Call to Order
Roll Call: Council

Pledge of Allegiance led by Council Member Pete McCracken

Invocation

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
This is the opportunity to address the Council on any matter of interest, whether on the agenda or not.

SCHEDULED MATTERS

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

OTHER MATTERS

ADJOURNMENT to the Council Meeting of January 15, 2008 at 6:00 p.m.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the California Ralph M. Brown Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, or to be able to access this agenda and documents in the agenda packet, please contact the Deputy City Clerk at (559) 782-7464. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting and/or provision of an appropriate alternative format of the agenda and documents in the agenda packet.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
FOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 12, 2008

APPLICANT:
City of Porterville
291 N. Main Street
Porterville, CA  93257

SPECIFIC REQUEST:
This public meeting has been scheduled to receive public testimony on the City’s Draft Comprehensive General Plan Update, including associated Environmental Impact Report and Urban Water Management Plan, as a continuation of the Public Meeting held on December 18, 2008

PROJECT DETAILS:
The following is to provide additional information on the General Plan, as was discussed in the previous public meeting and to offer a preliminary staff response to some of the issues raised. At the previous public meeting, there was a desire expressed by members of the public to have a better explanation of the vision for each individual land use category proposed in the plan. Since the land use categories were not fully explained in the previous presentation, they are offered in this report as additional information.

In addition to this, a number of other comments and questions were raised regarding the plan. Written comments received during the formal review period have been attached to this report for your reference. A preliminary staff response to the major points raised has been provided in this report in order to clarify the plan’s intent and staff’s position on these issues. A full response will be available at the formal Public Hearing to be held sometime in the near future.

GENERAL PLAN PROPOSED LAND USE CATEGORIES

The following descriptions apply to land uses indicated on the General Plan Land Use Diagram. Land use classifications are organized into the following categories: Residential, Mixed Use, Commercial, Office/Industrial and Public/Open Space.

Residential

Rural Residential. This designation is intended to allow opportunities for rural living on lots ranging in size from 2.5 to 10 acres or more. This land use is around the periphery of the community because
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it helps serve as a transition between agriculture/open space and more intensive urban uses. This type of development helps define the limits of urban development.

Clustered development is encouraged, and smaller lots may be allowed, provided that the overall density does not exceed 0.2 units per acre, with lower limits applying in the Hillside Development Zone.

*Resort-Residential.* This designation is intended to allow residential development along the Lake Success shore and surrounding hillsides. There is an emphasis on creating a resort community with supporting commercial and recreation uses. Pedestrian-oriented design standards, including clustered development patterns, will promote sustainable development. The maximum overall density is 5.0 units per acre, with lower limits applying in the Hillside Development Zone.

*Very Low Density Residential.* This designation is typical of large lot or executive home single-family subdivisions. The maximum residential density is 2.5 units per gross acre.

*Low Density Residential.* This density represents typical single-family subdivisions. The maximum residential density is 6.0 units per gross acre.

*Low-Medium Density Residential.* This density is also for typical single-family subdivisions, but allows for smaller lots. The maximum residential density is 9.0 units per gross acre.

*Medium Density Residential.* This density range would accommodate a variety of housing types, such as small-lot single-family homes, detached zero lot line developments, duplexes, townhouses, and garden apartments. Pedestrian-oriented design and clustered development can support higher levels of density. The maximum residential density is 12.0 units per gross acre.

*High Density Residential.* This classification is intended to accommodate attached homes, two- to four-plexes, and apartment buildings. The maximum residential density is 24.0 units per gross acre.

*Mixed Use*

*Downtown Mixed Use.* Downtown Mixed-Use development allows for a mostly vertical mix of commercial, service, office, and residential uses. The vertical nature of this type of use may allow for a reduction in the minimum parking requirements. This designation allows a maximum FAR of 3.0. The maximum residential density is 30.0 units per gross acre.

*Commercial Mixed Use.* This designation allows for either horizontal or vertical mixed-use development. Commercial, service, office, and residential uses are allowed. Buildings more than one story are strongly encouraged. The designation allows a maximum FAR of 2.0. The maximum residential density is 24.0 units per gross acre.

*Commercial/Office/Industrial*

*Downtown Retail.* Pedestrian-oriented and “Main Street” design standards, a vertical mix of uses, and the retention of a unique retail environment is the focus in the Downtown area. This designation allows for a maximum FAR of 3.0.
Retail Centers. Design and use standards will be established for regional shopping centers located at major circulation intersections. Large format or "big box" retail and auto sales as well as travel related services, such as hotels and gas stations are allowed. This designation allows for a maximum FAR of 0.35.

General and Service Commercial. This designation is intended for retail and service uses that meet local and regional demand. Examples of allowable uses include: equipment rental and repair, commercial print shops, auto sales, storage facilities, and wholesale businesses, and specialized retail not normally found in shopping centers. Accessory office uses related to the primary commercial use are also allowed. This designation allows for a maximum FAR of 0.40.

Neighborhood Commercial. This designation is intended for small-scale commercial development that primarily provides office space and convenience retail for local neighborhoods. This designation allows for a maximum FAR of 0.30.

Professional Office. This designation is intended for office complex development, including professional and medical offices, as well as research and development activities. Small restaurants, support services, convenience retail and limited medium and high density residential are also allowed. This designation allows for a maximum FAR of 0.50.

Industrial Park. This designation comprises a mix of light industrial, secondary office, bulk retail, and service uses. Typical uses include warehouse, mini-storage, research and development, wholesale, bulk retail, and office space with limited customer access. Other uses may be allowed, such as commercial recreation, distribution centers, or other uses that require large, warehouse-style buildings. Small-scale retail and service uses serving local employees and visitors are permitted as secondary uses. This designation allows for a maximum FAR of 0.40.

Industrial. This designation allows primary manufacturing, refining, and similar activities including those with outdoor facilities. It also accommodates warehousing, distribution, with support commercial services and ancillary office space. No retail uses are allowed. This designation allows for a maximum FAR of 0.60.

Agriculture/Rural/Conservation

Agriculture/Rural/Conservation. This designation preserves agricultural and resource conservation areas. Incidental residential uses with septic systems are allowed, subject to health and environmental standards. Clustered housing is strongly encouraged because it makes the provision of other infrastructure, such as roads and electricity, more cost-effective and limits the impact on natural resources. Industrial gravel and aggregate mining is allowed in areas designated as Mineral Resource Zones.

Public Uses and Open Space

Public/Institutional. This designation is intended for lands owned by public entities, including the Municipal Airport, City Hall, County buildings, and the hospital. At the Municipal
Airport, industrial park uses will be allowed. It will provide for needed public facilities, including, but not limited to, recycling centers, sewage treatment ponds, and police and fire stations. This designation allows for a maximum FAR of 0.25.

**Education.** This designation is intended for lands owned by public or private entities for educational purposes, including schools, colleges, vocational training facilities, and administrative offices.

**Commercial Recreation.** This designation is intended for campgrounds, off-road vehicle complexes, and other recreation areas where patrons usually pay to participate. The maximum FAR is 0.10.

**Parks.** This designation applies to both public and private recreation sites and facilities. It allows for a maximum FAR of 0.10.

**Overlays**

**Hillside Development Zone.** All development within the Hillside Development Zone is subject to hillside development and design standards. Review criteria and limitations on maximum density are based on slope.

**Downtown Planning Area.** This overlay is intended to emphasize the Downtown area where the City wants to promote mixed use development. Pedestrian-oriented design standards will apply.

**Transition Landscape Buffers.** This designation is intended to provide a variable-width landscaped buffer between industrial and industrial park uses, or heavily traveled highways and residential land uses. The recommended buffer widths are between 150 to 200 feet. Frontage roads, orchards, and recreational uses are allowed in these areas.

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE TO COMMENTS**

At the December 18, 2008 Public Meeting held for the General Plan, a number of interested individuals raised questions and concerns. In addition to this, staff has received a number of written comments. These written comments are attached to this staff report for your consideration.

The questions raised at the meeting and in writing are summarized below:

1. The areas adjacent to the Tule River on the East Side of Porterville should be reclassified from open space and low density residential to commercial and high density residential to support future commercial uses and mobile home parks.

   **Preliminary staff response:** This area has a number of challenges when defining land uses such as limited access to State Highway 190, proximity to the Tule River, rural character, and abundance of mineral resources. The sites identified for future development have been considered on this criteria. High density residential uses and significant commercial uses proposed for this area are not recommended. A recent conversation with the commenter helped resolve the concern to a large degree. It was discussed that in the Agriculture/Rural/Conservation areas, that clustered housing is allowed, and that the desired development would be possible under the proposed land use configuration.
2. The properties at 482 S. Plano St. and 448 E. River St. are designated residential in the plan, but are currently operated as commercial uses and should remain as such.

Preliminary staff response: The General Plan has already addressed this issue and the subject property has been designated as commercial. Staff intends this site to be designated as General and Service Commercial and will make sure that the consultant reflects this in the final plan.

3. The property located on Lot #14 of S. Corona Dr. is designated as park and open space land in the plan, but a residence was recently built on it.

Preliminary staff response: Staff concurs that this parcel should be designated as residential, with the adjacent properties remaining as open space in order to preserve significant archeological resources.

4. There is a need to know what the zoning is going to be and what the zoning ordinance is going to allow specifically before we make any decisions on a General Plan.

Preliminary staff response: General Plans must be prepared under specific guidelines contained in California State Law. These guidelines mandate that a General Plan be prepared prior to any implementation tools, including zoning ordinances. There is no flexibility in operating outside of these provisions. However, the land use category descriptions provide insight and guidance on what shape the zoning will take. It will serve as the framework for the zoning map and ordinance updates.

5. There is property located in the northeast area of the city that has a park designation on it and it should be residential.

Preliminary staff response: The General Plan includes the general placement of a number of improvements, including parks, schools, streets, trails, and other public facilities. It should be understood that these are general lines drawn in strategic locations, but that they do not constitute a finished design product. It is at the project review phase that specific design details will be review and approved, including the placement and size of public improvements. The General Plan identifies a need to have a park in that general area, but an exact location is not defined at this time. As the area develops, decisions on exact locations of parks and other public facilities will be made in the context of the proposed development and the need for a park in the area.

6. There are concerns over the established safe yield estimates for groundwater being too high.

Preliminary staff response: Staff has dedicated significant time and energy to determine the most accurate capacity for planning purposes. When the city prepares the update to the Water System Master Plan, a Water Balance Study will be prepared to further refine safe yield numbers.
7. Parks should be located next to schools so that parking can be shared.

*Preliminary staff response:* So noted.

8. There are concerns over future development on the north end of town and the impacts that will have on properties there.

*Preliminary staff response:* Staff will look into this further.

9. There should be commercial uses along North Main Street instead of Residential.

*Preliminary staff response:* There is a great need to have multi-family land available, close to downtown and other commercial areas, so a change like this would necessitate replacing that potential housing at another site. Staff will look into this further, however, staff recognizes that there is already a significant commercial presence, including available land for commercial development, and that nearby commercial corridors and centers downtown, along Henderson Avenue, and along Hwy 65 render another commercial corridor in this area unnecessary. It is staff's position that there is a much greater need for residential infill development to support existing and proposed commercial areas, especially for multi-family residential uses. It should also be noted that there is currently a significant single and multi-family presence in this area at this time.

10. Property located east on Highway 190 should be commercial, rather than residential.

*Preliminary staff response:* This area has a number of challenges when defining land uses such as limited access to State Highway 190, proximity to the Tule River, rural character, and abundance of mineral resources. The sites identified for future development have been considered on this criteria. Any substantial commercial uses proposed for this area are not recommended.

11. More of the open space should be placed on the West Side to preserve prime farmland, than on the east side in the hills.

*Preliminary staff response:* The distribution and location of open space is based on many factors including development capacity, soil type, biological and geological sensitivity and accessibility. Close coordination with the Farm Bureau and other interests has resulted in this pattern.

12. A walkway should be established along Porter Slough.

*Preliminary staff response:* The Plan identifies trails along the river and canal. The viability and/or necessity of a trail along the slough will be reviewed.

13. We need to consider allowing the construction of alternative energy sources to reduce air pollution.

*Preliminary staff response:* So noted. The Plan promotes sustainability, which includes energy efficiency.
14. We need to include the Sequoia National Forest in the “linking recreation to open space” section, rather than Sequoia National Park.

*Preliminary staff response: Staff will make sure that that is properly reflected.*

15. The City should develop a traffic impact fee program (TIFP) based on “build-out” of the General Plan to collect funds for improvements to State infrastructure.

*Preliminary staff response: This is already addressed in the General Plan.*

16. Noise mitigation along state highways should be the responsibility of property owners or the City of Porterville.

*Preliminary staff response: Staff will look into this further.*

17. The General Plan should incorporate the guiding principles of the “San Joaquin Valley Regional Blueprint; Vision for the Valley” in order to coordinate the plan with regional planning efforts.

*Preliminary staff response: Staff has participated in the creation of the Regional Blueprint and as made an effort to coordinate the General Plan with those regional efforts.*

18. The City should perform a proper records search and identify areas of significant archeological sensitivity in order to identify the existence of Native American cultural resources.

*Preliminary staff response: Consideration was given in the plan for known important archeological sites and preservation of these areas has been incorporated through land use restrictions. Further studies are already required, and will continue to be required at the project level to identify and protect areas of significant cultural sensitivity.*

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Staff recommends that the City Council receive public testimony on the General Plan, the Environmental Impact Report and the Urban Water Management Plan.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Comment Letters received during comment period
2. Slides for the previous public meeting held on December 18, 2007
01/07/2008
PORTERVILLE, CA

CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS
PORTERVILLE, CA;

IN OCTOBER OF 2006 MY HUSBAND, RICHARD ANDERSON & MYSELF COMPLETED THE DEVELOPMENT OF LOT # 14 ON SO. CORONA DR. APN # 261-190-014. MY HUSBAND PASSED AWAY ON 09/16/2007 SO I HAVE BEEN QUITE BUSY TAKING CARE OF HIM AND SINCE HIS DEMISE BUSY WITH ALL THE DEMANDS WHEN SOMEONE DEPARTS THIS EARTH. I AM ALSO A REAL ESTATE BROKER BUT HAVE NOT BEEN VERY ACTIVE IN THAT FIELD FOR OBVIOUS REASONS. IT HAS RECENTLY BEEN CALLED TO MY ATTENTION THAT THE NEW GENERAL PLAN MAP SHOWS THAT MY PROPERTY WOULD BE IN THE GREEN ZONE FOR PARKS & RECREATION. I DO NOT MIND LIVING IN A PARK AS LONG AS THE CITY WANTS TO TAKE CARE OF THE GROUNDS, PAY THE TAXES, ETC. OR THEY MIGHT WANT TO RE-IMBURSE ME THE $255,000. I HAVE INVESTED IN THE PROPERTY WHICH INCLUDES $15,000.00 FOR SIDEWALKS, CURBS, & GUTTERS WE PAID OUT OF POCKET. & WHICH APPARENTLY IS GOING TO BE THE ONLY SIDEWALK ON THIS SIDE OF THE HILL SINCE ALL THE OTHER PROPERTIES WILL BE PARK OR HAVE AN ADDRESS ON WILLIAMS. I'M ALSO CONCERNED FOR PARCEL #15 TO THE SOUTH OF ME. THE OWNER HAS HAD IT LISTED WITH ME BUT I CAN NOT SELL IT IF THE ZONING IS GOING TO CHANGE. WILL HE BE PAID FOR HIS PROPERTY UNDER EMINENT DOMAIN RULES? I INTEND TO BE PRESENT AT SATURDAY'S MEETING AND WOULD LIKE SOME ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS.

SINCERELY,

Muriel Anderson
781-5899 OR 350-3515
December 26, 2007

Members of the Porterville City Council
C/O City of Porterville
291 N. Main Street
Porterville, Ca. 03257

Re: The Draft General Plan

Councilmen,

When the update process for the General Plan was announced I attended the first public meeting and found that the property on which we do business, 482 South Plano Street, and the property we own at 448 E. River Street were designated to come into the City with a Residential zoning designation. I was told that, since the business was established, we would be allowed to continue to operate as non-conforming use. I was also told that, if our business were to burn or suffer other substantial damage, we could not rebuild the business and any construction would have to conform to the Residential designation.

Even though we are not scheduled to be annexed into the City in the near future we would like to settle this matter now rather than wait until it was imminent with little time to negotiate if the City were to reject our request. Also, since the County of Tulare takes the City General Plan into account when issuing permits to properties adjacent to the City, a Residential designation could hamper the growth of our business.

While meeting with Mr. Longley, Mr. Dunlap, and other city officials I pointed out that the frontage property on Plano Street was overwhelmingly commercial and that our property on River Street was bordered on three sides by commercial property. The representatives of the City agreed with me at that time that a Commercial designation for these properties would be appropriate.

Subsequently I received the attached letter from the City agreeing to direct the company that was preparing the Draft General Plan to designate our business site on Plano Street as Heavy Commercial. However, this letter completely ignored the River Street property.
Recently I received the "Notice of Public Hearing" regarding the Draft General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. I went to City Hall and found that the properties in question were now designated as Retail. I was assured that, as the zoning codes are now, this would allow air conditioning and sheet metal manufacturing. I am not positive of this. I was also told that these zoning codes were to be reviewed and re-written in about a month, which could mean that all of my time and effort have been wasted.

Gray's Air Conditioning, Inc. has been in business since 1944 and I believe that it is the oldest Porterville based business in existence. It has employed five generations of the Gray family and hundreds of local people over the years. We have contributed tremendously to the growth of Porterville. We have performed many humanitarian acts and supported many local children's causes and activities. We have always treated our customers in a fair and honest manner as customers should be treated.

Please see to it that the City treats us in the same fashion. Please see that the General Plan reflects the commitment made by the City in regards to our business property and please extend this commitment to the River Street property as I was told would happen in my meeting with the City.

If you would like to meet with me regarding this matter and visit the locations discussed herein, please call me at (559)359-0993.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Randall D. Gray, V.P

cc: Mr. Richard Christenson, Attorney at Law
May 30, 2006

Mr. Randy Gray
Gray’s Air Conditioning, Inc.
482 South Plano Street
Porterville, CA 93257-5449

Subject: General Plan Update Process

Dear Mr. Gray:

I am writing this letter to you in response to our meeting last Friday morning regarding changing the land use designation of the General Plan concerning your property on Plano Street. I view the property that is currently located at the southeast corner of Plano Street and Date Avenue, which includes your property, to be appropriate for a commercial General Plan designation to be consistent with the other three corners of the intersection. Based on our earlier meeting, I have already directed the City’s consultant to designate your property as Heavy Commercial which would allow your use as it currently exists. It would not create a non-conforming use under the City’s current zoning standards.

It is important to note that the City is not currently looking at annexing your property, nor will the adoption of a new General Plan initiate this process. If the City were to initiate the process sometime in the future, you would be contacted. This type of effort is usually initiated by property owners of property to be annexed. I do not know of interest of property owners in that area.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (559) 782-7460.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Bradley D. Dunlap, AICP
Community Development Director

Cc: John Longley, City Manager
    Michael Dyett, Dyett and Bahtia
December 18, 2007

Mr. John Longley  
City Manager  
City of Porterville  
291 North Main Street  
Porterville, CA. 93257

RE: City of Porterville General Plan Land Use

Dear Mr. Longley:

We have reviewed the City’s General Plan Land Use Map, Public Hearing Draft and Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2030 General Plan. As a landowner with several properties in the planning area, we have many concerns as to how the city has classified properties that we currently own.

The properties that we currently own are in the East section of Porterville and lie adjacent to the Tule River. Some of these properties are currently being used for commercial use and in the future we plan to convert them into a mobile home park or other similar development which would classify them as a High Density Residential Use. Some of the properties will remain for the commercial use category. Your plan calls for these properties to be classified as “Agriculture/Rural/Conservation” and also “Very Low Density Residential”.

We would like to ask that you would re-classify these properties on your General Plan. I am attaching a list of the APN Numbers and a description of said properties. If you would like, we would be willing to meet with you or your planning department to discuss this further.

If you have any questions or need any other information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mitchell Brown, President

Cc: Porterville City Council  
   Bradley D. Dunlap, Community Development Director  
   Benjamin Kimball, City Planner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN NO.</th>
<th>ACREAGE</th>
<th>CURRENT USE</th>
<th>PROPOSED USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>282-030-41</td>
<td>27.72</td>
<td>Boydston Mine Site</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282-050-18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Material Storage</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282-060-002</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>Rock Plant</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282-060-017</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Rock Plant</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282-060-019</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Rock Plant Buffer</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282-080-001</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>Boydston Mine Site</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284-050-009</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>Rock Plant</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284-050-022</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>Rock Plant</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MB & DW INC.
14200 Road 284
Porterville, CA. 93257

December 18, 2007

Mr. John Longley
City Manager
City of Porterville
291 North Main Street
Porterville, CA. 93257

RE: City of Porterville General Plan Land Use

Dear Mr. Longley:

We have reviewed the City’s General Plan Land Use Map, Public Hearing Draft and Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2030 General Plan. As a landowner with several properties in the planning area, we have many concerns as to how the city has classified properties that we currently own.

The properties that we currently own are in the East section of Porterville and lie adjacent to the Tule River. Some of these properties are currently being used for commercial use and in the future we plan to convert them into a mobile home park or other similar development which would classify them as a High Density Residential Use. Some of the properties will remain for the commercial use category. Your plan calls for these properties to be classified as “Agriculture/Rural/Conservation” and also “Very Low Density Residential”.

We would like to ask that you would re-classify these properties on your General Plan. I am attaching a list of the APN Numbers and a description of said properties. If you would like, we would be willing to meet with you or your planning department to discuss this further.

If you have any questions or need any other information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mitchell Brown, President

Cc: Porterville City Council
Bradley D. Dunlap, Community Development Director
Benjamin Kimball, City Planner
### MB & DW, INC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN NO.</th>
<th>ACREAGE</th>
<th>CURRENT USE</th>
<th>PROPOSED USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>264-010-008</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>Residential &amp; Ag</td>
<td>Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264-080-030</td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282-030-006</td>
<td>45.14</td>
<td>Residential &amp; Ag</td>
<td>Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282-030-009</td>
<td>28.09</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282-030-31</td>
<td>46.46</td>
<td>Residential &amp; Ag</td>
<td>Mobile Home Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282-060-022</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>Residential &amp; Ag</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284-070-060</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>Residential &amp; Ag</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282-060-007</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>Residential &amp; Ag</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 18, 2007

Mr. John Longley
City Manager
City of Porterville
291 North Main Street
Porterville, CA. 93257

RE: City of Porterville General Plan Land Use

Dear Mr. Longley:

We have reviewed the City’s General Plan Land Use Map, Public Hearing Draft and Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2030 General Plan. As a landowner with several properties in the planning area, we have many concerns as to how the city has classified properties that we currently own.

The properties that we currently own are in the East section of Porterville and lie adjacent to the Tule River. Some of these properties are currently being used for commercial use and in the future we plan to convert them into a mobile home park or other similar development which would classify them as a High Density Residential Use. Some of the properties will remain for the commercial use category. Your plan calls for these properties to be classified as “Agriculture/Rural/Conservation” and also “Very Low Density Residential”.

We would like to ask that you would re-classify these properties on your General Plan. I am attaching a list of the APN Numbers and a description of said properties. If you would like, we would be willing to meet with you or your planning department to discuss this further.

If you have any questions or need any other information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Mitchell Brown, President

Cc: Porterville City Council
    Bradley D. Dunlap, Community Development Director
    Benjamin Kimball, City Planner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN NO.</th>
<th>ACREAGE</th>
<th>CURRENT USE</th>
<th>PROPOSED USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>282-060-001</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>Equipment Yard</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 5, 2007

Mr. Bradley D. Dunlap, AICP
City of Porterville
291 N. Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257

Dear Mr. Dunlap:

Caltrans has completed its review of the City of Porterville General Plan Update. Caltrans has the following comments:

Recently, the City has approved numerous residential subdivisions, commercial or retail centers, and light industrial projects that are developed or are currently being constructed. Growth from these and the proposed changes in the General Plan will continue to impact State Route (SR) 190 and SR 65 in the future. The increased traffic volumes on the State Routes will need to be mitigated as part of project specific development and as part of regional effort through Tulare County Association of Governments or local funds. Individual developments will typically be required to prepare Traffic Impact Studies (TIS).

The General Plan Update process of evaluating and preparing circulation plans is an ideal time to consider updating the citywide Traffic Impact Fee Program (TIFP). A TIFP allows for the city to establish a pro-rata fair share fee structure that collects mitigation fees based on project development impacts and provides needed funds for improvements to the State and local road systems in an equitable and efficient manner. Since a project’s TIS needs to address impacts for the highest use of undeveloped lands, Caltrans recommends that the City develop a TIFP that is based on “build-out” of the General Plan. If the City were to develop a comprehensive TIFP that would adequately address the impacts of subsequent development based on the General Plan “build-out”, it may not be necessary for Caltrans to comment on a project by project basis.

Caltrans would need to continue reviewing development proposals that are adjacent to state facilities, of regional significance or may reduce the level of services of state facilities. As a transportation partner, Caltrans is requesting a copy of the City of Porterville Zoning Ordinance to facilitate the review of future projects. The Ordinance is necessary to evaluate the TIS comparison assessment of the highest land uses utilized in the study in order to properly comment during the project review cycle.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
Mr. Bradley D. Dunlap  
December 5, 2007  
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With any new development or as part of the redevelopment effort the City should plan for the future widening of SR 65 and SR 190 by requiring the dedication to the ultimate right of way as delineated in the Transportation Concept Report. The City should require sufficient setbacks from the highway system to incorporate or modify the system as required in the future. Many of the interchanges have had only minor modifications since originally constructed. In the future, modification of the existing interchanges will be necessary. In rare cases, complete reconstruction of an interchange could be warranted. The General Plan Update should consider the traffic impacts and mitigation at interchanges. The City should not take any action that could jeopardize the future acquisition of right of way for roadway purposes.

The integration between the State highway system and local road network is a critical component for a safe and efficient seamless transportation network. As growth occurs, the need for auxiliary lanes on State Routes, additional lanes on the ramps, intersection and driveway set backs on the local road away from the State highway system are typically needed. Caltrans is your partner in planning the efficient design of the integration between the highway system and the local roads. We look forward to working with you in addressing this important portion of the transportation system.

Where development occurs in constrained locations such as Jayce Street at SR 190, the creation of a local road arterial can, at times, be the only means of adequately addressing a lack of State highway right of way. Caltrans would like to partner with the City to address congestion by preserving right of way or for the creation of the local road arterial networks.

As traffic volumes increase, roadway noise becomes more pronounced. Noise studies in conformance with FLIWA regulations should be included in the Environmental Impact Report and areas of concern should be defined. Mitigation for the defined area needs to be considered for all non-commercial and industrial areas. The City needs to make a condition of approval stating that any required future noise abatement will be the responsibility of the property owner or the City of Porterville.

Caltrans notes that the City has implemented a Transportation Impact Fee program. We support this approach to mitigating for development's impacts to infrastructure. Caltrans recommends that the City consider incorporating State facilities within this fee program. The State Highway System provides the backbone for transportation, both regionally and locally. A seamless, efficient transportation system, including the State Highways, is critical for the movement of people and goods and hence the future economic development of the area.

Caltrans recommends that the City of Porterville incorporate the guiding principles of the "San Joaquin Valley Regional Blueprint; Vision for the Valley." The Blueprint represents a collaborative planning process, with the eight San Joaquin Valley counties working together to prepare a guide for growth within the Central Valley. The Blueprint will develop a valley-wide "vision" that will include the integration of transportation, housing, land use, economic development and environmental protection that will serve as a significant contribution to improving the Valley's quality of life.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
Mr. Bradley D. Dunlap  
December 5, 2007  
Page 3

We look forward to reviewing the Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan Update. If you have any questions, please call me at (559) 488-7306.

Sincerely,

AL DIAS  
Central Planning Branch  
District 6

C: Mr. Ted Smalley, Tulare County Association of Governments  
Deputy Executive Director

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
November 27, 2007

Mr. Ben Kimball
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
291 N. Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257

Re: SCH#2006011033; CEQA Notice of Completion; draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for General Plan 2030 Update; City of Porterville; Tulare County, California

Dear Mr. Kimball:

The Native American Heritage Commission is the state agency designated to protect California's Native American Cultural Resources. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archaeological resources, is a 'significant effect' requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per the California Code of Regulations §15064.5(b)(c) (CEQA guidelines). In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the 'area of potential effect (APE)', and if so, to mitigate that effect. To adequately assess the project-related impacts on historical resources, the Commission recommends the following action:

- Contact the appropriate California Historic Resources Information Center (CHRIS). Contact information for the Information Center nearest you is available from the State Office of Historic Preservation (916/653-7278)/http://www.ohp.parks.ca.gov/1068/files/IC%20Roster.pdf The record search will determine:
  - If a part or the entire APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
  - If any known cultural resources have already been recorded in or adjacent to the APE.
  - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
  - If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

- If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.

- The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.

- The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center.

- Contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for:
  - A Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project area and information on tribal contacts in the project vicinity that may have additional cultural resource information. Please provide this office with the following citation format to assist with the Sacred Lands File search request: USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle citation with name, township, range, and section.

- The NAHC advises the use of Native American Monitors to ensure proper identification and care given cultural resources that may be discovered. The NAHC recommends that contact be made with Native American Contacts on the attached list to get their input on potential project impact (APE). In some cases, the existence of a Native American cultural resources may be known only to a local tribe(s).

- Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.

- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archaeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5 (f). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.

- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.

- Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains or unmarked cemeteries in their mitigation plans.

- CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(d) requires the lead agency to work with the Native Americans identified by this Commission if the initial Study identifies the presence or likely presence of Native American human remains within the APE. CEQA Guidelines provide for agreements with Native American, identified by the
NAHC, to assure the appropriate and dignified treatment of Native American human remains and any associated grave liens. √ Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98 and Sec. §15064.5 (d) of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) mandate procedures to be followed, including that construction or excavation be stopped in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery until the county coroner or medical examiner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. Note that §7052 of the Health & Safety Code states that disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony. √ Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in §15370 of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines), when significant cultural resources are discovered during the course of project planning and implementation.

Please feel free to contact me at (916) 653-6251 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Attachment: List of Native American Contacts

Cc: State Clearinghouse
Santa Rosa Rancheria
Clarence Atwell, Chairperson
P.O. Box 8
Lemoore, CA 93245
(559) 924-1278
(559) 924-3583 Fax

Kenneth Woodrow
1179 Rock Haven Ct.
Salinas, CA 93906
831-443-9702
Foothill Yokuts
Mono

Tule River Indian Tribe
Neil Peyron, Chairperson
P.O. Box 589
Porterville, CA 93258
chairman@tulerivertribe.nsn.
(559) 781-4271
(559) 781-4610 FAX

Santa Rosa Rancheria
Lalo Franco, Director - Cultural Department
P.O. Box 8
Lemoore, CA 93245
(559) 925-2831
(559) 469-3556 - CELL

Wukchumni Tribe
Susan Weese, C/o Lalo Franco
2504 West Beech Street.
Visalia, CA 93277
(559) 925-2831 - Lalo Franco

Sierra Nevada Native American Coalition
Lawrence Bill, Interim Chairperson
P.O. 125
Dunlap, CA 93621
(559) 338-2354

Foothill Yokuts
Mono

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2006011033; CEQA Notice of Completion; draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for Porterville 2030 General Plan; Tulare County, California.
Porterville

2030

General Plan

Prepared by

DYETT & BHATIA
Urban and Regional Planners

In association with

Omni-Means, Transportation Planners and Engineers
Environmental Science Associates
Charles Salter Associates, Noise Consultants, and
Land Use Associates
Purpose of General Plan

- Establish long-range vision
- Establish long-range development policies
- Provide procedure for analyzing projects
- Reflect current planning efforts
- Improve quality of life
- Accommodate projected growth
- Provide basis for implementation tools

General Plan Process

- Two Year Process
  - Stakeholder Interviews
  - Public Workshops
  - Website Posting and Comment Opportunity
  - City Council Study Sessions
  - Parks and Leisure Services Commission
  - Circulate Draft EIR and General Plan
  - Respond to comments
  - City Council Adopt General Plan
Future Steps

- Amend Sphere of Influence and Urban Development Boundary
- Update Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances
- Adopt Hillside Development Ordinance

General Plan Requirements

- The General Plan must be comprehensive
- The General Plan must be internally consistent
- The General Plan must be long-range
Table 1-1: Required Elements & General Plan Elements Correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Elements</th>
<th>General Plan Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Chapter 2: Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>Chapter 4: Circulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Chapter 6: Open Space &amp; Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>Chapter 6: Open Space &amp; Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Chapter 7: Public Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Chapter 9: Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Contained in a separate volume, adopted March 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing Land Use Calculations

Table 2-1: Existing Land Use: Porterville Planning Area (2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Incorporated</th>
<th></th>
<th>Unincorporated</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Planning Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Rural/Conservation</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20,390</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>21,210</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4,760</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Shopping</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2,634</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2,009</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified (Roads, water, etc.)</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,161</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,130</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table includes development projects approved in 2005.
Source: Tulare County Assessor, Dyer & Partners, 2007

Growth Strategy

- Compact
  - Urban Development Boundary/Sphere of Influence
  - Open Space Action Plan
  - Infill Development
- Balanced
- Equitable
- Better Neighborhoods
- Economic Opportunities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Maximum Residential Density (houses/acre)</th>
<th>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort Residential</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very-Low Density Residential</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Mixed Use</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Mixed Use</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/ Rural Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-1: Buildout General Plan Land Use Acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Developed Land</th>
<th>General Plan</th>
<th>2030 Total</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort Residential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Density Residential</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>3,802</td>
<td>4,311</td>
<td>8,113</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Subtotal</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>9,479</td>
<td>14,589</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Mixed Use</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Mixed Use</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Centers</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General &amp; Service Commercial</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use and Commercial Subtotal</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Park</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Office</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Industrial Subtotal</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>2,077</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Institutional</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Open Space</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Open Space Subtotal</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>3,679</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Rural/Conservation</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>11,731</td>
<td>11,996</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified (Roads, water, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6,755</td>
<td>27,886</td>
<td>36,640</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Overlays

- Hillside Development Zone
- Downtown Planning Area
- Transition Landscape Buffers
Economic Development Strategy

- Ensure physical capacity for businesses
- Ensure industrial land capacity for businesses
- Ensure social capacity for businesses
- Support existing businesses
- Recruit new businesses
- Identify industry clusters
- Provide incentives
- Foster positive City-Business relationships
- Improve workforce training

Table 3-2: Projected Employment Growth in Porterville, 2005-2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Jobs in 2005</th>
<th>Jobs in 2030</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Average Annual Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>7,505</td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>4,706</td>
<td>7,661</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>4,212</td>
<td>6,462</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>230%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>-160</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,471</td>
<td>31,719</td>
<td>12,248</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circulation/Transportation Strategy

- Complete Circulation network to provide efficient movement of goods and people
- Develop properly sized circulation improvements
- Promote Use of multiple modes of transportation
- Improve Scenic character of travel ways
- Protect neighborhoods from through traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-4: Major Planned Street Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons Ave; Indiana St - Jaye St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Ave; Friant-Kern Canal - Newcomb St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Ave; Prospect St - Indiana St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest St; Teapot Dome Ave - Horton Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Ave; Ave 138 - Westfield Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaye St; Springville Dr; Olive Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaye St; SR 190 - Springville Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaye St; Gibbons Ave; SR 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St; Henderson Ave; Ave 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomb St; Pioneer Ave; North Grand Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomb St; Teapot Dome Ave; Olive Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Grand Ave; Reid Ave; SR 65 - Piano St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Grand Ave; Prospect St; SR 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Ave; Friant-Kern Canal; Westwood St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Ave; Prospect St; Indiana St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano St; Henderson Ave; Reid Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano St; Scranton Ave; SR 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect St; Mulberry Ave; Westfield Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton Ave; SR 65; Indiana St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springville Dr; Indiana St; East of Jaye St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 65; S. City Limits; SR 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teapot Dome Ave; Newcomb St; S. Main St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood St; Henderson Ave; Friant-Kern Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood St; SR 190; Olive Ave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4-4: Major Planned Street Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Major Roads</th>
<th>SR 65 Interchange Improvements</th>
<th>SR 65 Grade Separations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foothill Parkway: Reid to Road 284</td>
<td>Avenue 181 (new)</td>
<td>Westfield Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest Parkway (Extension): Foothill Parkway to</td>
<td>Olive Ave (exists)</td>
<td>Morton Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave 176</td>
<td>Teapot Dome Ave (new)</td>
<td>Scranton Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mertz Avenue Extension: Newcomb - Hillcrest</td>
<td>North Grand Ave (new)</td>
<td>Indianna St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henderson Ave (exists)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR 190 Interchange Improvements</th>
<th>SR 190 Grade Separations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westwood St (new)</td>
<td>Newcomb St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St (existing)</td>
<td>Piano St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest St (new)</td>
<td>Indiana St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road 284 (new)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Porterville, Omni-Means, 2007; Dyess and Bhata, 2007*
Park, Schools and Public Facilities

Strategies

- Provide a network of parks and open space
- Preserve and protect Significant Ridgelines
- Place parks in close proximity to new residential development
- Coordinate/co-locate with schools
- Create a variety of park types
Table 5-3: Parks by Type at Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Existing Acreage</th>
<th>Proposed Acreage</th>
<th>Total Acreage at Buildout</th>
<th>Parkland Ratio at Buildout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Recreation</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230.5</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Acres of neighborhood, community, and specialized recreation parkland per 1,000 residents.
2. The 40 acres of parkland in the Resort Residential area is not represented in the total because the type of facility has not yet been determined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Current Capacity</th>
<th>New Students</th>
<th>Total Students at Buildout</th>
<th>Students at Buildout in Excess of Capacity</th>
<th>New Schools Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>9,320</td>
<td>7,468</td>
<td>15,882</td>
<td>6,552</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>5,321</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>6,075</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>9,911</td>
<td>3,836</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,878</td>
<td>13,069</td>
<td>30,814</td>
<td>11,936</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Assumes only 25 percent of the housing units Resort Residential community will generate students.
2. Assumes 2005 school district generation rates: 0.4 elementary school students, 0.1 middle school students, and 0.2 high school students per new housing unit.
3. Assumes average school size of 550 students (grades K-5), 800 students (grades 6-8), and 1,500 students (grades 9-12). The number of schools needed is rounded up.


---

**Open Space and Conservation Strategies**

- Protect significant environmental resources and assets
- Support rural conservation
Open Space Classifications

- Open Space for Public Health and Safety
- Open Space for Natural Resources
- Open Space for Resource Production
- Open Space for Recreation
- Open Space for Native American Sites
- Open Space to Shape and Limit Urban Form
Farmland/Mineral/Biological Resources Preservation Strategy

- Acknowledge the importance of non-renewable resources
- Promote conservation through the policies in the Open Space and Conservation Element

Table 6-2: Buildout Farmland Soils in Planning Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Buildout Acres</th>
<th>Percent of Planning Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Farmland</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland of Statewide Importance</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Farmland</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland of Local Importance</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing Land</td>
<td>6,946</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>25,239</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Land &amp; Water Resources</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection; Oyst and Bhatia, 2007.
Figure 3.1-3: Farmland Conversion
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Public Health and Safety Strategy

- Identify sources of potential hazards
- Develop preventative and responsive policies to mitigate hazards
- Respond to the requirements of the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 and FEMA regulations
Emergency and Public Services Strategy

- Plan for new emergency and other public services to meet the demands of the growing City
- Establish plans for responding to emergency situations

Noise Strategy

- Identify noise sources that exist in the City and project anticipated noise sources and levels to 2030
- Develop measures to minimize noise and to address compatibility of land uses
Table 9-1: Land Use Compatibility For Community Noise Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>&gt;80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Low Density Single Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Multi Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use &amp; High Density Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging - Hotels, Hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums, Concerts, Halls, Amusements</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Area, Outdoor Spectator Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds, Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses, Riding Stables, Water Recreation, Campgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Buildings, Business, Commercial and Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Manufacturing, Utilities, Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation:

- Normally Acceptable
- Conditionally Acceptable
- Normally Unacceptable

Legend:

- Shaded areas indicate locations where the land use is not compatible with the noise levels specified.
- Open areas indicate locations where the land use is acceptable at the noise levels specified.

Sources:

- City of Phoenix, 2008.
Responsible Entities for Implementation

- City Council
- Community Development Department
- Parks & Leisure Services Department
- Public Works Department
- Police & Fire Departments
- Parks & Leisure Services Commission
- Library Board of Trustees
- Redevelopment Advisory Committee
- Community Dev. Block Grant Advisory Committee
- Measure H Oversight Committee
- Audit Review Committee
- Affirmative Action Advisory Committee
- Building Code Review Board

Regulatory System

- Zoning Regulations
- Subdivision Regulations
- Building and Housing Codes
- Capital Improvement Program
- Enterprise Zone Re-Authorization, other incentive zones
Porterville

Draft Environmental Impact Report
2100 General Plan

Issues Analyzed in the EIR

- Land Use and Agriculture
- Visual Resources
- Parks, Recreation and Open Space
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils and Seismicity Hazards
- Safety and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Resources
- Public Utilities and Services
- Energy Use and Global Climate Change
- Transportation
General Plan Alternatives Considered

- Alternative 1 – Linked Neighborhood Centers
- Alternative 2 – South Main Street Mixed Use District
- No Project Alternative

Table ES-5: Proposed General Plan and Alternatives: Comparison of Buildout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed General Plan</td>
<td>14,080</td>
<td>45,220</td>
<td>19,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>34,250</td>
<td>107,300</td>
<td>54,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>31,560</td>
<td>96,710</td>
<td>40,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>33,540</td>
<td>103,570</td>
<td>48,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,860</td>
<td>81,350</td>
<td>50,930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rounded to nearest tenth position.
Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

- Agricultural Land Conversion
- Noise
- Special Status Species & Habitats
- Air Quality

Irreversible Environmental Changes

- Water Consumption
- Energy Sources
- Construction-Related Impacts
Growth Inducing Impacts

- Population Increase
- Increase in Regional Housing Demand
- Jobs/Employment Balance

Cumulative Impacts

- Air Quality
- Transportation
- Land Use Changes
- Noise Levels
- Increased Exposure to Seismic Hazards
- Increased Water Demand and Water Quality Impacts
- Impact on Prominent Hillsides
- Conversion of Open Space
- Conversion of Agricultural Lands
CITY OF PORTERVILLE

URBAN WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN
2007 UPDATE

November 2007

Prepared by:

Provost and Pritchard Engineering Group, Inc.

City of Porterville
Uses for UWMP

- Long Range Planning Document for Water Supply
- Source Document for Cities and counties in Preparation of their General Plans
- Foundation Document and Source of Information for a Water Supply Assessment and Written Verification of Water Supply
- Key Component to an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Participated in UWMP development</th>
<th>Invited to public meetings</th>
<th>Attended public meetings</th>
<th>Received copy of draft</th>
<th>Commented on the draft UWMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porterville ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Bella ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucelito ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Tule River ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixley ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandasla ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Pot Dome WD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindmore ID</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay-Strathmore ID</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare County</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tule River Association</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.1 - Current and Planned Water Supplies (AF/Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>45,200</td>
<td>62,220</td>
<td>82,530</td>
<td>74,880</td>
<td>89,620</td>
<td>107,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Area (acres)</td>
<td>9,170</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>23,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Yield (acre-feet/year)</td>
<td>9,170</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>23,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total City Demands*</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier Produced Groundwater*</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>23,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier Surface Divisions*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Purchases*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>5,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desalination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Ground Water Issues

- Historically used for **ALL** water demands
- Not significantly impacted by droughts
- Levels have declined over the years
- Dependent on recharge efforts
Surface Water Issues

- Historically not used in Porterville
- Dependent on precipitation/stiff competition for water supply
- Need new infrastructure to treat
- Could be used for groundwater recharge

Demand Management Measures

- Water Surveys
- Residential Plumbing Retrofits
- Water System Audits
- Metering
- Landscape Conservation Programs
- High Efficiency Washing Machine Rebates
- Public Information Programs
- School Information Programs
- Commercial & Industrial Conservation
- Wholesale Agency Programs
- Conservation Pricing
- Water Conservation Coordinator
- Waste Water Prohibition
- Low Flow Toilet Replacement
Planned Water Supply Projects

- Construct Surface Water Treatment Plant
- Water Distribution System Improvements
- New Well Construction
- Water Conservation

Water Shortage Contingency Plan

- Estimate of Minimum Supply
- Catastrophic Supply Interruption Plan
- Prohibition, Penalties and Consumption Reduction Methods
- Analysis of Revenue Impacts of Reduced Sales During Shortages
- Draft Ordinance and Use Monitoring Procedure
If you don’t plan where you’re going, you never know where you may end up....
PUBLIC HEARING

STAFF REPORT

TITLE: COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE, INCLUDING ASSOCIATED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND URBAN WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

APPLICANT: City of Porterville
291 N. Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257

SPECIFIC REQUEST:

This public meeting has been scheduled to receive public testimony on the City’s Draft Comprehensive General Plan Update, including associated Environmental Impact Report and Urban Water Management Plan.

PROJECT DETAILS:

The General Plan Update was initiated to take a comprehensive look at where the City is, where it would like to be in the future and to create a vision of what Porterville should be like in 2030. Some areas of the City may change very little in this timeframe, and others may change dramatically. The General Plan focuses on current community needs and neighborhood character, economic development opportunities and challenges, how to encourage mixed use and infill development and appropriate development outside the current City limits. Lastly, it responds to residents’ and other stake holders’ preferences about where different land uses such as housing, shopping, industry, parks and recreation, and public facilities should be located and how City resources should be used to achieve the Plan’s goals.

Looking ahead, Porterville faces several planning challenges over the next 23 years. The foremost challenge is to support sustainable development. Sustainable development has been defined as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” The goal of sustainability is to balance economic prosperity, environmental quality and social equity with the conservation of natural resources (such as water). In order to preserve and enhance the environmental quality of Porterville, sustainable development entails both encouraging the infill development of existing vacant land within the City limits, and
protecting important agricultural lands and open space areas around the urban periphery. These are necessary steps to create a sustainable footprint for future growth while preserving the city’s agriculture community and small town character. The equity element of sustainability typically refers to the distribution of costs and benefits across all members of society. Therefore, another significant challenge is to ensure the dedication of land and resources for new housing, schools, parks and community facilities. In addition, sustainable growth will require careful planning in order to provide adequate public infrastructure to the entire community without impairing environmental resources.

Improving economic stability and vitality is another challenge for Porterville over the next two decades. Enhancing the City’s economic role in the region will require building a diversified job base, expanding the base economy, supporting a multi-modal transportation system, and developing regional attractions, such as unique shopping areas and high-quality parks and recreation. Thus, this General Plan has been prepared to:

- Establish a long-range vision that reflects the aspirations of the community and outlines steps to achieve this vision;
- Establish long-range development policies that will guide the Community Development Department, Public Works Department, Finance Department, Police Department, Fire Department, Parks and Leisure Services Department and City Council decision-making;
- Provide a basis for judging whether specific development proposals and public projects are in harmony with plan policies;
- Reflect Porterville’s current planning and economic development efforts;
- Plan in a manner that improves the quality of life for the whole community and meets future land needs based on the projected population and job growth;
- Allow City departments, other public agencies, and private developers to design projects that will preserve and enhance community character and environmental resources, promote sustainability, and minimize hazards; and
- Provide the basis for establishing detailed plans and implementation programs, such as the zoning and subdivision regulations, specific and master plans, and the Capital Improvement Program.

GENERAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS

State law requires each California municipality to prepare a general plan. A general plan is defined as “a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the county or city, and any land outside its boundaries which in the planning agency’s judgment bears relation to its planning.” State requirements call for general plans that “comprise an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for the adopting agency.” A city's general plan has been described as its constitution for development – the framework within which decisions on how to grow, provide public services and facilities, and protect and enhance the environment must be made. California's tradition of allowing local authority over land use decisions means that the State's cities have
considerable flexibility in preparing their general plans. While allowing considerable flexibility, State planning laws do establish some requirements for the issues that general plans must address. The California Government Code (Section 65300) establishes both the content of general plans and rules for their adoption and subsequent amendment. Together, State law and judicial decisions establish three overall guidelines for general plans:

- **The General Plan Must Be Comprehensive.** This requirement has two aspects. First, the general plan must be geographically comprehensive. That is, it must apply throughout the entire incorporated area and it should include other areas that the city determines are relevant to its planning. Second, the general plan must address the full range of issues that affect the city's physical development.

- **The General Plan Must Be Internally Consistent.** This requirement means that the general plan must fully integrate its separate parts and relate them to each other without conflict. “Horizontal” consistency applies both to figures and diagrams as well as general plan text. It also applies to data and analysis as well as policies. All adopted portions of the general plan, whether required by State law or not, have equal legal weight. None may supersede another, so the general plan must resolve conflicts among the provisions of each element.

- **The General Plan Must Be Long-Range.** Because anticipated development will affect the city and the people who live or work there for years to come, State law requires every general plan to take a long-term perspective.

### CONSISTENCY REQUIREMENTS WITHIN THE GENERAL PLAN

The General Plan includes six of the seven elements required by State law: Land Use, Circulation, Open Space, Conservation, Safety, and Noise. It also includes three other optional elements that address local concerns: Economic Development; Parks, Schools & Community Facilities; and Public Utilities. The current Housing Element was adopted in March of 2004 as a separate volume. The State has recently initiated the update process for valley cities. Staff is currently working with the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) to determine the housing supply to be accommodated between 2008 and 2014. The Housing Element Update is required to be adopted by 2009.

### ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

State law now requires General Plans to include consideration of environmental justice in preparing policies and implementation programs, and in creating the physical framework for development. The problems of environmental justice that the General Plan can address include procedural inequities and geographic inequities.

- Procedural inequities might include “stacking” commissions or committees with individuals who ignore the interests of minority and low-income residents, holding meetings at times and
places that minimize the ability of low-income residents to participate, using English-only communications when non-English speaking populations may be affected by land use decisions, and requiring lower levels of mitigation for projects affecting low-income and minority populations.

- Geographic inequities might include providing fewer public services, transit services, and parks for minority and low-income residents than for middle- and upper-income residents. Several new policy initiatives, distributed throughout the General Plan, are included to address environmental justice.

**PLAN PREPARATION PROCESS**

The General Plan update was initiated in the summer of 2005. In order for the General Plan to accurately address community needs and values, a comprehensive public process of obtaining the input of residents, businesses, and property owners as well as City officials was central to the update process. This involved the sharing of information and ideas between elected and appointed officials, City staff, the planning consultants, and residents. A number methods were used over the course of the General Plan update including:

- Stakeholder Interviews
- Community Workshops
- General Plan Update Advisory Committee Meetings
- City Council Study Sessions
- Parks & Leisure Services Commission
- Newsletters
- Posting on City Website
- General Plan Update Mailing List
- Printed Documents

**GENERAL PLAN THEMES & KEY INITIATIVES**

Several themes for the General Plan were identified and considered by the GPUAC, based on input by the public and from key stakeholders and City staff.

- **Compact, Balanced, and Equitable Growth.** Clearly defined urban edges reflect a commitment to focus future growth within the City in order to prevent urban sprawl and protect environmentally sensitive areas. Policies to encourage infill development are found throughout the General Plan.

- **Protect Community Assets.** The Plan renews the City’s commitment to protect and enhance its community assets, including small town community character, Downtown Porterville, a strong sense of community, a diverse population, historic buildings, affordable housing, and a family atmosphere. Community guidelines are described in full detail in the Land Use
Element. The arrangements of land uses on the General Plan Land Use Diagram (Figure 2-2) create a framework within which quality community design is possible.

- **Economic Development & Jobs.** A significant amount of land is planned for uses that provide jobs. Areas designated “Professional Office” and “Industrial Park” will accommodate uses that provide employment opportunities for existing and future residents consistent with the Economic Development Strategy described in the Economic Development Element.

- **Variety Commercial & Retail Opportunities.** The General Plan provides for the full range of commercial and retail uses needed for the future population and business community, consistent with the Economic Development Strategy described in the Land Use Element. Regionally-oriented establishments are placed on major roadway corridors; community and neighborhood-oriented uses are placed within planned communities and neighborhoods.

- **Park and Community Facility Network.** New parks and community facilities are placed in close proximity to proposed residential development and when possible by schools, trails and bikeways. A further discussion of parks is presented in the Parks, Schools & Community Facilities Element of the General Plan.

- **Complete Roadway System.** The land uses presented on the General Plan Land Use Diagram are structured around the proposed roadway network, and the two components are interactive and interrelated. The types, location, capacity, and use of these roadways are presented in the Circulation Element.

- **Integrated Neighborhoods & Neighborhood Centers.** Neighborhoods are defined as areas with a mix of land uses, including housing, shopping, and other local services, which interrelate and serve one another. Neighborhoods depicted on the General Plan Land Use Diagram work as part of a network, are internally accessible by non-motorized means, include community facilities such as parks and schools, and have a central focal point.

- **Mix of Housing Types.** The General Plan Land Use Diagram depicts seven residential and two mixed use land use designations. These land uses will accommodate a diverse range of housing types and prices to provide housing choice.

- **Adequate, Flexible School Sites.** School sites depicted on the General Plan Land Use Diagram are intended to meet the school districts’ needs, and relate well to adjacent neighborhood centers and parks. A further discussion of schools is presented in the Parks, Schools & Community Facilities Element.

- **Open Space Action Plan.** The Open Space and Conservation Element outlines the five types of open space preserved as part of the Action Plan. Additional General Plan policies are intended to protect ridgelines, visible hillsides and other significant natural and archeological resource areas from development that would have adverse impacts.

**DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE PLAN**

Full development under the General Plan is referred to as “buildout.” It should be noted that when buildout will actually occur is not specified in or anticipated by the Plan, and designation of a site for a certain use does not necessarily mean that the site will be built/redesigned with the designated use
by 2030, the horizon of the Plan. Buildout of the General Plan is expected to accommodate community growth according to the following table:

### Projected City Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing (2006)</th>
<th>Expected Increase Over Planning Period</th>
<th>Total at Buildout (2030)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>45,220</td>
<td>62,080</td>
<td>107,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Housing Units</td>
<td>14,080</td>
<td>20,170</td>
<td>34,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Floor Area</td>
<td>7,200,000 s.f.</td>
<td>23,300,000 s.f.</td>
<td>30,500,000 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>19,470</td>
<td>34,990</td>
<td>54,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A city’s jobs/employment ratio (jobs to employed residents) would be 1:1 if the number of jobs in the city equaled the number of employed residents. In theory, such a balance would eliminate the need for commuting. More realistically, a balance means that in-commuting and out-commuting are matched, leading to efficient use of the transportation system, particularly during peak hours. The current jobs/employment ratio in Porterville is 0.96:1, which means that the number of jobs in the City is slightly less than the number of employed residents. At buildout, the General Plan will add more jobs than employed resident, increasing jobs/employment balance to 1.13:1.

### ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for this project, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. The purpose of the EIR is to inform decision makers and the general public of the potential significant environmental impacts of a proposed project.

The proposed Plan EIR is a program EIR, defined in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 as: “...an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either: (1) Geographically; (2) As logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions; (3) In connection with the issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or (4) As individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental impacts which can be mitigated in similar ways.”

Program EIRs can be used as the basic, general environmental assessment for an overall program of projects developed over a 23 year planning horizon. A program EIR has several advantages. First, it provides a basic reference document to avoid unnecessary repetition of facts or analysis in subsequent project-specific assessments. Second, it allows the lead agency to look at the broad, regional impacts of a program of actions before its adoption and eliminates redundant or contradictory approaches to the consideration of regional and cumulative impacts. As a program EIR, this document focuses on the overall effects of the proposed General Plan in the Planning Area.
In order to place many of the proposed General Plan policies into effect, the City would adopt or approve specific actions—zoning regulations, zoning map amendments, development impact fees, specific plans, capital improvement programs, development projects, etc.—that would be consistent with the policies and implementation measures of the Plan. This program EIR does not preclude the need for environmental review of specific plans and individual projects subsequent to Council adoption of the proposed General Plan. CEQA mandates that lead agencies adopt mitigation monitoring and reporting programs for projects identified as having significant impacts where mitigation measures have been identified. Mitigation monitoring and reporting programs are intended to ensure compliance during project implementation. These programs provide the additional advantages of providing staff and decision-makers with feedback as to the effectiveness of mitigation measures, as well as the experience and information to shape future mitigation measures.

The proposed General Plan is intended to be self-mitigating, in that the policies and programs of the proposed Plan are designed to mitigate environmental impacts. This EIR clearly shows how the impacts of future development in Porterville will be mitigated through implementation of the policies and programs of the proposed Plan. Any residual impact after implementation of these proposed policies and programs is identified as measured against the significance criteria established for each impact area. The significance criteria is an identifiable quantitative, qualitative, or performance level of a particular environmental effect in which non-compliance indicates that the effect is significant.

This EIR represents the best effort to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed General Plan given its long-term planning horizon. It can be anticipated that conditions will change; however, the assumptions used are the best available at the time of preparation and reflect existing knowledge of patterns of development and travel patterns.

The proposed General Plan EIR is based on the following key assumptions:

- **Full Implementation.** This EIR assumes that all policies in the proposed General Plan will be fully implemented and all development will be consistent with the proposed General Plan Land Use Diagram.
- **Buildout in 2030.** This EIR assumes that buildout of the proposed General Plan will occur by 2030. It is understood that development under the proposed General Plan will be incremental and timed in response to market conditions. And while the proposed General Plan includes policies intended to control the amount and location of new growth, it does not include interim “phases” (development scenarios) as this is considered speculative.

The issues evaluated in this EIR were determined during the initial phase of the project. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the EIR on the Porterville 2030 General Plan was circulated in the December 2006 and the City received comments during a 30-day review period. The NOP is in Appendix A of this EIR. These comments, along with input received during public workshops and
meetings helped to identify the major planning and environmental issues and concerns in the General Plan and helped establish the framework and focus of the environmental analysis.

The first step toward completion of this Draft EIR was the initial analysis of the environmental setting. This analysis compiled specific information on the current conditions, the characteristics of the City, and the major issues it faces. Information on the environmental setting provides background regarding relevant issues and is used to evaluate potential impacts. Based on the initial analysis of the environmental setting, as well as the NOP comments and public meetings, the following issues are analyzed in this EIR:

- Land Use and Agriculture
- Visual Resources
- Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils, and Seismicity Hazards
- Safety and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Resources
- Public Utilities and Services
- Energy Use and Global Climate Change
- Transportation

Although the proposed General Plan is largely self-mitigating, meaning that the policies contained therein are designed to mitigate any significant environmental impacts, there are several impacts classified as significant and unavoidable that have been identified in the areas listed below:

**Agricultural Land Conversion**

Approximately 3,050 acres of Prime Farmland soils (of which 2,880 acres are on unincorporated lands) would be converted to urban uses as a result of full buildout of the proposed General Plan. Substantial amounts of Farmland of Statewide Importance and Unique Farmland soils (approximately 4,200 acres) would also be converted. Of these lands, 3,200 of these converted acres are in Williamson Act contracts (agricultural preserves); however, these lands can only be annexed after the contracts expire. Though the proposed General Plan provides policies to minimize the extent of growth/spawl associated with future development, this agricultural land conversion is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

**Noise**

Future development within the Planning Area will result in the development of new roads near existing neighborhoods and overall increased traffic volumes, thus increasing noise levels in some
areas. The proposed General Plan requires the construction of approximately 65 miles (140 lane miles) of new arterial and collector roads and about 25 miles (45 lane miles) of widening of existing roads to serve new development. This does not include the new residential roads which serve local neighborhoods. Though the proposed General Plan provides policies to minimize the extent of noise associated with future development, this impact is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

**Special Status Species & Habitats**

With buildout of the proposed General Plan and associated implementation programs, the resulting agricultural land conversion will also impact known special status species in the Planning Area because it will cause the conversion of or encroachment on their habitats. While the proposed Plan specifically avoids physical encroachment on much of the grassland area in the eastern foothills, the additional noise, light, glare, stormwater runoff, and general human activity associated with population growth elsewhere in Porterville has the potential to reduce the suitability and attractiveness of nearby wildlife environments for habitat uses. The substantial agricultural land conversion and resulting impact on species and habitats constitute a significant and unavoidable impact.

**Air Quality**

Buildout of the proposed General Plan will result in an unavoidable and significant increase in emissions associated with vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and electricity use, directly related to population growth. While the proposed General Plan commits the City to support federal, State, and SJVAPCD efforts to reduce emissions through their policies to reduce automobile use, promote walkability, support transit, and increase energy conservation in new buildings and energy management in public buildings, public infrastructure (e.g. street lighting), and publicly-owned vehicles, any plan designed to accommodate population growth, as this plan is designed to do, would result in this unavoidable significant impact.

The significant impacts related to the proposed General Plan and associated implementation programs would not be considerably different under any other likely growth scenario for Porterville that accommodates residential and non-residential development proposed for the city.

**ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT AND THEIR EFFECT:**

1. **No Project.** Consideration of the No Project alternative is required by CEQA in all EIRs and represents the continuation of the current City of Porterville General Plan land use designations. In the absence of the proposed General Plan, the existing General Plan and zoning would continue to guide development in the Planning Area. There are many differences between the proposed General Plan and the No Project Alternative. As compared to the proposed General Plan, the No Project Alternative:
• Uses a different Planning Area;
• Has a planning horizon of 2020 instead of 2030;
• Does not create neighborhood centers focused on school and park combinations; and
• Does not assume the reauthorization of the Enterprise Zone.

Projections until 2030 based on the existing General Plan land use designations indicate that 11,780 additional housing units and 31,460 additional jobs over the 2006 estimates could be supported by 2030. The total population would be 81,390, only an 80 percent increase of the 2006 population. No land use designations were given to the land outside the 1998 Planning Area for these projections.

2. **Approve the Project.** Approval of the General Plan would result in the type of development described in the Draft General Plan.

3. **Alternative Design #1 - Linked Neighborhood Centers.** The development concepts proposed in this alternative support a natural extension of the existing community edges focusing growth into distinct neighborhood centers, which are connected by bike trails and new road connections. Alternative 1 also proposes strengthening the existing Downtown through an increase in development opportunities for retail shops, housing, office space and services. It creates a new 125-acre educational campus near Granite Hills High School. Approximately 1,000 acres of Resort Residential development would be allowed with up to 1,500 housing units. This alternative would have the same planned transportation network as in the proposed General Plan. This alternative assumes the reauthorization of the Enterprise Zone. Alternative 1 would accommodate an estimated 17,480 additional housing units by the year 2030. New commercial, office, and industrial development would accommodate an additional 21,100 jobs within the Planning Area. The total population would reach approximately 96,710, almost 115 percent increase over the 2006 population.

4. **Alternative Design #2 - South Main Street Mixed Use District.** The development concepts proposed in this alternative are intended to promote the intensification of the existing downtown area with more mixed use development and creates a new growth center in the South Main Street District south of SR 190. Compact neighborhood centers are proposed between Scranton and Teapot Dome Avenues as well as along Foothills Parkway and in the new eastern and western neighborhoods. In general, new development would be consistent with established development patterns in the city. This alternative would have a similar transportation network as in the proposed General Plan but would require additional improvements along SR 190. Approximately 650 acres of Resort Residential development would be allowed in a more compact configuration, with up to 1,500 housing units. This alternative assumes the reauthorization of the Enterprise Zone. Alternative 2 would accommodate an estimated 19,460 additional housing units and 29,130 additional jobs by the year 2030. The total population would reach approximately 102,570, more than 125 percent increase over the 2006 population.
URBAN WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Draft Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) was prepared by Provost and Pritchard Engineering on behalf of the City of Porterville in accordance with the California Urban Water Management Planning Act (ACT). The Act became part of the California Water Code with the passage of Assembly Bill 797 in 1983. The Act requires that every urban water supplier providing water for municipal purposes to more than 3,000 customers, or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet (AF) of water annually, prepare and adopt an UWMP, and update it every five years. The UWMP is required for a water supplier to be eligible for State grants and loans and drought assistance administered by the Department of Water Resources (DWR). The City of Porterville last updated their UWMP in 1990.

The Act requires water agencies to evaluate and describe their water resource supplies and projected needs over a twenty-year planning horizon, and to address a number of related subjects including water conservation, water service reliability, water recycling, opportunities for water transfers, and contingency plans for drought events. This plan evaluates the City’s water resources over a 23-year planning horizon from 2007 to 2030.

The purpose, required contents, and process for preparing and adopting Urban Water Management Plans are specified in California Water Code sections 10610 – 10656. The overall goal is to provide water suppliers throughout the State a framework for carrying out their long-term planning responsibilities and for reporting their strategies to meet future water challenges to both State government and the communities they serve.

An UWMP has many uses including the following:
1. Long range planning document for water supply;
2. Source document for cities and counties as they prepare their General Plans;
3. Foundation document and source of information for a Water Supply Assessment and a Written Verification of Water Supply; and

This UWMP is organized according to the Guidebook to Assist Water Suppliers in the Preparation of a 2005 Urban Water Management Plan, prepared by the California DWR in January 2005.

COORDINATION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Coordination of Plan Preparation

Many local water agencies were involved in the preparation of this UWMP. The following table lists the agencies and their level of involvement.

Coordination with Appropriate Agencies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Participated in UWMP development</th>
<th>Invited to public meetings</th>
<th>Attended public meetings</th>
<th>Received copy of draft</th>
<th>Commented on the draft UWMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porterville ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Bella ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucelito ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Tule River ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixley ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalia ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Pot Dome WD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindmore ID</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay-Strathmore ID</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare County</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tule River Association</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Interagency Efforts**

The City and Porterville Irrigation District (PID) recently completed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding cooperative water operations. In the MOU the two parties agreed to jointly develop and conduct programs to increase surface water imports to the City.

**Planned Interagency Efforts**

The City has not historically worked a lot with other agencies in the management of their water resources, but the plan provides for building closer relations with the County of Tulare and nearby irrigation and water districts. The City began to build those relationships during preparation of their General Plan Update and UWMP in 2006 and 2007.

The City has not been a participant in an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP), but is interested in evaluating the benefits of participation. Funding is available from Proposition 50 and 84 for IRWMPs. PID may prepare an IRWMP with the member agencies of the Tule River Improvement Joint Powers Agreement, since it includes most of the important regional water users. The City may also consider preparing an IRWMP with the Tulare County Association of Governments. Historically, this group has coordinated mostly on transportation projects, but they could feasibly collaborate on water projects also.

In 2007 or 2008 the City plans to prepare an MOU with PID to share groundwater level and quality data.

**Resource Maximization/Import Minimization Plan**

The City has strived to maximize their existing water resources to minimize the need to import water. This has been done through conservation programs, especially metering, to minimize per capita consumption. As discussed in Section 7, the City's per capita demands are lower than most
cities in the area. However, an expanding population has required more groundwater pumping. This has stretched the local groundwater supplies and some well yields have declined. Consequently, the City sees the need to import significant quantities of surface water in the near future. Completion of water sales agreements with other water agencies will be important to accomplish this goal.

Public Participation

This has been updated as part of the City’s General Plan Update. The General Plan Update included numerous opportunities for public involvement and comments. In addition, the public was specifically involved in the development of this UWMP through the following:

- Public Hearing on Water Issues. A public hearing was held on December 12, 2006 at the Porterville City Hall to discuss water management issues and the UWMP. The invitees included seven irrigation/water districts, 18 General Plan Update Advisory Committee Members, and 107 General Plan Stakeholders. Thirteen people attended the public hearing in addition to City staff. The hearing was led by the City’s planning and engineering consultants. During the public hearing a brief presentation was given on current and future water management issues. The public provided several comments and questions that were discussed at length. These comments are all addressed in this UWMP.

- General Plan Approval Public Hearing. A public hearing is being held on December 18, 2007 to solicit comments on the Final General Plan Update. At this meeting the public will have the opportunity to comment on the final UWMP. Further public notice and opportunity for comment on the UWMP will be provided pursuant to Government Code Section 6066 prior to adoption of the plan. The is anticipated to occur early in 2008.

WATER SOURCES

The City has relied exclusively on groundwater to meet water demands in the past. The City’s Draft UWMP establishes a goal of gradually reducing groundwater pumping to match the aquifer safe yield by 2020. Surface water purchases and reductions in demand (achieved through water conservation efforts) would be used to meet remaining demands. Current and planned water sources for the City are summarized in the following table.
## Current and Planned Water Supplies (AF/Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>45,200</td>
<td>52,220</td>
<td>62,530</td>
<td>74,860</td>
<td>89,620</td>
<td>107,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Area (acres)</td>
<td>9,170</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>23,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Yield (acre-feet/year)</td>
<td>9,170</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>23,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total City Demands&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier Produced Groundwater&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>23,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier Surface Diversions&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Purchases&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>5,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desalination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 – Total demands based on assumed per capita use of 250 gallons/day from 2001 Porterville Water System Master Plan
2 – The aquifer safe yield is assumed to be 1.0 acre-feet/acre. This value is approximate and needs to be verified with a detailed water balance study
3 – Includes water rights on the Tule River with the Pioneer Ditch Company and Porter Slough Ditch Company
4 – Surface water sellers are likely to include Porterville Irrigation District and other local irrigation and water districts
5 – The City uses recycled water for crop irrigation and groundwater recharge, but there is no direct use by customers. Refer to Section 12 for data on recycled water use.

Detailed discussions on the City’s groundwater and surface water are provided below.

### Groundwater

The City has historically used groundwater to meet all of their water demands. Groundwater supplies are not significantly impacted by droughts, and, as a result, there is no history of any water supply deficiencies for the City water system. Even during the 1976-1977 drought records indicate a sufficient supply of water. However, groundwater levels have declined about 0.5 to 1.0 feet/year over the last 20 years based on Department of Water Resources' well hydrographs. This decline in groundwater levels, however, is not consistent with the decline in well yields, which has been more serious. Some City wells have seen capacity reductions from 1,500 gallons per minute (gpm) to 500 or 600 gpm (although well rehabilitation may be able to restore these wells to their previous performance levels). In addition, some new wells have capacities of 500 gpm or less, although this might be improved by drilling wells in different locations. Nevertheless, the City has decided to gradually decrease groundwater pumping to match the aquifer safe yield by 2020 (see Section 4.1). Surface water will be imported to satisfy demands unmet by groundwater pumping. Unmet demands may also be reduced if water conservation efforts are successful. Information on the geology and hydrogeology of Porterville was acquired from reports prepared by the United States Bureau of Reclamation in 1954.
Groundwater Management

The City of Porterville does not currently have a Groundwater Management Plan (GMP). The Deer Creek and Tule River Authority (DCTRA) is a joint powers authority comprised of five local irrigation districts in the vicinity of the City. The DCTRA adopted a new Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) in the summer of 2006. The City may consider becoming a partial or full member of the DCTRA and signatory to the GMP, or the City may develop their own GMP. The Draft UWMP proposes establishing a goal of preparing a GMP by 2010.

The following tables provide past and anticipated future groundwater pumping volumes.

**Amount of Groundwater Pumped (AF/Y)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basin Name</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tule Sub-basin</td>
<td>11,009</td>
<td>12,740</td>
<td>12,329</td>
<td>12,786</td>
<td>12,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Water Supply</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amount of Groundwater Projected to Be Pumped (AF/Y)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basin Name(s)</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tule Sub-basin</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>23,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Water Supply</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Surface water that is recharged and later pumped from wells is not included in Table 4.3.

Impacts from continued groundwater pumping on groundwater levels, changes in direction of groundwater flow, and groundwater quality are not known, and could only be determined through an extensive groundwater study. However, as shown in previous table, the City does plan to gradually decrease groundwater pumping to eventually reach the aquifer safe yield, which should help to rectify the current state of overdraft.

**Surface Water**

Surface water is less reliable than groundwater since its availability depends on precipitation. The reliability of surface water sources for the City cannot be determined until specific water sources and water sellers are identified. The reliability will also depend on details in any surface-water purchase agreements. The City may acquire some firm water that would be guaranteed or almost guaranteed each year. This water would possibly be treated at a new surface water treatment plant. The City will also buy surplus or floodwaters that are only available during wet years. This water would be available in varying quantities and would most likely be recharged and later pumped for use in
normal and dry years. The City has established goals for surface water purchases and the City could begin purchasing and banking water in advance to meet these demands in case droughts occur in the near future.

PID is the first and most logical choice for a surface water partner. PID has several surface water supplies including appropriative water rights on the Tule River, ditch company water rights on the Tule River, and Central Valley Project Friant Division water. PID has stated that due to the seasonal nature of water there are points in time when more water is available than their landowners can reasonably use. It is during these times that PID would be able to sell water to the City. Surface water purchases from PID would be a dependable supply and a surface water purchase agreement between the two agencies is considered likely for the following reasons:

- The City has already held discussions with PID including meetings during the development of the General Plan and this UWMP that strengthened their relationship.
- The City and PID recently completed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding cooperative water operations. In the MOU the two parties agreed to jointly develop and conduct programs to increase surface water imports to the City.
- PID has a vested interest in selling surface water to the City, as opposed to other distance agencies, since use of the water by the City would benefit PID’s groundwater levels.
- PID expressed their interest in negotiating a surface water purchase agreement in their written comments on the draft UWMP.

It should also be noted that other surface water supplies could be available to the City, if needed. With access to the Friant-Kern Canal the City can potentially buy water from anywhere in the State and get it exchanged for delivery nearby. In addition, the City could feasibly purchase canal company stock from the various stockholders. This would be a relatively simple way to transfer water supplies. These water sources will be pursued in the future if necessary, but it is believed that groundwater pumping, surface water purchases from PID, and water conservation efforts will allow the City to meet their water demands through at least 2020.

Although the City’s aquifer is in a state of overdraft they could still meet their water demands for several more years solely with groundwater. Therefore, the City is not in an immediate need to secure surface water sources, and could secure them incrementally as demands increase. However, the City recognizes the need to address their water problems as soon as possible. The City has a goal purchasing 700 AF/year beginning in 2010 and gradually increasing purchases to 5,440 AF/year by 2030 (this excludes use of the City’s ditch company water rights). This gradual increase is necessary due to the time needed to complete negotiations and construct infrastructure needed to accommodate surface water. Securing the surface water supplies in this time period is considered feasible and will be a priority for City staff. These purchases will allow the City to reduce groundwater pumping to the estimated safe yield by 2020, which is considered a reasonable goal.

Surface water demands can also be reduced through conservation efforts. The City has a goal of reducing per capita demand by 10% by 2030 through various conservation programs. Even greater
demand reductions may be possible if the City has sufficient funding and staff to implement conservation programs.

**Existing Surface Water Rights**

The City has limited surface water rights in the Pioneer Ditch Company and Porter Slough Ditch Company. These water rights can provide up to 900 AF of water per year from the Tule River. Some of this water is used for a small pond at a municipal park in the City, but, historically, most of this water has not been used by the City. By virtue of holding stock in the two ditch companies, the City is allowed to divert Tule River floodwater in some years for free. Flood releases, under direction of the Corps of Engineers, are charged against the Success Reservoir storage accounts with the highest percentage of their allowable storage space filled. The units, whose stored water is released for flood control, has first call on the flood released water for their irrigation and spreading demands, after which the flood released water is available to others. When feasible, the City will divert these flood waters for groundwater recharge.

**Other Surface Water Sources**

Other surface water sources potentially available to the City include Central Valley Project Friant water and other Tule River waters. Central Valley Project Friant water originates in Lake Millerton and is conveyed through the Friant-Kern Canal. This water is not fully reliable since the Friant-Kern Canal is taken out of service for a 10-week period every three years. However, this impact would be minor since the outage period is relatively short, the City has a groundwater supply, and there would be low demand for water when the Canal is taken out of service (winter months). In addition, Porterville could use existing storage facilities to store surface water prior to a canal outage. Tule River water is stored in Lake Success, which is located a few miles east of the City.

**Surface Water Purchases**

The Porterville Irrigation District, located west of the City, has appropriative water rights on Tule River, ditch company water rights on the Tule River, and Central Valley Project Friant Division water rights. Due to the seasonal nature of water supplies and demands, the Porterville Irrigation District sometimes has more water available to its landowners than they can reasonably use at the time. It is during these periods that PID would be able to sell some of their water to the City. PID has been able to find willing buyers for the water, but they would prefer to sell it to a local agency, such as the City of Porterville, since that would benefit PID's groundwater levels and the local community. The City and PID have held several meetings to discuss surface water purchases and, provided the City Council concurs, both sides are committed to holding further discussions and would hope to ultimately negotiate a surface water purchase agreement.

In December 2006 the City approved $34,000 per year for three years to purchase surface water for groundwater recharge. This was the first major commitment by the City to import surface water and address the problem of declining well yields. If local irrigation districts sell surplus CVP water to
the City with no markup then the water would cost about $50/AF. This represents the lower end of possible water costs and at this price the $34,000 could purchase 680 AF/year or about 6% of the 2005 City water demands. It should be recognized, however, that surface water could cost up to $100/AF or more.

Surface Water Treatment

The City will need to construct a surface water treatment plant if surface water supplies are delivered directly to customers. Boyle Engineering Corporation has already prepared a report outlining the steps needed to develop a plant. The City has determined that a surface water treatment plant will need a fairly firm water supply and operate the majority of the time to be economical. City staff has held discussions with Porterville Irrigation District about partnering on the construction and operation of a treatment plant. The results of the discussions were favorable and both sides are interested in further negotiations, provided the City Council concurs. Construction of a surface water treatment plant will be dependent on the City identifying a funding source for the project.

TRANSFERS AND EXCHANGES

The City of Porterville presently has limited water supplies that could be transferred or exchanged. Groundwater constitutes the majority of their water supply and cannot be transferred or exchanged. The City has rights to 900 AF of Tule River water with the Pioneer Ditch Company and Porter Slough Ditch Company. The City will not likely transfer or exchange these supplies but plans to use them directly for groundwater recharge, landscape irrigation, or as treated surface water.

The City is interested in purchasing (transferring in) surface water from other agencies. The City has determined that surface water is needed to supplement groundwater due to rapidly declining well yields (see Section 14). Surface water purchases will improve the reliability of the City’s water supply. Surface water purchases are discussed in Section 4.2.

The City has established a goal of gradually increasing surface water purchases between 2007 and 2020 so that groundwater pumping is equal to the safe yield in 2020 (see Section 4.1 for more details). Surface water will be either recharged or treated and delivered directly to users. When possible, the City will take advantage of more affordable floodwaters and recharge more water in wet years. As a result, surface water purchases will vary annually, but, on a long-term average, will meet their purchase goals.
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1 - INTRODUCTION

This Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) was prepared by the City of Porterville in accordance with the California Urban Water Management Planning Act. The City of Porterville (City) is located in the San Joaquin Valley in central California. Porterville is nestled against the western edge of the Sierra Nevada foothills in the southern portion of Tulare County. The City covered approximately 13.3 square miles in 2005, however, this UWMP covers a 56.8 square mile ‘Planning Area’ that includes the City of Porterville and unincorporated Tulare County lands. The Planning Area encompasses land that is of interest for long-term planning, including hillsides and surrounding agricultural land.

The Urban Water Management Planning Act (Act) became part of the California Water Code with the passage of Assembly Bill 797 in 1983. The Act requires that every urban water supplier providing water for municipal purposes to more than 3,000 customers, or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet (AF) of water annually, prepare and adopt an UWMP, and update it every five years. The UWMP is required for a water supplier to be eligible for State grants and loans and drought assistance administered by the Department of Water Resources (DWR). The City of Porterville last updated their UWMP in 1990.

The Urban Water Management Planning Act requires water agencies to evaluate and describe their water resource supplies and projected needs over a twenty-year planning horizon, and to address a number of related subjects including water conservation, water service reliability, water recycling, opportunities for water transfers, and contingency plans for drought events. This plan evaluates the City’s water resources over a 23-year planning horizon from 2007 to 2030.

The purpose, required contents, and process for preparing and adopting Urban Water Management Plans are specified in California Water Code sections 10610 – 10656. The overall goal is to provide water suppliers throughout the State a framework for carrying out their long-term planning responsibilities and for reporting their strategies to meet future water challenges to both State government and the communities they serve.

An UWMP has many uses including the following:
1. Long range planning document for water supply;
2. Source document for cities and counties as they prepare their General Plans;
3. Foundation document and source of information for a Water Supply Assessment and a Written Verification of Water Supply; and
This UWMP is organized according to the *Guidebook to Assist Water Suppliers in the Preparation of a 2005 Urban Water Management Plan*, prepared by the California DWR in January 2005.
2 - COORDINATION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

2.1 - Agency Coordination

Coordination of Plan Preparation
Many local water agencies were involved in the preparation of this UWMP. Table 2.1 lists the agencies and their level of involvement.

Table 2.1 - Coordination with Appropriate Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Participated in UWMP development</th>
<th>Invited to public meetings</th>
<th>Attended public meetings</th>
<th>Received copy of draft</th>
<th>Commented on the draft UWMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porterville ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Bella ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucelito ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Tule River ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixley ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalia ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Pot Dome WD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindmore ID</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay-Strathmored ID</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare County</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tule River Association</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to Attachment 4 for the written comments provided by Porterville Irrigation District and the Tule River Association. This UWMP was revised to address these comments.

Existing Interagency Efforts
The City and Porterville Irrigation District (PID) recently completed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding cooperative water operations (Attachment 1). In the MOU the two parties agreed to jointly develop and conduct programs to increase surface water imports to the City.

Planned Interagency Efforts
The City has not historically worked a lot with other agencies in the management of their water resources. However, they plan to build closer relations with the County of Tulare and nearby irrigation and water districts. The City began to build those relationships during preparation of their General Plan Update and UWMP in 2006 and 2007.

The City has not been a participant in an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP), but they are interested in evaluating the benefits of participation. Funding is
available from Proposition 50 and 84 for IRWMPs. PID may prepare an IRWMP with the member agencies of the Tule River Improvement Joint Powers Agreement, since it includes most of the important regional water users. The City may also consider preparing an IRWMP with the Tulare County Association of Governments. Historically, this group has coordinated mostly on transportation projects, but they could feasibly collaborate on water projects also.

In 2007 or 2008 the City plans to prepare an MOU with the Porterville Irrigation District to share groundwater level and quality data.

Resource Maximization/Import Minimization Plan
The City has strived to maximize their existing water resources to minimize the need to import water. This has been done through conservation programs, especially metering, to minimize per capita consumption. As discussed in Section 7, the City’s per capita demands are lower than most cities in the area. However, an expanding population has required more groundwater pumping. This has stressed the local groundwater supplies and well yields are declining rapidly. Consequently, the City sees the need to import significant quantities of surface water in the near future (see Section 5). Completion of water sales agreements with other water agencies will be important to accomplish this goal.

2.2 - Public Participation
This Urban Water Management Plan was updated as part of the City’s General Plan Update. The General Plan Update included numerous opportunities for public involvement and comments. In addition, the public was specifically involved in the development of this UWMP through the following:

Public Hearing on Water Issues. A public hearing was held on December 12, 2006 at the Porterville City Hall to discuss water management issues and the UWMP. A list of the invitees is found in Attachment 3. The invitees included seven irrigation/water districts, 18 General Plan Update Advisory Committee Members, and 107 General Plan Stakeholders. Thirteen people attended the public hearing in addition to City staff. The hearing was led by the City’s planning and engineering consultants. During the public hearing a brief presentation was given on current and future water management issues. The public provided several comments and questions that were discussed at length. These comments are all addressed in this UWMP.

General Plan Approval Public Hearing. A public hearing was held on [date] to solicit comments on the Final General Plan Update. At this meeting the public also had the opportunity to comment on the final UWMP.
3 - CITY OF PORTERVILLE PLANNING AREA INFORMATION

3.1 - Geography
The City of Porterville is located in the San Joaquin Valley in central California. The City is nestled against the western edge of the Sierra Nevada foothills in the southern portion of Tulare County. Porterville is approximately 24 miles southeast of Visalia, California and 50 miles north of Bakersfield, California. The Friant-Kern Canal, a major conveyance facility of the Central Valley Project, passes approximately 4 miles to the west of the center of the City. The City is also situated approximately one mile east of the Porterville Irrigation District (PID). PID encompasses about 17,400 acres in Tulare County.

The City of Porterville covered approximately 13.3 square miles in 2005. This UWMP focuses on the City, but still addresses some areas outside of the City that are within the Planning Area as defined in the General Plan update. The Planning Area covers about 56.8 square miles (see Attachment 2). In 2005, approximately 27,800 acres (43.5 square miles) or about 75 percent of the Planning Area lied outside of the existing City Limits within unincorporated Tulare County. The Planning Area encompasses land that is of interest for long-term planning, including hillsides and surrounding agricultural land. However, being included within the Planning Area does not necessarily mean that the City is considering annexation.

3.2 - Hydrologic Features
The Tule River, which flows through the southern portion of the City, is one of the principal watercourses in Tulare County. The City is bisected by the Tule River, dividing the northern and southern portions of the City. Under normal conditions discharge in this River is regulated by Success Dam, located approximately 5 miles upstream. Tule River flood stages at the City have been reduced significantly by Success Dam, which is operated for flood control by the US Army Corps of Engineers. The 100-year floodplain for the Porterville urban area is delineated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Flood Insurance Rate Maps and these floodplains closely correspond to the watercourses that flow through the City. The main channel of the Tule River can pass flows of about 10,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) before extensive damage occurs. Damage to urban property would occur at flows of approximately 16,000 cfs.

Porter Slough is a natural distributary of Tule River and flows through the center of the urban area (see Attachment 2). It originates from Tule River approximately 4 miles upstream from the center of the City, and returns to the river approximately 17 miles below its point of origin. Porter Slough has a designated capacity of 450 cfs and is an officially designated floodway of Tule River as determined by the State Reclamation Board. In practice the policy has been to prevent Tule River flood flows from entering Porter Slough in order to avoid potential flooding problems in central Porterville. However, controlled flows are released into Porter Slough for groundwater recharge.
Private ditches form another major water feature in the area. Seven ditch companies divert water from points within the Planning Area: Pioneer, Campbell-Moreland, Porter Slough, Vandalia, Poplar, Hubbs-Miner and Woods-Central. In addition to delivering water for irrigation, these ditches also provide extra capacity to carry peak flood flows and urban stormwater runoff. Finally, the Friant-Kern Canal defines the western edge of the Planning Area. Water in the Canal is imported from the San Joaquin River northeast of Fresno, and distributed to the western portion of the Planning Area by the Porterville Irrigation District.

3.3 - Climate
The climate in the City of Porterville is semi-arid and may be classified as interior Mediterranean. Summers are hot and dry with low humidity, while winters are very mild with infrequent snowfall. Temperatures vary from average summer highs of approximately 100°F to average winter lows near freezing. The average annual precipitation is approximately 10 inches. However, the Tule River Watershed tributary to Success Reservoir, based on 41 years of record, has a basin mean annual precipitation of 31.3 inches. Eighty five percent of the annual precipitation occurs between November and April. Table 3.1 summarizes climatic data for the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Monthly Avg ET₀ (in)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rainfall (in)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Temperature (F)</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 – Climate Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Monthly Avg ET₀ (in)</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>55.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Rainfall (in)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Temperature (F)</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1) Rainfall and temperature data from Western Regional Climate Center, Porterville Station, based on data from 1971-2000
2) Evapotranspiration data from California Irrigation Management Information System Porterville (#169) Station, Based on data from 2000-2007

3.4 - Water Supply Infrastructure
Water production and distribution in the City are provided by two separate water systems maintained and operated by the Public Works Department. Each system is completely independent of each other. The systems include the Central City System and the Municipal Airport System. Both systems combined include about 200 miles of pipeline and are currently being connected by an inter-tie project (under construction).

The City currently operates and maintains three hillside reservoirs: two with a capacity
of 3 million gallons and one with a capacity of 300,000 gallons. The two larger reservoirs are usually filled during off-peak hours and then release water during the high usage hours. The reservoirs increase the City's ability to maintain system pressure during peak demand and fire flow situations. Site acquisition has been accomplished for the City's third proposed 3-million gallon reservoir. Water levels in the reservoirs are monitored and controlled by a computerized telemetry control system.

The City currently acquires all of its water from groundwater. In 2007, the City had about 34 active wells and a number of inactive and standby wells. About 17 of the wells were controlled with a telemetry system to maintain system pressure under varying loads. City wells are concentrated in the west-central portion of the City where well yields are generally the highest. Most of the City's wells are gravel packed and range from 230 to 700 feet in depth. The City has approximately 14,000-metered connections, of which 13,000 are residential meters. Refer to the 2001 Water System Master Plan for more details on the City's water supply infrastructure.

The City has submitted an application for a low interest $9 million loan to fund infrastructure improvements. If the loan is approved some water supply infrastructure may be constructed, including a surface water treatment plant. The City will also be updating their Water System Master Plan in 2008 and during the process expect to identify several new infrastructure projects.

3.5 - Demographics
The City of Porterville population was projected as part of the Porterville General Plan Update, which was completed in 2007. Table 3.2 presents projected population growth from 2006 to 2030.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>45,200</td>
<td>52,220</td>
<td>62,530</td>
<td>74,860</td>
<td>89,620</td>
<td>107,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Population values are rounded to the nearest 100

The City has an average household size of 3.3 people and a vacancy rate of 5 percent, as estimated by the Department of Finance for 2005. Refer to the General Plan Update for details on the basis for the population projections. Refer to Section 7 for discussions on current and projected per capita water demands.
4 - WATER SOURCES

The City has relied exclusively on groundwater to meet water demands in the past. The City has established a goal of gradually reducing groundwater pumping to match the aquifer safe yield by 2020. Surface water purchases and reductions in demand (achieved through water conservation efforts) will be used to meet remaining demands. Current and planned water sources for the City are summarized in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 - Current and Planned Water Supplies (AF/Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>45,200</td>
<td>52,220</td>
<td>62,530</td>
<td>74,860</td>
<td>89,620</td>
<td>107,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Area (acres)</td>
<td>9,170</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>23,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Yield (acre-feet/year)</td>
<td>9,170</td>
<td>11,050</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>23,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total City Demands(^1)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier Produced Groundwater(^2)</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>23,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier Surface Diversions(^3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water Purchases(^4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>5,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water(^5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desalination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 – Total demands based on assumed per capita use of 250 gallons/day from 2001 Porterville Water System Master Plan
2 – The aquifer safe yield is assumed to be 1.0 acre-feet/acre. This value is approximate and needs to be verified with a detailed water balance study
3 – Includes water rights on the Tule River with the Pioneer Ditch Company and Porter Slough Ditch Company
4 – Surface water sellers are likely to include Porterville Irrigation District and other local irrigation and water districts
5 – The City uses recycled water for crop irrigation and groundwater recharge, but there is no direct use by customers. Refer to Section 12 for data on recycled water use.

Detailed discussions on the City’s groundwater and surface water are provided below.

4.1 - Groundwater

In 2006 groundwater was the sole water source used by the City of Porterville. Information on the geology and hydrogeology of Porterville was acquired from reports prepared by the United States Bureau of Reclamation in 1954. Following are discussions on the soils, geology and groundwater in the Porterville area.
Soils
The City of Porterville is located at the interface of three general soil types. The first is located to the south of the City and consists of very deep, moderately well to excessively well-drained, fine sandy loam. The second, located northeast of the City, is described as moderately deep to very deep, well-drained, low permeability clay. The third, found northwest of the City, is characterized as moderately deep, well-drained, sandy loam underlain by hardpan. Some of the best topsoils for groundwater recharge are located along the present or ancestral channels of the Tule River.

Geology
Porterville sits entirely on top of the alluvial fans of the Tule River and its distributaries. This material is composed of active fan and floodplain deposits consisting of loose, porous, unconsolidated sediments. Sands predominate but there is also a high percentage of silt. The bedrock (basement complex) is present at relatively shallow depths beneath the eastern end of the City. However, the depth to bedrock steepens appreciably to the southwest and is too deep in most of the City to be an important factor in evaluating groundwater conditions. Within the City of Porterville, the base of the usable aquifer is the top of bedrock.

Groundwater Basin
The City is located in the Tule Sub-basin of the San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin. The Tule Sub-basin is not presently adjudicated but is considered to be in a state of overdraft.

Groundwater/Hydrogeology
The Porterville Area is underlain by an unconfined aquifer. Most of the aquifers lie at depths from 75 to 400 feet. The City is fortunate to be located in a unique area which receives groundwater recharge from the Sierra Nevada Mountains. In addition, appreciable volumes of groundwater recharge occur from seepage from the Tule River and ditches that divert from the River. Percolation from rainfall and irrigation also contribute to the groundwater storage. Specific yield is defined as the volumetric fraction of water that an aquifer will yield when all the water is allowed to drain out of it by gravity. Specific yield within the City is about 0.14, which is relatively high for the Southern San Joaquin Valley.

Groundwater Recharge
Locally, groundwater recharge occurs along the channels of the Tule River as evidenced by a ridge of higher water table contours along the River. Irrigation districts occasionally recharge aquifers through the use of artificial basins and open land spreading, especially in wet years.

Success Reservoir is located on the Tule River and provides flood prevention and storage of irrigation water. The Tule River Associates and Army Corps of Engineers run water from Success Reservoir through the Tule River and Porter Slough, providing
important groundwater recharge. The danger of water logging the areas adjacent to the Tule River, Porter Slough, and other distributaries is not imminent, as the specific yield is very high in these areas, permitting rapid dispersion of percolated water.

The City has not recharged groundwater in the past, however they are interested in developing a recharge program, particularly in the Porter Slough. The City also owns approximately 25 stormwater basins that could potentially be plumbed to accept surface water deliveries. The basins would have to be enlarged, or only take water in the dry season, since they are presently sized only to accept flood waters. Some incidental recharge already occurs in these basins but the volume that infiltrates is not known.

Well Yields
Well yields have decreased substantially in the Porterville area and the City has recognized that sole reliance on groundwater is not sustainable (see Section 14 for more details). The area east of Plano Avenue, as elevation increases towards the foothills, is considered groundwater deficient. Water is supplied to the eastern area from wells located in western and central Porterville. As a result, water storage is required on the eastern edge of the City. Even though the eastern area is water short, it is considered a potential growth area.

Groundwater Budget
Safe yield is defined as the maximum rate of continuous diversion or withdrawal that can be maintained indefinitely without depleting a groundwater supply. The safe yield is primarily a function of groundwater inflow and outflow, natural groundwater recharge, artificial groundwater recharge, and seepage from imported surface water. Preferably, groundwater pumping should be equal to or less than the safe yield so that groundwater resources are preserved. No estimates of the City’s safe yield are available and it can only be accurately determined through a detailed water balance study. However, the City has decided to eventually reduce groundwater pumping to match the safe yield by 2020, so a preliminary estimate of the safe yield was estimated for this UWMP.

Safe yield is usually described in terms of flowrate. Here the units of AF/year are used. The term 'unit safe yield' is also used herein to describe the safe yield over a unit area of land. The units for unit safe yield used here are AF/acre/year.

Declining groundwater levels in Porterville indicate that groundwater is not sufficient to satisfy future demands, and that other water sources will be required to offset future needs. A review of 21 hydrographs for wells in and around Porterville shows a gradual groundwater level decline of about 0.75 feet/year. It should be noted that the groundwater level decline is only moderate and is not consistent with the large decline in well yields experienced in the last ten years. Many of the City's wells have less than half the pumping capacity they had several years ago. Recent investigations show some well screens are partially plugged from encrustation, although detailed inspections
have not been performed on all of the wells. Some new well yields are also low, but this may be because the wells are not being sited in the best locations.

The discrepancy between the moderate groundwater level declines but severe well yield declines could also be because water is being extracted from deeper semi-confined aquifers, and pumping is not reflected in the near surface groundwater. However, the available literature does not indicate the presence of semi-confined aquifers in Porterville. More detailed hydrogeologic analyses are needed to understand the reasons for these discrepancies.

In 2005, the City covered about 13.3 square miles (~8,500 acres), and pumped 12,200 acre-feet of water. With a groundwater level decline of 0.75 feet, and assuming a specific yield of 0.14, the total overdraft was about 900 AF. Therefore, the unit safe yield can be roughly estimated at (12,200-900 AF)/8,500 acres = 1.3 AF/acre/year. Due to the uncertainty in these calculations, the actual unit safe yield will be assumed to be 25% less than 1.3 AF/acre/year, or about 1.0 AF/acre/year. It should be noted that this value is very approximate and is only being used because no other values are available. The City plans to perform a detailed water balance study in the next five years to verify this number and recognizes that it could change appreciably.

Safe yield will actually vary as the City annexes additional land. With more land the City will have a greater area to place wells and pump groundwater. Total safe yield was calculated for 5-year increments through 2030 based on anticipated annexations. Newly annexed lands are expected to increase at about 2.5% per year, with occasional bumps of about 500 to 1,000 acres in single years to increase industrial lands. Refer to Table 4.1 for anticipated City land areas and total safe yields through 2030.

The City is planning on some extensive annexations which will substantially increase the total safe yield over time. Some annexations would not increase the total safe yield much, if at all. For instance, if land is annexed east of the City in the foothills or flatlands abutting the foothills then it will have no impact on the safe yield. This region is groundwater poor and the City has no wells in the area and probably no plans on installing wells in the area. On the other hand, annexations to the west of the City in agricultural land will increase the safe yield. The estimated unit safe yield of 1.0 AF/acre/year is based on an average unit safe yield over the entire City, including both poor groundwater areas and good groundwater areas. It is assumed that future annexations will have a similar share of good versus poor groundwater producing lands, and therefore the unit safe yield will stay constant.

Groundwater Quality
Groundwater quality in the Porterville area is generally good but some wells have been decommissioned due to water quality problems. Refer to Section 13 for more details on the groundwater quality in Porterville.
Groundwater Management
The City of Porterville does not currently have a Groundwater Management Plan (GMP). The Deer Creek and Tule River Authority (DCTRA) is a joint powers authority comprised of five local irrigation districts in the vicinity of the City. The DCTRA adopted a new Groundwater Management Plan (GMP) in the summer of 2006. The City may consider becoming a partial or full member of the DCTRA and signatory to the GMP, or the City may develop their own GMP. The City has established a goal of preparing a GMP by 2010.

Table 4.2 and 4.3 provide past and anticipated future groundwater pumping volumes.

**Table 4.2 - Amount of Groundwater Pumped (AF/Y)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basin Name</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tule Sub-basin</td>
<td>11,009</td>
<td>12,740</td>
<td>12,329</td>
<td>12,786</td>
<td>12,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Water Supply</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.3 - Amount of Groundwater Projected to Be Pumped (AF/Y)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basin Name(s)</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tule Sub-basin</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>16,580</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>23,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Water Supply</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Surface water that is recharged and later pumped from wells is not included in Table 4.3.

Impacts from continued groundwater pumping on groundwater levels, changes in direction of groundwater flow, and groundwater quality are not known, and could only be determined through an extensive groundwater study. However, as shown in Table 4.3, the City does plan to gradually decrease groundwater pumping to eventually reach the aquifer safe yield, which should help to rectify the current state of overdraft.

**4.2 - Surface Water**

**Existing Surface Water Rights**
The City has limited surface water rights in the Pioneer Ditch Company and Porter Slough Ditch Company. These water rights can provide up to 900 AF of water per year from the Tule River. Some of this water is used for a small pond at a municipal park in the City, but, historically, most of this water has not been used by the City. By virtue of holding stock in the two ditch companies, the City is allowed to divert Tule River floodwater in some years for free. Flood releases, under direction of the Corps of Engineers, are charged against the Success Reservoir storage accounts with the highest percentage of their allowable storage space filled. The units, whose stored
water is released for flood control, has first call on the flood released water for their irrigation and spreading demands, after which the flood released water is available to others. When feasible, the City will divert these flood waters for groundwater recharge.

Other Surface Water Sources
Other surface water sources potentially available to the City include Central Valley Project Friant water and other Tule River waters. Central Valley Project Friant water originates in Lake Millerton and is conveyed through the Friant-Kern Canal. This water is not fully reliable since the Friant-Kern Canal is taken out of service for a 10-week period every three years. However, this impact would be minor since the outage period is relatively short, the City has a groundwater supply, and there would be low demand for water when the Canal is taken out of service (winter months). In addition, Porterville could use existing storage facilities to store surface water prior to a canal outage. Tule River water is stored in Lake Success, which is located a few miles east of the City.

Surface Water Purchases
The Porterville Irrigation District, located west of the City, has appropriated water rights on Tule River, ditch company water rights on the Tule River, and Central Valley Project Friant Division water rights. Due to the seasonal nature of water supplies and demands, the Porterville Irrigation District sometimes has more water available to its landowners than they can reasonably use at the time. It is during these periods that PID would be able to sell some of their water to the City. PID has been able to find willing buyers for the water, but they would prefer to sell it to a local agency, such as the City of Porterville, since that would benefit PID's groundwater levels and the local community. The City and PID have held several meetings to discuss surface water purchases and both sides are committed to holding further discussions and hope to ultimately negotiate a surface water purchase agreement.

In December 2006 the City approved $34,000 per year for three years to purchase surface water for groundwater recharge. This was the first major commitment by the City to import surface water and address the problem of declining well yields. If local irrigation districts sell surplus CVP water to the City with no markup then the water would cost about $50/AF. This represents the lower end of possible water costs and at this price the $34,000 could purchase 680 AF/year or about 6% of the 2005 City water demands. It should be recognized, however, that surface water could cost up to $100/AF or more.

Surface Water Treatment
The City will need to construct a surface water treatment plant if surface water supplies are delivered directly to customers. Boyle Engineering Corporation has already prepared a report outlining the steps needed to develop a plant. The City has determined that a surface water treatment plant will need a fairly firm water supply and operate the majority of the time to be economical. The City has held discussions with Porterville Irrigation District about partnering on the construction and operation of a
treatment plant. The results of the discussions were favorable and both sides are interested in further negotiations. Construction of a surface water treatment plant will be dependent on the City receiving approval for a $9 million infrastructure loan in 2007.
5 - RELIABILITY OF WATER SUPPLY

This section discusses the reliability of water supplies and their vulnerability to seasonal and climatic shortages. Seasonal shortages are based on precipitation patterns of individual watersheds. The City considers estimated impacts due to climate change or climate fluctuations to be highly speculative and has chosen not to rely on them. The City does recognize that they exist and will reassess their water supply adequacy regularly to address climate changes. The City will also design their system with some redundancy so that some adverse impacts from climate change can be accommodated.

Groundwater
The City has historically used groundwater to meet all of their water demands. Groundwater supplies are not significantly impacted by droughts, and, as a result, there is no history of any water supply deficiencies for the City water system. Even during the 1976-1977 drought records indicate a sufficient supply of water. However, groundwater levels have declined about 0.5 to 1.0 feet/year over the last 20 years based on Department of Water Resources' well hydrographs. This decline in groundwater levels, however, is not consistent with the decline in well yields, which has been more serious. Some City wells have seen capacity reductions from 1,500 gallons per minute (gpm) to 500 or 600 gpm (although well rehabilitation may be able to restore these wells to their previous performance levels). In addition, some new wells have capacities of 500 gpm or less, although this might be improved by drilling wells in different locations. Nevertheless, the City has decided to gradually decrease groundwater pumping to match the aquifer safe yield by 2020 (see Section 4.1). Surface water will be imported to satisfy demands unmet by groundwater pumping. Unmet demands may also be reduced if water conservation efforts are successful.

Surface Water
Surface water is less reliable than groundwater since its availability depends on precipitation. The reliability of surface water sources for the City cannot be determined until specific water sources and water sellers are identified. The reliability will also depend on details in any surface-water purchase agreements. The City may acquire some firm water that would be guaranteed or almost guaranteed each year. This water would possibly be treated at a new surface water treatment plant. The City will also buy surplus or floodwaters that are only available during wet years. This water would be available in varying quantities and would most likely be recharged and later pumped for use in normal and dry years. The City has established goals for surface water purchases (Table 4.1) and the City could begin purchasing and banking water in advance to meet these demands in case droughts occur in the near future.

PID is the first and most logical choice for a surface water partner. PID has several surface water supplies including appropriative water rights on the Tule River, ditch company water rights on the Tule River, and Central Valley Project Friant Division water. PID has stated that due to the seasonal nature of water there are points in time
when more water is available than their landowners can reasonably use. It is during these times that PID would be able to sell water to the City. Surface water purchases from PID would be a dependable supply and a surface water purchase agreement between the two agencies is considered likely for the following reasons:

1) The City has already held discussions with PID including meetings during the development of the General Plan and this UWMP that strengthened their relationship.

2) The City and PID recently completed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding cooperative water operations. In the MOU the two parties agreed to jointly develop and conduct programs to increase surface water imports to the City (see Attachment 1).

3) PID has a vested interest in selling surface water to the City, as opposed to other distance agencies, since use of the water by the City would benefit PID’s groundwater levels.

4) PID expressed their interest in negotiating a surface water purchase agreement in their written comments on the draft UWMP.

It should also be noted that other surface water supplies could be available to the City, if needed. With access to the Friant-Kern Canal the City can potentially buy water from anywhere in the State and get it exchanged for delivery nearby. In addition, the City could feasibly purchase canal company stock from the various stockholders. This would be a relatively simple way to transfer water supplies. These water sources will be pursued in the future if necessary, but it is believed that groundwater pumping, surface water purchases from PID, and water conservation efforts will allow the City to meet their water demands through at least 2020.

Although the City’s aquifer is in a state of overdraft they could still meet their water demands for several more years solely with groundwater. Therefore, the City is not in an immediate need to secure surface water sources, and could secure them incrementally as demands increase. However, the City recognizes the need to address their water problems as soon as possible. Table 4.1 lists anticipated surface water purchases. The City has a goal purchasing 700 AF/year beginning in 2010 and gradually increasing purchases to 5,440 AF/year by 2030 (this excludes use of the City’s ditch company water rights). This gradual increase is necessary due to the time needed to complete negotiations and construct infrastructure needed to accommodate surface water. Securing the surface water supplies in this time period is considered feasible and will be a priority for City staff. These purchases will allow the City to reduce groundwater pumping to the estimated safe yield by 2020, which is considered a reasonable goal. Note that the City plans to perform a detailed study to more accurately estimate safe yield, which may change some of the values in Table 4.1.

Surface water demands can also be reduced through conservation efforts. The City has a goal of reducing per capita demand by 10% by 2030 through various conservation
programs. Even greater demand reductions may be possible if the City has sufficient funding and staff to implement conservation programs. The new supplies listed in Table 4.1 could be from surface water purchases or reduced demand due to conservation efforts.
6 - TRANSFERS AND EXCHANGES

The City of Porterville presently has limited water supplies that could be transferred or exchanged. Groundwater constitutes the majority of their water supply and cannot be transferred or exchanged. The City has rights to 900 AF of Tule River water with the Pioneer Ditch Company and Porter Slough Ditch Company. The City will not likely transfer or exchange these supplies but plans to use them directly for groundwater recharge, landscape irrigation, or as treated surface water.

The City is interested in purchasing (transferring in) surface water from other agencies. The City has determined that surface water is needed to supplement groundwater due to rapidly declining well yields (see Section 14). Surface water purchases will improve the reliability of the City’s water supply. Surface water purchases are discussed in Section 4.2.

The City has established a goal of gradually increasing surface water purchases between 2007 and 2020 so that groundwater pumping is equal to the safe yield in 2020 (see Section 4.1 for more details). Surface water will be either recharged or treated and delivered directly to users. When possible, the City will take advantage of more affordable floodwaters and recharge more water in wet years. As a result, surface water purchases will vary annually, but, on a long-term average, will meet their purchase goals.
7 - WATER DEMANDS

In their 2001 Water System Master Plan, the City estimated per capita consumption at 250 gallons/day. This value includes all City water uses (residential, commercial, municipal, industrial, etc.). In other words, it includes total water demands divided by the total population. Future commercial, institutional and industrial developments are not expected to significantly impact per capita water consumption through 2030. However, per capita consumption may decrease slightly as housing densities increase due to intensified competition for land. The City has also established a goal of reducing per capita demand through conservation programs. The goal is to reduce consumption by 10% by 2030. This would reduce demand from 250 to 225 gpcpd. However, for the present, water planning and system design will still be based on the 250 gpcpd in the event this conservation goal is not realized.

In 2005, water usage by customer type was roughly 62% for single family residential, 12% for multi-family residential, 19% for commercial/institutional, 4% for large landscape irrigation, and 5% for other. The City's population is expected to more than double by 2030 with a corresponding increase in water demands from about 12,700 to 30,400 AF/year. The City has no plans to sell water to other agencies in the future as they expect challenges in meeting their own demands. Water deliveries by customer type from 2001 to 2030 are presented in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1 - Past, Current and Projected Water Deliveries (AF/yr)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Metering</th>
<th>Single family</th>
<th>Multi-family</th>
<th>Comm /Inst.</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>Agric</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>6,473</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,497</td>
<td>10,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>6,903</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,142</td>
<td>11,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>8,826</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,246</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>10,540</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>3,266</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,173</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>12,656</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,588</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>15,195</td>
<td>2,871</td>
<td>4,595</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,687</td>
<td>25,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>18,178</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>5,541</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,663</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The anticipated number of water accounts for each customer type through 2030 are presented in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2 – Past, Current and Projected Water Accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Metering</th>
<th>Single family</th>
<th>Multi-family</th>
<th>Comm /Inst.</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>Agric</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>11,268</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>13,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>11,907</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>13,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>14,293</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>16,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>17,156</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>20,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>20,594</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>24,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>24,720</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>28,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Metered</td>
<td>29,673</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>34,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. The number of metered connections is assumed to grow by 3.7% annually (same as the expected population growth).
   2. The number of unmetered connections is assumed to remain unchanged (but it may decrease if connections are decommissioned).

The City also delivers recycled water, uses water for groundwater recharge, and has system leakage. These values are presented in Table 7.3 but they do not represent additional water sources or demands. Firstly, all water that is recharged will later be pumped and consumed; hence, it is incorporated into the numbers in Table 7.1. Secondly, recycled water is used for groundwater recharge and crop irrigation. Therefore, the recycled water is not used to directly meet the needs of the City customers, although it does contribute to the local water budget. Losses are almost all from pipeline leakage and result in groundwater recharge, so they are not true losses to the City.
Table 7.3 - Additional Water Budget Components (AF/Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater recharge¹</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-3,200</td>
<td>0-4,800</td>
<td>0-8,800</td>
<td>0-10,400</td>
<td>0-12,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled water²</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System leakage³</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ – Only a range of values for groundwater recharge can be provided at this time. They are assumed to range from 0% to about 200% of annual average surface water deliveries

² – Recycled water assumed to be 46.7% of total water deliveries (groundwater and surface water)

³ – System leakage assumed to be 5% of total water delivered into system, based on past records.
8 - DEMAND MANAGEMENT MEASURES

The City has implemented many demand management measures (DMM) to reduce per capita water consumption. Metering has probably had the greatest impact on conserving water. In 2007 about 98% of the City’s deliveries were metered. All metered customers are billed on a volumetric basis and therefore have incentives to conserve water. The City has also established a goal to increase water conservation efforts with education being the cornerstone of the City’s water conservation program. The City also recognizes that a diversified water conservation portfolio is necessary since different programs have varying impacts on different groups. As a result, the City’s water conservation efforts include a variety of programs and measures.

Table 8.1 shows per capita water consumption for several cities in the California Central Valley.

Table 8.1 – Per Capita Water Demands by City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Metered</th>
<th>Per Capita Use (gpcpd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dinuba</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clovis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalinga</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turlock</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cities</td>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metered</td>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmetered</td>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Porterville Water System Master Plan, February 2001, Carollo Engineers, Table 3.3

Table 8.1 shows that per capita water consumption in Porterville is slightly lower than the other Central Valley cities. However, there is still room for improvement as evidenced by the Cities of Clovis and Dinuba who have water usage of around 200 gpcpd.

The City has established a goal of reducing per capita demand through conservation programs. The goal is to reduce consumption by 10% by 2030. This would reduce per capita demand from 250 to 225 gallons/day. However, for the present, water planning
and system design will still be based on the 250 gpcpd in the event this conservation goal is not realized.

8.1 - Water Survey Program
Water surveys involve an on-site assessment of water uses on a customer’s property to identify area of high water usage or water waste.

The City has not developed or implemented a targeting/marketing strategy for single family or multi-family home water surveys. However, the City does perform water surveys at the request of water users. Typically the City is asked to perform a water survey if a customer feels that their water bill is too high. Often the customer asks to have their meter tested or recalibrated. In most cases the meters are functioning properly and City staff then perform a water survey to determine where the customer has high water usage. The water survey includes the following:

1. Check indoor and outdoor plumbing for leaks
2. Check irrigation system timers
3. Evaluate irrigation watering schedule
4. Recommend various water conservation measures to the customer, such as modifications to their irrigation schedule and retrofitting with water efficient fixtures and appliances

Outdoor water consumption accounts for a large proportion of total water sold and offers the biggest target for water savings, so the surveys tend to focus on improving landscape irrigation efficiencies.

The City of Albuquerque developed a Water Use Audit Program (Western Resource Advocates). The program sponsored 125 water audits with water savings averaging 8 percent and estimated potential savings at 30 percent. Based on residential water use records, it is assumed that 185 gpcpd is used in Porterville for residential use, then an 8% reduction would equate to 8% x 185 gallons/capita/day x 3.3 persons/household x 365 days/year = 17,800 gallons/year/household = 0.05 AF/year/household. The effectiveness of the water surveys on conservation will be based on this value.

Porterville performs about five water surveys per year and only at the request of customers. Studies have shown that water surveys are not effective unless they are specifically requested by a customer. When a customer is forced to participate they often have no desire to conserve water and hence will not follow recommendations or suggestions. Studies also show that water surveys have very high costs per volume of water saved. Little (2006) evaluated the unit costs to implement various water conservation programs. Little reports that the long term cost for water savings from water surveys is $1,284/AF. This is presently about four times the cost of delivered water in Porterville. Considering this high cost, the City does not plan to actively market or promote its water survey program, but will continue to perform water surveys when
they are requested. It is assumed that future demand for water surveys will remain unchanged.

Table 8.2 and 8.3 provide details on past and projected future water surveys in Porterville.

Table 8.2 – Past Residential Water Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Residential Surveys</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Expenditures - $</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Water Savings – AF/Y</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3 – Future Residential Water Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Residential Surveys</td>
<td>5 (est)</td>
<td>5 (est)</td>
<td>5 (est)</td>
<td>5 (est)</td>
<td>5 (est)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Expenditures - $</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Water Savings – AF/Y</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 - Residential Plumbing Retrofits

Residential plumbing retrofits can include fixtures such as low flow showerheads, showerhead flow restrictors, toilet flappers and faucet aerators. Estimated savings for some of these fixtures include 2.8 gpcpd for low flow showerheads and 2.8 gpcpd for low flow faucets, and 22 gallons per day for a family of three that uses a complete plumbing retrofit kit (Western Resource Advocates, 2003).

Plumbing retrofits are a fairly expensive means to conserve water. Little (2006) determined that the average lifetime cost per acre-foot saved for device giveaways is $457. This is more expensive than the current $314/AF charged to customers for delivered water. As a result, the City only has a limited plumbing retrofit program. It involves the distribution of showerhead flow restrictors at the annual Porterville City Fair. It is believed that distribution of the showerhead flow restrictors also helps to promote a culture of water conservation. A large cross section of the community can be reached at the City Fair and therefore the City plans to continue these efforts.

There is no enforceable ordinance in effect in the City requiring replacement of high-flow showerheads and other water use fixtures with their low flow counterparts. In addition, no data is available on the number of houses with water efficient plumbing.
fixtures. However, all new buildings in the City are constructed according to State plumbing codes and Title 24 Building Standards. These require that new plumbing fixtures installed since 1992 be water efficient. In addition, many of the fixtures provided by the City have likely been installed and some owners have probably purchased and installed fixtures themselves.

The City tracks the number of showerhead flow restrictors that are handed out and their cost. The effectiveness of the flow restrictor distribution on water conservation is based on the number that are given out. First, it is assumed that 50% of the flow restrictors that are distributed are eventually installed. Each flow restrictor is assumed to reduce water consumption by 2.8 gpcpd (same as low flow showerheads) and each restrictor is assumed to be used by two people. This equates to annual water savings of 0.6 AF/year for each 100 flow restrictors that are distributed.

Tables 8.4 and 8.5 include data on past and anticipated future plumbing retrofits in Porterville.

### Table 8.4 – Past Plumbing Retrofits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Showerhead Flow Restrictors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Expenditures - $</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Water Savings - AF/Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.5 – Future Plumbing Retrofits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Showerhead Flow Restrictors</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Expenditures - $</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Water Savings - AF/Y</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.3 - Water System Audits

Water system audits include an evaluation of the City’s distribution system for leaks and other losses. The system losses (water input minus water metered) are a good indication of the system integrity. In 2006, Johnson Controls performed a water system audit and was able to account for 95% of the City’s water. This result was better than expected considering the age of the system and meters. In addition, the Porterville Finance Department prepares annual reports showing water production versus water sales. These reports show that system losses ranged between 4% and 10% between 2001 and 2005. Losses are actually lower because the records do not account for fire hydrant flushing or the water delivered to unmetered accounts, which is estimated at 2% of total water usage. In addition, water that is lost through pipeline leakage usually
seeps to the groundwater table where it is available to the City through well pumping, so it is not considered a true loss.

The City's distribution system is operated under pressure, and, as a result, leaks are usually apparent. Only a small number of leaks are repaired each year. A physical system audit is not performed every year, mainly because the system appears to be in good condition and the current losses are considered reasonable. However, all new water lines are pressure tested to verify that leakage is minimal. Data is not readily available on the miles of pipeline repaired or replaced annually, or the expenditures for this work. These records will be tracked more closely in future years.

The effectiveness of the water system audits will be measured by the losses calculated annually. Increasing losses would indicate the leaks have increased and/or flowmeters are not accurate.

8.4 - Metering
Currently, about 98% of the water used in the City is metered. In addition, all new connections in the City are required to be metered and billed by volume used.

Meter Retrofits and Replacements
The City has no current plans to install meters on unmetered properties due to the high cost. In addition, no meter replacement programs are currently planned because a recent audit and some meter testing has found most meters to be accurate (see Section 8.3). Nevertheless, as the meters become older the City will consider replacement or recalibration.

Water Bills
A sample water bill is included as Attachment 5. City water bills show the amount of water used each billing period, and compares that value to water used during the same billing period in the previous year. This information allows water users to evaluate the effectiveness of their own conservation programs.

Effectiveness of Meters
Metering certainly creates an incentive to reduce consumption since customers are billed on a volumetric basis. Per capita water demands for several cities in the area are shown in Table 8.1. Cities that are metered use, on average, 61 gpcpd less than cities that are unmetered (279 gpcpd vs. 218 gpcpd). This equates to 6.83 AF/year for each 100 people. Due to a lack of any other data, this value will be used to estimate the water saved by metering customers in the City. Statistics on past and projected future metering are provided in Tables 8.6 and 8.7.
Table 8.6 – Past Metering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Metered Accounts</td>
<td>13,159</td>
<td>12,885</td>
<td>13,176</td>
<td>13,176</td>
<td>13,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Unmetered Accounts</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Retrofit Meters Installed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Population Served</td>
<td>41,009</td>
<td>41,009</td>
<td>41,945</td>
<td>43,150</td>
<td>44,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Water Savings - AF/Y</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td>3,039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.7 – Future Metering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Metered Accounts</td>
<td>15,032</td>
<td>15,584</td>
<td>16,156</td>
<td>16,749</td>
<td>17,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Unmetered Accounts</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Retrofit Meters to Be Installed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Population Served</td>
<td>46,900</td>
<td>48,588</td>
<td>50,371</td>
<td>52,220</td>
<td>54,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Water Savings - AF/Y</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5 - Large Landscape Conservation Programs
Large landscape customers include golf courses, cemeteries, and other customers with large turf or garden areas (>10,000 square feet). In 2005, the City had only 48 AF of water used for large landscape irrigation customer types. However, this number is misleading since other customer types (Institutional and Other) also have large landscape irrigation. Large landscaping probably uses about 10 percent of total City water demands.

Existing Programs
Existing large landscape conservation programs are described below

1) Conservation During Droughts. Large (and small) landscape water conservation is especially promoted during designated droughts (see Section 11) through water timing restrictions and enforcement of water waste policies.

2) Artificial Turf. The City has placed artificial turf on a traffic median as a demonstration project. The City will consider adding a sign to advertise the site.

3) Education Programs. Landscape water conservation is a critical part of the City’s Public Information Program (see Section 8.7).

4) Water Surveys. The City does not have a specific program for auditing large landscape accounts. However, the City will perform a water survey (see Section 8.1) for a customer that has large landscape water demands.
The City does not presently perform water budgets or offer rebates for landscape conversions.

Possible Future Programs
Several new ideas for large landscape conservation were identified. The City does not plan to implement these in the near future but has established a goal of evaluating their merits over the next five years. These ideas include:

1. Require large properties to have an irrigation audit
2. Coordinate with local nurseries to compile a list of low-water using trees and plants
3. Provide rebates for irrigation control systems
4. Require some degree of xeriscape on new properties
5. Limit amount/percentage of high water use vegetation on new properties
6. Provide xeriscape garden tours and xeriscape classes
7. Develop and implement water efficient parkway and landscape design guidelines for all new residential, commercial, industrial and governmental developments

Measuring Effectiveness of Program
The effectiveness of the large landscape conservation programs will be measured with the following:

1. Comparison of customers water usage before and after water surveys
2. Comparison of customers water usage during normal climatic conditions and during droughts
3. Comments on and demand for landscape water conservation education

8.6 - High Efficiency Washing Machine Rebates
Due to the potentially high cost per volume of water saved, the City has chosen not to provide rebates for high efficiency washing machines, and will achieve water conservation goals through other programs. See Section 8.15 for more details on the economics of high efficiency washing machine rebates.

8.7 - Public Information Programs
Education programs are the most common form of conservation measures in most cities. Likewise, the City would like to make public education the centerpiece of their conservation efforts.

Current
Current public information programs on water conservation include the following:

1. City participation in Water Awareness Month (May)
2. Bill stuffers on water conservation
3. News programs
4. Radio commercials in English and Spanish
5. Booth at the Porterville City Fair
6. Water bills that compare current water usage to the previous year’s usage.

These efforts are typically implemented during the high water use period of April to September. These efforts are also intensified during droughts.

**Planned**
If funding and staff time permit, the City will add the following to their public information program during the next five years (2007-2011):
1. Booths at public events such as neighborhood association meetings and garden clubs.
2. Facility tours (such as the wastewater treatment plant) to civic groups and students.
3. City Council Meetings may be broadcast on television in the future. This would provide the public more opportunities to listen to discussions on water issues.

**Evaluations**
Evaluating the effectiveness of public education programs is difficult. The impacts from water conservation education are long term and benefits may not be immediately realized. Logically, water conservation education should reduce per capita consumption over time. However, per capita consumption can also vary with many other factors such as weather, development trends, and other demand management measures. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the pubic education programs will be measured by trends in per capita water consumption. In addition, public comments on and demand for the information programs will also be considered.

Past expenditures and projected future expenditures on public educations programs are summarized in **Tables 8.8 and 8.9**.
Table 8.8 - Past Public Information Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Programs</th>
<th>Actual Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid advertising</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Inserts / Newsletters / Brochures</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration Gardens</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events, Media</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program to coordinate with other government agencies, industry and public interest groups and media</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.9 - Planned Public Information Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Programs</th>
<th>Estimated Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid advertising - Newspaper</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Announcement - Radio</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Inserts / Newsletters /</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration Gardens</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events, Media Events, Fair</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program to coordinate with other government agencies, industry and public interest groups and media</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual expenditures - $</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.8 - School Education Programs
The City has not performed any school education programs in the past five years. However, the City has identified education as one of the major elements of their conservation program, and they therefore plan to renew school education programs in 2007. The City’s Water Conservation Coordinator currently visits schools to educate students on recycling and stormwater. Water conservation will be added to this program in the future. School Education Programs will be evaluated similar to Public
Information Programs (see Section 8.7). A summary of planned school education programs is provided in Table 8.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>No. Classroom Presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 3rd</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th-6th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th-8th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Expenditures</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational materials will be given to the students that meet state education framework requirements. Each presentation will be given to a multiple grade assembly including about 350 to 400 students. Currently there are no plans to give teacher workshops.

8.9 - Commercial, Industrial, and Institutional Conservation Programs
The number of commercial, institutional, industrial, and municipal/other water accounts between 2001 and 2005 is shown in the Table 8.11 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Class</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Institutional</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal/Other</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water usage from these accounts has averaged about 20% of the total City water usage. Large water users include about 150,000 gallons per day (estimated) at a local hospital, and 100,000 gallons per day (estimated) at a large poultry farm.

The City currently requires new car washes to install water recycling systems. These systems have the potential to reduce water consumption from 12,000 to 4,500 gallons per day at each car wash. The systems cost approximately $40,000. Presently, the City only monitors the recycling systems for one year but will consider more long-term monitoring in the future. Statistics are not available on the number of car washes or estimated water savings. The number of car washes that will be installed in the next five years is also unknown.

The City does not plan to implement a toilet replacement program for commercial, industrial and institutional water users. Toilet replacements are not considered the
most economical means to conserve water and are often removed by customers (see Section 8.15), and, as a result, other water conservation programs will be pursued.

The City has no immediate plans to implement other conservation programs for commercial, industrial and institutional water users. However, over the next five years, the City plans to study the merits and benefits of the following programs:

1. Provide funding to businesses to install water efficient systems and processes
2. Require large water users to submit a water conservation plan
3. Perform on-site surveys of water users for water efficiency and water waste
4. Distribute promotional information on water conservation to all parties that apply for building permits.

8.10 - Wholesale Agency Programs
The City of Porterville does not provide any wholesale water to other entities. The City also anticipates challenges meeting their own water demands and therefore has no plans to supply wholesale water to others in the future.

The City plans to purchase surface water from other local agencies in the future to meet water demands. Refer to Section 4.2 for more details.

8.11 - Conservation Pricing
Currently, about 98% of the water used in the City is metered. In addition, all new connections in the City are required to be metered and billed by volume of use. All potable water users are charged the same volumetric rate regardless of the volume used or purpose of use. Water users are also charged a fixed monthly fee based on the size of their flowmeter. In 2007, the volumetric rate for water was $0.72/100 cubic feet = $314/acre-foot. The unit rate, however, can be increased by 20% during droughts (see Section 11 for more details). The City is not considering a tiered rate structure that increases volumetric water fees as water usage increases. The current rate structure (volumetric pricing and increases during droughts) appears to encourage water conservation, and additional water conservation will be sought through various voluntary programs (education, water surveys, etc.). If these measures are not successful in reducing demands then the City will consider tiered pricing when the UWMP is revised in 5 years.

Residential sewer rates are assessed a fixed monthly fee for sewer services. Commercial, industrial and institutional customers are charged sewer fees based on volume of wastewater, but the rate also varies for different customer types (restaurants, car washes, schools, etc.) since the chemistry of their wastewater varies. Some customers, such as retail stores, have two meters, one for indoor use and one for landscaping, since the landscaping accounts are not billed for sewerage.
The impact of metering on water consumption is described in Section 8.4. In summary, it is estimated to reduce consumption by about 60 gpcpd. The impact of the 20% rate increase during drought on consumption is not known and will have to be tested during an actual drought. However, The City estimates that it will reduce consumption by about 20%.

8.12 - Water Conservation Coordinator
The City of Porterville has one designated part-time Water Conservation Coordinator (WCC). She is employed full time with the City and devotes part of her time to water conservation efforts and the rest of her time to other topics such as recycling and stormwater education. More information on the WCC is provided below:

Name: Wyndi Ferguson
Title: Water Systems Specialist
Experience: Grade D2 Water Distribution, has worked for City for 13 years
Date position created: 1989
Percent of time spent on water conservation efforts: 6%

The City plans to increase water conservation efforts, particularly education, over the next five years. At this time it is anticipated that the current WCC can accommodate this additional workload. It should also be noted that many other staff in the Public Works Department and Community Development Department spend time supporting and assisting the WCC.

Evaluating the effectiveness of the WCC’s efforts is difficult. The WCC performs a myriad of tasks, although most of them are related to water conservation education. Therefore, the effectiveness of the WCC will be evaluated similar to the public information programs (See Section 8.7).

Tables 8.12 and 8.13 provide data on past and anticipated future efforts for the WCC.

Table 8.12 – Past Water Conservation Coordinator Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Full-time Positions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Part-time Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Supplied by Other Agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Expenditures - $</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.13 – Planned Future Water Conservation Coordinator Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Full-time Positions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Part-time Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Supplied by Other Agency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Expenditures - $</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.13 - Water Waste Prohibition
According to Section 25-5 of the City Municipal Code, “The consumer shall use reasonable care to prevent the waste of water, shall not allow water to run or waste from his property onto streets or highways, shall not use water in washing sidewalks, building entrances or lobbies or other properties to such excess that water shall flow in street gutters beyond the frontage of the properties occupied by them.”

The City has a Water Conservation Plan (WCP) that is implemented during droughts (see Section 11). When a drought is declared the WCP moves from Phase I to Phase II or III, depending on the severity of the drought. During droughts, City staff will be more diligent in enforcing the water waste prohibition and if necessary will issue notices and fines.

Detailed data is not available on water waste violations and fines. More detailed records will be maintained in the future. The effectiveness of this policy is difficult to determine and quantify since it is a deterrent and prevents waste before it can occur. Nonetheless, the City will track the number of warnings and violations, especially during droughts.

8.14 - Residential Low Flow Toilet Replacement
Due to the potentially high cost per volume of water saved and possible problems with customer satisfaction, Porterville has chosen not to provide rebates for low flow toilet replacements, and will achieve water conservation goals through other programs. Refer to Section 8.15 for more details on why this DMM is not being implemented.

8.15 - Evaluation of Programs Not Implemented
The City has chosen not to implement the following demand management measures:

1. High Efficiency Washing Machine Rebates Programs
2. Residential Low Flow Toilet Replacements

These water conservation programs were evaluated according to several criteria as discussed below:
Legal Authority. The City of Porterville has the legal authority to implement these programs.

Technology. The technology is readily available for the City to implement these programs.

Environmental. These programs would have some environmental benefit through the conservation of water. Plumbing retrofits and replacements would retire appliances before their life expectancy and expedite their delivery to landfills.

Social. By implementing these programs the City would help to spread a ‘culture’ of water conservation.

Health. There are no known health impacts from implementing or not implementing these programs.

Customer Impact. These programs would have a positive impact on customers by reducing their water demands and thus reducing their water bills. They may have a negative impact as some people believe that high efficiency water appliances do not perform as well as standard appliances. The City may also lack the available staff to implement these programs.

Cost Sharing. No cost sharing programs were identified that would lower the financial burden on the City for implementing these programs. The City will monitor grant opportunities that could assist with these programs in the future.

Economics. The economics of certain water management programs are difficult or impossible for the City to evaluate without detailed and expensive studies. As a result, the City looked at a study by Little (2006) that provided typical costs to implement common programs.

The economics of these programs was evaluated by comparing the cost to customers for delivered water versus the cost of the programs. Currently, water deliveries in Porterville cost $314/AF (a small monthly assessment for flowmeters is ignored in this analysis).

According to Little, washing machine rebates have a lifetime cost of $404/AF of water saved based on a 12-year life expectancy. Therefore, the benefit cost ratio would be $314/$404 = 0.78.

Little also states that the lifetime cost (based on 20 years) per volume of water saved for toilet rebates is $436/AF, resulting in a benefit/cost ratio of $314/$436 = 0.72. However, toilet replacements have a lower cost of $181, resulting in a benefit/cost ratio of
$314/$181 = 1.73. This difference was surmised to be because distributions programs allow a utility to assert total quality control by offering only highly efficient models, ensures that toilets are installed properly, and also check for leaks or other conservation opportunities in the household during installation.

In summary, the washing machine rebates and toilet rebates will not be implemented because they are not economical. Toilet distributions appear economical according to Little’s study, but the City is lacking staff to implement a program and is concerned that the toilets will eventually be removed due to customer dissatisfaction.
9 - PLANNED WATER SUPPLY PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

This section provides a description of planned water supply projects that could directly increase water supplies. Although the City is planning to complete the projects described below, their success will be dependent on staff and funding availability, and in some cases cooperation from other agencies. Planned water supply projects include the following:

**Construct Surface Water Treatment Plant.** The City plans to design and construct a surface water treatment plant. The plant will allow the City to directly deliver surface water to customers. The size of the plant is currently unknown and will depend on several factors including available funding and the volume of surface water the City can secure through long-term purchase agreements (see Section 4.2).

**Water Distribution System Improvements.** Porterville expects to update their Water System Master Plan in 2007-2008. This will include an analysis of the distribution facilities needed to accommodate population growth, a surface water treatment plant, and the facilities needed to accept and recharge surface water. After completion of the Master Plan a number of new projects will likely be identified. These projects will improve the distribution system and provide greater assurance that the City can meet peak water demands.

**New Well Constructions.** In the past the City has typically installed one to two new wells each year with capacities ranging from 500 to 1,500 gpm. The City will continue to install new wells at a rate necessary to keep up with demands. Due to the unreliable nature of surface water, well capacities will need to have sufficient capacity to meet almost 100% of City demands. Planned groundwater recharge will help to ensure that the wells can provide the same yield in normal, single dry, and multiple dry years.

**Water Conservation.** The City has established a goal of reducing per capita water demands by 10% by 2030. This would be accomplished gradually through a variety of demand management measures described throughout this UWMP. For the present, water planning and system design will assume that these conservation goals are not met. **Table 9.1** presents the potential water savings if this goal is met. The water savings are essentially equivalent to securing a water source of the same volume.
Table 9.1 – Water Conservation Goals (AF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Water Demand</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Demand Reduction Goal</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Conserved</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Total Water Demand</td>
<td>14,310</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>19,740</td>
<td>23,090</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to Attachment 7 for an implementation schedule for the aforementioned projects.
10 - DEVELOPMENT OF DESALINATED WATER

The City of Porterville is several hundred miles from the Pacific Ocean so the use of desalinated sea water is not a practical option. Local groundwater and surface water generally do not have high saline contents that would prevent consumption for potable use so desalination of local supplies is not needed.
11 - WATER SHORTAGE CONTINGENCY PLAN

The City has an existing Water Conservation Plan (WCP) that outlines policies and procedures to help reduce water demands during droughts. It should be noted that in April 2007 the City was re-evaluating the WCP with the goal of enhancing it. City staff believe that the WCP may be inadequate to address the 2007 drought and they are investigating more aggressive measures to encourage water conservation.

11.1 - Stages of Action
The Water Conservation Plan includes three phases of implementation. Actions in each phase would be undertaken by the City or the general public. When staff determines that water supply conditions warrant a phase change they present the request to the City Council for their approval. Presently, there are not any defined triggers (i.e. water allocations, snowpack levels, etc.) for moving from one phase to the next. Any decision to change phases will however be based on a combination of surface water supplies, weather conditions, trends in water usage, groundwater levels, and well yields.

Conservation measures gradually increase with each phase. The public are given opportunities to voluntarily reduce consumption in Phase I, if these efforts are not sufficient, then Phase II is implemented, which includes some additional mandatory and voluntary measures. If these are not sufficient then Phase III is implemented, which include several other mandatory regulations.

The State of California requests that a drought plan be developed that can reduce consumption by up to 50%. It is not known how much the existing WCP can reduce consumption. The mandatory measures alone would probably not reduce consumption by 50%, and this goal could probably only be achieved with significant voluntary reductions. The effectiveness of the WCP in reducing demand will have to be tested during future single-dry-year and multiple-dry-year droughts. In addition, as previously mentioned, the City is looking at enhancing the WCP, which may include more aggressive measures to further reduce demands.

11.2 - Estimate of Minimum Supply
Historically, the City has pumped groundwater to meet all water supply demands. While there may be less water infiltrating from rainfall, snowfall, runoff and irrigation during dry years, it does not adversely impact groundwater supplies in the short term. As a result, the City has had fairly consistent water supplies during different hydrologic years. Although well yields are gradually declining each year, it is expected that there would be no water shortages during the next three years (2007-2009), even if a multi-year drought occurred. However, shortage will eventually occur if the City does not secure surface water or reduce water demand.

11.3 - Catastrophic Supply Interruption Plan
The City does not have a formal written plan to address a catastrophic non-drought related interruption in water supply (i.e. power outage, system failure, natural disaster,
etc.). However, the WCP could be used to reduce consumption after a catastrophic supply interruption. The City also has back-up generators in the event of a power outage. Lastly, the City recognizes the need for more contingency plans to address non-drought related events and plans to investigate other alternatives during 2007.

11.4 - Prohibition, Penalties and Consumption Reduction Methods
Descriptions of the prohibitions, penalties and consumption reduction methods in each phase of the Water Conservation Plan are provided below:

Phase I
Phase I applies during periods when a normal water supply is available. Water conservation efforts include a myriad of programs and policies that are described in Section 8.

Phase II
Phase II applies during periods when there is a water supply shortage. All of the conservation measures in Phase I will continue to be implemented along with the following regulations.

Actions by the City:

1. Public Information Program. The City will pursue a more aggressive distribution of information than its efforts initiated in Phase I to promote public awareness of the need to conserve water with a stronger emphasis on the water shortage condition.
2. Water System Pressure Reduction. The City’s water system may experience reduced water pressures during high usage periods. This may deter water use for nonessential activities and encourage scheduling of landscape watering to late nights or early mornings.
3. City Landscapes and Watering Schedules. All City parks, median islands and public facility landscapes will be watered during the late night or early morning hours to reduce impact on the water system during peak usage hours.
4. Leak Detection - Water Waste. The City will continue in its proactive plan to audit water supply usage. All City staff will be reminded of the necessity of reporting any evidence of leaks or water waste for immediate action. There will be an emphasis on coordinated community efforts to reduce water waste.
5. Waste of Water Notices. City staff will be equipped to issue “Waste of Water” notices to consumers identified as misusing water.

Actions by the General Public:

1. Conservation Efforts. The general public will be strongly encouraged to utilize those water conservation measures contained within the City's public information program.
2. Restaurants. Notices will be sent to all restaurants within the City limits requesting support of water conservation efforts by serving water to customers upon request.
only.
3. Lawn and Landscaping Watering. All residential, commercial and industrial landscape watering should be reduced to a minimum and avoid watering between the hours of 5 a.m. to 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. to 10 p.m.
4. Vehicle Washing and Sidewalk Hosing. Vehicle washing should be accomplished either by automatic car washes that recycle water or with buckets and hoses equipped with a shut-off nozzle.

Phase III
Phase III applies during periods when there is a severe water shortage and the following mandatory regulations will apply:

Actions by the City:

1. Public Information Program. The utility billing system will begin to notify customers of restrictions on water use. The program to promote public awareness will be intensified with emphasis placed on communicating the mandatory water conservation requirements to the public.
2. Rate Structure Enhancement. A 20% rate increase on all residential and landscape accounts will go into effect. This rate increase will encourage water conservation and will also serve as a provision to recover the lost revenues from water conservation.
3. City Landscapes and Watering Schedules. All City parks, median islands and public facility landscapes will continue to be watered during the late nights or early morning hours to confine impact on the water system to off-peak usage hours. If it becomes necessary, watering of City parks and median islands will be suspended and evaluated each day.

Actions by the General Public:

1. Landscape Watering. Landscape watering shall only be allowed between the hours of 5 a.m. to 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. to 10 p.m.
2. Outside Washing. Sidewalk and driveway washing will be prohibited.

11.5 - Analysis of Revenue Impacts of Reduced Sales During Shortages
The City bills most of its customers on a volumetric basis. As a result, conservation measures, which aim to reduce water consumption, can also reduce revenue for the City. Significant water conservation during droughts can have a major impact on City revenues. Although the City would have lower water purchase and pumping costs with lower water deliveries, they also have considerable fixed and overhead costs that are the same for any volume of water delivered. As a result, conservation measures need to be coupled with rate adjustments to ensure that the water system is financially sustainable.
The City has developed a Water Conservation Plan that raises water rates by 20% during droughts. The higher unit rate is intended to discourage use, but it will also help to offset the revenue lost from selling a lower volume of water. The suitability of this 20% increase is not yet known and it needs to be tested during a single-year and multi-year drought. If, in the future, the 20% price increase is found to be inadequate the City will again reevaluate the WCP and modify it accordingly.

Implementation of the WCP will not have a large impact on expenditures or revenues. No additional costs are expected for billing or operations. Existing City staff will provide the personnel needed to implement the plan and enforce water conservation measures. It is likely that higher expenditures will be needed for public information programs, but these will probably be small compared to the total City water budget. Fines for water waste are a source of revenue and they typically increase during droughts. However, the revenues from fines are also small compared to the overall City water budget.

11.6 - Draft Ordinance and Use Monitoring Procedure
Water meters are read monthly, but during a drought the water consumption must be tracked more frequently. Reading customer meters more frequently would be costly and impractical. However, the City will be able to closely track groundwater pumping and surface water deliveries on a daily basis. This data will be evaluated weekly to determine if the WCP is effective in reducing water consumption.
12 - RECYCLED WATER PLAN

The City owns and operates a wastewater treatment plant that provides secondary level treatment of all of the City’s wastewater. In 2005 the City generated approximately 5 million gallons (MG) of wastewater each day. Recently, wastewater generation has averaged 46.7% of total water used. Accordingly, the wastewater generation will increase to an estimated 12.5 MG/day (annual average) by 2030.

The City presently uses wastewater effluent (recycled water) for groundwater recharge and crop irrigation. Six ponds are used to percolate wastewater effluent. In the spring and summer the ponds are dry because the effluent is used to irrigate crops. Crops are irrigated with recycled water on agricultural land located about 5 to 6 miles from the City’s center. The City has annexed this land so they can keep it under agricultural production and ensure that there is always a demand for the effluent.

12.1 - Coordination
The City has not actively involved other agencies in determining the best uses for recycled water, partly because all of the water is already being used for beneficial purposes. Recently the City has been encouraged by several parties to consider other uses for the water, such as landscape irrigation, dual distribution systems, and industrial water supply, but tertiary level treatment would need to be added to their wastewater treatment plant. The best opportunity for these alternative uses would occur if the City constructs a satellite wastewater treatment plant. Tertiary treatment could be added to the plant and the recycled water could be used in the plant’s service area. If opportunities arise to use recycled water for other uses then a public hearing will be used to solicit comments from the public and other agencies.

12.2 - Wastewater Quantity, Quality and Current Uses
Table 12.1 summarizes the past and projected volumes of wastewater generated and treated in Porterville.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater collected &amp; treated in service area¹</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5,720</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity that meets recycled water standards (secondary level)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ - Wastewater assumed to be 46.7% of total water delivered into system

A breakdown of recycled water use for crop irrigation and groundwater recharge is not available. More detailed data on recycled water use will be maintained in the future. Estimating future recycled water uses would be highly speculative and therefore is not included here. However, the City plans to recycle 100% of its effluent (i.e. none will be
sent to evaporation ponds). It is also likely that some recycled water will be used for groundwater recharge and crop irrigation through 2030. It is possible that some will be used for landscape irrigation in the future.

The use of recycled water for residential non-potable use would only be possible if a dual distribution system is constructed and the water receives tertiary-level treatment. The construction of a dual distribution system would only be practical in new developments. The City plans to investigate the use of dual distribution systems some time in the coming five years.
13 - WATER QUALITY IMPACTS ON RELIABILITY

During a public meeting for the Porterville General Plan Update, 28 people in attendance agreed that water quality was an important environmental resource to protect in Porterville. Presently, water quality problems do not pose a threat to water reliability, but the City recognizes the need to protect water quality and prevent future degradation. A discussion on surface water quality and groundwater quality follows.

Surface Water
Future surface water sources would likely be purchased from local irrigation and water districts. These districts have water rights on the San Joaquin River and Tule River. Both of these water sources originate primarily from precipitation in the Sierra Nevada Mountains and as a result have good to excellent water quality. These water supplies have no restrictions on use for municipal water, but they will require standard water treatment.

Tule River water is delivered from Lake Success. According to a report entitled Surface Water Treatment Guideline prepared by Boyle Engineering in February 2005: "the reservoir (Lake Success) periodically experiences turnover episodes which have caused hydrogen sulfide problems. These turnovers take place in the spring and fall. In the summer/fall, the lake experiences algae growth problems." A turnover episode takes place when convection circulation occurs in a lake causing the lower waters to rise and the upper waters to sink. Hydrogen sulfide must be present in the lake bottom sediments and is brought to the surface during a turnover episode.

Additional development in watershed areas may cause some water quality degradation in the San Joaquin and Tule Rivers. However, improved watershed management may prevent further degradation or even improve the water quality. As a result, it is assumed that the quality of these surface water sources will remain good to excellent through the next 25 years.

Groundwater
Groundwater quality in the City is generally good, however a few wells have been shut down due to water quality problems. Wells adjacent to Porter Slough have been closed due to perchloroethylene (PCE) contamination, and a few wells in the downtown area have experienced nitrate problems. In addition, wells in the eastern part of town have nitrate problems (originating from citrus orchards). All active wells produce water that meets State and Federal drinking water quality standards.

The City does not presently provide treatment of any well water. Blending could feasibly be used at wells that experience water quality problems. However, the City does not have infrastructure in place to blend good and poor quality groundwater, and do not have plans to construct blending facilities in the immediate future. The City does
not perform any groundwater remediation, but there are possibly some other agencies conducting groundwater remediation projects within the City limits.

Groundwater quality is generally better on the western edge of town, and hence most of the production wells are placed in this area. At each new well site, a test hole is drilled to characterize the groundwater quality before a decision is made to install a new well.

The impacts of groundwater quality on future supplies are unknown, especially since no detailed groundwater quality studies have been performed in the area. However, water supply, as opposed to water quality, is considered a greater threat to water reliability. As a result, the City is actively seeking a surface water supply. The City is also constructing an inter-tie between the City wide water distribution system and the airport distribution system. This will allow groundwater from the Deer Creek Watershed to be delivered to most of the City. This could result in a significant increase in the water supplies available to the City, since the Deer Creek Watershed is benefitting from percolation of treated effluent.
14 - WATER SERVICE RELIABILITY

Water service reliability in the City is determined by the distribution system performance, well yields, and the reliability of future surface water sources.

**Distribution System Performance**
The City’s distribution system is operated under pressure, and, as a result, leaks are usually apparent. Only a small number of leaks are repaired each year and the system appears to be in good condition.

To help ensure system reliability, the City requires full pressure and leak testing of all newly constructed water lines. The City Fire Department also tests fire hydrants annually to help maintain the integrity of the fire protection system. In addition, the City currently operates and maintains three hillside reservoirs with a total storage capacity of 6.3 million gallons. These reservoirs increase the City’s ability to maintain system pressure during peak demand and fire flow situations.

Historically the water delivery capacity, as opposed to the water source, has been the limiting factor in providing a reliable water supply. During hot years water demands increase and the capacity of the distribution system is near its limit when trying to meet peak demands. This situation will worsen as the population expands. To address this issue, the City plans to update their Water System Master Plan in 2007-2008 and will likely identify some necessary distribution system improvements.

**Well Yields**
The City has historically used groundwater to meet all of their water demands. Groundwater supplies are not significantly impacted by droughts, and, as a result, there is no history of any water supply deficiencies for the City water system. Even during the 1976-1977 drought, records indicate a sufficient supply of water. However, presently groundwater levels are slowly declining, most well yields are decreasing, and some wells have been decommissioned due to water quality issues. As a result, water reliability is expected to be a concern in the future.

Groundwater levels have declined about 0.5 to 1.0 feet/year over the last 20 years based on Department of Water Resources' well hydrographs. This decline in groundwater levels, however, is not as serious as, and not consistent with, the decline in well yields, which is the City's impetus for seeking more surface water. Some City wells have seen capacity reductions from 1,500 gallons per minute (gpm) to 500 or 600 gpm. In addition, new wells typically have capacities of 500 gpm or less. The lower well yields are known to be partially due to well encrustation, and possibly improper sighting of the wells, but more hydrogeologic studies and well inspections are needed to better understand the reasons why groundwater level declines are not as serious as well yield declines.
Surface Water Source Reliability
Surface water is less reliable than groundwater since its availability depends on precipitation. The reliability of surface water sources for the City cannot be determined until the water sources and water sellers are specifically identified, although Porterville Irrigation District is considered likely to sell water to the City. The reliability will also depend on details in any surface-water purchase agreements. The City may acquire some firm water that would be guaranteed or almost guaranteed each year. However, it is more likely that the City will only be able to buy surplus or floodwaters that are only available during wet years. This water would be available in varying quantities and would most likely be recharged, and later pumped for use in normal and dry years.

The tables below assume that the City will be able to acquire sufficient surface water to meet normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year demands. This will have to be verified when the City develops surface water purchase agreements with other agencies.

### Table 14.1 - Projected Normal Year Supply and Demand Comparison (AF/Y)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand totals</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (supply - demands)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During a single dry year the City will implement Phase II of the Drought Response Plan. This is expected to reduce consumption by about 20%. Sufficient water supplies will be available to meet these demands if the City can arrange long-term agreements to purchase surface water.

### Table 14.2 - Projected Single Dry Year Water Supply (AF/Y)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply Totals</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Totals</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (supply - demands)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During a multiple year drought the City will probably have to rely almost exclusively on groundwater. Presently, the groundwater wells could probably provide sufficient water during a multi-year drought. However, as groundwater levels and well yields decline, this will be unlikely in the future unless the City recharges and banks a sufficient water volume to meet demands during the drought. As stated above, it is assumed that the City will have sufficient water supplies to meet these demands. The City will have to continue...
installing new wells so they can meet their full water demands with groundwater in dry years.
Implementation of 1990 UWMP
The City last updated their UWMP in 1990. The major goals presented in that Plan are discussed below along with the City's progress with each goal.

Parkway and Landscape Design Guidelines. The City planned to prepare and distribute parkway and landscape design guidelines, but this goal has not yet been achieved, and, as a result, the City is committed to revisiting this goal in the next few years.

Ultra-Low-Flow Toilets for New Construction. The City established a goal to require that all new buildings include ultra-low-flow toilets in compliance with new plumbing codes. The City has successfully enforced the new plumbing code on all new building projects since 1992.

Use of Reclaimed Water. The City established a goal to use treated wastewater for landscape irrigation and equipment wash water at the wastewater treatment plant. This goal was not realized, but the City presently uses 100% of its wastewater for other beneficial uses. As stated in Section 12, the City may consider alternative uses for recycled water in the future, including the aforementioned uses at the wastewater treatment plant.

Progressive Utility Rate Structure. The City set a goal of considering baseline water allowances and charging customers higher rates if their water use exceeded that baseline allowance. This would result in a tiered or progressive utility rate structure. This proposal was not viewed positively by some City staff. In addition, the current practice of metering provides significant incentives for reducing water consumption and per capita water demands in the City appear to be lower than many Central Valley Cities (see Section 8). In addition, the City has a program to increase water rates by 20% in the event of a drought. For now, the City will implement the many demand management measures discussed in Section 8. If these measures are not successful at reducing demands further then a tiered rate structure will be considered when the UWMP is updated in 5 years.

Adoption of 2007 UWMP
A public hearing was held on [specify date] to solicit comments on the UWMP. This UWMP was adopted by the Porterville City Council on [specify date]. A copy of the adoption resolution is included in Attachment 6.

Implementation of 2007 UWMP
An implementation schedule for the UWMP from 2007 to 2011 is included as Attachment 7.
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MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
REGARDING COOPERATIVE WATER OPERATIONS BETWEEN
THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE AND THE PORTERVILLE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

This Memorandum of Understanding made and entered into and effective this day of Dec. 13, 2006, by and between the CITY OF PORTERVILLE, existing by virtue of its Charter and the Constitution and laws of the State of California, hereinafter referred to as "City", and the PORTERVILLE IRRIGATION DISTRICT, a Political Subdivision of the State of California and a California Irrigation District, existing by virtue of and pursuant to Division 11 of the California Water Code, Section 20500, et seq., hereinafter referred to as "District".

The District administers programs to preserve and protect the area's groundwater resources including but not limited to, importation of surface water supplies from the Friant-Kern Canal, acquisition of Tule River water rights and storage and operation of groundwater recharge basins.

The District is a member of the Deer Creek and Tule River Authority, a California Joint Powers Authority. Among the members of the DCTRA are seven irrigation or water districts in the general vicinity of the City. Those member districts, individually and collectively, conduct water importation, distribution and delivery operations in the Southern portion of Tulare County.

The physical boundaries of both City and District overlap in certain areas, resulting in an area or areas commonly within the jurisdiction of both parties.

The City's Land Use Element of the General Plan supports growth west to the Friant-Kern Canal and it is anticipated that there will be a notable impact on the groundwater resources of the City and District as a result of this growth.

The City has approved the expenditure of $34,000 per year for a three-year period, commencing on January 1, 2007, for the acquisition of surface water, from any source, for use in recharging the groundwater aquifer underlying the City.

The District recognizes that recharge to the aquifer underlying the City will help to offset groundwater pumping by the City for municipal and industrial purposes thereby reducing the impact of the City's pumping operations on the natural recharge of the aquifer underlying the District.

The legislative bodies of City and District have and do find and determine that it is in their mutual interests and advantage for the City and the District to develop and conduct
programs intended to increase the importation of surface water to the area of the City for recharge to the underlying groundwater aquifer or for other beneficial purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is agreed by and between the parties hereto as follows:

1. This MOU is entered into this 13th day of December, 2006.
2. The term of this MOU shall be three years, commencing on January 1, 2007.
3. The parties hereto agree to jointly develop and conduct programs intended to increase the importation of surface water to the area of the City for the recharge of the underlying groundwater aquifer or for other beneficial purposes.
4. The City agrees to make available $34,000 on an annual basis for the purchase of water to be imported into the vicinity of the city limits of the city of Porterville.
5. The District agrees to identify from its own surface water supplies, or to facilitate the identification of surface water supplies controlled by other DCTRA member districts, that may be made available for purchase by the City.
6. It is understood and agreed to by the parties that any surface water made available to the City under this MOU shall be water that would not otherwise have been recharged to the underground aquifer east of the Friant-Kern canal.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this MOU to be executed as of the day and year first above written.

City of Porterville

By: Cameron J. Hamilton
   Mayor

Porterville Irrigation District

By: Guido A. Lombardi
   President, Porterville Irrigation District

By: David L. Hoffman
   Secretary, Porterville Irrigation District
City of Porterville
Urban Water Management & Water Assessment Public Meeting Notice
December 12, 2006 @ 4:00 p.m.

Irrigation Districts

Vandalla Irrigation District
2032 S. Hillcrest
Porterville, CA 93257
ATTN: Steve Drumright

Tea Pot Dome Water District
105 W. Tea Pot Dome Avenue
Porterville, CA 93257
ATTN: Keith Norris

Porterville Irrigation District
P.O. Box 1248
Porterville, CA 93258
ATTN: David Hoffman

Lindmore Irrigation District
P.O. Box 908
Lindsay, CA 93247
ATTN: Robert Baranek

Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation District
P.O. Box 846
Lindsay, CA 93247
ATTN: Scott Edwards

Lower Tule River Irrigation District
357 E. Olive Avenue
Tipton, CA 93272
ATTN: Dan Edwards

Saucelito Irrigation District
P.O. Box 3858
Porterville, CA 93258
ATTN: James Akins

General Plan Update Advisory Committee

Eric Borba
14866 Road 200
Porterville, CA 93257

Donald Brown, PhD
264 N. Westwood St.
Porterville, CA 93257

John Eby
1557 E. Olive Ave
Porterville, CA 93257

Paul Paulin
2037 W. Linda Visa
Porterville, CA 93257

Brian Ennis
643 N. Westwood St.
Porterville, CA 93257

Jackie Witzel
14043 Road 200
Porterville, CA 93257

Rick McIntire
31862 Country Club Drive
Porterville, CA 93257

Tom Velasquez
350 S. Kessing
Porterville, CA 93257

Keith Hanson
1279 W. Henderson Ave.
Porterville, CA 93257

Donnette Silva-Carter
93 N. Main St.
Porterville, CA 93257

Jeff Keele
100 E. College Ave.
Porterville, CA 93257

John Snavely
600 W. Grand Ave.
Porterville, CA 93257

Kelly Morgan
465 W. Putnam Ave.
Porterville, CA 93257

Renay Sprague
75 North D Street
Porterville, CA 93257

Theresa Szymanis
5961 S. Mooney Blvd.
Visalia, CA 93291

Dave Nenna
2780 Yowlumne Ave., Suite A
Porterville, CA 93257

Greg Woodard
P.O. Box 950
Porterville, CA 93257

Gilbert Yniguez
851 N. Cottage Street
Porterville, CA 93257

General Plan Stakeholders

Jerald Acaster
1310 N. Greenfield
Porterville, CA 93257

Mike Bennett
333 W. Henderson Ave.
Porterville, CA 93257

Michael Carlos
838 E. Cleo Ave
Porterville, CA 93257

Ted Cornell
P.O. Box 11
Porterville, CA 93258

Eva Day
24667 Avenue 96
Terra Bella, CA

Eleanor Forster
P.O. Box 8548
Porterville, CA 93258

Jim & Joan Gillham
243 Parkwest St.
Porterville, CA 93257

Josef Guerrero
322 S. "F" Street
Porterville, CA 93257

Robert Gutierrez
970 N. Creek View Place
Porterville, CA 93257

Keith Hansen
597 W. Mulberry Ave.
Porterville, CA 93257

Lois Innis
1148 W. Glenn Court
Porterville, CA 93257

Josh Kitrell
1359 N. Grand Ave.
Porterville, CA 93257

Javier Lopez
19637 Road 232
Strathmore, CA 93267

Pargat Mahal
1949 W. Santa Maria Ave.
Porterville, CA 93257

Paul Matos
3530 W. Mineral King, Ste. A
Visalia, CA 93291

Mac & Diane McInnis
423 El Rancho Ave.
Porterville, CA 93257

John Miller
P.O. Box 614
Ducor, CA 93218

Tim Miller
1911 Apostle Lane
Riverside, CA 92506

Darryl Minier
1341 San Lucia Ave.
Porterville, CA 93257

Carol Mills
P.O. Box 1282
Porterville, CA 93258

Lee Moore
669 N. Arlene St.
Porterville, CA 93257
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Zip Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grace Munoz-Rios</td>
<td>345 West Belleview</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Nichols</td>
<td>456 N. Hawaii Street</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Owen</td>
<td>16151 Mustang Drive</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Pergeson</td>
<td>1707 W. School Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Reynolds</td>
<td>P.O. Box 78</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Schuller</td>
<td>P.O. Box 211</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Seyler</td>
<td>1805 W. Dale Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty Simpson</td>
<td>588 Crawford Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Spring</td>
<td>1421 Atkins Way</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitta Toor</td>
<td>13200 Road 112</td>
<td>Tipton, CA</td>
<td>93272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Vafeades</td>
<td>526 W. Dexter</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell Wall</td>
<td>1305 N. Scenic</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Woodard</td>
<td>461 N. Crestview</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Wyatt</td>
<td>247 N. Larsen</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Young</td>
<td>489 W. Kanai</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wally Jensen</td>
<td>211 N. Main St.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Raymond</td>
<td>177. W. Henderson Ave. # 5</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Bush</td>
<td>197 W. Cherry Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Neece, Jr.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 791</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Cardell</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1930</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Black</td>
<td>167 W. Poplar Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Billiou</td>
<td>1343 S. Main</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Taylor</td>
<td>11 E. Yates Ave</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Keenan</td>
<td>315 W. Oak St.</td>
<td>Visalia, CA</td>
<td>93291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Gibson</td>
<td>151 N. Main</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mac Donald</td>
<td>375 N. Main</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Longley</td>
<td>291 N. Main Street</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Perrine</td>
<td>291 N. Main Street</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Stadtherr</td>
<td>314 N. Main Street</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Beltran</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2043</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Corkins</td>
<td>1666 S. Leggett St.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Lindgren, CFP</td>
<td>141 E. Mill Avenue</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Saldana</td>
<td>4500 S. Laspina</td>
<td>Tulare, CA</td>
<td>93274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Dewing</td>
<td>1813 Thunderbolt Dr.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Walters</td>
<td>619 N. Main St.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexter Goodell</td>
<td>180 S. &quot;E&quot; St.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Roberts</td>
<td>1396 West Herndon Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Gray</td>
<td>482 S. Plano St.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Gray</td>
<td>482 S. Plano St.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Wright</td>
<td>750 S. Jaye Street</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geane Lohse</td>
<td>333 W. Henderson</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Schulz</td>
<td>4500 S. Laspina</td>
<td>Tulare, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Winton</td>
<td>150 W. Morton Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marshall</td>
<td>516 W. Shaw Avenue</td>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>93704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimi Stoneburner</td>
<td>1680 N. Newcomb</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary Austin</td>
<td>P.O. Box 10009</td>
<td>Tulare, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parn Clark</td>
<td>631 N. &quot;G&quot; Street</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Vink</td>
<td>357 E. Olive</td>
<td>Tipton, CA</td>
<td>93272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Matthiessen</td>
<td>813 West Oak, Suite D</td>
<td>Visalia, CA</td>
<td>93291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William McKinley</td>
<td>108 E. Mill Avenue</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Stone</td>
<td>800 W. Henderson Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>93257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee Gilford</td>
<td>362 N. Porter Road</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Wooley</td>
<td>786 Road 188</td>
<td>Delano, 93215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicki Edwards</td>
<td>13095 Road 208</td>
<td>Delano, 93215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto de la Rosa</td>
<td>10 N. Main Street</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto Gomez</td>
<td>200 N. Third Street</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Paynter</td>
<td>2109 W. Bullard, Suite 141</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Newcome</td>
<td>1820 Thunderbolt Drive.</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Hatfield</td>
<td>253 E. Worth Avenue</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Hall</td>
<td>100 E. College Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sawyer</td>
<td>P.O. Box 2000</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hoffman</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1248</td>
<td>Porterville, 93258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Mauney</td>
<td>115 E. Oak Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Tree</td>
<td>187 W. Olive Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Lessenger</td>
<td>976 N. Scenic Drive</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Porter</td>
<td>3500 W. Orchard Ct.</td>
<td>Visalia, 93291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Young</td>
<td>P.O. Box 3699</td>
<td>Visalia, 93278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Owen</td>
<td>16151 Mustang Drive</td>
<td>Springville, 93265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Reed</td>
<td>19 E. Putnam Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Shamley</td>
<td>P.O. Box 908</td>
<td>Porterville, 93258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Rather</td>
<td>2194 W. Delta Ave.</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Johnson</td>
<td>600 S &quot;E&quot; St.</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Eckhoff</td>
<td>137 N. Main Street</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Smith</td>
<td>P.O. Box 1688</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Thoburn</td>
<td>2425 S. Blackstone</td>
<td>Tulare, 93274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avtar Singh Basra</td>
<td>134 N. Main St.</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Rogers</td>
<td>898 Production Place</td>
<td>Newport Beach, 92663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schott Cochran</td>
<td>5961 S. Mooney Blvd</td>
<td>Visalia, 93277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Maples</td>
<td>2800 W. Burrel</td>
<td>Visalia, 93291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Sierra</td>
<td>617 N. Main Street</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Johnson</td>
<td>4025 W. Noble, Suite A</td>
<td>Visalia, 93277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Nenna</td>
<td>2780 Yowlumne Ave., Suite 1</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Capone</td>
<td>806 W. Westfield Avenue</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Delperdang</td>
<td>1300 S. &quot;F&quot; Street</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Johns</td>
<td>678 N. Plano St.</td>
<td>Porterville, 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Places</td>
<td>P.O. Box 853</td>
<td>Springville, 93265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 7, 2007

Mr. Bradley D. Dunlap, AICP
Community Development Department
City of Porterville
291 North Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257

RE: URBAN WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

Dear Mr. Dunlap:

At your invitation, the Porterville Irrigation District (PID) has reviewed the City of Porterville's draft document entitled "Urban Water Management Plan" (Plan). Following are comments generated as a result of that review.

Throughout the document, reference is made to the intent to construct a surface water treatment facility in order to achieve the goal of maintaining groundwater extractions within the safe yield characteristics of the groundwater reservoir. As you are aware, PID supports that policy and is in negotiations with the City with regard to a potential water supply for utilization in the proposed surface water treatment plant. However, the Plan makes little reference to either these negotiations or the need for a dependable surface water supply to support the construction of a surface water treatment facility. In fact, numerous references are made to the fact that the only water the City is going to be able to access will be intermittent flood waters and waters that are available for purchase in excess of the need of surface water rights and contract holders. Such supplies are typically insufficient to justify the construction of a surface water treatment
plant and are typically available during periods of time when the demand from City customers would be at a minimum. We feel that an inconsistency exists in the presentation of the manner that a water supply will be made available for the proposed surface water treatment plant. The expression of being able to only purchase intermittent surplus supplies is in conflict with the statement presented on page 3 of the Plan wherein it is noted that the City will need, ultimately, to purchase significant quantities of surface water in order to support the demands generated from an expanded customer base.

The Plan makes reference to the City currently covering approximately 15.3 square miles. This is in contrast to a planning area of 56.8 square miles. The basis is significant as the computed safe yield, at 9,000 acre-feet, is computed to be reflective of the current service area. The safe yield, however, remains constant throughout the planning period. We feel that the Plan might underestimate the safe yield available to the City when the service area expands to the future anticipated service territory. This process would tend to overstate the amount of water which would need to be purchased to satisfy the shortfall between demand and safe yield. The required surface water purchases presented in Table 4.1 of 20,500 acre-feet by 2030 may, therefore, be overstated.

On page 10, at 4.2 Existing Surface Water Rights, there appears to be an error in the reported number of Pioneer Ditch Company shares the City owns. Our records indicate the City owns 449 shares.

On page 11, under “Other Surface Water Sources,” it is indicated that water to be made available through the Friant-Kern Canal is not fully reliable as the Canal is taken out of service for a defined period of time every three years. It should be noted that the period of time during which the Canal is unavailable due to maintenance, is a period of time when urban demands are at their lowest. Therefore, this typically results in minimal impacts on an agency which has some degree of water available which meets current state and current drinking water standards from a groundwater source. The Plan should acknowledge that this potential deficiency and reliability need can apparently be overcome, given the amount of water available from current City production facilities meeting applicable drinking water standards.

Additionally on page 11, under “Surface Water Sources” the PID is stated to have
“riparian” water rights on the Tule River, when in fact PID has “appropriative” water rights on the Tule River. In that same paragraph it states “...PID has surplus surface water in most years.” this is not a completely true statement. PID is generally unable to meet the total annual water supply demands of its landowners, and cannot therefore be considered to have an excess water supply, the seasonal nature of the water supply means there are points in time at which more water is available to landowners than can reasonably be used at that time. PID does prefer to work with the City to manage its surface water supply for the benefit of the ground water resource underlying both PID and the City.

The Plan acknowledges that, with only reasonable efforts, the City could save approximately 3,700 acre-feet per year due to conservation efforts. Such savings would allow the City to contain their groundwater extractions under current demand conditions to the anticipated safe yield of the groundwater reservoir. This would allow the City to immediately achieve their goal of maintaining extractions within the safe yield parameter. Conflicting with this position, however, is the discussion on page 27, at 8.11, where it is stated that the current rate structure appears to adequately encourage water conservation. As the desired conservation savings are not currently being achieved, this statement appears to be untrue and should be revisited.

Please accept the appreciation of PID to comment on the City’s draft Plan. The majority of PID’s comments deal with the need to address conflicting statements within the Plan, along with the issue of potentially underestimating the safe yield available to the City as its service area expands. We stand ready to further address these issues with the City, should you so desire, as you work to complete the document.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Sean P. Geiver
General Manager
Porterville Irrigation District
August 13, 2007

City of Porterville
291 North Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257

Attn: Mr. Bradley D. Dunlap, AICP

Re: City of Porterville Urban Water Management Plan, 2007 Update

Dear Mr. Dunlap:

The subject Plan was provided to our office on August 3, 2007 by Mr. Dan Vink, General Manager, Lower Tule River Irrigation District. Thus, the reason for our comments not arriving by August 07, 2007.

First, and foremost we applaud the City for recognizing the limit of the availability of the groundwater supply, the current exclusive source, for urban use. We further commend the City for budgeting $34,000 per year for three years for the purchase of surface water for groundwater recharge. We encourage a more-aggressive and Tule River Basin inclusive program for importation of surface water.

The importation of surface water for the City from outside the Tule River Basin, by exchange, rather than reallocation of Tule River water within the Basin, is the only means of correction of the overdraft within the Basin.

It appears from the report the City should be recharging the reclaimed water in East Porterville for recharge rather than transporting the reclaimed water, 45% of the water delivered, into the Deer Creek Basin for irrigation use.

The Tule River Association has monitored groundwater levels of the Tule River Basin between Success Reservoir and the Friant Kern Canal for more than 25 years, and the Association is willing to share such data for development of the annual zone of depression surrounding the city and for determination of the safe yield of that portion of the Basin.

The City of Porterville Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) is a very informative document and contains extensive pertinent data. The following specific comments, organized by page number, are meant to be constructive.

1. On Page 1 and in Page 4 the report states the UWMP is the Planning Area of the City, which covers 56.8 square miles. Is the UWMP area coincident with the current General Plan area of the City? An area of 36,350 acres seems rather extensive.
2. Page 2. The Tule River Improvement Joint Powers Agreement was not formulated as an Authority, only an Agreement. Currently the member agencies of the TRJPA are considering the development of an IRWMP as a project under that agreement.

3. Page 5. The Tule River Watershed tributary to Success Reservoir, based upon 41 years of record, has a basin mean average annual precipitation of 31.26 inches.

All of Table 3.1 Climate Data need to have the units identified and a total would be helpful. Other tables of the report also need the addition of the units for clarification.

4. Pages 7, 8 & 9. The aquifer safe yield of 9,000 a.f./year, along with the specific yield within the City of about 0.14, and the computation of 1.9 a.f./acre from the PID 1998 Water Conservation Plan are of interest.

Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 1469, Ground-Water Conditions and Storage Capacity in the San Joaquin Valley California, Table 6. Estimated ground-water storage capacity, by township subunits of the San Joaquin Valley, California, and identified a specific yield, in T21S, R27E, MDB&M, of 12.4 percent for depths of 50-100 feet, of 7.4 percent for depths of 100-200 feet, and 9.8 percent for all zones with lesser specific yields easterly of Township 21 South.

5. Page 8. The Tule River Sub-Basin is located within the Tulare Lake Basin of the San Joaquin Valley. The statement; "The Army Corps of Engineers runs water from Success Reservoir through the Tule River and Porter Slough, providing important groundwater recharge," is incorrect. The Corps has no water rights on the Tule River and only controls the release from Success Reservoir during flood operations, otherwise the Tule River Associates controls the Tule River releases from Success Reservoir, as well as all diversions from the Tule River and Porter Slough.

6. Page 10, 13. Table 4.2 - Amount of Groundwater Pumped, the Basin Name should be Tule, not Tulare.

The computation of surface water rights in Pioneer Water Company and Porter Slough Ditch Company doesn't appear to be correct, either the 600 a.f. is incorrect or the number of shares is incorrect, and perhaps both. My records, although outdated, indicate the City of Porterville has 446 shares of Pioneer Water Company stock.

7. Page 11. The statement; "By virtue of holding stock in the two ditch companies, the City is allowed to divert Tule River floodwater in some years for free." is not technically correct. Flood releases, under direction of the Corps of Engineers, are charged against the Success Reservoir storage account(s) with the highest percentage of their allowable storage space filled. The unit(s), whose stored water is released for flood control, has first call on the flood released water for their irrigation and spreading demands, after which the flood released water is available to others.
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The Porterville Irrigation District does not have pre-1914 riparian water rights on Tule River. Technically, pre-1914 riparian water does not exist under California water law. Riparian water rights are pertinent to the riparian lands adjacent to the River. The Porterville Irrigation District administers the Tule River pre-1914 appropriative water rights of several mutual water companies.

3. Page 41. The flow of the Tule River originates primarily from rainfall not snowmelt. The statement; "... the lake periodically experiences turnover episodes which have caused hydrogen sulfide problems." needs clarification. What is a "turnover episode", and how does that cause hydrogen sulfide problems?

Suggest an evaluation of the annual water quality report of the Tule River at Success Reservoir as prepared by the Corps of Engineers.

In summary, we appreciate the statistics that were identified in the Urban Water Management Plan listed as follows:

(1.) Use of 250 gals. per capita per day, and 12,700 a.f. of groundwater in 2006;
(2.) 90% of water used metered;
(3.) 45% of the water delivered appears as wastewater;
(4.) 26 active wells;
(5.) 14,000 metered connections;
(6.) 2030 population of 108,700 more than doubled from 2006 of 45,200;
(7.) Aquifer safe yield of 9,000 a.f./year;
(8.) City water demands of 12,700 a.f. in 2006 and 30,400 a.f. in 2030;
(9.) 900 a.f./year of surface water rights by City from Pioneer Water Company and Porter Slough Ditch Company stock ownership;
(10.) The City charge for water of $3.14 per acre-foot.

Thank you for the opportunity of commenting on the City of Porterville Urban Water Management Plan.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

R. L. Schafer

RLS/mep

cc: TRA Agencies
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
291 N. MAIN ST. 
PORTERVILLE, CA 93257

ACCOUNT NUMBER | SERVICE ADDRESS | BILLING DATE | DELINQUENT DATE | TOTAL DUE |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

RETURN THIS STUB WITH YOUR PAYMENT

CITY OF PORTERVILLE, 291 N. MAIN ST., PORTERVILLE, CA 93257

[Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Period</th>
<th>No. of Days</th>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Meter Reading</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Billing Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/15 to 09/14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>WATER -5/8</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BACKFLOW SER 1*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT CHARGES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAST PAYMENT: 14.66- AMOUNT DUE: 12.50


**PAYMENT POLICY**

CURRENT CHARGES ARE NOW DUE AND PAYABLE.
To prevent a 10% penalty fee, payment for current charges must be received BEFORE 5:00 PM on the delinquent date.
Water may be disconnected for an unpaid previous balance.

KEEP THIS PORTION FOR YOUR RECORDS

ACCOUNT NUMBER: 43-80001-01
CUSTOMER NAME: CITY OF PORTER/WELL #22
SERVICE LOCATION: 101 N NBWCOMB ST
BILLING DATE: 10/17/2007
DELIQUENT DATE: 11/16/2007

NOTICE: IF YOU HAVE A PREVIOUS BALANCE AND IT REMAINS UNPAID, YOUR WATER MAY BE DISCONNECTED.
To prevent water shut-off and the related charges, payment for a previous balance must be received BEFORE 5:00 PM on the due date stated below. If you have already paid the previous balance, please disregard this notice. Thank you!

11/05/2007

MESSAGES:

DUE TO THE THANKSGIVING DAY HOLIDAY ON NOVEMBER 22, CUSTOMERS WITH REFUSE SERVICE ON THURSDAY WILL HAVE THEIR CONTAINERS SERVICED ON SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 24. REFUSE SERVICE WILL NOT BE AFFECTED FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 23. PLEASE REMEMBER TO SET CONTAINER OUT FOR SERVICE NO LATER THAN 6:00 A.M.

EMERGENCY SERVICE CALLS AFTER 5:00 PM, and on HOLIDAYS and WEEKENDS, call 782-7426

Questions regarding your bill, water consumption, or a previous balance? Please call 782-7438 or 782-7445.
Attachment 6 - UWMP Adoption Resolution

TO BE PROVIDED BY CITY OF PORTERVILLE
## Project Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Groundwater Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Integrated Regional Water Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Groundwater Data Sharing Agreement w/ Porterville ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate Surface Water Purchase Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Potential Sites for Groundwater Recharge Basins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Balance Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Construct Surface Water Treatment Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Alternatives for Comm/Indust/Inst Water Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Alternatives for Large Landscape Water Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Public Information Programs on Water Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Education Programs on Water Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Water Conservation Plan (Drought Contingency Plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water System Master Plan Update 2007-2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Alternative Uses for Recycled Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1) The tasks listed in this schedule do not include existing on-going efforts
2) Implementation of these tasks will be dependent on funding and staff availability
3) Preparation of an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan will be dependent on the City finding a suitable team of agencies to collaborate on the effort
December 27, 2007

Mr. Ben Kimball
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
291 N. Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257

Re: SCH#2006011033: CEQA Notice of Completion; draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for General Plan 2030 Update; City of Porterville; Tulare County, California

Dear Mr. Kimball:

The Native American Heritage Commission is the state agency designated to protect California’s Native American Cultural Resources. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archaeological resources, is a ‘significant effect’ requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per the California Code of Regulations §15064.5(b)(c) (CEQA guidelines). In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the ‘area of potential effect (APE), and if so, to mitigate that effect. To adequately assess the project-related impacts on historical resources, the Commission recommends the following action:

✓ Contact the appropriate California Historic Resources Information Center (CHRIS). Contact information for the Information Center nearest you is available from the State Office of Historic Preservation (916/653-7278)/
http://www.ohp.parks.ca.gov/1058/files/CHRIS%20Roster.pdf. The record search will determine:

- If a part or the entire APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
- If any known cultural resources have already been recorded in or adjacent to the APE.
- If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
- If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

✓ If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.

- The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.
- The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center.

✓ Contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for:

* A Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project area and information on tribal contacts in the project vicinity that may have additional cultural resource information. Please provide this office with the following citation format to assist with the Sacred Lands File search request: USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle citation with name, township, range and section.

* The NAHC advises the use of Native American Monitors to ensure proper identification and care given cultural resources that may be discovered. The NAHC recommends that contact be made with Native American Contacts on the attached list to get their input on potential project impact (APE). In some cases, the existence of a Native American cultural resources may be known only to a local tribe(s).

✓ Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.

- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5 (f). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.

- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.

✓ Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains or unmarked cemeteries in their mitigation plans.

* CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(d) requires the lead agency to work with the Native Americans identified by this Commission if the initial Study identifies the presence of likely presence of Native American human remains within the APE. CEQA Guidelines provide for agreements with Native American, identified by the
NAHC, to assure the appropriate and dignified treatment of Native American human remains and any associated grave liens.

✓ Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98 and Sec. §15064.5 (d) of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) mandate procedures to be followed, including that construction or excavation be stopped in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery until the county coroner or medical examiner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. Note that §7052 of the Health & Safety Code states that disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony.

✓ Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in §15370 of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines), when significant cultural resources are discovered during the course of project planning and implementation.

Please feel free to contact me at (916) 653-6251 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Attachment: List of Native American Contacts

Cc: State Clearinghouse
Santa Rosa Rancheria
Clarence Atwell, Chairperson
P.O. Box 8
Lemoore, CA 93245
(559) 924-1278
(559) 924-3583 Fax

Tule River Indian Tribe
Neil Peyron, Chairperson
P.O. Box 589
Porterville, CA 93258
chairman@tulerivertribe.nsn.
(559) 781-4271
(559) 781-4610 FAX

Wukchumni Tribe
Susan Weese, C/o Lalo Franco
2504 West Beech Street
Visalia, CA 93277
(559) 925-2831 - Lalo Franco

Sierra Nevada Native American Coalition
Lawrence Bill, Interim Chairperson
P.O. 125
Dunlap, CA 93621
(559) 338-2354

Kenneth Woodrow
1179 Rock Haven Ct.
Salinas, CA 93906
831-443-9702

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2006011033; CEQA Notice of Completion; draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for Porterville 2030 General Plan; Tulare County, California.