INVESTIGATIVE STORY TIP TO CHICOSOL

The housing problem behind Chico's homelessness response ... Follow the policies, people, contracts, and outcomes

November 6, 2026

To: ChicoSol News / chicosol@protonmail.com

From: Scotty Franzyshen, Chico, California

Dear ChicoSol,

I am writing with a request for a comprehensive, independent investigation into Chico's housing crisis and the increasingly extensive system we have created to manage homelessness. I respect ChicoSol, and that is why I am bringing these questions to you. I want journalism that follows the evidence, gives the people involved a chance to respond, and investigates the underlying housing problem rather than only the visible consequences.

Your November 5 Town Hall report described disagreements over the City's proposed homelessness plan. Based on what I personally heard at the November 4 meeting, one person emphasized drugs while at least three people spoke directly about housing. Yet the published story discussed addiction without adequately presenting those housing arguments. That description of speakers is my eyewitness account, which you can verify against the meeting recording. There was also an important difference between a goal of housing people and the City's proposed goal of reducing the unsheltered count by 25 percent. Those are not the same outcome. [1][8]

WE NEED AFFORDABLE HOUSING. Not simply another plan to reduce the visibility of people experiencing homelessness.

I am not asking you to prove a conspiracy, accuse every provider of bad faith, or assume that every official or contractor has profited improperly. My concern is a SYSTEM. Whether it was deliberately designed or simply emerged from years of political decisions, funding incentives, housing shortages, and administrative practices, it appears capable of repeating a destructive cycle:

Too little housing affordable to lower-income residents -> more housing insecurity -> more visible homelessness -> a public narrative focused on disorder, drugs and crime -> enforcement and restrictive sheltering -> more spending on services and management -> inadequate permanent-housing outcomes -> the cycle starts again.

I ask ChicoSol to investigate whether the flow of Chico's housing and homelessness system works this way, and if so, why. Some programs do excellent work. Some public dollars plainly help people. That does not answer whether the combined system is organized and funded to end homelessness rather than to maintain its management.

1. Start with the housing history, not the encampments

Chico has had decades of state-required housing planning. In the 2007-2014 RHNA cycle, the City's recorded low-income production was approximately 17.6 percent of its allocation. In 2014-2022, the City reported 194 lower-income-category units against a low-income allocation of 643, or 30.2 percent. During that latter cycle, the above-moderate-income category reached 3,492 units against an allocation of 1,638, or about 213.2 percent. These are RHNA reporting and permitting measures, not a guarantee that all units were occupied or that the City committed a legal violation simply by missing a production target. [2][3]

The fundamental contrast remains: the housing being developed was disproportionately above the price point of the households most likely to face housing insecurity. When was the last time Chico met its full low-income RHNA allocation? Has it ever done so across the nearly 45 years of this state planning system? I want the actual archival record, not a declaration we have not yet established.

Please examine the choices behind those numbers. California dissolved redevelopment agencies in 2012. What affordable-housing funding did Chico lose, and what replaced it? In October 2020, the City advanced discussion of inclusionary zoning, but by January 2022 that approach was abandoned. The City's Housing Element subsequently recorded Council opposition to an inclusionary ordinance. Who made those choices? What development-feasibility studies were considered? What replacement policy was adopted and what did it deliver? What incentives, density changes, accessory dwelling units, small-lot or single-room-occupancy opportunities, housing trusts, subsidies, acquisition programs, and publicly owned sites were explored, adopted, or rejected? [3]

Please examine Valley's Edge and other major developments in that same context: the affordability commitments, approval process, land-use choices, public infrastructure costs, and actual units affordable to households at different income levels. Also examine short-term rentals, vacant or underused properties, older motels that might be adapted, and barriers faced by smaller shared-housing or rooming-house approaches. Vacancy figures alone do not establish that homes are suitable, accessible or affordable to people with low incomes.

We previously raised a comparison with Oroville. The figures require careful reconciliation: our earlier research cited higher end-of-cycle low-income progress there, while Oroville's adopted 2022-2030 Housing Element reports 205 of 284 low-income units, or 72.2 percent, through 2021 and zero very-low-income units in that table. I want the final APR for matching periods checked before any definitive cross-city claims are printed. The broader comparison should include affordable housing supply, rents, homelessness rates per 10,000 people, PIT methodology, poverty, and available mental-health or substance-use indicators, rather than assuming the two communities have identical populations. [4]

Researchers Gregg Colburn and Clayton Page Aldern have shown why housing-market conditions help explain geographic differences in homelessness more convincingly than simplistic claims that one community simply has more addiction or mental illness. People facing those challenges live in every community. The availability and price of housing determine how easily vulnerable people can remain housed. This is a crucial comparison for ChicoSol to investigate.

2. The City paid almost $50,000 to identify the accounting problem in 2022

On August 3, 2021, the City authorized a contract with Hope Street Coalition to develop a homelessness strategic plan; contemporary reporting put the contract at **$49,950**. The February 28, 2022 plan and its supporting report warned about unreliable data and the lack of a complete picture of City homelessness expenditures. It recommended an annual report on homelessness-related City activities and costs, records across departments including Police and Fire, and specific quarterly performance reporting for designated outreach functions. Its data recommendations also addressed shelter use and results. [5][6][7]

Some of that report's policy framework emphasized public order and enforcement, and I do not endorse every recommendation. But its recommendations on fiscal accounting should be examined on their own merits.

What happened after the City paid for that report? Were the recommendations accepted, funded, assigned, implemented, deferred or explicitly rejected? Where are the annual cross-department reports, the quarterly reports and the outcome evaluations? Chico does publish CAPER and other housing financial documents, and those records deserve examination. What remains missing is a demonstrated reconciliation of the full homelessness response across City departments, outside contractors, shelters, healthcare payments, and permanent-housing results. If such a reconciliation exists, please publish it. [5][6][9]

Before adopting another five-year plan, shouldn't the public be told whether the last strategy's accounting and performance recommendations were actually carried out? If not, why not, and who was responsible for follow-through?

3. Trace the growth of the service and shelter infrastructure

In 2017 Chico advanced a consolidated homelessness-services concept, and in 2018 the City entered an agreement involving the Jesus Center to move that idea forward. The stated goal was coordinated help, and those intentions deserve fair treatment. But how did the service network and the allocation of public resources evolve afterward? Which providers were offered opportunities, and which ideas were excluded? [10]

Examine the Jesus Center/Renewal Center campus, Genesis Pallet Shelter, Torres Community Shelter and True North Housing Alliance, the Alternative Camping Site, smaller programs, and other service providers. The Renewal Center project had financing involving New Markets Tax Credits. Public project records identify an estimated total cost of approximately **$18.38 million** and a **$18.5 million NMTC allocation**, with separate financing announcements involving Accion Opportunity Fund, California Statewide Communities Development Corporation, Capital One, Raza Development Fund and Community Vision. The financing figures overlap and must not be added together as though they were separate projects or unrestricted cash payments. [11][12][13]

Who owns each facility and parcel? Who financed it and on what terms? Who receives rent, interest, tax-credit benefits, project-development fees, program-management fees, reimbursement or contractor payments? What portion was public money, private capital, donated funds, debt or tax-credit allocation? Who approved the transactions, and were the competing options documented? Profits or fees do not automatically demonstrate misconduct; the question is whether the financing structures were transparent, appropriate and aligned with measurable housing outcomes.

The City's draft reports approximately **$3.49 million in Genesis actual costs in fiscal year 2024-25**. A May 2026 Council presentation reportedly cited **46 moves into permanent housing from Genesis since**

its 2022 opening. Those figures cover different periods and cannot honestly be divided into a valid success rate. They do call for independently audited figures: unique people housed at the shelter, occupancy, length of stay, exclusions, discharges, permanent-housing exits, retention at six and twelve months, returns to homelessness, and the full cost of a successful sustained placement. [8][14]

Please follow the smaller contracts as closely as the large ones: temporary fencing throughout town, grading, transporting dirt to and from the pallet-shelter site, utilities, security, cleaning, storage, sanitation, towing, personal-property handling, encampment removal, repairs and construction change orders. Who provided the goods or labor? How much was paid? Was the work competitively bid? Who were the subcontractors? Where are invoices and payment records?

This is not about attacking shelter workers. Many provide necessary help under difficult conditions. It is about establishing what taxpayers and donors financed, who received payment, and what residents actually gained.

4. Follow the new insurance and CalAIM revenue, too

We have discussed this before, and it must not be omitted: **California's CalAIM program connects homelessness services to Medi-Cal managed-care financing**. Qualified Enhanced Care Management and Community Supports may include case coordination, housing navigation, deposits, tenancy support, recuperative care, qualifying temporary recovery housing, and other defined services. Ordinary shelter room and board is not automatically billable to Medi-Cal. Eligibility, contracts and service rules matter.

There is a specific local financial record. In True North Housing Alliance's 2024-25 City CDBG public-services application, the operator of Torres Shelter anticipated narrowing its operating gap through additional state grants and **increased billing of health insurance companies for CalAIM services**. The same application describes anticipated Medi-Cal billing revenue for Community Supports and CalAIM-supported staffing. [15]

The Jesus Center advertised for a **CalAIM Medical Biller** responsible for submitting ECM and Community Supports claims to Medi-Cal and managed-care plans. This demonstrates billing capacity and financial planning, not a verified amount of claims paid. Partnership HealthPlan is the relevant local Medi-Cal managed-care plan following the 2024 transition. [16]

CalAIM services can be valuable. The investigative questions are: Which providers hold contracts? How much was billed, approved, denied and paid in each year and service category? What share came from managed-care reimbursements versus CDBG, HUD, County grants, PATH, HHIP and private sources? How are services documented and audited? Are any costs counted twice across public reports? What are the permissions and privacy safeguards for moving information among the HMIS, Coordinated Entry, health plans, shelters and outreach providers? Where are the independently verified housing outcomes?

How many workers are employed primarily to coordinate, document, authorize, bill, report and administer services, and how many people successfully obtain permanent homes? The existence of these jobs is not evidence of fraud. The structural question is whether financing supports managing the same person's homelessness for years while no suitable affordable home is available for the person to move into. **Care should support the pathway to housing ... not replace it.**

5. Follow the police, cleanup and enforcement expenditures

What does Chico Police Department actually spend on homelessness-related enforcement, including overtime, specialized units, calls for service, transport, citations, encampment actions, equipment and administration? What do Public Works, Fire, the City Attorney, outside counsel, storage vendors and cleanup contractors spend on the same issue? How much is devoted to prevention, rental support and permanent housing by comparison? Can the public see an auditable five- or ten-year accounting of both categories? [5][6]

The Warren settlement expires **January 14, 2027**, and the City has considered camping and property ordinances for implementation after that date. Its plan is specific about enforcement, but the public should demand equally specific and funded permanent-housing commitments. At the November 3 Council stage, the City's paperwork also contained a discrepancy between draft minutes and proposed ordinance language on notice periods and temporary RV arrangements; I asked the City Clerk for reconciliation. A current, adopted legal text should be consulted rather than treating every earlier draft as law. [8][17]

The City's shelter listing itself explains that Genesis has no walk-up intakes and that some requests can take weeks for outreach follow-up. What safe place exists for someone who is turned down, discharged, cannot safely use a particular shelter, or needs accommodations for disability, health, family, pets, privacy, or safety? What happens when beds exist on a list but are not actually usable by a particular individual? [18]

Being homeless is not a crime. Enforcement may change where someone sleeps; it does not create a home. We need to know whether it also takes people farther away from work, property, medications, healthcare or trusted relationships.

6. Investigate harm reduction and treatment funding choices

Please look directly at how different kinds of support have been treated. Chico adopted an ordinance restricting syringe-exchange programs in 2021 and amended the restrictions in March 2025. The 2025 action was supported across Council, not only by one faction. Northern Valley Harm Reduction Coalition challenged the ordinance; the California Department of Public Health authorized the coalition to conduct a syringe-services program in September 2025. That means it would be wrong to claim syringe services were wholly eliminated. The real questions concern regulatory burdens, actual access, public-health results and who advocated for or against each measure. [19][20][21]

At the same time, NSPR reported in August 2026 that Stonewall Alliance lost more than **$120,000 annually** in County mental-health contract funding after changes associated with Proposition 1; Iverson Wellness and Recovery Center and Sixth Street Center for Youth were among other programs facing closure or funding disruption. Those were not all City of Chico funding decisions. Report the actual responsible entities, services lost, populations affected and alternative resources. [22]

The contrast includes new treatment investment. On April 7, 2026 the Council considered and approved **$651,376 in City opioid-settlement matching funds** for a planned Jesus Center substance-use treatment facility, associated with a separate approximately **$6.5 million state award**. Such treatment can be needed and beneficial; the question is how it was chosen, how it will be evaluated, and why other evidence-based services may be shrinking. [23]

I support appropriate treatment that is accessible to people who want it. I oppose making permanent housing contingent upon sobriety, program compliance or coercive treatment requirements. The City's response must distinguish emergencies involving danger to self or others from blanket assumptions about

everyone experiencing homelessness. What independent addiction specialists, clinicians, street-medicine practitioners and housing-system experts were consulted when these approaches were chosen?

7. Follow the public relationships, without presuming criminal conduct

This topic needs real reporting, particularly where the same people appear across political, police, charitable and development settings. The relationships are leads for public-record review ... not proof that anyone is corrupt.

ChicoSol reported in 2020 that the Police Community Advisory Board formed under then-Police Chief **Mike O'Brien** included **Kasey Reynolds, Tom van Overbeek and Rob Berry**. Critics at the time questioned its independence and transparency, while the chief defended its representative role. O'Brien later became a Councilmember. What influence did this board have, what did it recommend, and how were members selected? [24]

The Renewal Center website identifies **Tom van Overbeek and Kim Hawley** as members of its **Campaign Executive Council**. This is a documented fundraising connection. Review its scope and dates, and determine whether any later Council decisions concerning the same organization involved disclosed interests, recusals or other safeguards. Do not assume a campaign role equals personal financial gain. [25]

A publicly available Rotary biography describes Jesus Center Executive Director **Amber Abney-Bass** as married to **Mark Bass**, formerly a Chico Police Department sergeant. ChicoSol reported that Bass was involved in two fatal officer-involved shootings, and has reported on related lawsuits and police records. The family relationship and the policing history can be verified independently. There is, however, **no evidence in the materials I have assembled that the marriage itself improperly influenced Jesus Center contracting**. If it is relevant to an actual decision, establish that connection through documents rather than insinuation. [26][27]

ChicoSol reported that the **Chico Police Officers' Association**, a union distinct from Chico PD management, supplied **$19,500 in direct and indirect 2026 election support** for Reynolds, van Overbeek and Tracy Vincent, including an **$18,000 contribution to Common Ground Chico**. Its reporting also identified development-related contributors to that PAC. Those are political finance facts. What issues were advocated, what disclosures were made, and what official decisions followed? Campaign support does not by itself prove improper conduct. [28]

The late Representative **Doug LaMalfa** publicly attended a Genesis anniversary event with Jesus Center leadership in May 2023. **James Gallagher** publicly listed endorsements from Reynolds, O'Brien, van Overbeek and other Butte County officials in his congressional campaign materials. Public appearances and endorsements establish connections, not kickbacks or coordination. If broader networks matter to this story, document them through campaign records, donor disclosures, grant letters, appropriations, nonprofit filings and the conduct of officials in office. [29][30]

Also trace how senior City appointments and legal advice shaped this plan, including City Manager **Gillian Haen**, City Attorney **Ryan Jones**, the prior municipal administrations, and the actual votes of all seven Councilmembers. As the November election and subsequent seating of Councilmembers change local governance, don't substitute predictions or campaign rhetoric for the official decisions and dates on record.

8. Why so few funded options? What about organizations that offered alternatives?

Chico Housing Action Team (CHAT), Safe Space, North State Shelter Team (NSST), True North, the Jesus Center, street-outreach and faith-based partners do different kinds of work. Their diversity matters. But has the City's contracting and approval system given smaller or new organizations a meaningful opportunity to offer additional shelter, micro-housing, safe sites or housing?

NSST's proposal for four tiny homes for older women is a concrete example. In October 2025 Council supported moving the idea into a City process, but permitting and siting barriers remained, and a prospective church partner withdrew. City staff later clarified that Council support was **not project approval**. In 2026 NSST continued discussing a self-funded four-home safe-spot model. Why did it take so long? What standards applied, and were they the same as those applied to established programs? [31][32]

CHAT's **61-unit Builders' Village** demonstrates the scale of permanent affordable/supportive housing that a community organization can help build; in October 2026 final utility-related work was still being resolved. Please confirm applications, eligibility, opening dates, capital financing, actual occupancy and cost before quoting any waiting-list size as fact. [33]

We need safe temporary options during the years it takes to produce permanent homes. That includes small shelters, rooms, shared homes, tiny houses, appropriate recuperative care, accessible congregate shelters, pet-compatible options and safe places to stay. Yet the objective must remain long-term housing, not a permanent waiting room.

I have also proposed an independent, community-governed approach to Genesis, meaningful participation by people with lived experience, and a **permanent City Commission on Housing and Homelessness** to oversee RHNA progress, homelessness-program performance, funding and policy. These are proposals, not things already enacted. I am exploring the Chico Union of the Homeless as a way for affected people to participate in decisions rather than merely be counted and processed.

9. Use the research and the independent people who understand the system

Barbara Poppe should be at the top of this expert list. On October 15, 2026 I organized and held a conversation with Barbara Poppe involving Chico community participants. She formerly directed the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness. Barbara Poppe and Associates has conducted community-wide assessments, including Fresno's Street2Home framework. I formally asked Chico to commission an **independent systems and funding review** by her firm and publish its findings. She could advise on how an external assessment would examine governance, financing, gaps, housing pathways and accountability. [34]

I also urge you to examine the work of **Iain De Jong and OrgCode** on housing-focused outreach, low-barrier service, progressive engagement and measuring permanent exits; **Dr. Jill Wiwcharuk, 'Street Doctor Jill,'** on addiction, street medicine, trust and accessible care; and **Mark Horvath and Invisible People** on stigma, public narratives, lived-experience leadership and the policy consequences of portraying people experiencing homelessness as the problem. They offer different types of expertise; neither a documentary perspective nor an individual practitioner's approach substitutes for independent evaluation. My conversations and work with these people and their materials are part of why I am asking these questions. [35][36][37]

Peer-reviewed research matters too. A systematic review of **26 studies** found that, in its included comparisons, Housing First programs reduced homelessness and improved housing stability more than Treatment First approaches. That is not proof that every program labelled Housing First works equally well; it is strong evidence against making treatment a universal prerequisite for housing. [38]

Then consider the federal funding direction. On **October 19, 2026**, Anna Bailey's Center on Budget and Policy Priorities report, Five Ways HUD's Continuum of Care Funding Notices Would Undermine Effective Homelessness Solutions If Lawmakers Don't Act, examined proposed funding changes that could (1) put existing housing assistance at risk; (2) destabilize effective housing projects; (3) reward punitive enforcement; (4) shift funding away from high-need communities; and (5) create damaging uncertainty for providers. It described short-term programs with potential abstinence and 20-hour-per-week service requirements. It projected **97,160 people nationally**, including **14,940 in California**, at risk of losing housing assistance under the June 2026 notice, along with **$1.23 billion** nationwide and **$237.7 million in California** in permanent-housing funding at risk. These are **projections, not confirmed cuts, and not Chico-specific figures**; federal litigation remained ongoing. HHS and HUD have openly described the new federal direction as 'Treatment First.' [39][40][41]

Please ask whether local funding incentives could reward intake, occupancy, compliance, referrals, enforcement and ongoing services more predictably than verified permanent-housing placements and sustained retention. The answer must come from actual Chico and Butte County funding contracts and results, not national projections alone.

10. Remember the people, not just the systems

I experienced homelessness in Chico for more than ten years. I have stayed at local shelters, know their limits, and recognize that people working in them can offer real assistance. I also know people whose income was not sufficient to secure a home. For one older person, ten $40 housing applications would cost $400, while a $90-per-night motel would absorb about $630 a week, before a deposit or first month's rent. A longtime older resident I tried to help ultimately left Chico because housing was unaffordable. I now spend about **68 percent of my own income on housing**.

These are not abstract numbers. Working people, people with disabilities and seniors can be priced out without having addiction or mental illness. Some people need substantial supportive care, but others need primarily a room, deposit, rent they can afford, or prevention assistance. People should have a genuine choice among safe, accessible and voluntary services.

My **Chico Campout for Compassion**, scheduled for November 14, is a public-awareness effort, not a fundraiser or a central encampment. It is part of an attempt to have the conversation that the housing shortage demands. The public is welcome to disagree with me, and I am ready to work with businesses, congregations, neighborhoods, advocates and officials to improve conditions for ALL Chicoans.

11. What I am actually asking ChicoSol to publish

Please develop an investigation or a series that answers these questions with original records and interviews:

- **Housing:** What did Chico know about low-income housing needs, which policies were adopted or abandoned, and which affordable homes were actually permitted, completed, occupied and preserved?

- **Older plans:** What happened to the $49,950 Hope Street report's annual cost accounting and performance recommendations?
- **Financial flow:** What is the full five- or ten-year public and private funding map for homelessness services, infrastructure, policing, cleaning, insurance claims, administration and permanent housing? Who received each contract and why?
- **Providers and insurance:** How much revenue flowed to the Jesus Center, True North, CHAT, other operators, and their subcontractors from City, County, State, federal, charitable and CalAIM sources? What was counted twice, if anything, and what housing outcomes resulted?
- **Influence and governance:** Who sat on boards, fundraising councils or advisory groups? How did campaign contributions, documented relationships, procurement procedures, public votes, disclosures and recusals interact? Was any actual conflict established?
- **Health policy:** Which harm-reduction, behavioral-health and voluntary treatment programs were reduced, restricted or expanded, by which government, and with what evidence and consequences?
- **Practical choices:** What safe alternatives exist for people who cannot use a specific shelter? What opportunities exist for smaller and independently governed providers?
- **Outcomes:** How many people exited to permanent housing? How many remained housed after six or twelve months? How many were only moved from one temporary setting to another? What did each sustained placement cost?

I do not want a predetermined verdict. If the City can demonstrate real progress, publish it. If particular providers have outstanding housing results, tell that story. If a contract or personal relationship is entirely proper, establish that through the records. And if important accountability recommendations were left unfinished, explain the institutional and political reasons.

I have submitted research on Chico's housing history and policies to City Council, written comments on the draft strategic plan, and a complaint to California's Attorney General Housing Justice Team. I can supply the underlying documents and participate in interviews. My October 18 report and November 3 update are available at the link in the supporting records. [42]

The next Council consideration of the draft plan is scheduled for **November 17, 2026**. ChicoSol has an opportunity to bring these questions into the public record before the community commits to another multi-year approach. [1]

What did we know? What did we fund? Who made the decisions? Who received the money? What permanent homes and lasting housing outcomes resulted?

HOUSING IS THE ISSUE ... HOMELESSNESS IS THE OUTCOME.

Please investigate the housing problem ... not just the consequences of managing it.

Sincerely,

Scotty Franzyshen Building • Fixing • Serving https://www.sfranzyshen.org

APPENDIX A - EVIDENCE STATUS AND OPEN RECORDS

Purpose. These are reporting leads, not accusations. A public document establishes what it actually states, not necessarily whether a service occurred, a reimbursement was paid, a contract was improper, or a policy caused a particular outcome.

Documented starting points

- City RHNA permit counts for Chico's fifth cycle and a City Housing Element acknowledging a very substantial gap between low-income and above-moderate-income housing production. Older cycles and the full City history remain to be reconstructed.
- Hope Street Coalition's February 2022 plan and separate municipal-costs study explicitly recommending improved City spending and program data; the report's actual implementation history has not been reconstructed.
- Public funding/financing materials for Renewal Center, including overlapping NMTC allocation and other financing. A project financing diagram and cash flow statement are still needed before describing beneficiaries or returns.
- Draft City cost figure for Genesis for FY2024-25 and a May 2026 program-reported cumulative permanent housing exit count. Neither is a citywide total or a multi-year cost-per-placement calculation.
- True North's CDBG application explicitly discusses health-insurance billing under CalAIM; the Jesus Center's public billing job listing establishes billing staffing needs, not amounts paid.
- 2025 City Council records on syringe services and CDPH's separate authorization; County/state-driven mental-health funding changes require attribution to the correct government.
- ChicoSol's 2020 PCAB membership report; Renewal Center's own fundraising committee listing; public bio identifying a family relationship; ChicoSol's reporting on police shootings; ChicoSol's 2026 political spending investigation. None alone establishes a corrupt contract or criminal coordination.
- NSST public record supports a City process for a tiny-home proposal, not blanket approval of a site or operating program.
- HUD/HHS proposed and contested federal policies and CBPP modelled risks. No confirmed Chico-specific funding loss is established by the national report.

Documents and interviews ChicoSol could seek

- All Chico Housing Element implementation timetables, Annual Progress Reports, CAPERs, local housing-fund statements, inclusionary-zoning studies, land-use votes and development agreements since at least 2007; earlier RHNA cycles from HCD or City archives.
- Hope Street Coalition contract, scopes, invoices, final deliverables, transmittal letters, work-plan follow-up, Council implementation votes, quarterly reports and annual municipal-cost inventories from 2022 onward.
- Five to ten years of City general-ledger transactions tagged to homelessness, homeless-related CPD/Fire/Public Works activities, cleanup vendors, fencing contractors, site work and emergency-shelter operations.
- Original Genesis management agreements, renewals, reimbursement schedules, operating budgets, performance reports, invoices and cost allocations; same records for Torres, Renewal and any City-supported

alternatives.

- Jesus Center/Renewal campus property deeds, liens, investor and lender relationships, NMTC transaction charts, Forms 990, related-party disclosures and contracts; distinguish capital from operating funds, debt from gifts, and allocation authority from cash payments.
- Partnership HealthPlan / CalAIM contracts with providers, publicly reportable aggregate billing and paid claims, program participation, PATH/HHIP/IPPs and staffing grants; guard against counting the same revenue twice and protect individual medical privacy.
- Shelter exit cohorts, actual permanent housing placements, tenancy retention and the cost of stable housing outcomes, with definitions consistent across all providers.
- Council and department records for 2021 and 2025 syringe-service rules, program service accessibility, legal advice and enforcement; changes in County and State funding to Stonewall, Iverson and Sixth Street; new SUD treatment grant criteria.
- PCAB membership, appointment procedures, meeting minutes, terms and policy recommendations; Campaign Executive Council roles, Council disclosures and recusals; PAC filings, FPPC Forms 700 and contract-award records.
- All applications and denials for small-provider shelter/safe-site proposals; NSST site approval records and fees; outreach to faith partners; evidence of different treatment of comparable proposals.
- Recorded November 4 Town Hall statements by speakers who emphasized housing; any revised draft plan with public changes redlined before November 17.

Quantities not to conflate

- A **25 percent reduction in unsheltered homelessness** is not the same as permanent housing for 25 percent of everyone experiencing homelessness.
- **PIT count** is a one-night snapshot; **HMIS** tracks service use over time, with distinct coverage and privacy limitations.
- **RHNA** allocations are planning/production benchmarks. Simply missing a production target is not automatically proof of illegal conduct.
- **Construction commitments, NMTC allocations, loans, grant awards and expenses** are different financial concepts and often refer to the same overall project.
- **Cumulative service contacts, shelter admissions and housing exits** are different numerators and denominators. A reported 46 placements since 2022 cannot be divided by one fiscal year's $3.49 million cost to produce a valid longitudinal outcome rate.
- **Medi-Cal billing capacity** is not proof of claims paid or ordinary shelter room-and-board reimbursement.
- **An official's participation, an endorsement, a marriage or a campaign donation** is a verifiable connection, not evidence of bribery or improper benefit without additional records.
- **National projected HUD effects** are not actual Butte County losses. Their local relevance requires checking grants and renewal terms.
- **The user's systems cycle** is an investigable hypothesis about structural incentives, not a finding that individuals intentionally caused homelessness.

APPENDIX B – SOURCE STARTING POINTS

Sources are provided to assist independent verification. Links and dates reflect material reviewed through November 6, 2026. Some numbers come from prior public comments and remain to be reconciled with original local records. Selected records are user-supplied and available on request. If a URL moves, the document title and jurisdiction should still identify the record.

[1] ChicoSol, November 5, 2026 Town Hall coverage
https://chicosol.org/2026/11/05/community-members-respond-to-citys-plan-for-managing-homelessness/

[2] City of Chico, fifth-cycle RHNA permit progress (2014-2022)
https://chicoca.gov/documents/Departments/Community-Development/Housing%20Division/Housing%20Documents/rnha_production_-_5th_cycle_-_2021.pdf

[3] City of Chico, 2022-2030 Housing Element
https://chicoca.gov/documents/Departments/Community-Development/Housing%20Division/HE%20Update%202022/Chico%20Housing%20Element%202022%20Update.pdf

[4] City of Oroville, 2022-2030 Housing Element (prior-cycle comparison)
https://www.orovilleca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/614/2022-to-2030-Housing-Element-PDF

[5] Hope Street Coalition, Strategic Plan to Address Homelessness, February 2022
https://chicoca.gov/documents/City-Services/Sheltering-Provisions/Homelessness-Strategic-Planning-Efforts/hope_street_coalition_homelessness_strategic_plan_fnl_1.pdf

[6] Hope Street, Objectives, Data, and Municipal Costs supporting report
https://chicoca.gov/documents/City-Services/Sheltering-Provisions/Homelessness-Strategic-Planning-Efforts/chico_report_on_objectives_data_costs_1.pdf

[7] Chico News & Review, August 4, 2021 coverage of $49,950 contract
https://chico.newsreview.com/2021/08/04/charging-forward/

[8] City of Chico, draft Unhoused Strategic Plan and public-input materials
https://chicoca.gov/City-Services/Housing--Homelessness/Unhoused-Strategic-Plan/

[9] City of Chico, housing reports, CAPERs, APRs and fund documents
https://chicoca.gov/Departments/Community-Development/Housing-Division/Housing-Reports-and-Documents/index.html

[10] Scotty Franzyshen, October 18 housing report and November 3, 2026 update
https://www.sfranzyshen.org/images/Chicos_Housing_Crisis_Original_Eight_Pages_Plus_November_3_Update.pdf

[11] New Markets Tax Credit Coalition, Jesus Center / Renewal Center campus
https://nmtccoalition.org/project/jesus-center-renewal-center-campus/

[12] Equity Community Builders, Renewal Center New Markets Tax Credit allocation
https://ecbsf.com/what-we-do/new-markets-tax-credits

[13] Accion Opportunity Fund, reported Renewal Center financing
https://aofund.org/news/investing-in-communities-with-new-55m-allocation/

[14] User October 28, 2026 public comments; Genesis cost and housing-exit figures (available on request) - Obtain original from Scotty Franzyshen.

[15] True North Housing Alliance 2024-25 CDBG application, CalAIM insurance billing, City of Chico
https://chicoca.gov/documents/Departments/Community-Development/Housing%20Division/24-25%20PS%20Apps/24-25-CDBG-PS-All-Apps.pdf

[16] The Jesus Center, CalAIM Medical Biller job advertisement
https://www.indeed.com/q-medical-biller-jobs-jobs.html

[17] User November 3 Council submission regarding camping ordinance / minutes discrepancies
https://www.sfranzyshen.org/images/Chicos_Housing_Crisis_Original_Eight_Pages_Plus_November_3_Update.pdf

[18] City of Chico, shelter availability and Genesis intake rules, November 5, 2026
https://chicoca.gov/City-Services/Housing--Homelessness/Shelter-Bed-Availability/

[19] Chico City Council, March 2025 ordinance procedures for syringe services
https://chico-ca.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?event_id=831&view_id=2

[20] Chico Municipal Code, Chapter 9.29 syringe exchange programs
https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/chico/latest/chico_ca/0-0-0-29228

[21] California CDPH, September 2025 Northern Valley Harm Reduction authorization
https://ceqanet.lci.ca.gov/2025091084

[22] NSPR, August 7, 2026, Stonewall Alliance loss of County mental-health funding
https://www.mynspr.org/news/2026-08-07/stonewall-alliance-chico-navigates-loss-of-funds-launches-new-campaign

[23] City Council, April 7, 2026 Jesus Center treatment-center opioid matching item
https://chico-ca.granicus.com/GeneratedAgendaViewer.php?event_id=1191&view_id=2

[24] ChicoSol, February 18, 2020 Police Community Advisory Board membership
https://chicosol.org/2020/02/18/city-council-will-re-examine-police-advisory-board/

[25] Renewal Center website, Campaign Executive Council listing
https://renewalcenterchico.org/

[26] Rotary Club of Chico, July 2022 Amber Abney-Bass biography
https://www.chicorotary.com/speakers/40f93bcb-8b10-4808-a1c9-c1f10a355ef5

[27] ChicoSol, August 18, 2026 reporting on former Sgt. Mark Bass
https://chicosol.org/2026/08/18/da-ramsey-charged-her-the-city-paid-her-325000/

[28] ChicoSol, November 1, 2026 Chico Police Officers Association election spending
https://chicosol.org/2026/11/01/__trashed/

[29] NSPR, May 11, 2023 Pallet Shelter anniversary with then Rep. LaMalfa
https://www.mynspr.org/news/2023-05-11/a-year-since-its-opening-chicos-pallet-shelter-has-served-over-280-people

[30] James Gallagher campaign, list of local political endorsements
https://electjamesgallagher.com/gallagher-announces-impressive-butte-county-support-for-congress-in-special-election/

[31] ChicoSol, October 8, 2025, North State Shelter Team tiny homes proposal
https://chicosol.org/2025/10/08/tiny-homes-win-on-a-split-council-vote/

[32] ChicoSol, December 14, 2025, City clarification on tiny homes permit status
https://chicosol.org/2025/12/14/city-explains-process-for-tiny-homes-on-church-parking-lots/

[33] October 2026 coverage: CHAT Builders Village, 61 permanent units nearing completion
https://ccegrant.com/builders-village-opens-in-chico-to-fight-homelessness-disability/

[34] Fresno County 2018 materials on Barbara Poppe & Associates Street2Home
https://fresnocounty.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?GUID=352DABAC-CE71-4859-A08B-0AD8A6A999F4&ID=3713514&Options=&Search=

[35] OrgCode, resources on homelessness-system and housing-focused outreach
https://www.orgcode.com/

[36] Invisible People, journalism, research and lived experience
https://invisiblepeople.tv/

[37] Street Doctor Jill (independent street medicine perspective; interviews and material to confirm) - Obtain original from Scotty Franzyshen.

[38] 2020 Community Guide systematic review of Housing First versus Treatment First
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32732712/

[39] CBPP, Anna Bailey, October 19, 2026 Five Ways HUD CoC Funding Notices
https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/five-ways-huds-continuum-of-care-funding-notices-would-undermine-effective

[40] Congressional Research Service, September 18, 2026 analysis of HUD funding notice
https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/2026-09-18_IN12709_0955e2327c158a22f774a854854a58c5620c2c96.html

[41] HHS/HUD, August 17, 2026 announcement of Treatment First direction
https://www.hhs.gov/press-room/hhs-hud-advance-treatment-first-homelessness-addiction-mental-illness.html

[42] Scotty Franzyshen, November 3 report and October AG complaint (complaint available on request)
https://www.sfranzyshen.org/images/Chicos_Housing_Crisis_Original_Eight_Pages_Plus_November_3_Update.pdf