete Phase 1 lighting and meet Proposition 68 grant requirements, a targeted geotechnical investigation (GI) and testing was performed by Crawford & Associates at all 7 pole locations to depths approximately 40 to 60ft.

The initial results have return varying conditions in all seven locations, with ground water between 9.5 ft and 15 ft, and the depth of liquifiable soil between 6 to 47 feet deep.

Due to these conditions, a site class F site-specific Stie Response Analysis (SRA) is required for the light pole structures. A third-party consultant who specializes in SRA is required to perform this task. Crawford & Associates will coordinate with the third-party consultant and BENEN will continue to manage the effort. BENN is not adding any additional cost at this time other than the pass-through cost from Crawford & Associates.

Financial Impact

Due to the unfavorable results of the initial GI, and the depth of the unsuitable soil, the increased construction costs cannot be estimated with any certainty at this time for the redesigned and installation of the lighting foundation. An updated project budget will be provided when the contractor receives the information necessary to provide an updated cost proposal for the additional work.

At this time the budget will be increased by $20,982.50 through a supplemental appropriation resolutions that will be presented at a future City Council meeting.

The graph below shows a more accurate projection:

Sports Complex Cost Summary Projection		
Base Bid	$	2,466,672.00
10% Contingency	$	246,667.00
06/24/2025 - Cut & Abandon Water Services	*$*	*27,280.00*
06/26/2025 - Revised Hydraway Drainage	*$*	*31,472.00*
08/21/2025 - Remove Fabric Under Chip Sea	*$*	*2,912.47*
08/21/2025 - Light Pole Foundation	*$*	*45,380.50*
08/26/2025 - Unsuitable Soils	*$*	*134,425.00*
Subtotal	*$*	*2,713,339.00*
Original Bennett Engineer Contract w/subs	$	490,000.00
Amendment #1 - Budget Transfer	$	-
Amendment #2 - Decrease to cover subs	$	(109,600.00)
Amendment #3 - Geotechnical Investigation	$	65,037.20
Bennett Engineer Contract w/subs	$	445,437.20
Unico	$	99,614.00
Unfunded City Staff Work and Material	$	462,000.00
Total Estimated Cost	$	3,720,390.20
Consideration for Approval		
Additional Geotechnical Study	$	20,982.50
Estimated Construction Change Order	*$*	-
Total	$	20,982.50
If Approved, new projected amount	$	3,741,372.70
Funding Sources		
Grant Award	$	3,000,000.00
Unfunded Amount	$	741,372.70
Total Estimated Cost	$	3,741,372.70

Compliance with City Council Strategic Plan or Budget Goals

The City Council and City staff are committed to providing effective leadership while providing quality cost-effective local government services.

Attachments:

- BENEN Amendment #4 to Task Order 16-607-402, with Crawford Scope and Fee
- Preliminary results of the seven borings locations

BENEN
1082 Sunrise Avenue, Suite 100
Roseville, California 95661
T 916.783.4100

February 10, 2026

Elisa Arteaga, City Administrator
City of Gridley
685 Kentucky Street
Gridley, CA 95948

Re: RRT Sports Complex Phase 1, Amendment No. 4 –Project Budget Reallocation

Ms. Elisa Arteaga,

This Task Order Amendment authorizes Bennett Engineering Services Inc additional budget to the project to perform new professional services described below. Services are to be performed in accordance with the Agreement dated October 17, 2016, between the City of Gridley and Bennett Engineering Services, as amended.

Project Name: Gridley – RRT Sports Complex Phase 1 (BENEN Project #16-607-206)

Scope of Work: The Project budget and scope of services are hereby amended as set forth in this Amendment No. 3. A budget of **$20,982.50** is allocated to cover the costs associated with Crawford and Associates Geotechnical Investigation for Sports Lighting Foundations. The attached scope and fee proposal provide a detailed description of the services to be performed; **see Exhibit A: Scope of Services and Fee Estimate.**

The amended contractor amount is not to exceed $466,419.70 without prior authorization from the City.

Requested by:

Dave Harden, P.E. – City Engineer

City of Gridley

Approved:_____ Date:_____
Elisa Arteaga, City Administrator

Bennett Engineering Services

Approved:_____ Date:_____
Stacey Lynch, Vice President

Cc: DH,MR

February 9, 2026

Supplemental Services
Lighting Improvements
Gridley, California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND SCOPE OF SERVICES

Based on the geotechnical scope of work already performed, it has been determined that a site class F site-specific Site Response Analysis (SRA) is needed for the light pole structures. It is our understanding that an ASCE 7-22 exception cannot be used as the fundamental period of the structure is longer than 0.5 seconds.

Crawford & Associates, Inc. (Crawford) will coordinate with a third-party consultant (Dr. Ramin Motamed) and provide Dr. Ramin Motamed with the necessary information to perform the SRA.

Using CBC 2025 and assuming the fundamental period of the proposed structure is longer than 0.5 seconds, Dr. Ramin Motamed will proceed with the following tasks:

Task	Details
Development of design soil profiles	Review subsurface soil information and prepare up to 4 design profiles
Develop design input time histories	Develop design input acceleration time-histories (target motions) at the base of 1-D soil column models for one hazard level
Run dynamic ground analysis	Run site response analyses on 1-D soil column models based on design profiles
Develop the design ARS at the ground surface	Develop the Design ARS at the ground surface based on SRA results
Prepare a report and summarize results	Prepare a draft report for review by (Crawford), implement comments, and issue a final report

DELIVERABLES:	DRAFT AND FINAL REPORT

Project Name: **Lighting Improvements**
County/City: **Gridley, Ca.**
Services: Geotechnical

Date: **2/9/2026**

Crawford & Associates, Inc.
Geotechnical Engineering, Design and Construction Services

Crawford & Associates, Inc. Tasks and Descriptions

		Principal *	Senior Project Manager *	Project Manager II	Project Manager I	Senior Engineer II	Senior Engineer I	Senior Geologist	Project Engineer III / Geologist III	Project Engineer II / Geologist II	Project Engineer I / Geologist I	Staff Engineer / Geologist	Drafter	Project Coordinator	Administrative Assistant	HOURS PER TASK	LABOR COST PER TASK	OTHER DIRECT COSTS	TOTAL COST PER TASK
	Crawford Staff	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD				
	Hourly Rate	$ 275.00	$ 255.00	$ 245.00	$ 210.00	$ 225.00	$ 205.00	$ 180.00	$ 180.00	$ 160.00	$ 150.00	$ 140.00	$ 125.00	$ 135.00	$ 115.00				
TASK NO. 1																			
	Project Management and Coordination						6.00				4.00	4.00		1.00	1.00	16.00	$ 2,640.00	$ -	$ 2,640.00
	Task 1 - Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	16.00	$ 2,640.00	$ -	$ 2,640.00
TASK NO. 2																			
	Site Specific Analysis															0.00	$ -	$ 18,342.50	$ 18,342.50
	Task 2 - Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	$ -	$ 18,342.50	$ 18,342.50
	Subtotal- Hours/Tasks	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**6.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**4.00**	**4.00**	**0.00**	**1.00**	**1.00**	**16.00**			

Overtime and Graveyard Charges May Apply
(*) Indicates Key Staff
(**) Indicates Prevailing Wage Classifications

TOTAL LABOR COST:	$ 2,640.00
OTHER DIRECT COSTS:	$ 18,342.50
TOTAL ESTIMATED FEE:	**$ 20,982.50**

PRELIMINARY GEOTECHNICAL INFORMATION

SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION

Crawford conducted seven subsurface exploration borings at the project site between November 18th and December 12th, 2025. A summary of the subsurface exploration is provided in Table 1 below. The locations if the exploratory borings are shown on Figure 2.

Table 1: Subsurface Exploration Summary

Boring No.	Completion Date	Drill Rig Type	Hammer Type	Hammer Eff.	Elevation	Depth of Boring
R-25-001	11/26/2025	Truck: G100GT	140lb Automatic	85	93	56.5
R-25-002	11/20/2025	Truck: G100GT	140lb Automatic	85	93	45.75
R-25-003	11/18/2025	Truck: G100GT	140lb Automatic	85	92	50.92
R-25-004	11/20/2025	Truck: G100GT	140lb Automatic	85	90	61.5
R-25-005	11/19/2025	Truck: G100GT	140lb Automatic	85	90	51.5
R-25-006	12/12/2025	Truck: G100GT	140lb Automatic	85	93	71.5
R-25-007	11/21/2025	Track	140lb Automatic	76.9	93	52.5

GROUNDWATER

Groundwater was encountered in all seven borings at a depth of about 9 to 15 feet bgs. We present the summary of the groundwater findings for each boring in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Groundwater Summary

Boring No.	Completion Date	Ground Surface Elevation (ft)	Groundwater Depth/Elevation (ft)
R-25-001	11/26/2025	93	13 / 80
R-25-002	11/20/2025	93	15 / 78
R-25-003	11/18/2025	92	15 / 77
R-25-004	11/20/2025	90	10 / 80
R-25-005	11/19/2025	90	10 / 80
R-25-006	12/12/2025	93	9.5 / 83.5
R-25-007	11/21/2025	93	12 / 81

Considering groundwater was encountered between about 9 to 15 feet bgs (elev. 77 to 83.5 feet) in our explorations, we consider the design high groundwater to be about elevation 84 feet.

Groundwater levels can fluctuate due to changes in precipitation, seasonal variations, local irrigation, and possibly other factors. Depth to groundwater should be determined immediately prior to work by those responsible for construction.

CORROSION EVALUATION

Corrosion test results on soil samples obtained from the borings completed for this project are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: Soil Corrosivity Test Results

Boring / Sample No.	Depth (ft)	pH	Minimum Resistivity (ohm-cm)	Chloride (ppm)	Sulfate (ppm)
R-25-001 / 7A	26.0-26.5	7.51	1910	7.9	13.4
R-25-001 / 7B	25.5-26.0	7.66	2280	7.8	9.1

For structural elements, Caltrans[1] defines a corrosive environment as an area where the soil has either a chloride concentration of 500 ppm or greater, a sulfate concentration of 1,500 ppm or greater, or has a pH of 5.5 or less. With the exception of MSE wall design, Caltrans does not include minimum resistivity as a parameter to define a corrosive area for structures. Soil and water are not required to be tested for chlorides and sulfates if the minimum resistivity is greater than 1,100 ohm-cm.

Based on the corrosivity test results summarized in Table 3 and current Caltrans' guidelines, the site is considered not corrosive to structural concrete/steel foundation elements. The provided corrosion test results are only an indicator of corrosion potential. The designer should consult with a corrosion engineer if the test result values are considered significant to the design.

SITE SIESMICITY EVALUATION

SEISMIC DESIGN CRITERIA

Seismic design criteria are included in Section 11 of ASCE 7-22 (Sections referenced hereafter refer to ASCE 7-22) and Supplement 3, including the risk-targeted maximum considered earthquake (MCE_R) Spectral Response Acceleration Parameters obtained from the USGS Seismic Design Geodatabase[2]. These parameters are available online through the ASCE Hazard Tool[3] website using the data from the USGS Seismic Design Map, site location, and Site Class.

[1] Caltrans Corrosion Guidelines Version 3.2, May 2021
2 https://doi.org/10.5066/F7NK3C76
[3] https://ascehazardtool.org/

SITE CLASS AND RISK CATEGORY

The boring data show subsurface soils at the site generally consist of soft to hard cohesive layers and very loose to very dense non-cohesive layers. Groundwater was encountered at a depth of about 9 to 15 ft below ground surface (approximately elevation 84 to 77 ft).

Based on the results of our liquefaction analyses, we identified soil layers susceptible to liquefaction at the site. Therefore, based on the presence of liquifiable soils, the site should be classified as a Site Class F according to Section 20.2.1 of ASCE 7-22, unless the exception in Section 20.2.1.1 can be used. If the exception in Section 20.2.1.1 can be used, then the site can be classified as a Site Class D based on the soil and groundwater conditions encountered during our investigation. The structural engineer should review the exception in Section 20.2.1.1 of ASCE 7-22 to determine if it can be used for the proposed improvements and the site can be classified as a Site Class D.

Crawford used correlations with SPT blow count N-values (Burmister[4]) corrected for hammer efficiency from the 2025 borings to determine the average shear wave velocity ($\bar{v}_S$) in the upper 30 meters or 100 feet. Direct field measurements (i.e. seismic Cone Penetration Tests) were not utilized to measure the shear wave velocities. Due to the method of data collection, Section 20.3 of ASCE 7-22 requires a range of $\bar{v}_S$ ($\bar{v}_S$/1.3 to 1.3*$\bar{v}_S$) to be evaluated if $\bar{v}_S$ was estimated. Our estimated $\bar{v}_S$ was 725 feet per second (ft/s) (221 meters per second) using explorations R-25-001 through R-25-007. Therefore, a range of $\bar{v}_S$ from 558 ft/s to 943 ft/s (170 m/s to 287 m/s) was evaluated. As these $\bar{v}_S$ values span over two site classes in Table 20.2-1 of ASCE 7-22 (Site Classes D and DE), the most critical ground motion was determined at each period.

We assume a Risk Category of II for the proposed piles.

SEISMIC DESIGN PARAMETERS

Crawford used the ASCE Hazard Tool website, considering the site location (latitude 39.353782 and longitude -121.694782) and Risk Category II to determine the MCE_R spectral response acceleration parameters from the USGS Seismic Design Geodatabase for Site Classes D and DE. The MCE_R spectral response acceleration parameters are summarized in Table 4 below.

[4] AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, Section 10.4.6.2.4, 8th Edition, 2018 and Burmister's Energy-Area Correction for Sampler Size Conversions to SPT N-value.

Table 4: Seismic Design Parameters (ASCE 7-22)

Spectral Response Acceleration Parameter[1]	Site Class	
	D	DE
S_s – MCE_R, 5% Damped, Spectral Response Acceleration Parameter at a period of 0.2 s	0.72 g	
S_1 – MCE_R, 5% Damped, Spectral Response Acceleration Parameter at a period of 1 s	0.25 g	
S_{MS} – MCE_R, 5% Damped, Spectral Response Acceleration Parameter at a period of 0.2 s adjusted for site class	0.99 g	1.09 g
S_{M1} – MCE_R, 5% Damped, Spectral Response Acceleration Parameter at a period of 1 s adjusted for site class	0.63 g	0.84 g
S_{DS} – Design Spectral Acceleration Parameter a period of 0.2 s	0.66 g	0.73 g
S_{D1} – Design Spectral Acceleration Parameter at a period of 1 s	0.42 g	0.56 g
T_L – Long-Period Transition Period	16	
Site Modified Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA_m)	0.38 g	0.38 g

MULTI-PERIOD DESIGN RESPONSE SPECTRUM

MULTI-PERIOD DESIGN RESPONSE SPECTRUM

The multi-period design response spectrum was developed following Section 11.4.5 of ASCE 7-22 and Supplement 3 as two-thirds of the multi-period 5%-damped MCE_R response spectrum obtained from the USGS Seismic Design Geodatabase. Crawford used the ASCE Hazard Tool website to obtain the multi-period design response spectrum for Site Class D and DE and determined the critical spectral accelerations at each period to develop the multi-period design response spectrum.

The multi-period design response spectra for Site Class D and DE are shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Multi-Period Design Spectra for Site Class D and DE

Site Class D		Site Class DE	
Period, s	**Sa, g**	**Period, s**	**Sa, g**
0	0.28	0	0.29
0.01	0.29	0.01	0.29
0.02	0.29	0.02	0.29
0.03	0.29	0.03	0.29
0.05	0.33	0.05	0.32
0.075	0.42	0.075	0.4
0.1	0.51	0.1	0.5
0.15	0.63	0.15	0.63
0.2	0.69	0.2	0.71
0.25	0.72	0.25	0.77
0.3	0.73	0.3	0.8
0.4	0.71	0.4	0.81
0.5	0.67	0.5	0.79
0.75	0.53	0.75	0.65
1	0.42	1	0.54
1.5	0.3	1.5	0.4
2	0.23	2	0.31
3	0.15	3	0.21
4	0.11	4	0.15
5	0.088	5	0.12
7.5	0.06	7.5	0.081
10	0.047	10	0.062

The most critical ground motion was determined at each period amongst the two Site Classes (D and DE) following Section 20.3 of ASCE 7-22. Based on the USGS Geodatabase results, Site Class D was found to be the most critical spectral accelerations between 0.05 to 0.15 seconds. Site Class DE was found to have the most critical spectral accelerations between 0 to 0.03 seconds and 0.2 to 10 seconds.

The recommended multi-period design spectrum with the most critical spectral accelerations at all periods is provided in Table 6 below. The spectral acceleration value between the discrete period values shown in Table 6 may be interpolated per Section 11.4.5.1 of ASCE 7-22 and Supplement 3.

Table 6: Recommended Multi-Period Design Spectra

Period, s	Sa, g
0	0.29
0.01	0.29
0.02	0.29
0.03	0.29
0.05	0.33
0.075	0.42
0.1	0.51
0.15	0.63
0.2	0.71
0.25	0.77
0.3	0.8
0.4	0.81
0.5	0.79
0.75	0.65
1	0.54
1.5	0.4
2	0.31
3	0.21
4	0.15
5	0.12
7.5	0.081
10	0.062

LIQUEFACTION AND SEISMIC SETTLEMENT

LIQUEFACTION POTENTIAL

Soil liquefaction can occur when saturated, relatively loose sand and specific soft, fine-grained saturated soils (typically within the upper 50 feet) are subject to ground shaking strong enough to create soil particle separation that results from increased pore pressure. This separation and subsequent pore pressure dissipation can lead to decreased soil shear strength and settlement. Liquefaction is known to occur in soils ranging from low plasticity silts to gravels. However, soils most susceptible to liquefaction are clean sands to silty sands, and non-plastic silts. Granular soils with SPT blow count $(N_1)_{60} \geq 30$, rock, and most clay soils are not liquefiable.

To evaluate the potential for soil liquefaction to occur at the site, Crawford used the simplified procedure outlined by Youd et al.[5] for the boring data and associated laboratory test results, design groundwater elevation of 84 ft, a PGA of 0.38g, a site-to-fault distance of 60.8 miles, and a maximum moment magnitude of 6.67. The site-to-fault distance and maximum moment magnitude was determined using the USGS Deaggregation Unified Hazard Tool.

SEISMIC SETTLEMENT

Based on the results of our analysis, soil layers susceptible to liquefaction are present within borings R-25-001 and R-25-003 through R-25-007. We present a summary of the soil layers susceptible to liquefaction, the evaluated liquefaction induced settlement, and the potential for surface manifestation for each boring in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Liquefaction Analyses Results

Boring No.	Light Pole Support No.	Approximate Depths of Liquefiable Soil Layer (ft)	Approximate Elevations of Liquefiable Soil Layer (ft)	Surface Manifestation (Y/N)[1]	Estimated Total Liquefaction Induced Settlement (in)
R-25-001	P4	10 to 23	83 to 70	Y	4.0
		34 to 38	59 to 55	N	
R-25-002	P5	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0
R-25-003	P6	31.5 to 34	60.5 to 58	N	0.5
R-25-004	P7	6 to 20	84 to 70	Y	4.0
R-25-005	P1	6 to 18	84 to 72	Y	3.25
R-25-006	P2	9 to 13	84 to 80	N	1.0
R-25-007	P3	9 to 21.5	84 to 71.5	Y	4.0
		43 to 47	50 to 46	N	

[1] Surface manifestation triggers downdrag conditions on the pole foundation.

The actual total liquefaction-induced settlement at the surface could range from half to twice the calculated values.

Additionally, during a seismic event, ground shaking can cause densification of loose to medium dense granular soil layers above the water table that can result in settlement of the ground surface. Our analyses results in a seismic settlement of about 0.25 inches or less above a groundwater elevation of 84 ft.

SURFACE MANIFESTATION

Relatively shallow, thick layers of liquefiable soil were encountered in borings R-25-001, -004, -005, and -007 approximately between elevations 84 to 70 feet. Based on methods by Ishihara[6], overlying non-liquefiable soil layers present within the aforementioned borings are not thick

[5] Youd & Idriss: Liquefaction Resistance of Soils: Summary Report from the 1996 NCEER and 1998 NCEER/NSF Workshops on Evaluation of Liquefaction Resistance of Soils, April 2001

[6] Ishihara, K. (1985), Stability of Natural Deposits During Earthquakes Proceeding of the 11th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, San Francisco, 1:321-376.

enough to resist the upward pressures. Therefore, there is potential for surface manifestation at the ground surface generally surrounding the proposed pole foundations P1, P3, P4, and P7.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

FOUNDATIONS

Based on discussions with the design team and the information provided in Plan Sheet C1 "Pole Support Foundation", dated December 11, 2024, by the design team, we understand that the foundation for each light pole will consist of a 18.25-inch diameter precast concrete pole set inside a 42-inch diameter drilled hole and a rebar cage, and stabilized with concrete backfill in the annular space. Per Plan Sheet C1, the vertical and horizontal rebar will be placed outside of the precast concrete pole and inside the annular space to be filled in with concrete. Additionally, our axial and lateral analyses presented below utilize the anticipated moment, shear and vertical load at the top of the 42-inch pile of 103.68 kip-ft, 1.847 kips and 3.416 kips, respectively, as shown on Plan Sheet C1.

AXIAL CAPACITY AND LATERAL CAPACITY

For axial and lateral capacity for the pole foundations, we recommend using the allowable skin friction and allowable passive equivalent fluid pressure (EFP) values presented in Tables 8 through 12 and below lowest adjacent grade. A factor of safety of 2.0 was applied for the allowable skin friction and passive EFP. The uppermost 3 ft below lowest adjacent grade should be ignored. The designer should neglect end bearing.

The passive EFP should be a triangular distribution to a depth of 10 feet below lowest adjacent grade. Below the triangular distribution (below 10 ft) the designer should use a constant distribution for the passive EFP.

Table 8: Preliminary Allowable Skin Friction and Passive EFP Values – Pole P1 & P7 (R-25-005 & R-25-004, respectively)

Elevation (ft)	Skin Friction (psf/ft)	Passive EFP (psf/ft)[1]
90 to 82	50	200
82 to 71	400[2]	175[2]
71 to 62	900	125
62 to 38	800	N/A

[1]Use constant distribution for passive EFP below 10 ft lowest adjacent grade.
[2]For seismic event and between elevation 84 to 71 ft, reduce skin friction and passive EFP to 80 psf/ft and 60 psf/ft, respectively.

Table 9: Preliminary Allowable Skin Friction and Passive EFP Values – Pole P2 (R-25-006)

Elevation (ft)	Skin Friction (psf/ft)	Passive EFP (psf/ft)[1]
93 to 84	200	340
84 to 80	450[2]	160[2]

80 to 76	700	215
76 to 22	900	125

[1]Use constant distribution for passive EFP below 10 ft lowest adjacent grade.
[2]For seismic event, reduce skin friction and passive EFP to 80 psf/ft and 60 psf/ft, respectively.

Table 10: Preliminary Allowable Skin Friction and Passive EFP Values – Pole P3 and P4 (R-25-007 and R-25-001, respectively)

Elevation (ft)	Skin Friction (psf/ft)	Passive EFP (psf/ft)[1]
93 to 84	50	210
83 to 75	250[2]	160[2]
75 to 70	650[2]	160[2]
70 to 62	800	125
62 to 57	600[3]	N/A
57 to 37	900	N/A

[1]Use constant distribution for passive EFP below 10 ft lowest adjacent grade.
[2]For seismic event, reduce skin friction and passive EFP to 80 psf/ft and 60 psf/ft, respectively.
[3]For seismic event, reduce skin friction to 135 psf/ft.

Table 11: Preliminary Allowable Skin Friction and Passive EFP Values – Pole P5 (R-25-002)

Elevation (ft)	Skin Friction (psf/ft)	Passive EFP (psf/ft)[1]
93 to 85	50	165
85 to 70	750	310
70 to 47	900	125

[1]Use constant distribution for passive EFP below 10 ft lowest adjacent grade.

Table 12: Preliminary Allowable Skin Friction and Passive EFP Values – Pole P6 (R-25-003)

Elevation (ft)	Skin Friction (psf/ft)	Passive EFP (psf/ft)[1]
92 to 84	250	360
84 to 72	600	180
72 to 42	900[2]	125

[1]Use constant distribution for passive EFP below 10 ft lowest adjacent grade.
[2]For seismic event and between elevation 60.5 to 58 ft, reduce skin friction to 135 psf/ft.

Additionally, the minimum pile tip elevation for the lateral condition is provided in Table 13.

Table 13: Minimum Pole Tip Elevations – Lateral Condition

Boring No.	Light Pole Support No.	Minimum Tip Elevation (ft)
R-25-001	P4	60
R-25-002	P5	68
R-25-003	P6	67
R-25-004	P7	62
R-25-005	P1	62
R-25-006	P2	70
R-25-007	P3	60

Our liquefaction evaluation results in liquefaction-induced settlement of soil along the shafts for pole foundations P1, P3, P4, and P7, thus developing negative skin friction and reducing the axial capacity. The recommended tip elevation for design, considering reduced axial capacity due to negative skin friction, is provided below.

REDUCED AXIAL CAPACITY DUE TO NEGATIVE SKIN FRICTION

The seismic-induced negative skin friction for the proposed 42-inch drilled shafts for pole foundations P1, P3, P4, and P7 was evaluated using the Neutral Plane Method outlined in FHWA[7]. A factor of safety was not applied.

The results of our analysis for the seismic neutral plane method recommended tip elevation for design are shown in Table 14 below.

Table 14: Seismic Neutral Plane Results

Boring No.	Light Pole Support No.	Ultimate Capacity (kips)	Neutral Plane Elev. (ft)	Maximum Drag Load (kips)	Maximum Axial Load (kips)	Recommended Tip Elevation (ft)
R-25-007 R-25-001	P3 P4	141	68	63	67	58
R-25-004 R-25-005	P7 P1	126	67	63	67	60

The maximum drag load and the maximum axial compression load (drag load plus the permanent dead load) in the shaft occur at the neutral plane location. The structural capacity of the pile in axial compression must exceed the maximum axial load of 67 kips.

The shafts should be spaced at a minimum of three shaft diameters center-to-center (CTC). If closer spacing is utilized, or if the pile loading or cutoff elevation is changed, Crawford should be consulted for re-evaluation.

[7] Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Design and Construction of Driven Pile Foundations – Volume I, Publication No. NHI-16-009, 2016

R-25-004

R-25-005

R-25-006

R-25-007

R-25-003

R-25-002

R-25-001

Independence Place

FRANK HALL DR.

Legend

APPROX. BORING LOCATION

0 80'

1"=80'

NORTH

Source:
Basemap: AutoCAD Civil3D Geolocation Tool, using Bing Maps

Crawford & Associates, Inc.
Geotechnical Engineering, Design and Construction Services

Musco Lighting

Gridley, CA

Figure 2
Exploration Map

Prj. No: 25-1730.1
Date: 01/14/2026

City Council Agenda Item #5
Staff Report

Date: February 17, 2026

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Elisa Arteaga, City Administrator

Subject: Fencing for 110 Virginia Street – Receivership Property

X	Regular
	Special
	Closed
	Emergency

Recommendation
Council to review and discuss fencing options for 110 Virginia Street, Gridley. Council may also choose to delay fencing until the outcome of the potential sale of the property.

Background
The property at 110 Virginia Street is currently under city receivership due to its severely deteriorating condition. Council is already familiar with the property and its ongoing issues. At the end of 2025, Council directed staff to secure the property with fencing to prevent public trespassing.

The receivership attorney contacted City staff to request quotes for fencing and requested that the City advance the costs, which could be recovered if and when the property is sold.
The City received two quotes for temporary six-month fencing, both in the amount of $5,040:

- **L&M Rental Fence, Inc.** – Rio Linda, CA
- **VSB Systems** – Forrest Ranch, CA

Additionally, the City received a quote for permanent fencing that the City would own after installation, totaling $26,843.42 from Wireman Fence Products in Rancho Cordova, CA.

Legal/Cost Recovery Considerations:
- Temporary fencing rented specifically for 110 Virginia Street is straightforward to charge against the property if proceeds are available from the receivership.
- Permanent fencing, which the City would own, may allow the City to try to recover costs by estimating a rental value; however, this falls outside the normal scope of the receivership and could involve additional legal or departmental considerations.
- Any reimbursement from the receivership for fencing will depend on available sale proceeds after the Receiver's Certificate (loan) and associated fees are paid, and the City should understand it may be out-of-pocket for all fencing costs.
- If the property is sold, the buyer will be required to install fencing immediately after the close of escrow (within a Council-determined reasonable timeframe, e.g., 5–10 days).

Financial Impact
Temporary fencing: $5,040, which may be recoverable from the property sale.

Permanent fencing**:** $26,843.42, which may be recoverable from the property sale and could provide long-term security for the city as needed.

The Temporary Fencing could be covered with the current budget. If the permanent fencing is selected, a supplemental appropriation would be presented at the next council meeting.

Temporary Fencing	950,023.19	5,040.00	660,120.49	289,902.70
Permanent Fencing	950,023.19	26,843.42	660,120.49	289,902.70

New Projected Budget	
With Temporary Fencing	955,063.19
With Permanent Fencing	976,866.61
Projected FY 2025-2026 GF Budget Surplus(Deficit)	(2,861,196.85)

Attachments

Fencing Quotes (3)

Wireman Fence Products
3469 FITZGERALD ROAD (916) 635-1700
Rancho Cordova, CA 95742

Quote

Customer No.: HOUSE ACC2
Quote No.: 58375

Quote To:

Ship To:

Date	Ship Via	F.O.B.	Terms
02/05/2026		Origin	C.O.D.

Purchase Order Number	Sales Person	Expiration
	Sergio	02/19/2026

Quantity Required	Shipped	B.O.	Item Number	Description	Unit Price	Amount
1800			M200090G06K	2" 9 GA GALV 6' K/K	5.100	9180.00
4			P42308	GAL PIPE S44 2-7/8 X 8'	75.920	303.68
177			P41908	GAL PIPE S44 2-3/8 X 8'	50.320	8906.64
86			P21321	GAL PIPE S22 1-5/8 X 21'	58.800	5056.80
177			FET1913	2-3/8 X 1-5/8 EYE TOP P.S.	3.870	684.99
107.000			W9G	9 GA GALV WIRE	1.490	159.43
6			FTBAR3470	GAL TENSION BAR 3/4 X 70"	5.990	35.94
30			FRTB23	2-7/8 REG TENSION BAND	1.150	34.50
6			FRE131	1-5/8 1-HOLE RAIL END	2.790	16.74
12			FRBB23	2-7/8 REG BRACE BAND	1.740	20.88
4			FPC23	2-7/8 POST CAP	2.890	11.56
9			FFT9S8.5	9 GA STEEL TIE 8-1/2"-100	9.410	84.69
11			FFT9S6.5	9 GA STEEL TIE 6-1/2"-100	7.690	84.59
13			FHR9S	9 GA STEEL HOG RING - #	6.140	79.82
1			FCB516114	5/16 X 1-1/4 CARR BOLT / 100	23.350	23.35

Quote subtotal	24683.61
Sales tax @ 7.25000%	1789.56
Sales tax @ 1.50000%	370.25
Quote total	26843.42

Thank You for Your Business

All Quotes subject to stock on hand

L&M RENTAL FENCE INC.
916-991-6154
SACRAMENTO, CA.

QUOTE

2511 Q St, Rio Linda, CA 95673
Phone: (916) 991-6154
Fax: (916) 991-1373
DIR# 1000046394

Date: 1/26/2026
Valid Until: 2/25/2026

Quote For: **Jerry Cox**
City of gridley

Terms: **COD**

Job Site: 110 Virginia St, Gridley, CA 95948

Quantity	Description	Unit Price	Amount
1,800	Lineal Feet Of 6 ft Tall Temporary Fence Panels		$ 5,040.00

THIS PRICE INCLUDES DELIVERY, INSTALLATION, REMOVAL, AND A RENTAL PERIOD FOR UP TO 6 MONTHS

Additional charges may be incurred for excess labor or intensive installation requirements due to challenging terrain or insufficient access, resulting in an extended carrying distance.

PLEASE NOTE: A 4% CREDIT CARD FEE APPLIED BY OUR MERCHANT SERVICE.

Subtotal	$ 5,040.00
TOTAL	**$ 5,040.00**

VSB Systems
P.O. Box 532
Forest Ranch, CA 95942

Temporary Fence Bid

PREPARED FOR

Jerry Cox

Gridley, CA

PREPARED DATE
January 26, 2026

ITEM	QTY	PRICE	No. of Months	TOTAL
Linear Feet of Temp Fence (Stands & Hardware Included)	1,800	.40	6	$4,320.00
Set up/Tear Down of Fence	2	$360		$720.00

$5,040.00