Call to Order
Roll Call

Adjourn to a Joint Meeting of the Porterville City Council and Porterville Redevelopment Agency.

JOINT CITYCOUNCIL/PORTERVILLE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AGENDA

Roll Call: Agency Members

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
This is the opportunity to address the City Council and/or Redevelopment Agency on any matter scheduled for Closed Session. Unless additional time is authorized by the Council, all commentary shall be limited to three minutes.

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY CLOSED SESSION:
A. Closed Session Pursuant to:
   1- Government Code Section 54956.9(b) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation – One Case.

During Closed Session, the Porterville Redevelopment Agency will adjourn to a meeting of the Porterville City Council.

CLOSED SESSION:
B. Closed Session Pursuant to:
   2- Government Code Section 54956.9(a) – Conference with Legal Counsel – John Stewart v. City of Porterville, Aaron Sutherland and Mark Azevedo, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 1:10-CV-00199-LJO-SMS.
   3- Government Code Section 54956.9(a) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Cynthia Bowles and Antonio Sousa v. City of Porterville, Officer Chris McGuire and Chief Chuck McMillan, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 1:10-CV-00937-LJO-GSA.
   4- Government Code Section 54956.9(c) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation – One Case.

7:00 P.M. RECONVENE OPEN SESSION
REPORT ON ANY COUNCIL ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

Pledge of Allegiance Led by Council Member Pete V. McCracken
Invocation
PROCLAMATIONS
Francisco Nuno – CCA Hall of Fame Inductee
Spirit of ’45 Day – August 14, 2010

PRESENTATIONS
Employee of the Month – Lupe Diaz
Tulare County – Public Health Strategic Plan

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
This is the opportunity to address the Council on any matter of interest, whether on the agenda or not. Unless additional time is authorized by the Council, all commentary shall be limited to three minutes.

CONSENT CALENDAR
All Consent Calendar Items are considered routine and will be enacted in one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these matters unless a request is made, in which event the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar.

1. City Council Minutes of June 15, 2010 and June 29, 2010

2. Negotiated Purchase of Eight Police Patrol Vehicles
Re: Authorizing staff to negotiate the purchase of eight (8) 2009 Ford Crown Victoria Police Interceptors with Downtown Ford of Sacramento.

3. Consolidated Waste Management Authority Membership Agreement Payment
Re: Authorizing payment to the CWMA for the City’s 2010/2011 membership contribution and the forwarding of funds received from the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.

4. Authorization to Advertise for Bids – Screening, Testing and Hauling Biosolids
Re: Authorizing staff to advertise for bids for the screening, testing, and hauling of biosolids to an approved facility.

5. Authorization to Advertise for Bids – Fire Station #2 Parking Lot Expansion Project
Re: Approving staff’s Plans and Project Manual for the project consisting of improvement for 34 parking stalls and consists of the installation of new paving, barrier curbs, drive approach and appurtenances.

6. Authorization to Negotiate a Contract for Architectural & Engineering Services for the Public Safety Building Project
Re: Authorizing staff to define a scope of professional services and negotiate a contract for the design and preparation of plans and project manual for the Public Safety Building Project.

7. Award of Contract - Jaye Street Sewer and Water Extension Project
Re: Awarding contract in the amount of $154,092.00 to 99 Pipeline, Inc. of Lindsay for the project consisting of the installation of sewer main, sewer laterals, water main, water services and related appurtenances in Jaye Street and Montgomery Avenue.
8. **Award of Contract – Olive Avenue Water Project**  
   Re: Awarding contract in the amount of $188,169.10 to Halopoff & Sons Inc. of Porterville, for the project consisting of the installation of a 12” water main and related appurtenances along Olive Avenue between Second Street and Plano Street.

9. **Acceptance of Project – Well No. 31 Project (Pumping Plant)**  
   Re: Accepting project as complete from Valle y Pump and Dairy Systems, and authorizing the filing of the Notice of Completion for the project consisting of the installation of a 250 HP pump, electrical system, above ground discharge piping and other items of work necessary to provide a complete pumping plant on the west side of Mathew Street south of Orange Avenue.

10. **New Measure R Local Consultant Preference Requirements**  
    Re: Considering adoption of the Measure R Local Preference Procedures, which were recently approved by the Tulare County Transportation Authority Board and requires all Request for Proposals/Request for Qualifications involving Measure R funding to include language establishing a local preference.

11. **Foothill Parkway Precise Alignment Plan**  
    Re: Authorizing the formation of a Foothill Parkway Alignment Focus Group for the purpose of reaching a consensus on a precise alignment for Foothill Parkway.

12. **Request to Apply for Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Funds**  
    Re: Authorizing the filing of an application with the Bureau of Justice Assistance Program for a grant award of $29,845.00.

13. **Proposed Agreement with City of Woodlake for Provision of Animal Sheltering Services**  
    Re: Considering approval of an agreement between the City of Porterville and the City of Woodlake for animal sheltering services.

14. **Sale of Surplus Vehicles to the City of Exeter**  
    Re: Approving the sale of surplus police vehicles to the City of Exeter for a purchase price of $4,800.00.

15. **Authorization to Roll Weed Abatement Balances to the Property Tax Rolls**  
    Re: Adopting a resolution authorizing the County Auditor to place uncollected weed abatement charges on the property tax rolls.

16. **Adoption of Annual Appropriation Limit**  
    Re: Approving a resolution adopting an appropriation limit of $47,774,303.00 for the 2010/2011 Fiscal Year as required by Article XIII – B of the California Constitution.

17. **Rescinding Resolution 81-2010 and Accepting Revised Official Canvass of Votes – June 8, 2010 Election**  
    Re: Approving a resolution rescinding Resolution 81-2010 and accepting the revised Official Canvass of Votes for the June 8, 2010 Election.
18. **Scheduling of FY 2010-2011 Budget Study Sessions**
Re: Approving the scheduling of Study Sessions for the purpose of reviewing the proposed FY 2010-2011 City Budget.

18a. **Request for a Letter of Support for the Tule River Indian Tribe’s Fee to Trust Application**
Re: Authorizing the Mayor to sign a letter of support for the Trust Conveyance of the Tribe’s 40 acre site, located in the vicinity of the Porterville Airport.

*A Council Meeting Recess Will Occur at 8:30 p.m., or as Close to That Time as Possible*

**SCHEDULED MATTERS**

19. **Consideration of Appointment to Measure R Citizens’ Oversight Committee**
Re: Considering appointment of an individual to serve as the City of Porterville’s representative on the Measure R Citizens’ Oversight Committee, for the term expiring on June 30, 2011.

20. **Designation of Voting Delegates and Alternate For League of California Cities 2010 Annual Conference – September 15-17, 2010**
Re: Considering designation of one City Council Member to serve as a voting delegate, and another to serve as an alternate, at the League of California Cities Annual Business Meeting.

21. **Award or Rejection Options – 2009/2010 Micro-Surfacing Project**
Re: Considering options regarding bids received for the project consisting of the installation of a durable thin asphalt overlay on several streets within the city.

22. **Preliminary Annual Engineer’s Report of Assessments for Lighting and Landscape Maintenance Districts and Setting a Public Hearing**
Re: Considering approval of resolutions pertaining to the initiation and preliminary approval of the Engineer’s Report for Fiscal Year 2010-2011, the levying and collection of assessments for Fiscal Year 2010-2011, and setting a Public Hearing for August 3, 2010.

23. **Consider Resolutions Pertaining to Engineer’s Reports and the Setting of a Public Hearing for Inclusion Within Lighting and Landscape Maintenance Districts for the Establishment of Tax Assessments Upon Parcels Located Within Garden Court Villas Subdivision, Meadow Breeze Phase 3 Subdivision, and Moorea Manor Subdivision**
Re: Considering approval of resolutions regarding the amendment and annexation processes for two existing districts and the formation of a new district, the levying and collection of assessments for Fiscal Year 2010-2011, and setting a Public Hearing for August 3, 2010.

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

**OTHER MATTERS**

**CLOSED SESSION**

Any Closed Session Items not completed prior to 7:00 p.m. will be considered at this time.

**ADJOURNMENT** - to the meeting of August 3, 2010 at 6:00 p.m.
It shall be the policy of the City Council to complete meetings, including closed sessions, by 11:00 p.m. unless, upon consensus, Council elects to continue past the adjournment hour.

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 Office of 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.

Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the City Council after distribution of the Agenda packet are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Office of City Clerk, 291 North Main Street, Porterville, CA 93257, and on the City’s website at www.ci.porterville.ca.us.
Called to Order at 6:00 p.m.
Roll Call: Council Member Hamilton, Council Member Irish, Council Member Martinez, Vice Mayor Ward (arrived at 6:02 p.m.), Mayor McCracken

Adjourned to a Joint Meeting of the Porterville City Council and Porterville Redevelopment Agency.

JOINT CITY COUNCIL/PORTERVILLE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AGENDA

Roll Call: Agency Member Hamilton, Agency Member Irish, Agency Member Martinez, Vice Chairman Ward (arrived at 6:02 p.m.), Chairman McCracken

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
None

CITY COUNCIL/REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY JOINT CLOSED SESSION:
A. Closed Session Pursuant to:
   1- Government Code Section 54956.9(b) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation – One Case.

   The Joint City Council/Redevelopment meeting adjourned during Closed Session to a meeting of the Porterville City Council.

CITY COUNCIL CLOSED SESSION:
B. Closed Session Pursuant to:
   4- Government Code Section 54956.9(b) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation – One Case.
   5- Government Code Section 54956.9(c) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation – Two Cases.

7:00 P.M. RECONVENE OPEN SESSION
REPORT ON ANY COUNCIL ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION
City Attorney Lew reported that no action was taken.

Pledge of Allegiance Led by Mayor Pete V. McCracken
Invocation – a moment of silence was observed.

PRESENTATIONS
   Employee Service Awards
   Southern California Edison – State of the Utility

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
   • John Coffee, Porterville, requested that the City Council Minutes of May 18, 2010, be removed from Consent Calendar and amended to change “shall” to “will” on page 2, paragraph 3; thanked the City for its work on North Prospect and expressed concern with the condition of other portions of Prospect Street.
   • John Hodge, address not given, spoke regarding “Keep the Spirit of ’45 Alive,” a national movement to make August 14th a National holiday to commemorate the ending of World War II and to recognize the “Greatest Generation.”
   • Edith Lavonne, 685 W. Morton, voiced support for the City’s public safety employees, lauding response times for both Police and Fire; spoke favorably of the Chamber of Commerce and the Shop Porterville First campaign; and spoke against the excessive use of consultants in government.
   • John Duran, address not given, spoke regarding gang violence, voicing concern with the DA’s recent plea bargain with a murder suspect; expressed concern with the condition of North Grand and inquired as to the status of repair; and spoke of in favor of establishing summer youth programs for local high school students and recent graduates.
   • Rick Land, address not given, came forward and introduced himself to the Council as a City Employee and Member of the Leadership Porterville Class of 2010.
   • Susie Blanchard, address not given, introduced herself as a Member of the Leadership Porterville Class of 2010.
   • Sarah Shapiro, address not given, introduced herself as a Member of the Leadership Porterville Class of 2010.
   • Khris Saleh, Porterville, congratulated Council Member-Elect Greg Shelton and Mayor McCracken for their successful campaigns, and thanked Council Member Felipe Martinez for his service; and expressed concern with the proposed funding in Item No. 11, and requested that more information be provided on Item Nos. 2 and 3.
   • Greg Shelton, 888 N. Williford Drive, spoke against 1) the proposed spending in Item No. 11 suggesting that such action would set precedent; and 2) the proposed amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Redevelopment Project No. 1.

CONSENT CALENDAR
   Item No. 2 was removed for further discussion.

   1. CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF MAY 18, 2010

Recommendation: That the City Council approve the Minutes of May 18, 2010.
3. APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE AND TULARE COUNTY HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

Recommendation: That the City Council approve and authorize the Mayor to sign Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement with Tulare County Health and Human Services Agency.

Documentation: M.O. 02-061510
Disposition: Approved

4. RESOLUTION OF INTENTION TO CONSTRUCT THE BEVERLY STREET WATER PROJECT, TO FORM THE BEVERLY STREET WATER FACILITY ASSESSMENT DISTRICT, AND TO LEVY ASSESSMENTS

Recommendation: That the Council adopt the proposed Resolution of Intention.

Documentation: Resolution 68-2010
Disposition: Approved


Recommendation: That the Council adopt the proposed resolution.

Documentation: Resolution 69-2010
Disposition: Approved

6. THIS ITEM HAS BEEN REMOVED.

7. CITY OF PORTERVILLE CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE – BIENNIAL REPORT AND AMENDMENT

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Accept the Conflicts and Disclosure Monitor Agency 2010 Biennial Report; and
2. Direct staff to amend said report for Council’s approval within ninety (90) days.

Documentation: M.O. 03-061510
Disposition: Approved
COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Vice Mayor Ward that the City Council approve Item No. 1, as amended, if necessary, to change “shall” to “will” on page 2, paragraph 3, and Items 3 through 7. The motion carried unanimously.

2. BUDGET ADJUSTMENT FOR THE 2009-10 FISCAL YEAR

Recommendation: That the Council approve the proposed budget adjustment and authorize staff to modify revenue and expenditure estimates as described on the schedule.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and the staff report was waived at the Council’s request.

The Council requested clarification regarding the legal services requiring special outside counsel and other litigation, which the City Manager provided.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Irish, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton that the City Council approve the proposed budget adjustment and authorize staff to modify revenue and expenditure estimates as described on the schedule. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved

PUBLIC HEARINGS

8. ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011 BUDGET

Recommendation: The City Manager proposes that the Council consider adoption of the proposed 2010-2011 Fiscal Year Budget, including any modifications and for the time period designated by Council.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item and presented the staff report.

Council Member Irish suggested that the Council consider postponing adoption of the proposed budget to allow the Council time to more thoroughly review the Budget and have their questions answered. He also suggested that additional study sessions be scheduled during the next 90 days, and made a motion as such.

The public hearing opened at 7:54 p.m.

- Brock Neeley, Porterville resident, spoke in favor of Council Member Irish’s motion and commented on the reconstruction of West North Grand.

- Edith LaVonne, address on record, spoke in favor of the motion and indicated that she wanted to review the proposed 2010-2011 Fiscal Year Budget.
Barry Caplan, Porterville resident, spoke in favor of the motion, and requested that last year’s budget be made available to the public in a format which would allow for easy comparison.

Dick Eckhoff, 197 N. Main, inquired as to how the motion on the floor would affect operations and the schedule of the Measure H Oversight Committee.

Greg Shelton, address on record, spoke in favor of delaying the adoption of the budget.

The public hearing was closed at 8:07 p.m.

Vice Mayor Ward inquired about personnel step increases and expenditures that may be more than what was budgeted for in 2009-2010, and the City Manager indicated that there was sufficient budgetary authorization for the 90 days.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Irish, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton that the City Council approve a Provisional Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Budget based on Fiscal Year 2009-2010 Budget for 90 days; and direct staff to schedule a series of budget study sessions. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved, and direction given.

9. BUDGET ADJUSTMENT/CITIZENS’ OPTION FOR PUBLIC SAFETY (COPS) PROGRAM FUNDING

Recommendation: That the City Council:

1. Conduct the public hearing to receive public comment;
2. Authorize use of these funds to offset costs for personnel assigned to the department’s Patrol Division, including necessary training, equipment, and overtime costs; and
3. Approve an increase to the Police Department’s 2009-2010 Budget, in the amount of $100,000.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and Captain Chris Dempsie presented the staff report.

The public hearing was opened at 8:09 p.m.

• Khris Saleh, 1206 W. Westfield Street, inquired about stipulations or conditions associated with the grant, and questioned whether the funds could be utilized in other areas of policing.

The public hearing was closed at 8:17 p.m.

The City Manager provided a brief explanation of the grant application process, which included indicating on the application the intended use of funds if received.
COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Council Member Felipe Martinez that the City Council authorize use of the funds to offset costs for personnel assigned to the department’s Patrol Division, including necessary training, equipment, and overtime costs; and an increase to the Police Department’s 2009-2010 Budget in the amount of $100,000. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved

10. RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY PERTAINING TO THE ACQUISITION OF A PORTION OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT APN #268-120-004, OWNER DARYL C. NICHOLSON, TRUSTEE OF THE DARYL C. NICHOLSON AND VICTORIA M. NICHOLSON TRUST – FOR THE PROPOSED SCRANTON AVENUE AND INDIANA STREET WIDENING PROJECT

Recommendation: That City Council:
1. Hear testimony from the owners and/or their representative(s), if they appear at the hearing and request to be heard;
2. Adopt the proposed Resolution of Necessity; and
3. Authorize the City Attorney to take all appropriate action necessary to acquire said property on behalf of the City of Porterville.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and City Attorney Julia Lew presented the staff report.

The public hearing was opened at 8:21 p.m.

• Barry Caplan, Porterville resident, requested clarification of Resolutions of Necessity and Eminent Domain.

The public hearing was closed at 8:25 p.m.

At the Mayor’s request, the City Manager explained that the project was under the Measure R Program and had been designated by TCAG as a regionally significant project. He stated that funding for the project was not local, and added that failure to acquire the property would delay the project.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Felipe Martinez, SECONDED by Council Member Irish that the City Council adopt the proposed Resolution of Necessity; and authorize the City Attorney to take all appropriate action necessary to acquire said property on behalf of the City of Porterville.

AYES: Irish, Martinez, Ward, McCracken
NOES: Hamilton
ABSTAIN: None
The Council recessed for ten minutes.

SCHEDULED MATTERS

11. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT BUSINESS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM – PORTERVILLE FORD LINCOLN MERCURY

Recommendation: That the City Council:

1. Consider approval of Community Development Block Grant Business Assistance Program (CDBG) funds in the amount of $100,000 to Porterville Ford Lincoln Mercury under the terms and conditions identified in items 1 through 4 proposed; and
2. Authorize a budget adjustment of $100,000 from General Fund carryover to be utilized for the Main Street Porter Slough project; and
3. Authorize the Mayor to sign all necessary documents to complete the transaction.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and Council Member Martinez noted a conflict of interest and left the Council Chambers. Development Associate Denise Marchant presented the staff report.

- The applicant, name not given, informed the Council that they have not entered escrow yet, and that the loan would be helpful, but that the project was not contingent upon approval.

A discussion ensued regarding the CDBG program and the funds available, during which the City Manager indicated that the item was being brought to Council because it was a large employer and because approval of the loan would require a budget adjustment out of another project.

Community Development Director Dunlap noted that the Small Business Development Center had reviewed the applicant’s business plan, and found the project to be advantageous. He also spoke about discretionary funds that are allocated to areas of need identified through CDBG Plan Development.

Staff addressed questions from the Council regarding how approval of the loan would affect the Main Street Porter Slough Project, and conditions regarding repayment of the loan.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Irish, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton that the City Council deny approval of Community Block Grant Business Assistance Program (CDBG) funds in the amount of $100,000 to Porterville Ford Lincoln Mercury.
AYES: Hamilton, Irish, Ward, McCracken
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Martinez
ABSENT: None

Disposition: Denied

The Council recessed for five minutes.

12. CONSIDERATION OF SETTING A SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING FOR THE RIVERWALK MARKETPLACE PHASE II PROJECT

Recommendation: That the City Council consider scheduling a special meeting on July 12, 2010 at 6:00 p.m.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and Community Development Director Brad Dunlap presented the staff report.

Mayor McCracken indicated that a scheduling conflict could exist depending on when the election results are certified by the County.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Council Member Martinez that the City Council schedule a special meeting on July 12, 2010 at 6:00 p.m.

AYES: Hamilton, Irish, Martinez, McCracken
NOES: Ward
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

Disposition: Approved

The City Council adjourned at 9:19 p.m. to a Joint Meeting of the Porterville City Council and the Porterville Redevelopment Agency.

JOINT CITY COUNCIL/REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MINUTES
June 15, 2010

Roll Call: Agency Member Hamilton, Agency Member Irish, Agency Member Martinez, Vice Chairman Ward, Chairman McCracken

Agency Members Hamilton and Irish noted conflicts of interest, recused themselves, and left the Council Chambers.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
• Dorothy Martin, 141 S. Williams Drive, spoke against the inclusion of Corona Heights Hill into the RDA project area.
• Roger Hunt, Tulare County Assistant Resource Management Analyst, voiced opposition to the 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan as proposed in Item PRA 01.
• Greg Shelton, address on record, spoke in opposition to proceeding with the proposed amendment to the Redevelopment Plan.
• Dick Eckhoff, address on record, spoke of RDA monies benefitting Tulare County through the increase of property values; commented that zoning dictated where low income housing would be allowed, not the RDA; and voiced support for the proposed amendment.
• Rosemarie Wiggins, 166 South Williams Drive, spoke against the inclusion of the Corona Heights area in the RDA project area.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
City Manager Lollis reported that two letters had been received prior to the Meeting, and one letter had been received during the meeting, all of which related to the Item PRA-01.

• Robert and Carolyn Krum, 140 So. Park Drive, submitted a letter in opposition to the inclusion of the Corona Heights area.
• Dorothy Martin, 141 S. Williams Drive, submitted a letter opposing the inclusion of Corona Heights Hill into the RDA project area.
• Perley Gilbert, 157 So. Williams Drive, submitted a letter opposing the rezoning of the area of Williams Drive, Park Drive and Corona.

PUBLIC HEARINGS
PRA-01 PROPOSED 2010 AMENDMENT TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE PORTERVILLEREDEVELOPMENT PROJECT NO. 1

Recommendation: Open and conduct the joint public hearing pursuant to the Joint Public Hearing Procedures contained under Tab 1 of the Record and consider and adopt all Resolutions and the Ordinance as appropriate.

Agency Board Actions:
1. Adopt a Draft Resolution of the Porterville Redevelopment Agency Making and Approving Findings Supporting the Inclusion of Certain Parcels of Land Which Are in Agricultural Use Within the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1, as Proposed to be Amended by the 2010 Amendment;

2. Adopt a Draft Resolution of the Porterville Redevelopment Agency Finding and Determining that the Use of Taxes Allocated from the Territory Proposed to be Added to the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1 by the Proposed 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1, for the Purpose of Providing Affordable Housing Outside the
Amended Project Area, Will be of Benefit to the Added Territory and the Overall Redevelopment Project;

3. Adopt a Draft Resolution of the Porterville Redevelopment Agency Certifying the Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1; Making Written Findings Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations; and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Program; and

4. Adopt a Draft Resolution of the Porterville Redevelopment Agency Approving the Proposed 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1 and Recommending the City of Porterville City Council Approve Said Amendment.

City Council Actions:

1. Adopt a Draft Resolution of the City Council of the City of Porterville Finding and Determining that the Use of Taxes Allocated from the Territory Proposed to be Added to the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1 by the Proposed 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1, for the Purpose of Providing Affordable Housing Outside the Amended Project Area, Will be of Benefit to the Added Territory and the Overall Redevelopment Project;

2. Adopt a Draft Resolution of the City Council of the City of Porterville Certifying the Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1; Making Written Findings Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations; and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Program;

3. Adopt a Draft Resolution of the City Council of the City of Porterville Receiving and Approving Written Findings Prepared in Response to Written Objections, Communications and Suggestions Received at or Before the Joint Public Hearing Conducted for the Proposed 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1;

4. Unless written objections are received, approve the proposed Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Porterville Approving and Adopting the 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1 and give first reading of the draft Ordinance; and

5. Waive further reading of the draft Ordinance, approve Ordinance and order to print.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and Community Development Director Dunlap
presented the staff report. Following the staff report he addressed some of the comments made in Oral Communications, particularly the concerns about high-density, low-income housing being constructed in the Corona Heights area.

Council Member Felipe Martinez stated that the costs to build on the side of hill would deter the construction of high-density, low-income housing, and added that he did not believe that the value of the Corona Heights properties would decrease as a result of being included in the Redevelopment Project Area.

In response to confusion regarding a change in the zoning of Corona Heights, a discussion ensued regarding the 2030 General Plan, the zone change process, and construction constraints in the area which would make high density residential unlikely.

Mayor McCracken inquired about how the Council/Agency would proceed if they were to amend the proposed project area. Vanessa Lockhart, Redevelopment Agency Counsel, and City Attorney Julia Lew advised the Council/Agency on how to proceed with an amendment. She noted that they were currently sitting as the City Council, Planning Commission and Redevelopment Agency.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION: MOVED by Vice Mayor Ward, SECONDED by Council Member Martinez that the City Council, acting as the Planning Commission, submit to the Redevelopment Agency and City Council a report and recommendation to modify the Added Territory to remove the land east of Plano, extending between Williams Drive and Corona Drive east to Isham.

AYES: Martinez, Ward
NOES: McCracken
ABSTAIN: Hamilton, Irish
ABSENT: None

The joint public hearing for the purpose of discussing the reduction of the added territory was opened at 10:13 p.m.

- Dorothy Martin, address on record, spoke in favor of the amendment which would exclude the Corona Heights area and thanked the City Council.
- Perly Gilbert, address on record, spoke in favor of the exclusion of Corona Heights and thanked the Council.
- Rosemarie Wiggins, address on record, thanked the Council for considering the removal of Corona Heights from the Added Territory.

The public hearing was closed at 10:15 p.m.

The Agency/Council recessed for five minutes to allow Legal Counsel the opportunity to
discuss the required action.

**AGENCY ACTION:** MOVED by Agency Member Martinez, SECONDED by Vice Chair Ward
PRA 01-061510

that the Redevelopment Agency accept the recommendation of the Planning Commission to modify the Added Territory to remove the land east of Plano, extending between Williams Drive and Corona Drive east to Isham.

AYES: Martinez, Ward, McCracken
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Hamilton, Irish
ABSENT: None

**COUNCIL ACTION:** MOVED by Council Member Martinez, SECONDED by Vice Mayor Ward
M.O. 09-061510

that the City Council accept the recommendation of the Planning Commission to modify the Added Territory to remove the land east of Plano, extending between Williams Drive and Corona Drive east to Isham.

AYES: Martinez, Ward, McCracken
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Hamilton, Irish
ABSENT: None

**AGENCY ACTION:** MOVED by Agency Member Martinez, SECONDED by Vice Chair Ward
PRA 2010-08

Porterville

that the Redevelopment Agency adopt a Draft Resolution of the Redevelopment Agency Making and Approving Findings Supporting the Inclusion of Certain Parcels of Land Which Are in Agricultural Use Within the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1, as Proposed to be Amended by the 2010 Amendment; adopt a Draft Resolution of the Porterville Redevelopment Agency Finding and Determining that the Use of Taxes Allocated from the Territory Proposed to be Added to the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1 by the Proposed 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1, for the Purpose of Providing Affordable Housing Outside the Amended Project Area, Will be of Benefit to PRA 2010-10 the Added Territory and the Overall Redevelopment Project; adopt a Draft Resolution of the Porterville Redevelopment Agency Certifying the Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1; Making Written Findings Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations; and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Program; adopt a Draft Resolution of the Porterville Redevelopment Agency Approving the Proposed 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1 and Recommending the City of Porterville City Council

PRA 2010-09

PRA 2010-11
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PRA 02-061510 Approve Said Amendment; and direct staff to change the boundaries to reflect the previous action of the Council regarding the removal of the land east of Plano, extending between Williams Drive and Corona Drive east to Isham.

AYES: Martinez, Ward, McCracken
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Hamilton, Irish
ABSENT: None

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Martinez, SECONDED by Vice Mayor Ward that the City Council adopt a Draft Resolution of the City Council of the City of Porterville Finding and Determining that the Use of Taxes Allocated from the Territory Proposed to be Added to the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1 by the Proposed 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1, for the Purpose of Providing Affordable Housing Outside the Amended Project Area, Will be of Benefit to the Added Territory and the Overall Redevelopment Project; adopt a Draft Resolution of the City Council of the City of Porterville Certifying the Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1; Making Written Findings Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations; and Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring Program; adopt a Draft Resolution of the City Council of the City of Porterville Receiving and Approving Written Findings Prepared in Response to Written Objections, Communications and Suggestions Received at or Before the Joint Public Hearing Conducted for the Proposed 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1; approve the draft Ordinance being, AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE 2010 AMENDMENT TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE PORTERVILLE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT NO. 1, waive further reading, and order the Ordinance to print; and direct staff to change the boundaries to reflect the removal of the land east of Plano, extending between Williams Drive and Corona Drive east to Isham.

AYES: Martinez, Ward, McCracken
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Hamilton, Irish
ABSENT: None

The City Attorney read the ordinance by title only.

Disposition: Approved, as amended.
Council Members Hamilton and Irish returned to the Council Chambers.

**SCHEDULED MATTERS**

**PRA-02 REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY 2010/2011 BUDGET**

Recommendation: That the City Council:

1. Adopt draft resolution deferring the Redevelopment Agency’s annual payments to Risk Management fund for the reconstruction of the Hockett Parking Lot;
2. Adopt draft resolution deferring the Redevelopment Agency’s annual payments to the City for the loan which was used for the development of parking lots; and
3. Adopt draft resolution providing General Fund Reserves to the Redevelopment Agency for the payment of the Porterville Civic Development Foundation loan which was used for the Redevelopment Amendment.

That the Porterville Redevelopment Agency:

1. Adopt the proposed 2010-2011 Redevelopment Agency Budget which reflects the above draft resolutions.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and Community Development Director Dunlap presented the staff report.

A brief discussion took place regarding the deferments and the California Redevelopment Association’s litigation against the State of California regarding the State’s taking of redevelopment funds.

**COUNCIL ACTION:** MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Vice Mayor Ward that the City Council adopt the draft resolution deferring the Redevelopment Agency’s annual payments to Risk Management fund for the reconstruction of the Hockett Parking Lot; adopt the draft resolution deferring the Redevelopment Agency’s annual payments to the City for the loan which was used for the development of parking lots; and adopt the draft resolution providing General Fund Reserves to the Redevelopment Agency for the payment of the Porterville Civic Development Foundation loan which was used for the Redevelopment Amendment.

AYES: Hamilton, Martinez, Ward, McCracken
NOES: Irish
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

**AGENCY ACTION:** MOVED by Agency Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Vice Chair Ward PRA 2010-12 that the Redevelopment Agency adopt the proposed 2010-2011
Redevelopment Agency Budget which reflects the above draft resolutions.

AYES: Hamilton, Martinez, Ward, McCracken
NOES: Irish
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

Disposition: Approved

The Joint Redevelopment Agency/City Council Meeting adjourned at 10:34 p.m. to a Meeting of the Porterville City Council.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
- Dick Eckhoff, address on record, inquired as to how many properties were included in the area removed from the Redevelopment Project Area; and suggested that some of those property owners might have favored remaining in the Project Area.
- Dorothy Martin, address on record, commented that everyone affected by the proposed Redevelopment Area amendment had had the opportunity to voice their opinion.
- Jessica Mahoney, Terra Bella, thanked Council Member Felipe Martinez for his service to the community, and expressed surprise with the outcome of the election.

OTHER MATTERS
- Council Member Hamilton offered condolences to the family of the youth who recently died in a vehicle versus pedestrian accident.
- Council Member Felipe Martinez lauded the Fly-In, Spaghetti Dinner, and Holy Cross Church Car Show events.
- Vice Mayor Ward spoke of his attendance at the Fair Campaign Kick-Off; thanked the citizens for taking the time to vote; congratulated Mr. McCracken and Mr. Shelton for their victories; and thanked all of the candidates for participating in the election.
- Mayor McCracken proposed a change in the methodology for selecting the Mayor and Vice Mayor and provided a hand-out of his proposal to the Council Members.
- Council Member Felipe Martinez spoke of the upcoming Class Reunion at Porterville High.
- Public Works Director Baldo Rodriguez reported on the bid opening for the Beverly Street Water Project, noting that eight bids had been received, the lowest being $103,000.

ADJOURNMENT
The City Council adjourned at 10:47 p.m. to the meeting of June 29, 2010 at 6:00 p.m.

SEAL
Luisa Herrera, Deputy City Clerk
Called to Order at 7:00 p.m.
Roll Call: Council Member Hamilton, Council Member Irish, Council Member Martinez, Vice Mayor Ward, Mayor McCracken

Pledge of Allegiance led by Council Member Felipe A. Martinez
Invocation – a moment of silence was observed.

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**
None

Mayor McCracken recommended, with no objections, that the Consent Calendar be considered after the Public Hearing Item.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

11. BEVERLY STREET WATER FACILITY DISTRICT

Recommendation: That the City Council:

1. Open the Public Hearing and take comments and accept any ballots;
2. Instruct the City Clerk to receive all ballots, count and report to the Council the outcome of the voting; and
3. If there is a majority favorable vote, approve the draft resolution for the formation of the Beverly Street Water Facility District and the levying of the assessments.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and Public Works Director Baldo Rodriguez presented the staff report.

The public hearing was opened at 7:04 p.m.

- Dale Kittrell, Porterville resident, expressed his concern that there had not been enough ballots submitted, and requested that the period to submit ballots be extended.

City Attorney Lew advised that the Council could extend the public hearing and the time to submit ballots. At the Council’s request, the Deputy City Clerk disclosed that a total of fourteen of the thirty ballots had been received to date. City Attorney Lew clarified that the results would be determined by the majority of ballots received in favor or in opposition, and would not be affected by the total number of ballots received. Following the City Attorney’s comments, Mr. Kittrell withdrew his request for an extension.

The Mayor announced the last call for ballot submission.
Jessica Mahoney, Terra Bella resident, inquired about ballot language and information being provided for Spanish speaking residents.

The public hearing was closed at 7:11 p.m.

The City Attorney advised that the Council consider Item No. 4 following results of the election.

The Deputy City Clerk and City Attorney exited the Council Chambers for ballot tabulation.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

Item No. 4 was pulled.

1. **CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 2010**

   Recommendation: That the City Council accept the Minutes of June 1, 2010.

   Documentation: M.O. 01-062910
   Disposition: Approved

2. **ACCEPTANCE OF PROJECT – MUNICIPAL POOL COMPLEX WATER SLIDE PROJECT**

   Recommendation: That City Council:
   1. Accept the project as complete; and
   2. Authorize the filing of the Notice of Completion.

   Documentation: M.O. 02-062910
   Disposition: Approved

3. **ACCEPTANCE OF PROJECT – PROSPECT STREET RECONSTRUCTION AND CONCRETE IMPROVEMENTS**

   Recommendation: That City Council:
   1. Accept the project as complete; and
   2. Authorize the filing of the Notice of Completion.

   Documentation: M.O. 03-062910
   Disposition: Approved

5. **REQUEST FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES TO UPDATE FIVE YEAR BIOSOLIDS MANAGEMENT PLAN AND PRE-APPLICATION**

   Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Approve obtaining the services of Carollo Engineers to assist in updating the 5-Year Biosolids Plan and Pre-Application at a cost of $17,000; and
2. Authorize the Mayor to sign the agreement.

Documentation: M.O. 04-062910
Disposition: Approved

6. APPROVAL OF MEASURE ‘R’ SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT - HERITAGE CENTER TRAILWAY EXTENSION (RAILS TO TRAILS PHASE II) PROJECT

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Approve the draft resolution affirming the City Council’s support of the Heritage Center Trailway Extension (Rails to Trails Phase II) project;
2. Authorize the Mayor and City Manager to execute the Heritage Center Trailway Extension (Rails to Trails Phase II) Supplemental Agreement; and
3. Direct the City Clerk to transmit the executed Supplemental Agreement to the Tulare County Authority

Documentation: Resolution 78-2010
Disposition: Approved

7. APPROVAL OF WILDLAND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AGREEMENT - HERITAGE CENTER TRAILWAY EXTENSION (RAILS TO TRAILS PHASE II) PROJECT

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Approve the draft Professional Services Agreement with Willdan for the Heritage Center Trailway Extension (Rails to Trails Phase II) project; and
2. Authorize the Mayor to execute the implementation of the agreement by his signature.

Documentation: M.O. 05-062910
Disposition: Approved

8. WATER SHARE PURCHASES

Recommendation: That the City Council authorize the Public Works Director to bid on PWC shares during the 2010/2011 FY in an effort to secure as many shares as possible for the $30,000.00 allocated.

Documentation: M.O. 06-062910
Disposition: Approved
9. **ASPHALT OVERLAY PROGRAM FOR 2010/2011**

Recommendation: That the City Council approve the 2010/2011 Asphalt Overlay Program authorizing expenditure of the budgeted funds.

Documentation: M.O. 07-062910

Disposition: Approved

10. **ACQUISITION OF RIGHT OF WAY – PROPERTY LOCATED AT APN 269-120-004 OWNER JUAN GONZALEZ – JAYE/GIBBONS STREET IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

Recommendation: That City Council:

1. Authorize staff to begin escrow, with the City paying escrow fees;
2. Authorize staff to make payment to Juan Gonzalez, in the amount of $150,150.00, less any previously paid relocation claims, after completion of escrow;
3. Authorize the Mayor to sign all necessary documents; and
4. Authorize staff to record all documents with the County Recorder.

Documentation: Resolution 79-2010

Disposition: Approved

**COUNCIL ACTION:** MOVED by Council Member Martinez, SECONDED by Vice Mayor Ward that the City Council approve Item No. 1 through 3, and 5 through 10, noting Vice Mayor Ward’s abstention from Item No. 9. The motion carried unanimously.

11. **BEVERLY STREET WATER FACILITY DISTRICT**

The City Clerk returned and reported that of the 14 ballots received 100% were in favor of the formation of the water facility district and assessment charge.

**COUNCIL ACTION:** MOVED by Council Member Martinez, SECONDED by Vice Mayor Ward that the City Council approve the draft resolution for the formation of the Beverly Street Water Facility District and the levying of the assessments. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved

4. **AWARD OF CONTRACT - BEVERLY STREET WATER PROJECT**

Recommendation: That City Council:

1. Award the Beverly Street Water Project to 99 Pipeline, in the
amount of $103,869.00 upon the successful completion of the Beverly Water Facility District;
2. Authorize progress payments up to 90% of the contract amount;
3. Authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen construction costs;
4. Authorize a 10% construction management, quality control and inspection services fee ($10,386.90); and
5. Authorize the appropriation of $124,642.80 from General Fund Reserves to finance the construction and related management services; or
6. If the formation of the Beverly Water Facility District is not successful, do not award the project to the lowest qualified bidder.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item. The staff report was waived at the Council’s request.

Vice Mayor Ward asked if the City was required to select the lowest responsive bidder or if there was a flexibility which would allow the selection of a local contractor. City Attorney Lew indicated that there was a small window relative to tax and business licenses that could be considered, but a policy would have to be set up ahead of time. The Vice Mayor requested that staff look into that option.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Council Member Martinez that the City Council Award the Beverly Street Water Project to 99 Pipeline, in the amount of $103,869.00 upon the successful completion of the Beverly Water Facility District; authorize progress payments up to 90% of the contract amount; authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen construction costs; authorize a 10% construction management, quality control and inspection services fee ($10,386.90); and authorize the appropriation of $124,642.80 from General Fund Reserves to finance the construction and related management services. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
None

OTHER MATTERS
- Council Member Hamilton commented on the Porterville High School Class of ’75 Reunion that had taken place on Saturday.
- Council Member Felipe Martinez indicated that he also attended the reunion and enjoyed the event.
- Mayor McCracken announced that the installation of the new Council would take place on July 6th.
ADJOURNMENT

The Council adjourned at 7:27 p.m. to the Council Meeting of July 6, 2010 at 6:00 p.m.

_____________________________
Luisa Herrera, Deputy City Clerk

SEAL

_____________________________
Pete V. McCracken, Mayor
SUBJECT: NEGOTIATED PURCHASE OF EIGHT POLICE PATROL VEHICLES

SOURCE: Finance Department/Purchasing Division

COMMENT: In accordance with the City’s Purchasing Policy and Procedure Manual, as amended by Resolution No. 122-87, the Porterville Police Department requests approval to negotiate the purchase of eight (8) Police patrol vehicles. Seven (7) vehicles are scheduled for replacement this fiscal year and one (1) vehicle sustained major damage in a traffic accident last December, resulting in a total loss. A subrogation demand is pending on the damaged vehicle; however, the at-fault driver was significantly underinsured, and anticipated insurance reimbursement is less than $10,000.

Staff has been advised that Downtown Ford of Sacramento has eight new 2009 model Ford Crown Victoria CHP Pattern Police Interceptors in stock which can be obtained using the City of Sacramento’s contract. These vehicles are identical to the City’s specifications and are $1,000 less than the State of California contract price for the 2010 model interceptor. Staff has researched availability and has learned that there are no other 2009’s left in California, and all remaining 2010 models are committed to other agencies. Since Council will not adopt the 2010-11 Budget until October, Staff is concerned that we will lose significant savings of dollars and time unless we act promptly to secure these remaining 2009 vehicles.

Staff therefore requests approval to purchase eight (8) new, 2009 Ford Crown Victoria Police Interceptors using the City of Sacramento’s contract with Downtown Ford in Sacramento, CA. Funds for the purchase are available in the department’s Equipment Replacement Fund.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council authorize Staff to negotiate the purchase of eight (8) 2009 Ford Crown Victoria Police Interceptors utilizing the City of Sacramento’s contract with Downtown Ford; and further, that Council authorize payment upon satisfactory delivery of the equipment.

D.D. Appropriated/Funded C.M. Item No. 2
SUBJECT: CONSOLIDATED WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY MEMBERSHIP AGREEMENT PAYMENT

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Field Services Division

COMMENT: On December 8, 1999, the Cities of Visalia, Porterville, Lindsay, Dinuba and Tulare entered into a Joint Powers Agreement forming the Consolidated Waste Management Authority (CWMA). By this agreement, a Joint Powers Authority was created to act as a regional agency and independent public agency to comprehensively plan, develop, operate, and manage the transformation, diversion, recycling, processing and disposal of solid waste within the members’ jurisdictions. On November 26, 2002, the cities of Exeter, Farmersville and Woodlake joined the CWMA.

On November 17, 2005, the CWMA Board approved Tulare County joining and on January 26, 2006, formally accepted the City of Woodlake’s withdrawal. On April 14, 2006, the City Council authorized the mayor to sign the new agreement with CWMA with these changes. The City of Porterville’s contribution share for FY 2010/2011 is $52,071.36. The City’s membership fee is paid from the Solid Waste Fund.

In June 2010, the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery awarded a total of $66,425 to the Consolidated Waste Management Authority members. The City of Porterville received a check for $6,409 as its portion of the awarded funds. These funds are used to finance the CWMA recycling education, community awareness, and clean-up programs within these eight agencies and need to be forwarded to the CWMA.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Authorize issuance of a check to CWMA for the following:
   a. Payment of $52,071.36 for the City’s membership contribution; and
   b. $6,409 for the City’s portion of CWMA’s awarded funds received from the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.
SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS - SCREENING, TESTING AND HAULING BIOSOLIDS

SOURCE: Public Works Department – Wastewater Treatment Facility

COMMENT: The City of Porterville Wastewater Treatment Facility produces approximately 1,200 metric tons of Biosolids annually and produces an additional several hundred tons of Biosolids from the cleaning of its anaerobic digesters. Staff is requesting approval to bid for the screening, testing and hauling of Biosolids to an approved facility.

The City currently applies Biosolids as a soil amendment to City owned farmland at agronomic rates. The quantity of Biosolids applied to the farmland is determined by the type of crop and its nitrogen requirement.

The acreage needed to dispose of the entire annual production of Biosolids is greater than the annual acreage available for Biosolids application. This situation leaves the City with an annual inventory of approximately 40 - 45% of its annual Biosolids production that must be screened, tested and hauled to an approved facility for disposal. The estimated cost is $75,000.

Wastewater Treatment Facility’s Operating Budget is the funding source and is included in the un-adopted 2010/11 Annual Budget.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council authorize staff to advertise for bids for the screening, testing, and hauling of Biosolids to an approved facility.
SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS – FIRE STATION #2 PARKING LOT EXPANSION PROJECT

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: Plans and Project Manual have been prepared for the Fire Station #2 Parking Lot Expansion Project and is available for Council's review in the La Barca Room. The project is located at 500 N. Newcomb. In order to take full advantage of the available funding, the project has been separated into two parts. The Base Bid includes improvements for 34 parking stalls and consists of installing new paving, barrier curbs, drive approach, and appurtenances. Add Alternate A includes improvements for 9 additional stalls and consists of installing new paving, barrier curbs, and appurtenances.

The estimated probable cost for the base bid for the Fire Station #2 Parking Lot Expansion Project is $49,648.50 with $4,964.85 required for the construction contingency (10%). An additional $4,964.85 is required for construction management, quality control and inspection. The total estimated cost for the project is $59,578.20. An Estimate of Probable Cost is attached for Council's review.

General Fund Carryover is the funding source for this project as approved in the 09/10 Annual Budget. Staff will seek Council’s authorization to award the base bid, plus the "add alternate," as funding permits.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Approve staff's recommended Plans and Project Manual; and

2. Authorize staff to advertise for bids on the Fire Station #2 Parking Lot Expansion Project.

ATTACHMENTS: Locator Map
Estimate of Probable Cost

P:\pubwork\Engineering\Council Items\Authorization to Advertise for Bids - Fire Station #2 Parking Lot Expansion Project - 2010-07-20.doc

Appropriated/Funded: [Signature]
CM: [Signature]

Item No. 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mobilization/Demobilization</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cleaning and Grubbing</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Import Fill - off-site delivery, includes hauling and traffic, and grading</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$2,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Remove Existing Pavement</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Remove Existing Concrete</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Remove Existing Curb</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Remove existing water line</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Remove and Relocate Existing Meter</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Remove and Relocate Existing Back Flow Preventer</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Adjust sewer cleanouts to grade and sewer cleanouts per detail shown</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Install Barrier Curb</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$7,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Install Asphalt Concrete</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$12,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Install 5&quot; of Class 2 Base</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$9,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Install Parking Stripes</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $45,135.00
10% Estimating Contingency $4,513.50
Total $49,648.50

Alternate Bid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mobilization/Demobilization</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cleaning and Grubbing</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Import Fill - off-site delivery, includes hauling and traffic, and grading</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Remove Existing Curb</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$430.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adjust sewer cleanouts to grade and sewer cleanouts per detail shown</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Install Barrier Curb</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Install Asphalt Concrete</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$3,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Install 6&quot; of Class 2 Base</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$2,475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Install Parking Stripes</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $12,905.00
10% Estimating Contingency $1,290.50
Total $14,195.50

Total Cost for Base bid and Alternate Bid $63,844.00

Project Manager: [Signature] 7-13-10
Public Works Director: [Signature] 7-13-10
City Engineer: [Signature] 7-13-10
City Manager: [Signature] 7-13-10
COUNCIL AGENDA: JULY 20, 2010

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO NEGOTIATE A CONTRACT FOR ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING PROJECT

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: On April 16, 2010 staff received 21 Statement of Qualifications\Proposals for design and preparation of plans and project manual for the Public Safety Building Project. The proposals were ranked in accordance with the "Policy for Selecting Consultants to Provide Architectural, Engineering and Similar Services" adopted by City Council (Resolution 16-2001). On June 23, 2010 staff interviewed the four top rated firms wherein they were rated according to the aforementioned policy, with the following results:

1. Taylor-Teter Partnership
   Fresno, CA            89.8 pts.
2. RRM Design Group
   San Luis Obispo, CA   89.0 pts.
3. PMSM Architects
   Paso Robles, CA       86.4 pts.
4. LEA Architects, LLC
   Phoenix, AZ           82.8 pts.

Staff is expecting consultant fees to be in the range of approximately $350,000. Staff will seek City Council approval of a Service Agreement at a later meeting, once a complete project scope is established.

The funding source will be from the 2010/2011 “Local” Measure ‘H’ tax revenue funds.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Authorize staff to define a scope of professional services and negotiate a contract with Taylor-Teter Partnership; and

2. Authorize staff to negotiate a contract with the 2nd or 3rd ranked firm if staff is unable to negotiate an acceptable contract with Taylor-Teter Partnership.

ATTACHMENT: Locator Map

P:\pubworks\Engineering\Council Items\Authorization to Negotiate a Contract for Architectural & Engineering Services for Public Safety Building - 2010-07-20.doc

Dir. Appropriated/Funded CM Item No. 0
COUNCIL AGENDA: JULY 20, 2010

SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT – JAYE STREET SEWER AND WATER EXTENSION PROJECT

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: On July 8, 2010, staff received seven (7) bids for the Jaye Street Sewer and Water Extension Project. Regrettably, one of the bids was deemed unresponsive to the City’s specifications.

The project includes installation of sewer main, sewer laterals, water main, water services and related appurtenances in Jaye Street and Montgomery Avenue in preparation of the upcoming Jaye Street/Montgomery Avenue Roundabout Project and the South Jaye Street Extension Project.

The Engineer’s Estimate of Probable Cost for the project is $270,600. The low bid for the project is 43% below the Engineer’s estimate. An additional $15,409.20 is required for the construction contingency (10%). An additional $15,409.20 is required for construction management, quality control and inspection (10%). The total estimated cost for the project is $184,910.40.

The Sewer Revolving Fund is the funding source for the sewer component of this project as approved in the 09/10 Annual Budget. The un-adopted 10/11 Annual Budget allocated funds within the Water Reserve Fund for the construction of the water system.

The bids are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 99 Pipeline, Inc. Lindsay, CA</td>
<td>$154,092.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Halopoff &amp; Sons Inc. Porterville, CA</td>
<td>$174,702.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Davis Moreno Construction Fresno, CA</td>
<td>$184,003.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sierra Construction &amp; Excavation Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>$188,808.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. HPS Mechanical Inc.  
   Bakersfield, CA  
   $247,022.00
6. Superior Pipeline, Inc.  
   Bakersfield, CA  
   $251,220.70

Staff has found the low bid acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Award the Jaye Street Sewer and Water Extension Project to 99 Pipeline, Inc. in the amount of $154,092.00;

2. Authorize progress payments up to 90% of the contract amount;

3. Authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen construction costs and 10% for construction management, quality control and inspection; and

4. Approve the expenditure of funds for the water system component of this project as outlined in the un-adopted 10/11 Annual Budget.

ATTACHMENT: Locator Map
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SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT – OLIVE AVENUE WATER PROJECT

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: On July 8, 2010, staff received seven (7) bids for the Olive Avenue Water Project. Regrettably, two of the bids were deemed unresponsive to the City’s specifications.

The project consists of installing a 12” water main and related appurtenances along Olive Avenue between Second Street and Plano Street. The new infrastructure is considered Master Plan facilities and will assist in the development of the new Courthouse site and all adjacent properties.

The engineer’s estimate for probable cost of the project is $266,945. The low bid for the project is 29.5% below the Engineer’s estimate. An additional $18,816.91 is required for construction contingency (10%), and $18,816.91 is required for construction management, quality control and inspection. The total estimated cost for the project is $225,802.92.

The Water Replacement Fund (Developer Fees) is the funding source for the project as approved in the 09/10 Annual Budget and an additional $147,000 was augmented by action of the City Council on May 4, 2010.

The bids are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Halopoff and Sons Inc. Porterville, CA</td>
<td>$188,169.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 99 Pipeline Inc. Lindsay, CA</td>
<td>$192,888.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sierra Construction &amp; Excavation Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>$198,532.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Davis Moreno Construction Fresno, CA</td>
<td>$220,251.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. HPS Mechanical Inc. Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>$248,835.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff has found the low bid acceptable.
RECOMMENDATION: That City Council:

1. Award the Olive Avenue Water Project to Halopoff and Sons, in the amount of $188,169.10;

2. Authorize progress payments up to 90% of the contract amount; and

3. Authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen construction costs and 10% for construction management, quality control and inspection.

ATTACHMENT: Locator Map
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COUNCIL AGENDA: JULY 20, 2010

SUBJECT: ACCEPTANCE OF PROJECT – WELL NO 31 PROJECT (PUMPING PLANT)

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: Valley Pump and Dairy Systems has completed the Well No. 31 Project per plans and specifications. The well is located on the west side of Mathew Street south of Orange Avenue. This contract is the second phase of the well project which consists of the installation of a 250 HP pump, electrical system, above ground discharge piping and other items of work necessary to provide a complete pumping plant.

Staff carefully tracks construction costs of all Capital Improvements Projects. Consistent with Council’s direction, staff has commenced with the reporting of project construction expenditures. On August 18, 2009, City Council authorized expenditure of $659,075 for construction, construction management and quality control services for the Well No. 31 Project. The following itemizes the construction-related cost in two categories: 1) the construction contract, and 2) a combination of construction management and quality control.

1) Final construction cost is $583,266.09.

2) Construction management and quality control costs are $47,225.95, which is 8.2% of the awarded construction contract. This amount is higher than the 5% construction management amount requested at the time of award. In hindsight, this percentage was an error. The actual requested percentage should have been near 10%. Another contributing factor to a higher than normal management cost is that the City utilizes consultants to manage all well facility projects.

Total project construction costs equate to $630,942.04, which is less than the $659,075 overall budget approved by Council at the time of award.

California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank (CIEDB) is the funding source for this project as approved in the 2009/2010 Annual Budget.

Valley Pump and Dairy Systems requests that the City accept the project as complete. Staff reviewed the work and found it acceptable.
RECOMMENDATION: That City Council:

1. Accept the project as complete;

2. Authorize the filing of the Notice of Completion; and

3. Authorize the release of the 10% retention thirty-five (35) days after recordation, provided no stop notices have been filed.

ATTACHMENT: Locator Map
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SUBJECT: NEW MEASURE R LOCAL CONSULTANT PREFERENCE REQUIREMENTS

SOURCE Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) recently informed the City of action taken by the Tulare County Transportation Authority (TCTA) Board unanimously approving a Local Preference procedure effective immediately.

The procedure outlines requirements that all Requests for Proposals/Requests for Qualifications (RFP/RFQ's) involving Measure R funding include language establishing a local preference. This language is noted in the attached Measure R Local Preference Procedures.

In addition, when submitting the supplement agreement to TCTA, the supplemental agreement is required to list local firms participating in the request.

TCAG is asking all agencies to implement the Local Preference procedures for projects funded by Measure R.

It should be noted that when selecting Consultants for professional engineering services, City staff has consistently used a rating process that pre-dates the August 21, 2002 adoption of the "Policy for Selecting Professional Services" and subsequent revision adopted March 30, 2009. This selection process and rating form incorporates two evaluation factors with regard to local consultant preferences that makes up 10% of the total rating points, see attached.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council adopt the Measure R Local Preference Procedures.

ATTACHMENT: Measure R Local Preference Procedures (adopted June 21, 2010)
Policy for Selecting Professional Services (adopted March 30, 2009)
Consultant Selection Rating Form (June 15, 2007)
Measure R Local Preference Procedures (adopted June 21, 2010)

Measure R was approved by Tulare County voters in November 2006. Projects for Measure R are for the most part well-defined and require a benefit for Tulare County residents. One of the challenges in the implementation of Measure R is how to ensure participation by local consulting firms in the development of Measure R projects including project design and environmental studies. State regulations require a Qualifications-Based-Selection process (QBS) when local agencies hire design, environmental and other professional services. There is considerable flexibility in the criteria that can be used by local agencies to score the consultant selection process. However, there also can be considerable variation of opinion concerning the best methods for encouraging the use of local consultants while taking care to avoid placing undue constraints on the selection of the most appropriate company for each assignment.

The following language is a first step to encourage agencies to increase the level of local participation.

The following language will be required to be included on the first full page of any RFP/RFQ using Measure R funding:

Local Preference

"Measure R was approved by Tulare County voters in November 2006. Measure R was supported locally and the transportation projects are for the benefit of the residents of Tulare County. Tulare County citizens will benefit from the contributions that local firms can make to Measure R projects. Such benefits include strong local knowledge, established relationships with the community and close proximity to the project locations. All prospective firms submitting for this RFP/RFQ are strongly encouraged to include local firms as part of the consultant team. For local consultants, the proposal should indicate the location of the office where the work will actually be performed on the specific project.”

The decision making body that approves a consultant selection using Measure R funds is required to receive a summary of local participation including the local firm names(s) and office locations where the work will be performed. When submitting a supplemental agreement to the TCTA, the supplemental is also required to list local firms participating in the request, if any, as noted above.

When the supplemental is presented to the TCTA board for approval or affirmation, the agenda item must list the local firms participating in the contract, including the extent of their planned participation and the office location where the work will be performed.

As instructed by the TCTA board TCAG Staff will continue to review local participation requirements for professional services with other agencies and will provide additional recommendations later this summer. The proposed language as set out above will communicate to any prospective firms that plan to work in Tulare County that inclusion of local firms is desired and encouraged as a part of the selection of consultants for Measure R projects.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
POLICY FOR SELECTING CONSULTANTS TO PROVIDE
ARCHITECTURAL, ENGINEERING AND SIMILAR SERVICES

Introduction

The variety, complexity, size, and quantity of annual projects required of the City justify an efficient procurement policy. These guidelines have been developed to establish the City's policy for selection of consultants for architectural and engineering services. Separate guidelines are hereby established for three levels of anticipated fee:

Informal Selection Process: Anticipated fees less than $25,000.
Semi-formal Selection Process: Anticipated fees from $25,000 to $100,000.
Formal Selection Process: Anticipated fees more than $100,000.

It is the City's intent to limit proposals by interested firms. It is believed that this is in everyone's best interest and allows for more equal competition between small and medium size firms and large firms that have substantial overhead or PR budgets. The architect/engineer is expected to expend costs and effort in applying for consideration without any guarantee of success. The City is interested in seeking broad competition and encouraging extensive participation. It is therefore incumbent upon the City to minimize the information and effort required to institute a short list. This would encourage greater participation, reduce cost to both the City and the consultant, reduce selection time, and increase the responsiveness of the selection process.

In order to promote fairness and objectivity in evaluating consultants, a rating form has been developed. Consultants will be evaluated and rated in accordance with the contents of the City's "Consultant Selection Rating Form" (Form GFRC-1, dated 7/19/99, as amended).

Informal Selection Process (Anticipated fees less than $25,000)

A. The highest ranking registered Engineer or Architect in charge of the project will select a Consultant based on the applicable criteria in the Consultant Selection Rating Form. The Consultant will be selected from a list maintained by the Public Works Department. New consulting firms are encouraged to make their capabilities known to the City. Selection of consultants by this method will be made on a rotational basis insofar as practicable; however, professional expertise and experience in the applicable field will be the major criteria for selection on any project.

B. The Director of Public Works is authorized, by adoption of this policy, to execute
professional services contracts less than $25,000.

**Semiformal Process (Anticipated fees between $25,000 and $100,000)**

A. The Director of Public Works (or his/her designee) will notify the professional community through an advertisement in a newspaper or by other means, of the City's proposed project and its need for professional services. Interested consultants will be invited to obtain a request for proposals (RFP) from the City.

B. The RFP will contain a brief description of the project, the estimated budget and selection criteria.

C. Interested consulting firms will be told what is expected to be in their submittal.

D. The Director of Public Works (or his/her designee) will develop a short list of at least three (3) firms who appear to have the desired professional expertise, experience, and capacity. These firms selected will be invited to an interview to be conducted by a three (3) member staff committee. Said committee will consist of the Director of Public Works (or his designee), the highest ranking engineer or architect in charge of the project and one other staff member. Prior to the interview, firms will be asked to prepare a presentation that develops their approach to the project.

E. The professional services contract will be awarded by City Council.

**Formal Selection Process (anticipated fees more than $100,000)**

A. The Director of Public Works (or his/her designee) will notify the professional community through an advertisement in a newspaper or by other means, of the City's proposed project and its need for professional services. Interested consultants will be invited to obtain a request for proposals (RFP) from the City.

B. The RFP will contain a description of the work to be done, the estimated project budget and other pertinent information regarding the project. The RFP will define the specific questions to be addressed in the proposal and selection criteria to be used.

C. The consulting firm will be told what specific information should be contained in their written proposal. Responses regarding the firm's technical perspective regarding the project are to be strictly limited to brief statements addressing the consultant's general concepts and approach to the project. Detailed, voluminous design information is not desired and will not be considered in the selection process.

D. A short list of at least three (3) firms whenever possible will be developed under the direction of the Department Head who is responsible for the project.
E. Those consultants short listed will be formally invited to make presentations before a formal selection committee. All interviews will be conducted by the same people and be completed in one day. Consultants may be limited to the number of participants allowed at the interview based on the size and complexity of the project.

F. The formal selection committee will be composed of three (3) members. The formal selection committee is as follows:

(*) Two - Professional from the private or public sector with specific knowledge in the field required of the consultant;

(*) One - Staff member appointed by the Public Works Director or City Engineer;

(*) Public Works Director or City Engineer who will advise the committee and assist in the tabulation of the results for ranking purposes but will not participate in the rating of the consultants.

G. Staff will assist in selecting the private sector professional.

H. Authorization for staff to negotiate a professional service contract requires City Council approval.

Procedure for Ranking Firms Using Form GFRC-1

A. The formal selection committee will score the consultants interviewed using the Porterville Consultant Selection Rating Form (Form GFRC-1).

B. Once the scores are totaled, each member of the committee will establish the preliminary ranking on his/her form starting with one (1) for the best and then descending order for the other firms (i.e., 2, 3, 4, etc.). In case of a tie score between two consultants in one rating form, the committee members will discuss the firms’ qualifications until the member with the tie score has enough information to break the tie by changing one or both scores.

C. The ranking numbers for each consultant, taken from each member of the committee, will then be added together for each consultant. The consultant with the lowest ranking total will then be ranked number one (1), followed by the next lowest as two (2), etc. This will establish the final ranking. This final ranking will then be presented to the City Council for action.
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# CONSULTANT SELECTION RATING FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Factor</th>
<th>Rating Factor Numerical Range &amp; Weighting Based on Importance of Factor</th>
<th>FIRM</th>
<th>FIRM</th>
<th>FIRM</th>
<th>FIRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Capability to perform all or most aspects of the project.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recent experience in projects comparable to the proposed project.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Firm's reputation for professional integrity and competence.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Key personnel's professional background and caliber.</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Adequate qualified personnel available for assignment to the project.</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Recent experience in specialized areas of expertise associated with the project.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Demonstrated ability to meet schedules or deadlines.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Demonstrated ability to complete projects without having major cost escalations or overruns.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Qualifications and experience of outside consultants regularly engaged by the consultant under consideration.</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Quality of project previously undertaken.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Familiarity with and proximity to the geographic location of the project.</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Capability of a branch office, which will do the work to perform independently of the home office, or conversely, its capability to obtain necessary support from the home office.</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Demonstration of an understanding of the project's potential problems and the City's special concerns.</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Degree of interest shown in undertaking the project.</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Evidence that consultant is an equal opportunity employer.</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Proximity of firm's office to project.</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE:**

**RANKING:**

Highest Possible Score = 77
SUBJECT: FOOTHILL PARKWAY PRECISE ALIGNMENT PLAN

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: The recently adopted 2030 General Plan incorporates a "circulation element" component that identifies arterial and collector street grids throughout the City. The circulation element also "suggests" alignments for unique parkway streets near the foothills east of Porterville. These parkway streets fall in a traffic capacity category between arterial and collector streets.

The suggested alignment for the parkway that traverses across Rocky Hill, herein after referred to as the Foothill Parkway, has come under scrutiny by some of the area property owners. The property owners object to the manner in which the suggested alignment bisects their property. A locator map of the Foothill Parkway is included in Council's packet.

Staff respectfully asks that Council authorize staff to form a Foothill Parkway Alignment Focus Group. The focus group will discuss alignment options with the property owners affected by the location of Foothill Parkway. The ultimate goal of the Focus Group is to reach consensus on a precise alignment for the Foothill Parkway.

Once consensus has been reached, Engineering will prepare a precise alignment plan with legal description and will ask Council to adopt said alignment plan. Adopting the precise alignment plan will allow staff to set conditions on subsequent improvements and prevent development within the Foothill Parkway limits.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Direct Engineering to contact and invite the Rocky Hill property owners to meet and discuss Foothill Parkway;

2. If consensus can be reached on the Foothill Parkway alignment, direct Engineering to prepare the necessary documents defining the precise alignment and limits of Foothill Parkway; and

3. Direct Engineering to present a report to City Council identifying the Foothill Parkway and request that Council accept the Foothill Parkway.

ATTACHMENT: Circulation Element
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SUBJECT: REQUEST TO APPLY FOR EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT FUNDS

SOURCE: Police Department

COMMENT: The City of Porterville has received notification that our jurisdiction is eligible to apply to the Bureau of Justice Assistance for a grant award of $29,845. The City of Porterville will be filing the grant application for funds from the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants Program, established within the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

The purpose of the JAG Program is to provide local jurisdictions with opportunities to reduce crime and improve public safety through the use of the grant funds for a variety of activities, from increasing personnel and equipment resources for law enforcement, to developing and supporting programs to enhance effective criminal justice processes. It is proposed at this time, if the City is awarded the JAG Grant, the funds will be used to offset operational costs for the Law Enforcement Joint Use Helicopter Program.

In FY 2009/2010, a total of $75,992 was expended in support of the Law Enforcement Joint Use Helicopter Program. Last year, Council approved a similar requested and as a result, approximately $30,690 of the above expenditure amount was charged to the 2009 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants Program.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1) Authorize the filing of the grant application; and
2) Authorize the Mayor to sign all necessary documents as they pertain to the grant; and
3) Authorize a budget adjustment upon receipt of the funds.
RESOLUTION NO.________

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE ACCEPTING EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT FUNDS AND APPROVING A BUDGET ADJUSTMENT TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT BUDGET

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Porterville as follows:

1. That the City of Porterville accept the FY2010 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) funds;

2. That the Police Department appropriation be increased by $29,845 from JAG funds received for Fiscal Year 2010/2011 to allow for the expenditure of those Grant Funds in support of the Law Enforcement Joint Use Helicopter Program and its operational costs.

ADOPTED this 20th day of July, 2010.

__________________________________________
Ron Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:

John Lollis, City Clerk

By Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
NOTICE OF INVITATION FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS
USE OF EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT FUNDS
BY THE PORTERVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT

Notice is hereby given by the City of Porterville that public comment is being accepted on the use of available grant funds from the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Funds in the amount of $29,845. The City of Porterville proposes to use these funds to offset operational costs for the Law Enforcement Joint Use Helicopter Program.

This notice is given in order to provide all interested parties an opportunity to be heard and to present their views with respect to the proposed use of said funds. Interested parties may give comments by calling the Porterville Police Department at (559) 782-7405 before 5:00 p.m., July 20th, 2010.
SUBJECT: PROPOSED AGREEMENT WITH CITY OF WOODLAKE FOR PROVISION OF ANIMAL SHELTERING SERVICES

SOURCE: Police Department

COMMENT: On November 1, 2009, the Police Department's Animal Control Unit assumed control of the animal shelter facility in Lindsay through a lease agreement. The Animal Control Unit is sheltering all animals picked up in our community at this facility. City staff has been contacted by representatives from the City of Woodlake who have requested sheltering services from the City of Porterville at the Lindsay Facility. This agreement would provide for the sheltering of animals picked up in the City of Woodlake by their employees and delivered to the facility. The City of Porterville will charge the City of Woodlake for the performance of these services. The fees charged to the City of Woodlake for these services are specified in the attached agreement.

Based on discussions with City of Woodlake staff, it is not anticipated that the number of animals received from Woodlake would be such a large amount that it would overwhelm or overly burden the operation at the shelter facility.

RECOMMENDATION: That City Council:

1) Approve the attached agreement between the City of Porterville and the City of Woodlake, for the provision of animal sheltering services; And,
2) Authorize the Mayor to sign the appropriate documents to implement the agreement.

ATTACHMENT: Agreement for Provision of Animal Sheltering Services

[Signature]
Dir.

[Signature]
CM

Item No. 13
AGREEMENT FOR
ANIMAL SHELTERING SERVICE

THIS AGREEMENT, made and entered into this 1st day of August, 2010, between the City of Porterville hereinafter referred to as "Porterville" and the City of Woodlake, hereinafter referred to as "Woodlake":

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, Porterville is operating an Animal Shelter facility located at 23611 Road 196, Lindsay, CA and is operating said facility for purposes of sheltering animals in accordance with the laws of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, Woodlake has a need for animal sheltering and has determined that it is in the best interest of Woodlake to contract with Porterville for the sheltering of animals picked up in Woodlake; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Government Code Section 51301, Porterville is authorized to contract with Woodlake and Woodlake is authorized to contract with Porterville for the performance by appropriate Porterville officers and employees of Woodlake functions;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS AGREED as follows:

1. ANIMAL SHELTERING SERVICES

A. Shelter Facility Care: Porterville shall maintain a humane and sanitary animal shelter that complies with all Federal, State and County statutes and regulations. This facility shall be suitable for the safe sheltering and proper care of all dogs, cats and other animals (wild or domestic) which may be impounded, or otherwise come into the custody of Woodlake, pursuant to the provisions of the Woodlake Municipal Code, or other regulation. After receipt of an animal at the shelter facility, animals requiring veterinary observation or treatment may be taken to a veterinary clinic of Porterville’s choice. Animals subject to quarantine away from the owner's premises shall be sheltered at this facility and held for ten (10) days pursuant to state rabies control statutes and regulations.

B. Holding Period: Animals impounded by Woodlake shall be held for redemption at the Porterville Shelter for a minimum period of six (6) days;
however, Porterville reserves the right to euthanize any sick or injured animal before the expiration of the minimum holding period upon the recommendation of a veterinarian, or when otherwise authorized by statute. Animals held as evidence in a criminal investigation or prosecution shall be held until released by the investigating officer, prosecutor, or a court order. Time of impoundment for the purpose of this agreement shall begin when an animal arrives at the shelter, or in the case of an animal impounded at a veterinary kennel or other premises, when the circumstances of its impoundment is received by staff at the shelter.

C. Sick or Injured Animals: Porterville will not accept or intake any animal that is sick or injured. Prior to delivery of sick or injured animals to the facility, Woodlake shall have the sick or injured animal examined and treated at a veterinary clinic. Thereafter, the animal may be delivered to the staff at the Porterville Shelter for intake. At this time, staff will receive any special instructions for care of the animal. Woodlake will be charged for any additional charges incurred by Porterville for follow-up care with the veterinarian or special medicine or treatment. Any additional charges will be itemized by the veterinarian or shelter staff.

D. Disposition of Impounded Animals: Woodlake’s right to custody of any animal; impounded for the minimum holding period required by this agreement shall pass to Porterville upon the expiration of the holding period and Woodlake shall thereafter have no responsibility for the care or the costs of sheltering of said animal. After expiration of this period, Porterville may at its sole discretion, hold the animal for a longer period, or may place the animal for adoption, release to a Rescue Group or may dispose of the animal.

E. Dead Animals: Porterville shall provide for the safe and sanitary disposal of all dead animals coming into its possession and of all animals destroyed by Porterville pursuant to the terms of this agreement.

F. Hours of Operation: Porterville shall provide suitable office hours at the animal shelter facility for the convenience of Woodlake residents seeking
to reclaim their animals. Porterville will staff the facility and receive animals from Woodlake on Sunday through Saturday, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., excluding holidays. The shelter facility will be open to the public during these days and hours.

G. **Other Animal Control Services:** This service agreement provides solely for the sheltering of animals picked up in Woodlake, by Woodlake employees. This agreement is not intended for Porterville to provide any animal control/enforcement services to Woodlake. Additionally, Porterville will not provide for the licensing of animals belonging to Woodlake residents, and Porterville will not serve as Hearing Officer for Woodlake on vicious animal complaints and hearings. Porterville will work cooperatively with Woodlake staff in an effort to identify the owners of any animal brought into the facility and take action to re-unite an animal with the rightful owner.

2. **VETERINARIAN CARE**

   In providing care for any animal coming into its possession pursuant to this agreement, Porterville’s decision to obtain veterinary services, Porterville’s selection of a veterinarian, and Porterville’s approval of veterinary fees for care and treatment of the animal, shall be final.

3. **RECORDS**

   Porterville shall maintain appropriate records and statistics regarding all services performed under this agreement. Woodlake may inspect and receive copies of such records upon request.

4. **HOLD HARMLESS**

   Porterville shall hold harmless, defend and indemnify Woodlake, it’s officers, agents, and employees from and against any liability, claims, action, cost,
damage, or losses for injury, including death, to any person, or damage to any property arising out of Porterville’s activities pursuant to this agreement. Woodlake shall hold harmless, defend, and indemnify Porterville, it’s officers, agents, and employees from and against any liability claims, actions, cost, damages or losses for injury, including death, to any person or damage to any property arising out of Woodlake’s activities pursuant to this agreement.

5. TERMS AND TERMINATION

A. This agreement shall become effective on August 1, 2010, and shall continue until June 30, 2011, at which time it will be reviewed and considered for renewal, unless there is a desire to terminate by either party.

B. Either party may terminate this agreement with or without cause upon proper delivery of a thirty (30) day written notice of termination to the other party.

C. Either party may terminate this agreement for material breach if the other party fails to remedy said breach within thirty (30) days after receiving written notice setting forth in detail the facts constituting said breach.

6. CHARGE FOR SERVICES

As consideration for Porterville carrying out the obligations and responsibilities as specified in this agreement, Woodlake agrees to compensate Porterville pursuant to the following fees:

A. Sheltering Service:

1. Dog or cat
   (Dog or cat litters shall be treated and counted as individual animals and charged accordingly) $30.00 per impoundment *
2. Dog or Cat (Quarantine) $50.00 per animal
3. Evidence fowl $6.00 per day
4. Horse, cow, goat, etc. $10.00 per day
5. Protective custody / evidence hold $8.00 per day
Animal Shelter Agreement (City of Woodlake)

6. Other animal hold $8.00 per day
7. Dead animal disposal $8.00 per animal

* An impounded dog or cat will be held for a minimum of six days, any requirement to keep the animal longer will be charged an additional $8.00 per day.

B. Veterinary Services: Woodlake shall reimburse Porterville for the cost of all veterinary services rendered for the examination and treatment of animals coming into Porterville's possession from Woodlake and pursuant to the provisions of this agreement, within thirty (30) days of receipt of an itemized bill. Billings for “veterinary services” will only apply to the examination or treatment of animals believed by Porterville to be sick or injured and which cannot be euthanized or which must be held as evidence in a criminal case.

7. NOTICES

Any notice to be given in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be served either by personal delivery or by first class mail, postage prepaid and addressed as listed below:

City of Porterville
Attn: John Lollis, City Manager
291 North Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257

City of Woodlake
Attn: Bill Lewis, City Administrator
350 No. Valencia Street
Woodlake, CA 93286

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

FOR CITY OF PORTERVILLE

_____________________________  ______________________________
Mayor                               Date
Animal Shelter Agreement (City of Woodlake)

City Clerk                              Date

FOR CITY OF WOODLAKE

______________________________  ______________________________
Mayor                                      Date

______________________________  ______________________________
City Clerk                                      Date
SUBJECT: Sale of Surplus Vehicles to the City of Exeter

SOURCE: Police Department

COMMENT: The City of Exeter has expressed a desire to purchase used police vehicles that are slated for surplus during the 2010-2011 fiscal year, from the City of Porterville. Exeter Police Chief Cliff Bush has engaged in discussions with City staff about the acquisition of surplus vehicles from the city. Four (4) vehicles were identified that would be useful to the Exeter Police operation. Chief Bush has inspected the vehicles and found them acceptable for purchase and use. Staff negotiated a sale price of $1,200 for each vehicle, for total revenue to the City of $4,800. The vehicles to be sold are listed as follows:

Unit 3218 - 2003 Ford Crown Victoria Marked Police Car License No. 1113487
Unit 3221 - 2003 Ford Crown Victoria Marked Police Car License No. 1113490
Unit 3226 - 2003 Ford Crown Victoria Marked Police Car License No. 1113484
Unit 3227 - 2003 Ford Crown Victoria Marked Police Car License No. 1113483

The Purchasing Agent is authorized to dispose of surplus property through public auction, trade-in or negotiated sale. Staff has determined that it is in the best interest of the City to negotiate with other agencies whenever possible. This allows the vehicles to be transferred “as is” without having to strip the patrol vehicles of emergency equipment and perform costly inspections. We also save the cost of the auctioneer’s commission. At the last auction (2005), the City sold eight police vehicles at an average price of $550 each. The lowest was sold for $250 and the highest was sold for $950. City Shop staff estimate the cost to strip the police equipment from the vehicles at approximately $120.00 per vehicle.

RECOMMENDATION: That City Council:
1) Approve the sale of the listed surplus vehicles to the City of Exeter;
2) Authorize the Purchasing Agent to transfer title to the City of Exeter.
SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO ROLL WEED ABATEMENT BALANCES TO THE PROPERTY TAX ROLLS

SOURCE: Finance Department

COMMENT: Staff has prepared a draft Resolution for Council consideration, which will authorize the County Auditor to place uncollected weed abatement charges on the property tax rolls. Authorization to utilize this collection method is identified in the City Code in sections 12.3.4 through 12.3.12.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council adopt the attached resolution authorizing the County Auditor to place these items on the property tax rolls for collection.

ATTACHMENT: Draft Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. ________

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE ORDERING THE PLACEMENT OF SPECIAL ASSESSMENT LIENS ON THE TULARE COUNTY TAX ROLLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011

WHEREAS, the City of Porterville City Charter Section 12.3.4, Nuisance and Authority to Abate, sets forth the procedure for all weed, nuisance and hazard abatements in the City of Porterville, with Porterville City Code Section 12.3.12, Collection on Tax Roll, thereafter setting forth the procedure for placement of delinquent assessments on the Tulare County Tax Rolls; and

WHEREAS, the Porterville City Council, having duly received and considered evidence and documentation concerning the delinquent accounts proposed to be placed on the Fiscal Year 2010/2011 County Tax Rolls concerning the necessity for the placement of the contemplated tax liens;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Porterville that the public interest and convenience require the submittal of the following liens, attached hereto as Exhibit “A”, to the Tulare County Auditor for placement on the property tax rolls for collection.

Adopted and approved this 20th day of July 2010.

__________________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________________
City Clerk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessee</th>
<th>Parcel Number Address</th>
<th>Amount Per Parcel</th>
<th>Assessment Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sahota Bhupinder Kaur</td>
<td>243-170-009 N. Linda Vista off N. Main/W. RR</td>
<td>719.65</td>
<td>720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahota Bhupinder Kaur</td>
<td>243-170-014 N. Linda Vista off N. Main/W. RR</td>
<td>1,188.09</td>
<td>1,188.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahota Bhupinder Kaur</td>
<td>243-170-015 N. Linda Vista off N. Main/W. RR</td>
<td>4,116.85</td>
<td>4,117.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahota Bhupinder Kaur</td>
<td>243-430-010 N. Linda Vista off N. Main</td>
<td>1,522.93</td>
<td>1,523.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahota Bhupinder Kaur</td>
<td>243-440-004 N. Linda Vista off N. Main</td>
<td>1,188.09</td>
<td>1,188.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahota Bhupinder Kaur</td>
<td>243-440-005 N. Linda Vista off N. Main</td>
<td>2,183.95</td>
<td>2,184.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahota Bhupinder Kaur</td>
<td>243-440-006 N. Linda Vista off N. Main</td>
<td>3,003.99</td>
<td>3,004.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Hovannissian</td>
<td>245-040-040 2248 W. Henderson Ave.</td>
<td>1,216.82</td>
<td>1,217.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Iracheta</td>
<td>247-130-052 NW corner of Mulberry &amp; Lime</td>
<td>673.59</td>
<td>674.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caren Ratermann</td>
<td>247-190-026 E. Marshall</td>
<td>468.57</td>
<td>469.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecelia Ceja</td>
<td>247-250-076 685 Sandra Circle</td>
<td>1,241.60</td>
<td>1,242.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fawson DDS</td>
<td>253-038-001 618 N. Main St.</td>
<td>1,956.15</td>
<td>1,956.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francison Madrigal</td>
<td>254-081-014 1010 E. Putnam</td>
<td>347.96</td>
<td>348.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvador Ledesma</td>
<td>254-081-016</td>
<td>521.96</td>
<td>522.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account #01-000545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WEED/HAZARD ABATEMENT**  
**FY2010-2011 Tax Roll**  
(from FY09-10 balances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessee</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Amount Per Parcel</th>
<th>Assessment Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael &amp; Iris Radusinovick account #01-000349</td>
<td>254-110-018 Jasmine Ranch Phase I</td>
<td>207.05</td>
<td>207.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Thomas Yoshida account #01-000103</td>
<td>254-110-019 Jasmine Ranch Phase I</td>
<td>207.05</td>
<td>207.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Iniguez account #01-000344</td>
<td>255-110-021 Jasmine Ranch Phase I</td>
<td>207.05</td>
<td>207.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Valle Capitol Corp Inc account #01-000364</td>
<td>255-170-020 E. Olive / E. GHHS</td>
<td>2,460.06</td>
<td>2,460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose &amp; Mary Rosalez account #01-000547</td>
<td>260-102-020 246 S. Ohio St.</td>
<td>934.66</td>
<td>935.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus R &amp; Mary Lopez account #01-000478</td>
<td>260-184-013 200 S. G St.</td>
<td>292.86</td>
<td>293.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Silva account #01-000559</td>
<td>260-187-001 347 W. Orange</td>
<td>3,660.68</td>
<td>3,661.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metco Investments LLC account #01-000300</td>
<td>261-200-031 245 S. Williams Dr.</td>
<td>468.57</td>
<td>469.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro &amp; Victoria Barbarena account #01-000486</td>
<td>269-010-028 950 S. Ohio</td>
<td>631.60</td>
<td>632.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Martinez account #01-000561</td>
<td>269-021-001 852 S. Indiana</td>
<td>559.90</td>
<td>560.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total amount of assessments | 29,979.68 | 29,983.00 |

Total number of assessments | 24 |
SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF ANNUAL APPROPRIATION LIMIT

SOURCE: Finance Department

COMMENT: Article XIII – B of the California Constitution requires that each governmental agency must adopt an appropriation limit each fiscal year. This limit represents the maximum amount of tax revenue that can be appropriated during the fiscal year.

The State Department of Finance has provided the percentage change in population for the City of Porterville and the percentage change in per capita personal income for the 2010/2011 fiscal year calculation. Based on this information and the guidelines established by the State, the appropriation limit for 2010/2011 fiscal year is $47,774,303. Budgeted tax proceeds subject to limitation are $27,697,678. The City continues to appropriate well below the maximum limit allowed by law.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council approve the attached resolution adopting the appropriation limit of $47,774,303 for the 2010/2011 fiscal year.

ATTACHMENTS: Draft Resolution
Worksheets
RESOLUTION NO. ______


WHEREAS, Article XIII – B of the California Constitution requires that each governmental agency adopt an appropriation limit each fiscal year, and

WHEREAS, the State of California has presented the guidelines for the consumer price index, the per capita personal income, and the population data for local governments to compute the appropriation limit;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Porterville, the appropriation limit for the 2010/2011 fiscal year is $47,774,303 as computed on the attached worksheet.

Adopted and approved this 20th day of July 2010.

_________________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:

_________________________________
City Clerk
# CITY OF PORTERVILLE

## APPROPRIATION LIMIT DOCUMENTATION

**FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011**

### PROCEEDS OF TAXES CALCULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTY TAXES</strong></td>
<td>7,536,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,551,137</td>
<td>1986-1987 BASE YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,087,363</td>
<td>1987-1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490,650</td>
<td>1988-1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,237,500</td>
<td>1989-1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,724,698</td>
<td>1990-1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,791,789</td>
<td>1991-1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307,004</td>
<td>1992-1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574,746</td>
<td>1993-1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158,101</td>
<td>1994-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229,000</td>
<td>1995-1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29,765,170</td>
<td>1996-1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>848,914</td>
<td>1997-1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27,697,678</strong></td>
<td>1998-1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **OTHER TAXES**       | 15,536,226                          |
| 1,551,137             | 1999-2000                           |
| 490,650               | 2000-2001                           |
| 4,237,500             | 2001-2002                           |
| 1,724,698             | 2002-2003                           |
| 5,791,789             | 2003-2004                           |
| 307,004               | 2004-2005                           |
| 574,746               | 2005-2006                           |
| 158,101               | 2006-2007                           |
| 229,000               | 2007-2008                           |
| 29,765,170            | 2008-2009                           |
| 848,914               | 2010-2011                           |
| **41,134,205**        | **68,831,883**                      |

| **PERMITS**           | 490,650                             |
| 490,650               | **10,422,371**                      |
| **11,744,767**        | **11,920,454**                      |
| **14,200,454**        | **13,372,258**                      |
| **16,127,057**        | **16,746,199**                      |
| **17,934,831**        | **18,717,825**                      |
| **20,071,738**        | **21,607,847**                      |
| **23,220,852**        | **24,779,949**                      |
| **26,415,190**        | **28,859,653**                      |
| **30,982,943**        | **32,516,481**                      |
| **33,283,295**        | **34,813,941**                      |
| **36,961,571**        | **44,122,620**                      |
| **46,931,401**        | **48,067,656**                      |
| **47,774,303**        | **20,076,626**                      |

**PROCEEDS OF TAXES**  

**UNDER APPROPRIATION LIMIT**

---


[2] Per State Department of Finance (per capita personal income).

[3] Per State Department of Finance (population growth of City or County, whichever is greater).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>4,026,915</td>
<td>4,026,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Fees</td>
<td>2,300,330</td>
<td>2,300,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMITS</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINE FROM AGENCIES</td>
<td>220,300</td>
<td>220,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE COUNTY GRANTS</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL GRANTS</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE OF MONEY &amp; PROPERTY RENT</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINES &amp; FORFEITURES</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REVENUES</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ESTIMATED REVENUES</td>
<td>7,568,248</td>
<td>7,568,248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Porterville 2009-2010 Original Budget adopted by City Council on June 15, 2010 for the first 90 days of FY2010-11.*
SUBJECT: RESCINDING RESOLUTION 81-2010 AND ACCEPTING REVISED OFFICIAL CANVASS OF VOTES – JUNE 8, 2010 ELECTION

SOURCE: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: On July 6, 2010, pursuant to the provisions of the City Charter, staff presented the City Council with Tulare County Registrar of Voters’ Official Canvass of Votes for the June 8, 2010 election, which the Council accepted via Resolution No. 81-2010.

It has subsequently come to light that 2,524 vote-by-mail ballots were not included in the tabulation procedures by Tulare County Election Officials. While the error did not change the outcome of the election, it did change the total number of votes counted. It is staff’s recommendation that the City Council take action to rescind Resolution 81-2010 and accept the revised Official Canvass of Votes for the June 8, 2010 Election.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council approve the draft resolution rescinding Resolution 81-2010 and accepting the revised Official Canvass of Votes for the June 8, 2010 Election.

ATTACHMENTS: 1) Resolution 81-2010
2) Revised Official Canvass
3) Draft Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. 81-2010


NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Porterville that the City of Porterville does hereby accept the Official Canvass of Votes from the Consolidated State Primary District Election of June 8, 2010, by the Tulare County Registrar of Voters, as follows:

City Council Member:

Two (2) four-year terms:

- Greg Shelton*  
  1,548 votes  
  19.73%
- Pete V. McCracken*  
  1,403 votes  
  17.88%
- John Simonich  
  1,205 votes  
  15.36%
- Felipe A. Martinez  
  963 votes  
  12.27%
- Taha Saleh  
  830 votes  
  10.58%
- Rodney Martin  
  739 votes  
  9.42%
- Edward Patino Jr.  
  534 votes  
  6.81%
- Jesse J. Carrillo  
  442 votes  
  5.63%
- Shawn Cable  
  170 votes  
  2.17%
- Write-In  
  12 votes  
  0.15%

Measure R – Pertaining to Leases of City Property

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>42.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>56.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered Voters  - 16,302
Total voters voting - 4,659
Total Percentage - 28.58%

Adopted this 6th day of July, 2010.

Pete V. McCracken, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
I, JOHN D. LOLLIS, the duly appointed City Clerk of the City of Porterville do hereby certify and declare that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of the resolution passed and adopted by the Council of the City of Porterville at a regular meeting of the Porterville City Council duly called and held on the 6th day of July, 2010.

THAT said resolution was duly passed, approved, and adopted by the following vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council:</th>
<th>McCracken</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>F. Martinez</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JOHN D. LOLLIS, City Clerk

By: Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
CERTIFICATION OF ELECTIONS OFFICIAL

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF TULARE

I, Rita A. Woodard, Registrar of Voters for the County of Tulare, State of California, hereby certify that I complied with all provisions of Chapter 2 of Division 7 of Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations for the Primary Election held on the 5th day of June 2010, in the County of Tulare, State of California, and all elections consolidated therewith.

I hereby set my hand and official seal this 12th day of July 2010, at the County of Tulare.

RITA A. WOODARD
REGISTRAR OF VOTERS
COUNTY OF TULARE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Hiley Wallis
Chief Deputy Treasurer-Tax Collector

ATTACHMENT NO. 2
## TULARE COUNTY Statement of Vote

### NON PARTISAN CITY OF PORTERVILLE MEMBER, CITY COUNCIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>Ballots Cast</th>
<th>Turnout (%)</th>
<th>THIA SAID</th>
<th>JOHN SIMONITCH</th>
<th>GREG SIBLEY</th>
<th>EDWARD FALINO, JR.</th>
<th>SHAWN CABLE</th>
<th>JESUS J. CABRON</th>
<th>RODNEY MARTIN</th>
<th>FELIX A. MARTINEZ</th>
<th>PETE V. MC CALLION</th>
<th>Write-In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>035 0036</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124504 0089</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124504 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124506 0091</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124506 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124513 0073</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124513 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124563 0071</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124563 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124593 0072</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124593 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124594 0073</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124594 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124595 0075</td>
<td>2103</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124595 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>2103</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124596 0073</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124596 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124596 0074</td>
<td>2342</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124596 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>2342</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124597 0075</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124597 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124598 0076</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124598 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124598 0077</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124598 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124599 0079</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124599 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Precinct Totals:
- 16322 2810 15.42
- 531 598 794 307 108 250 403 581 655

Vote by Mail Totals:
- 16322 2415 14.83
- 347 727 842 250 71 213 385 446 837

Grand Totals:
- 16322 4928 30.23
- 978 1295 1630 557 178 463 760 1010 1492

California
- 16302 4928 30.23
- 978 1295 1630 557 178 463 760 1010 1492

21st Congressional District
- 16302 4928 30.23
- 978 1295 1630 557 178 463 760 1010 1492

19th Senate District
- 16302 4928 30.23
- 978 1295 1630 557 178 463 760 1010 1492

34th State Assembly District
- 16302 4928 30.23
- 978 1295 1630 557 178 463 760 1010 1492

2nd District Board
- 16302 4928 30.23
- 978 1295 1630 557 178 463 760 1010 1492

5th Supervisorial District
- 16302 4928 30.23
- 978 1295 1630 557 178 463 760 1010 1492

Tulare County
- 16302 4928 30.23
- 978 1295 1630 557 178 463 760 1010 1492

City of Porterville
- 16302 4928 30.23
- 978 1295 1630 557 178 463 760 1010 1492
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>Ballots Cast</th>
<th>Turnout (%)</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>635 0035</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77.76%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124504 0066</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124504 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124506 0069</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>23.88%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124506 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124513 0070</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>19.72%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124513 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>20.57%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124593 0071</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124593 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124594 0072</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>16.46%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124594 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124595 0073</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>17.03%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124595 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124596 0074</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124596 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124597 0075</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124597 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124598 0076</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>13.03%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124598 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124599 0077</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>18.14%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124599 - Vote by Mail</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predict Totals</td>
<td>16302</td>
<td>2510</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote by Mail Totals</td>
<td>16302</td>
<td>2418</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Totals**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21st Congressional District</td>
<td>16302</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th State Senate District</td>
<td>16302</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34th State Assembly District</td>
<td>16302</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Equalization Board</td>
<td>16302</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Supervisors District</td>
<td>16302</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare County</td>
<td>16302</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Porterville</td>
<td>16302</td>
<td>4926</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. _____-2010


WHEREAS, on July 6, 2010, the Porterville City Council accepted the Official Canvass of Votes from the County Registrar of Voters for the June 8, 2010 Election via Resolution 81-2010. It was subsequently discovered that an error occurred during the County’s tabulation process which changed the number of votes cast, but not the election outcome. The County Registrar of Voters has issued a revised Official Canvass of Votes for the June 8, 2010 Election.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Porterville that Resolution 81-2010 shall be rescinded.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of Porterville does hereby accept the revised Official Canvass of Votes from the Consolidated State Primary District Election of June 8, 2010, by the Tulare County Registrar of Voters, as follows:

City Council Member:

Two (2) four-year terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg Shelton*</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>19.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete V. McCracken*</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>17.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Simonich</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>15.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felipe A. Martinez</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>12.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taha Saleh</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>10.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Martin</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Patino Jr.</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse J. Carrillo</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>5.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Cable</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write-In</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure R – Pertaining to Leases of City Property

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>43.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td>56.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registered Voters - 16,302
Total voters voting - 4,928
Total Percentage - 30.23%

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of July, 2010.

___________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:

John D. Lollis, City Clerk

___________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
COUNCIL AGENDA: July 20, 2010

SUBJECT: Scheduling of FY 2010-2011 Budget Study Sessions

SOURCE: City Manager

COMMENT: At its meeting on June 15, 2010, the City Council acted to continue City budgetary appropriations and expenditures as adopted for FY 2009-2010 through October 1, 2010, and directed the scheduling of Study Sessions for the purposes of reviewing in greater detail the proposed FY 2010-2011 City Budget, in particular the General Fund, prior to adoption.

In response to Council's direction, the following dates are recommended for the scheduling of Study Sessions in Council Chambers:

- Tuesday, July 27, 2010; 6:00 P.M.
- Tuesday, August 24, 2010; 6:00 P.M.
- Tuesday, August 31, 2010; 6:00 P.M.
- Tuesday, September 14, 2010; 6:00 P.M.
- Tuesday, September 28, 2010; 6:00 P.M.

For the first recommended Study Session on July 27, it is anticipated that the Council will review the proposed General Fund revenue estimates, "discretionary" General fund expenditures, and the Airport and Transit Fund budgets. Focuses of the additional recommended Study Sessions will depend upon Council direction.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council approve the scheduling of the Study Sessions as proposed.

ATTACHMENT: None
SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR A LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR THE TULE RIVER INDIAN TRIBE’S FEE TO TRUST APPLICATION

SOURCE: CITY MANAGER

COMMENT: On April 1, 2010, the City and Tule River Indian Tribe (Tribe) entered into a Cooperative Agreement (Agreement) regarding the conveyance of the Tribe’s 40 acre site located in the vicinity of the Porterville Airport into Trust with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Agreement provides for a clear understanding of the Tribe’s intentions for the land and establishes the interests of the City regarding the conveyance into trust.

In order to facilitate the conveyance, the Tribe has prepared an Environmental Assessment pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The document concludes that there will not be any unmitigatable impacts resulting from the conveyance.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council authorize the Mayor to sign the attached draft letter.
Dear Mr. Risling:

The City of Porterville (City) supports the Proposed Trust Conveyance of the Porterville Airpark of behalf of the Tule River Tribe (Tribe).

Such Proposed Trust Conveyance will not result in any significant unmitigated impacts to the environment pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as the Tribe has agreed pursuant to that Cooperation Agreement with the City of Porterville dated April 1, 2010 that:

(1) The Tribe will not engage in any new development, construction or new operation of any land use unless a written agreement is executed by the parties that assures consistency with the City’s General Plan, regulations and policies in effect at the time of the proposed development; and

(2) That in any such agreement any and all appropriate monetary and community contributions shall be committed to the City to account for the City’s share of lost revenues related to taxes, licenses, and development fees, etc.; and

(3) That in the event that the proposed development is not consistent with the City’s applicable regulations, development will not proceed unless and until a written agreement between the parties is executed addressing any additional impacts.

In essence, as the Tribe has agreed after such Proposed Trust Conveyance to follow existing City land use restrictions in effect at the time of such Proposed Trust Conveyance, there will be no change in use of such property other than a change in legal ownership.

Please contact us if we can further assist the Tribe in completing such Proposed Trust Conveyance.

Sincerely,

Ron Irish, Mayor
City of Porterville
SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT TO MEASURE R CITIZENS’ OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

SOURCE: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES/CITY CLERK DIVISION

COMMENT: As part of the passage of Tulare County Measure R, a Citizens’ Oversight Committee was established and charged with the responsibility of monitoring the expenditures of revenues derived from the Measure. The City of Porterville is permitted the appointment of one individual to serve on this committee. In July of 2009, the City Council appointed Mr. Ron Irish to serve as the City’s representative for the term of July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2011; however, with the recent appointment of Mr. Irish to the City Council, a new appointment to the Oversight Committee is now necessary.

Staff has provided notification of the vacancy to the public, and as of the time of publication of this agenda, Requests for Appointment have been received from Kent D. Hopper, Khris Saleh, and Ellen Nichols. Staff has also been advised that Mr. Wayne Foltz has expressed interest in serving in this regard. Any subsequent Requests received after publication of this agenda will be distributed to the Council for consideration and made available to the public under separate cover.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council consider the appointment of an individual to serve as the City of Porterville’s representative on the Measure R Citizens’ Oversight Committee, for the term expiring on June 30, 2011.

Attachment: Requests for Appointment

Item No. 19
City Of Porterville
Request For Appointment

Please complete all blanks

Name: Kent D. Hopper

Appointment to: Measure "R" Oversight Committee

Street Address: 1837 W. Nancy Avenue, Porterville, Ca.

Mailing Address: 1837 W. Nancy Avenue, Porterville, Ca.

Name Of Business: NewsTalk 1450/K-TIP Radio Station

Own or Operate: Operate/Operations Manager

Business Address: 1660 N. Newcomb St, Porterville, Ca.

Telephone: Home: 784-2293
Work: 784-1450
Fax: 784-2482
Email: talktohopper@ktip.com

City of Porterville Resident: Yes
Registered Voter: Yes

Submitted By:

Received By: [Signature]

Forwarded to: City Clerk/Date: 7/9/10
City Council/Date: 7/9/10
City Manager/Date: 7/9/10
Applicable Dept/Date: 
Qualifications:

Having been involved with community events and charities in other cities prior to purchasing our home in Porterville, has been valuable experience communicating with local residents.

I have been in the News/Broadcast business for nearly 30 years. This, too, has proved to be excellent experience for me. I have interviewed and worked with many many local leaders, listening and discussing local concerns and issues.

I feel that my part in the passage of Measure “R” played a role in it’s success. I was involved with the news end as well as the production of commercials with regards to Measure “R”. I feel it important to have committee members who will be serious about seeing that these monies are spent on the items for which it was intended. In addition, I feel public service is merely one way to give back to our own community.

I would be honored to help out and be a part of a team that is focused on Measure “R”.

Submitted by: Kent D. Hopper
July 9th, 2010
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT

Please complete all blanks.

Name: Khris Saleh

(Please Print)

Appointment to: MEASURE R CITIZENS OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
(Name of Board, Commission, or Committee)

☐ Reappointment; or IF NEW, please provide:

Street Address: 1235A N. PROSPECT ST
PORTERVILLE CA 93257

Mailing Address: SAME AS ABOVE

Name of Business:

☐ Own ☐ Operate

Business Address:

Telephone: Home (559) 310-0123
Work __________________
FAX (559) 282-3023
E-mail Khris-Saleh@yahoo.com

City of Porterville resident: ☒ Yes
☐ No

Registered Voter: ☐ Yes
☐ No
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Qualifications:

☒ Measure H Committee member
☒ City of Porterville Resident
☒ Registered Voter

☐ Resume attached
☒ Letter of request attached

Submitted By: __________________________  7/9/10

Received by: __________________________

Forwarded to: City Clerk ☐ Date: 7/14/10
City Council ☒ Date: 7/14/10
City Manager ☒ Date: 7/14/10
Applicable Dept. ☐ Date: __________________________

Tentative Council Mtg Date: __________________________
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M.A. Khris Saleh  
1235A N. Prospect Street  
Porterville, Ca 93257

July 9, 2010  

City Clerk  
City of Porterville  
291 N. Main Street  
Porterville, Ca 93257

Re: Request For Appointment to Measure R Committee

Dear Sir or Madam:

I would like to submit my request for appointment to the Measure R Citizens’ Oversight Committee.

I am looking forward to the opportunity to sit on the Oversight Committee so that I could get a better idea on where our taxes are going and how they are being utilized to solve our transportation needs. I will be diligent in my role as an oversight committee member. I will work hard to ensure that I understand the original ballot proposition and how it relates to the current expenditure plan. In addition, I will be fair and level headed in my analysis of the county’s transportation plan. Above all else, I will be mindful that I am representing the interests of the tax-paying citizens from the City of Porterville.

I humbly request that you review my request favorably and appoint me to serve on the Measure R Citizen’s Oversight Committee.

Respectfully Submitted,

M.A. Khris Saleh
Khris Saleh

1235 North Prospect Street, Porterville, California 93257
(559) 310-0173/ (559) 782-3023 fax
Email: khris_saleh@yahoo.com

Professional Objective
I am seeking the opportunity to represent the City of Porterville as a member of the Measure R Citizens' Oversight Committee.

Employment Experience
01/09-  Shop N Save Market / Al's Mini Mart  Porterville, California
       General Manager

09/05-10/08  Eli Lilly & Company  Monterey, California
             Pharmaceutical Sales Representative

5/02-09/05  Southern Wine and Spirits  Fresno, California
            Chain Sales Representative

Educational Background
01/97-12/01  California State University, Fresno  Fresno, California
Bachelor of Science Degree: Business Administration, Marketing.

Activities and Affiliations:
- General Motors Marketing Internship Agency Coordinator
- Fresno State/College of Sequoias Marketing Study Member
- Inter-Fraternity Council President
- Kappa Sigma Fraternity President

Extracurricular Activities
- Baseball Coach- Porterville Little League
- Soccer Coach- Porterville AYSO
- Information Officer-Porterville Little League Board of Directors
- Alumni Advisor- Kappa Sigma Fraternity
- Alumni Mentor- Craig School of Business; CSU Fresno
- Member- Transportation and Use Tax Oversight Committee (Measure H)
- Campaign Manager- Taha Saleh for City Council 2010
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT

Please complete all blanks.

Name: ELLEN NICHOLS

(Please Print)

Appointment to: MEASURE R OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

(Name of Board, Commission, or Committee)

☐ Reappointment; or IF NEW, please provide:

Street Address: 456 N. HAWAII ST.

PORTERVILLE

Mailing Address: SAME

Name of Business: RETIRED

☐ Own ☐ Operate

Business Address:

Telephone: Home 784-5539

Work

FAX

E-mail

City of Porterville resident:

☒ Yes

☐ No

Registered Voter:

☒ Yes

☐ No
Qualifications: I AM A VOTER WHO HAS EXERCISED THE VOTING PRIVILEGE IN NEARLY EVERY ELECTION SINCE I WAS OLD ENOUGH TO DO SO. I AM INTERESTED IN CITY AND COUNTY GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS, AS WELL AS STATE AND NATIONAL CONCERNS. I GATHER INFORMATION FROM SUCH VARIED SOURCES AS THE BBC TO K-TIP AND KUZZ RADIO; FROM PBS AND NPR TO CHANNEL 26 NEWS; FROM THE L.A. TIMES AND THE RECORDER; TO STUDENT NEWSPAPERS AND ORGANIZATIONS' NEWSLETTERS; AND FROM TALKING WITH PEOPLE. I HAVE WORKED IN BUSINESS, FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND PUBS, AND AS PART OF A FAMILY BUSINESS. MY BACHELOR'S DEGREE IS BASED ON LIBERAL ARTS.

☐ Resume attached
☐ Letter of request attached

Submitted By: Ellen Nichols  7-15-10

Date

Received by:

Forwarded to: City Clerk  Date: 7/14/10
City Council  Date: 7/14/10
City Manager  Date: 7/14/10

Applicable Dept.  Date:

Tentative Council Mtg Date: 7-20-10
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SUBJECT: DESIGNATION OF VOTING DELEGATES AND ALTERNATE FOR LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES 2010 ANNUAL CONFERENCE

SOURCE: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES/CITY CLERK DIVISION

COMMENT: The League of California Cities’ Annual Conference is scheduled to take place September 15 – 17, 2010 in San Diego. In addition to the training program offered, an important aspect of the League’s conference is the Annual Business Meeting, during which the membership considers and takes action on resolutions that establish official League policy. This year, the Business Meeting is scheduled for Friday, September 17th at 3:00 p.m.

In order to vote at this meeting, the City Council must designate a voting delegate. In the event the voting delegate is unable to serve in that capacity, the League’s Bylaws also allow for the designation of up to two alternates.

The estimated cost for attendance per Council Member is approximately $1,800. This cost includes conference registration and materials, accommodations, mileage and meals. Funding is currently available in the Council’s travel budget.

RECOMMENDATION: If there is interest in Council Member attendance at the League of California Cities Annual Conference, that the City Council designate one City Council Member to serve as a voting delegate, and one City Council Member to serve as an alternate voting delegate at the Conference.

ATTACHMENTS: Annual Conference Voting Procedures
Voting Delegate/Alternate Form

Item No. 20

Approved/Funded CM
1. **One City One Vote.** Each member city has a right to cast one vote on matters pertaining to League policy.

2. **Designating a City Voting Representative.** Prior to the Annual Conference, each city council may designate a voting delegate and up to two alternates; these individuals are identified on the Voting Delegate Form provided to the League Credentials Committee.

3. **Registering with the Credentials Committee.** The voting delegate, or alternates, may pick up the city’s voting card at the Voting Delegate Desk in the conference registration area. Voting delegates and alternates must sign in at the Voting Delegate Desk. Here they will receive a special sticker on their name badge and thus be admitted to the voting area at the Business Meeting.

4. **Signing Initiated Resolution Petitions.** Only those individuals who are voting delegates (or alternates), and who have picked up their city’s voting card by providing a signature to the Credentials Committee at the Voting Delegate Desk, may sign petitions to initiate a resolution.

5. **Voting.** To cast the city’s vote, a city official must have in his or her possession the city’s voting card and be registered with the Credentials Committee. The voting card may be transferred freely between the voting delegate and alternates, but may not be transferred to another city official who is neither a voting delegate or alternate.

6. **Voting Area at Business Meeting.** At the Business Meeting, individuals with a voting card will sit in a designated area. Admission will be limited to those individuals with a special sticker on their name badge identifying them as a voting delegate or alternate.

7. **Resolving Disputes.** In case of dispute, the Credentials Committee will determine the validity of signatures on petitioned resolutions and the right of a city official to vote at the Business Meeting.
2010 ANNUAL CONFERENCE
VOTING DELEGATE/ALTERNATE FORM

Please complete this form and return it to the League office by Friday, August 20, 2010. Forms not sent by this deadline may be submitted to the Voting Delegate Desk located in the Annual Conference Registration Area. Your city council may designate one voting delegate and up to two alternates.

In order to vote at the Annual Business Meeting (General Assembly), voting delegates and alternates must be designated by your city council. Please attach the council resolution as proof of designation. As an alternative, the Mayor or City Clerk may sign this form, affirming that the designation reflects the action taken by the council.

Please note: Voting delegates and alternates will be seated in a separate area at the Annual Business Meeting. Admission to this designated area will be limited to individuals (voting delegates and alternates) who are identified with a special sticker on their conference badge. This sticker can be obtained only at the Voting Delegate Desk.

1. VOTING DELEGATE

Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________

2. VOTING DELEGATE - ALTERNATE

Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________

3. VOTING DELEGATE - ALTERNATE

Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________

PLEASE ATTACH COUNCIL RESOLUTION DESIGNATING VOTING DELEGATE AND ALTERNATES.

OR

ATTEST: I affirm that the information provided reflects action by the city council to designate the voting delegate and alternate(s).

Name: __________________________ E-mail __________________________
Mayor or City Clerk (circle one) __________________________ Phone: __________________________
(signature) __________________________ Date: __________________________

Please complete and return by Friday, August 20 to:

League of California Cities FAX: (916) 658-8240
ATTN: Mary McCullough E-mail: mccullom@cacities.org
1400 K Street (916) 658-8247
Sacramento, CA 95814
COUNCIL AGENDA: JULY 20, 2010

SUBJECT: AWARD or REJECTION OPTIONS - 2009/2010 MICRO-SURFACING PROJECT

SOURCE Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: On June 29, 2010, staff received three (3) bids for the Micro-Surfacing Project. The project is part of the City's Measure “R” street maintenance program, which consists of a durable thin asphalt overlay on several streets within the City. An important project component is the removal and replacement of badly distressed asphalt concrete, along with the sealing of significant cracks. New pavement markings will be placed once each street receives the thin asphalt overlay. Streets and project limits are as follows:

- Main Street – Morton Avenue to Henderson Avenue
- Jaye Street – Date Avenue to Olive Avenue
- Prospect Street – Henderson Avenue to Westfield Avenue
- Henderson Avenue – Indiana Street to Prospect Street.
- Orange Avenue – D Street to Jaye Street

The Engineer’s Estimate for the project is $833,379.00. The low bid exceeded the Engineer’s Estimate by 25.7%.

The bids are as follows:

1. Intermountain Slurry Seal
   Watsonville, CA
   $1,047,935.56

2. Valley Slurry Seal
   West Sacramento, CA
   $1,105,673.85

3. Pavement Coatings
   Mira Loma, CA
   Non Responsive
   Incomplete Bid

The low bid exceeds available funding for this project and for Council’s information the following funding was available during the bidding process:

- 09/10 FY Measure “R” Local Fund Balance: $283,085
- 10/11 FY Measure “R” Local Fund Advancement: $726,558
  Total: $1,009,643

[Signature]
Appropriated/Funded CM ACTING

Item No. 21
The 10/11 “Local” Measure ‘R’ tax revenue advancement was recently approved by Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) as a one time option available to all agencies that may want to advance some of their road improvement/maintenance projects. TCAG presented this funding advancement option as a result of all the agencies diligent efforts in preparing “Shovel Ready” projects for the next round of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act fund (ARRA II) that never transpired.

**POSSIBLE OPTIONS**

1) Rejection of all bids and re-advertise the project. The only con to this option is timing. The project would require staff to rebid during the spring of 2011 so as to assure proper construction weather.

2) Award four (4) of the five (5) streets listed in the order outlined in the bid proposal (Main Street, Henderson Avenue, Prospect Street and Jaye Street). The following is an illustration of the funds needed to finance this option:

   - The low bidder remains the low bidder in this scenario and the contract amount would be $893,022.16. An additional $89,302 is required for the construction contingency and $22,326 (2.5%) is required for construction management, quality control and inspection. The total cost associated with the project is then $1,004,650, which is within budget.

3) Transfer funds from the Local Transportation Fund that are available and have become apparent as we close the 09/10 Fiscal Year Financial Reports or transfer funds from another project that may not bid during the 10/11 Fiscal Year. The following is an illustration of the funds needed to finance the project as bid:

   - Should Council decide to award all five streets, an additional $104,794 is required for the construction contingency and $26,198 (2.5%) is required for construction management, quality control and inspection. The 2.5% seems to be reasonable since this is a short term project. The total cost associated with the project is $1,178,928, which is $169,285 more than the available funds.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the City Council direct staff based on one of the following options:
Option No. 1

1) Reject all bids and direct City Engineer to re-advertise the project to the spring of 2011; or

Option No. 2

2) Award the Micro-Surfacing Project for streets in order listed within the bid proposal (Main Street, Henderson Avenue, Prospect Street and Jaye Street) to Intermountain Slurry Seal in the amount of $893,022.16;

3) Authorize progress payments up to 90% of the contract amount; and

4) Authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen construction costs and 2.5% for construction management, quality control testing and inspection; or

Option No. 3

5) Award the Micro-Surfacing Project to Intermountain Slurry Seal as bid in the amount of $1,047,935.56;

6) Authorize progress payments up to 90% of the contract amount;

7) Authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen construction costs and 2.5% for construction; and

8) Appropriate available Local Transportation Funds to offset the funding shortfall.

ATTACHMENTS: Locator Maps (Main, Jaye, Prospect, Henderson and Orange)
SUBJECT: PRELIMINARY ANNUAL ENGINEER'S REPORT OF ASSESSMENTS FOR LIGHTING & LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS AND SETTING A PUBLIC HEARING

SOURCE: PARKS AND LEISURE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: The City has created sixty-four lighting and landscape maintenance districts (LMDs) since 1989. A separate district has been established for each new land development. Many of these districts only contain street lighting, for which the assessment was to collect only a portion of the street lighting cost. Other districts have landscape improvements installed within public right-of-ways or public properties in addition to the street lighting. In these instances, the landscaping has been established to provide a more aesthetic appearance and a healthier environment. Only the property owners who directly benefit from improvements are assessed for the maintenance. Annually, a process of evaluating maintenance needs and establishing an assessment for each LMD must be followed.

The first attached Resolution is necessary to initiate the annual Engineer’s Report, which will show the proposed assessments for the 2010 – 2011 Fiscal Year. The second Resolution provides preliminary approval to the Engineer’s Report for Fiscal Year 2010 – 2011. The comprehensive annual Engineer’s Report is provided as an attachment. Once the assessments are approved by the City Council, they are transmitted to the County of Tulare for placement upon the tax bill of the property owners and indicated as a special assessment. The third Resolution declares the intent of the City Council to levy and collect the assessments for Fiscal Year 2010 – 2011, and sets a Public Hearing on the assessments for August 3, 2010.

City Council has expressed concerns in the past regarding the lack of maintenance in several Landscape Maintenance Districts. City staff has initiated an effort with the assistance of CSET workers to improve those Districts. Some of the duties performed by the CSET workers include pruning trees and shrubs, relocating irrigation and planting various plant material. The condition of the improved Districts will be documented for quality control. Staff is committed to continue to improve the assessment process, as well as increase maintenance efforts during the upcoming Fiscal Year. The Engineer’s Report for Fiscal Year 2010 – 2011 was produced by City staff. Last year the City utilized Willdan & Associates to produce the report at an expense of $7,700.
RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. That the City Council adopt Resolutions:
   c. Declaring the intent to levy and collect assessments for Fiscal Year 2010 – 2011, and offering a time and place for hearing objections thereto.

2. Further, that the City Council set a public hearing for 7:00 PM on August 3, 2010 regarding the Engineer’s Report and proposed assessments for the Landscape and Lighting Maintenance Districts for Fiscal Year 2010 – 2011.

ATTACHMENTS: Resolution ordering preparation of Engineer’s Report
Resolution of preliminary approval to Engineer’s Report
Engineer’s Report for Fiscal Year 2010 – 2011
Resolution declaring intent to levy assessments & set public hearing
RESOLUTION NO.: ________


WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Porterville has determined that the public interest, convenience and necessity required the maintenance of lighting systems, landscape planting materials, irrigation systems and appurtenances in designated areas of the City; and

WHEREAS, the City has established assessment districts to recover the cost of maintenance work; and

WHEREAS, Section 22622 of the California Streets and Highways Code requires that an Engineer’s Report be prepared and filed annually, outlining the assessments to be levied against the properties within the assessment district.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Porterville that:


APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of July 2010.

________________________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: ____________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
RESOLUTION NO.: _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE GIVING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF ENGINEER'S REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011 FOR LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS

WHEREAS, on the 20th day of July, 2010 said City Council did adopt a Resolution directing the Engineer of Work to make and file with the City Clerk of said City a report in writing for Fiscal Year 2010 – 2011 as required by the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972;

WHEREAS, said Engineer of Work has made and filed with the City Clerk of said City a report in writing as called for in said Resolution and under and pursuant to said Act, which report has been presented to this Council for consideration;

WHEREAS, said Council has duly considered said report and each and every part thereof, and finds that each and every part of said report is sufficient, and that said report, nor any part thereof, requires or should be modified.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Porterville that:

1. The Engineer’s Estimate of the itemized costs and expenses of said work and of the incidental expenses in connection therewith, contained in said report be, and each of them are hereby preliminarily approved and confirmed.

2. The diagram showing the Assessment Districts referred to and described in said report (the boundaries of the subdivision of land within each said Assessment District), are approved and confirmed as the same as existed at the time of passage of Resolution originally establishing each District.

3. The proposed assessments upon the subdivisions of land in said Assessment Districts are in proportion to the estimated benefit to be received by said subdivisions, respectively, from said normal and customary maintenance and of the incidental expenses thereof, as contained in said report, and are hereby preliminarily approved and confirmed.

4. Said report shall stand as the Engineer’s Report for the purposes of all subsequent proceedings, and pursuant to the proposed district.

Reference is hereby made to said maps for further, full and more particular description of said Assessment District, and the same maps so on file shall govern for all details as to the extent of each said Assessment District.
APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of July 2010.

Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: ________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
CITY OF PORTERVILLE, CALIFORNIA
ENGINEER'S REPORT FOR
LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS
2010-2011 FISCAL YEAR

SECTION 1. Authority for Report

This report is prepared by order of the City Council of the City of Porterville, Resolution Number. The report is in compliance with the requirements of Chapter 1, Article 4, and Chapter 3, Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code, State of California (Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972).

SECTION 2. General Description

The City Council has heretofore elected to place the permanent landscape area along Westwood Street of Westwood Estates, Unit 1, 2, and 3 subdivisions, into Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1 and to annex the permanent landscape areas along the perimeter streets of the following developments:

1. Annexation No. 1 = The Hope Drive, Newcomb Street, Thunderbolt Drive and Corsair Drive frontages of the Airport Industrial Park

2. Annexation No. 2 = Hillcrest Street right-of-way, fire access road, Jasmine Drive entries, west perimeter including the parcel on which the water tank is located, viewpoint look-out parcel at the northwest corner of Jasmine Ranch Subdivision, and the pedestrian access to each cul-de-sac from Hillcrest Street

3. Annexation No. 3 = Porter Creek Avenue right-of-way to the center line of the Porter Slough, median entry, 15' landscape area between Porter Creek Subdivision block wall to Westwood Street, the pedestrian access bridge over Porter Slough and all of the maintenance area to the center line of Porter Slough

4. Annexation No. 4 = LaVida Park Subdivision green belt, east on Plum Way Street and the entries east along Beverly Street

5. Annexation No. 5 = Westwood Estates #4 Subdivision, along the north and south entries adjacent to the block wall on Westwood Street and the median divider on White Chapel Lane including all trees in front yard planting strip

6. Annexation No. 6 = Northpointe Subdivision includes subdivision lighting located south of Westfield Avenue and east of Mathew Street

7. Annexation No. 7 = Quail Park Phase II Subdivision located on Lime Street

8. Annexation No. 8 = Westwood Park Unit Three Subdivision located on Westwood Street adjacent to the Tule River

9. Annexation No. 9 = Parcel Map No. 4132 located on the corner of Henderson Avenue and Westwood Street

10. Annexation No. 10 = Westview Subdivision located on the corner of Westfield Avenue and Cobb Street
11. Annexation No. 11 = New Horizons Phase One Subdivision and the remainder parcel located along Springville Ave. and Indiana Street
12. Annexation No. 12 = Sunrise Estates Phase Six Subdivision located on the corner of Prospect Street and Orange Avenue
13. Annexation 13 WITHDRAWN
14. Annexation No. 14 = Wisconsin Manor I Subdivision located on the corner of Wisconsin Way and Mulberry Avenue
15. Annexation No. 15 = Northpointe Phase II Subdivision located on Mathew Street
16. Annexation No. 16 = New Horizons Phase II located on the corner of Indiana Street and Springville Avenue
17. Annexation 17 NOT FORMED;
18. Annexation No. 18 = Westwood Mobile Home Park Phase I Subdivision located on Westwood Street and Olive Avenue
19. Annexation No. 19 = Castle Woods Phase I Subdivision located along Castle Avenue and Newcomb Street
20. District No. 2 = North Creek Estates located on Westwood north of Westfield
21. District No. 3 = New Expressions Phase I Subdivision located along Indiana Street between Springville Avenue and Cleo Avenue
22. District No. 4 = River Springs Phase I Subdivision located along Newcomb Street
23. District No. 5 = Castle Woods Phase II Subdivision located at Median Avenue and Salisbury.
24. District No. 6 = Creekview Estates located between Porter Creek Avenue and the property line in Porter Slough
25. District No. 7 = Ford Estates located on the corner of Roby and Westwood Avenue
26. District No. 8 = River Breeze located on Newcomb Street between Patsy and Spring Streets
27. District No. 9 = Orchard Ridge Phase 3 located on Mathew Street between Nancy Avenue, Cheryll Avenue and Belmont Street
28. District No. 10 = Orchard Ridge Phase 4 located on LaVida Court and Carmelo Street
29. District No. 11 = Orchard Ridge Phase 5 located on Mathew Street between LaVida Avenue, Michael Street and Julieanne Avenue
30. District No. 12 = Westwood Estates, Unit 5, Phase 2, located on Henderson Avenue and Brandy Way
31. District No. 13 = River Ranch 3, located on Lloyd Avenue and Newcomb Street
32. District No. 14 = River Springs, Phase Two Subdivision, located on River Avenue, Beverly Street, Date Avenue and River Springs Drive
33. District No. 15 = Meadowood, Phase One Subdivision, located on Newcomb Street, Cheryl Avenue and York Street
34. District No. 16 = New Expressions, Phase Two Subdivision, located on Lybarger Avenue Cul de Sac at the entry to the Tule River Parkway Trail
35. District No. 17 = Orchard Ridge Phase 6 Subdivision located north of Westfield Avenue between Michael Street and Lombardi Street on Julieann Avenue and Michael Street
36. District No. 18 = Ohio North Subdivision located on Ohio Way Street
37. District No. 19 = Williams Ranch, Phase One located south of Westfield Avenue on Silver Maple Street, Wall Court and San Lucia Court
38. District No. 20 = West View Place Subdivision located on Median Avenue
39. District No. 21 = Orchard Ridge Phase Seven Subdivision located on Pioneer Avenue, Michael Street and Mathew Street
40. District No. 22 = Meadowood Phase Two Subdivision located on Newcomb Street, Pioneer Avenue, Julieann Avenue, Greenfield Street, York Street and Birch Street
41. District No. 23 = Riverview Estates Phase Three Subdivision located on Roby Avenue, Belmont Street, Orange Avenue, Forest Avenue and Parkwest Street
42. District No. 24 = Orchard Ridge, Phase Eight Subdivision located on Mathew Street, Michael Street, Pamela Avenue and Santa Maria Avenue
43. District No. 25 = Casas Del Rio Subdivision located on Date Street, Casas Del Rio Avenue, Presidio Avenue, Rio Bonito Street, Alamo Court, Camellia Street, Tule Court and Rio Vista Avenue
44. District No. 26 = Orchard Ridge, Phase Nine Subdivision located on Belmont Street, Pamela, Santa Maria and Pioneer Avenues
45. District No. 27 = New Expressions, Phase Three Subdivision located on Springville Avenue, Cleo Avenue and McIntire Avenue along Wisconsin Street
46. District No. 28 = Meadowood, Phase Three Subdivision located on Westfield Avenue, Cheryl Avenue, Salisbury Street, Julieann Avenue and Pioneer Avenue
47. District No. 29 = River Springs, Phase 3 Subdivision located on Date Avenue, River Springs Drive and Atkins Court
48. District No. 30 = Sierra Meadows, Phase 1, Subdivision located at Indiana Street and Gibbons Avenue
49. District No. 31 = Williams Ranch, Phase 2 and 3 Subdivision on Westwood Street between Henderson and Westfield Avenues
50. District No. 32 = Sunrise Villa, Phase 1, 2 and 3 Subdivision located along Mulberry Avenue east of Cottage Street. Phases 2 and 3 were annexed on June 16, 2009
51. District No. 33 = New Expressions, Phase 4 Subdivision located on Indiana Street between Springville Avenue and the Tule River

52. District No. 34 = Meadow Breeze, Phase 3 Subdivision located on Matthew Street, Michael Place, Verdugo Place, Lu Ann Place, Belmont Place, Brian Avenue and Castle Avenue

53. District No. 35 = Meadow Breeze, Phase 1 Subdivision located on Pioneer Avenue and Salisbury Street

54. District No. 36 = Amalene Estates Subdivision located on Westwood between the Tule River and Olive Avenue; INCORPORATED INTO DISTRICT 40.

55. District No. 37 = Riverview Estates, Phase 4 Subdivision located south of Olive Avenue, and east of Mathew Street, including Union Lane and Parkwest Street

56. District No. 38 = Ranch Victoria, Phase One Subdivision located on the north side of Putnam Avenue and east of Mathew Street

57. District No. 39 = Williams Ranch Phase 4 Subdivision, including Theta Avenue, Bel-Aire Court, Terry Court, Silver Maple Street and Red Oak Street

58. District No. 40 = Amalene Estates Subdivision located on Westwood between the Tule River and Olive Avenue, including Vine Avenue, Clare Avenue, Clare Court, and Dogwood Street

59. District No. 41 = Beverly Glenn Subdivision, located between Lotus and Beverly Streets, including Date Avenue

60. District No. 42 = Sierra Estates Subdivision, located east of Leggett Street and including Grand Avenue, South Place, Doree Place and Maurer Street. It also includes stub streets for Bellevue and Kanai Streets

61. District No. 43 = Sierra Meadows Phase Two Subdivision located on Jaye Street and Gibbons Avenue and including Stacie, Yates, and Melinda Avenues and Mesa Oak and Pearson Streets

62. District No. 44 = Summit Estates, Phase One Subdivision located along Mathew Street and includes Orange Avenue and Lombardi and Argyle Streets

63. District No. 45 = New Expressions Phase Five Subdivision located along Parkway Drive and Indiana Street and includes Cloverleaf, Wisconsin, Bay Oak and Milo Streets

64. District No. 46 = Moorea Manor Subdivision located along Newcomb and includes San Lucia Lane

SECTION 3. Plans and Specifications

The plans and specifications for the landscaping have been prepared by the developers' engineers and have been approved as part of the improvement plans for the various developments. The plans and specifications for the landscaping are in conformance with the requirements of the City Council's conditions of approval of said Parcel Maps and Subdivisions.
Reference is hereby made to said subdivision maps, parcel maps and assessment diagrams for the exact location of the landscape areas. The plans and specifications by reference are hereby made a part of this report to the same extent as if said plans and specifications were attached hereto.

SECTION 4. Improvements

Landscaping improvements will include landscaping the entry ways, medians and areas behind subdivision block wall.

SECTION 5. Estimated Maintenance Costs

Maintenance is currently being performed by City staff and contract services. Accordingly, the City's record-keeping will be required to be sufficiently accurate to detail the expenses incurred on behalf of each individual annexation so that these costs may be recaptured through assessments.

The City Finance Department presently maintains records of expenditures for each annexation. Because of the restrictions placed upon municipal budgets through the passage of Proposition No. 218 and the lag between the time assessments are made and revenues are collected by the City, it is appropriate that assessments be made in advance of the anticipated expenditures to provide working capital for the maintenance effort. The fund balance for some districts would appear to justify a refund, however, it is clear that some of the costs for some of the districts have not been properly recognized. The staff is committed to identifying the discrepancies and rectifying during this fiscal year. Refunds have been included in the form of one time adjustments to the assessment reducing the amount actually assessed per lot.

The assessments include costs accumulated to date and estimated costs for the 2010-2011 fiscal year for Landscape and Lighting District No. 1, including Annexations 1 through 19 and District 2 through 46.

SECTION 6. Assessment Diagram

Copies of the assessment diagrams were attached to each individual Engineer's Reports and were labeled "Exhibit A". An Index Map is attached to this report identifying the location of the original district and each annexation.

SECTION 7. Assessment

The City Council, in forming Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1 and in annexing territories to the district, has maintained the philosophy that the subdivider or developer is responsible for the plantings, irrigation system and the maintenance of the improvements until they become well established. The assessments for maintenance thus only include anticipated costs incurred subsequent to the acceptance of the system by the City Council on behalf of the Maintenance District.

An exception to this philosophy is at Annexation No. 1, Airport Industrial Park, where the owners and the City will share costs for the plantings and irrigation system and the maintenance of improvements.
The maintenance of the landscaping is vital for the protection of both economic and humanistic values of the development. The City Council has heretofore determined that for the preservation of values incorporated within developments adjacent to landscaped areas, the landscaped areas should be included in a maintenance district to ensure satisfactory levels of maintenance. The establishment of the assessment for each development must be on a unit by unit basis which will preserve the integrity of each project. There should be a review of each annexation and District to determine if there are changed conditions that effect the assessment.

The determination of benefit for the lots within the districts takes into consideration the facts for the original districts and all annexations thereto.

**Following are estimated maintenance costs and assessments for each District and Annexation.**
District No. 1 - Westwood Estates Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2000
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $15,625.27

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 13,650 sq. ft. of landscaping area $10,952.15
Project Management, 126 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance ($4,048.39)

Maintenance: 13,650 sq. ft. of landscaping area $11,639.99
Project Management, 126 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,504.00
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $404.84
Reserves $1,971.60

Estimated Cost Per Year $15,520.43
Previous Year Assessment $15,017.05
New Assessment $15,520.43

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.
4. The benefit to all lots in the annexed area benefit by the uniform maintenance and appearance. All lots benefit equally.
5. The landscaping on Westwood Avenue is oriented away from the units adjacent to the landscaped area.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

Assessment (A) = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}

A = \frac{\$15,520.43}{126} = \$123.18 \text{ per lot}

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 126.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = \$123.18 \text{ per lot}
Annexation No. 1 - Airport Industrial Park  
2010-2011 Fiscal Year  
Maximum Assessment $3,833.00

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**
Maintenance: 1,024,967 sq. ft. of landscaping area $1,126.79
Project Management, 7 lots

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance ($3,144.68)

Maintenance: 1,024,967 sq. ft. of landscaping area $2,958.06
Project Management, 7 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,028.00
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $314.47
Reserves $597.91

Estimated Cost Per Year $4,898.44

Previous Year Assessment $3,833.00

New Assessment $3,833.00

**ASSESSMENT**
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. The benefit to the lots not adjacent to the landscaped area benefit by the uniform maintenance and appearance. All lots not abutting the landscaped area benefit equally.
4. It is proposed that the assessment be divided among the property owners based on their lot size in the assessment area.
5. The area along the south side of Hope Avenue will be included for maintenance until such time that the adjacent property to the south is developed.
6. The following parcels are exempt from fees since they were sold and/or developed prior to annexation to Maintenance District No. 1.
   a. Parcel 1 on Parcel Map No. 3503
   b. Parcel 1 on Parcel Map No. 3684
   c. Parcel 1 and 4 on Parcel Map 3735

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Total Landscape Maintenance Costs}}{\text{Total Net Assessable Square Feet}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{$3,833.00}{1,024,967} = .00374 \text{ per sq. ft.}
\]

Assess $.00374 per sq. ft. annual charge for landscape construction and maintenance for fiscal year.

Parcel 2 on P.M. No. 3813 = $156.82
Parcel 1 on P.M. No. 3503 = No Fee
Parcel 1 on P.M. No. 3641 = $261.47
Parcel 1 on P.M. No. 3684 = No Fee
Parcels 1 and 4 on P.M. No. 3735 = No Fee
Parcel 2 on P.M. No. 3503 = $162.90
Parcel 1 on P.M. No. 4687 = $464.30

Remaining property owner - COP = $2,787.51

Total = $3,833.00
Annexation No. 2 - Jasmine Ranch
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $8,000.00

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 22,100 sq. ft. of landscaping area $5,203.77
Project Management, 22 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance ($2,520.69)

Maintenance: 22,100 sq. ft. of landscaping area $8,201.23
Project Management, 22 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,088.00
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $252.07
Reserves $1,431.20

Estimated Cost Per Year $10,972.50
Previous Year Assessment $8,000.00
New Assessment $8,000.00

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. Each lot benefits equally from the other landscaped areas, therefore, each lot will share the combined cost equally.
4. The landscape and pedestrian easement is now abandoned and is eliminated from the Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1, Annexation #2, no other changes are proposed.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

\[ A = \frac{\text{Total Assessment} - F}{L} \]

\[ L = \text{Number of lots} \]
\[ F = \text{Assessment for remainder parcel} \]

The 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the above formula. There are 22 lots in Unit One. The 47.89 acre remainder parcel is included on the final subdivision map and will be assessed 20% of the total estimated cost for landscaping maintenance until it is developed at which time it will be combined with the other completed units and assessed fully.

Estimated Assessment
\[ F = 8,000 \times 0.20 = 1,600.00 \text{ for remainder} \]
\[ A = \frac{8,000 - 1,600}{22} = 290.92 \text{ per lot in Unit One} \]
Annexation No. 3 - Porter Creek
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $27,255.81

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**
Maintenance: 89,200 sq. ft. of landscaping area, includes slough clean up $27,896.92
Project Management, 177 lots

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $12,165.17
Maintenance: 89,200 sq. ft. of landscaping area, includes slough clean up $24,971.58
Project Management, 177 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,708.00
Reserves $4,001.94

Estimated Cost Per Year $30,681.52
Previous Year Assessment $23,643.46
New Assessment $23,643.46

**ASSESSMENT**
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. The lots not adjacent to the landscaped area benefit from the uniform appearance of the landscaping. All lots not adjacent to the landscaped area benefit equally.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[ \text{Assessment (A) = Cost (C)} \]
\[ \text{Number of Lots (L)} \]

\[ A = \frac{23,643.46}{177} = 133.58 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 177.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $133.58 per lot
Annexation No. 4 - La Vida Park
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $2,469.42

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 3,790 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: $2,203.65
Project Management, 17 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance ($313.90)

Maintenance: 3,790 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: $2,621.50
Project Management, 17 lots at $1000 ÷ $4.00 per lot $1,068.00
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $31.39
Reserves $558.13

Estimated Cost Per Year $4,279.02
Previous Year Assessment $2,469.42
New Assessment $2,469.42

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. The lots not adjacent to the landscaped area benefit from the uniform appearance of the landscaping. All lots not adjacent to the landscaped area benefit equally.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

A = $2,469.42 ÷ $145.26 per lot
17

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 17.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $145.26 per lot
ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 14,700 sq. ft. of landscaping area and Project Management, 47 lots

$5,899.43

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance

($10,415.36)

Maintenance: 14,700 sq. ft. of landscaping area Project Management, 47 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years Reserves

$6,524.80 $1,188.00 $1,041.54 $1,156.92

Estimated Cost Per Year

$9,911.26

Previous Year Assessment

$6,533.43

New Assessment

$6,600.00

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. The lots not adjacent to the landscaped area benefit from the uniform appearance of the landscaping. All lots not adjacent to the landscaped area benefit equally. Trees in the front yard right-of-way are included in the District on White Chapel Avenue.
4. The cost of planting and installing improvements is to be paid by the developer and no assessment is to be made therefore.
5. It is proposed that Lots 1 through 34 be assessed for maintenance of the landscaped area. It has been determined that the relative benefit of developed lots as compared to the reminder parcel is as shown in the formula below.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

\[ \text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} \]

\[ A = \frac{$6,600.00}{47} = $140.43 \] per lot

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 47.

Estimated Annual Assessment

A = $140.43 per lot
Annexation No. 6 - Northpointe Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $1,722.52

*ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010*

Maintenance: lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 8 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, Project Management, 81 lots $1,142.08

*ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011*

Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $6,125.80

Maintenance: lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 8 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, $633.21

Project Management, 81 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $643.00

Reserves $63.81

Estimated Cost Per Year $1,340.02

Previous Year Assessment $1,328.91

New Assessment $1,328.91

*ASSESSMENT*

1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

*FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:*

\[
A = \frac{\text{Assessment (A)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{1,328.91}{81} = 16.41 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 81.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $16.41 per lot
Annexation No. 7 - Quail Park Phase II
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $410.40

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 2 ea. @ 5,800 lumens,
Project Management, 12 lots $277.67

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $1,178.56
Maintenance: lighting: 2 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $61.45
Project Management, 12 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $436.00
Reserves $24.87

Estimated Cost Per Year $522.32
Previous Year Assessment $410.40
New Assessment $410.40

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{\$410.40}{12} = \$34.20 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 12.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $34.20 per lot
Annexation No. 8 - Westwood Park Unit 3 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $2,481.27

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 28,460 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 5 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 36 lots

$1,552.21

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance

$9,105.68
Maintenance: 28,460 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 5 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 36 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot

$2,320.84
$1,144.00

Reserves

$519.73

Estimated Cost Per Year

$3,984.57

Previous Year Assessment

$2,481.27

New Assessment

$2,481.27

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = \frac{Cost (C)}{Number of Lots (L)}

A = \frac{$2,481.27}{36} = $68.92 \text{ per lot}

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 36.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $68.92 \text{ per lot}
Annexation No. 9 - Parcel Map 4132
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $396.47

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**

Maintenance: lighting: 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens. $212.37
Project Management, 2 lots

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**

Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $1,528.22

Maintenance: lighting: 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens. $48.28
Project Management, 2 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $406.00
Reserves $22.71

Estimated Cost Per Year $476.99
Previous Year Assessment $396.47
New Assessment $396.47

**ASSESSMENT**

1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

It has been determined that the relative benefit of Parcel 2 as compared to Parcel 1 (developed parcel) is as shown below. This determination of the relative benefit was made based upon an estimate of lighting cost of $47.47, an administrative cost of $300, and a reserve of $49.00.

\[
P_1 = \text{Portion to be assessed to Parcel 1 (developed parcel)}
\]
\[
P_2 = \text{Portion to be assessed to Parcel 2}
\]
\[
T_A = \text{Total Assessment ($)}
\]
\[
A_E = \text{Administration and Engineering Cost}
\]
\[
A_1 = \text{Area of Parcel 1 (acres)}
\]
\[
L = \text{Lighting Cost}
\]
\[
T = \text{Total area (acres)}
\]

\[
P_2 = \frac{A_E \times A_1}{T} = \frac{349 \times 4.81}{6.61} = \$253.96
\]

\[
P_1 = \frac{T_A - P_2 + L}{6} = \frac{349 - 253.96 + 47.47}{6} = \$142.52
\]

Based on benefit in the district, the estimated assessment will be spread based on the preceding formula:

Estimated Assessment
\[
P_2 = \$253.96
\]
\[
P_1 = \$142.52
\]
Annexation No. 10 - Westview Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $1,824.30

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 1,307 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800 lucens, Project Management, 16 lots $1,345.68

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $3,738.84
Maintenance: 1,307 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800 lucens $1,550.35
Project Management, 16 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,064.00
Reserves $392.15

Estimated Cost Per Year $3,006.50
Previous Year Assessment $1,824.30
New Assessment $1,824.30

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = \( \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} \)

\[ A = \frac{1,824.30}{16} = 114.02 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 16.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $114.02 per lot
Annexation No. 11 - New Horizons Phase 1 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $1,045.80

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**
Maintenance: lighting: 6 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 11 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, 2 ea. @ 16,000 lumens. $1,111.50
Project Management, 63 lots

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $5,814.28
Maintenance: lighting: 6 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 11 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, 2 ea. @ 16,000 lumens. $686.87
Project Management, 63 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $589.00
Reserves $63.77
Estimated Cost Per Year $1,339.64
Previous Year Assessment $1,045.80
New Assessment $1,045.80

**ASSESSMENT**
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{1,045.80}{63} = 16.60 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 63.

**Estimated Annual Assessment**

\[
A = 16.60 \text{ per lot}
\]
Annexation No. 12 - Sunrise Estates Phase 6 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $1,429.00

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 2,840 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 7 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 32 lots $1,427.73

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance ($366.27)

Maintenance: 2,840 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 7 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $1,525.59
Project Management, 32 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,128.00
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $118.14
Reserves $398.04

Estimated Cost Per Year $3,169.77
Previous Year Assessment $1,429.00
New Assessment $1,429.00

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = \( \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} \)

\[
A = \frac{\$1,429.00}{32} = \$44.66 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 32.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = \$44.66 \text{ per lot}
\]
Annexation No. 14 - Wisconsin Manor 1 Subdivision  
2010-2011 Fiscal Year  
Maximum Assessment $1,824.69

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 3,030 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 3 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 8 lots $1,613.96

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance ($808.76)
Maintenance: 3,030 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 3 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $2,340.43
Project Management, 8 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,032.00
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $80.88
Reserves $505.86

Estimated Cost Per Year $3,959.17
Previous Year Assessment $1,824.69
New Assessment $1,824.69

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

A = $1,824.69 / 8 = $228.08 per lot

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 8.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $228.08 per lot
Annexation No. 15 - Northpointe Phase II Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $2,816.00

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 5 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, $582.25
Project Management, 59 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $7,337.18
Maintenance: lighting: 5 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 9,500 lumens $190.52
Project Management, 59 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $577.00
Reserves $38.38
Estimated Cost Per Year $805.90
Previous Year Assessment $802.56
New Assessment $802.56

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

A = $802.56 / 59 = $13.60 per lot

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 59.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $13.60 per lot
Annexation No. 16 - New Horizons Phase 2 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $1,803.34

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 8 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 8 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, $1,037.22
Project Management, 81 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $5,814.28
Maintenance: lighting: 8 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 8 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, $541.04
Project Management, 81 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $643.00
Reserves $59.20

Estimated Cost Per Year $1,243.24
Previous Year Assessment $1,233.75
New Assessment $1,233.75

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic
   appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the
   development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{$1,233.75}{81} = $15.23 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 81.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = $15.23 \text{ per lot}
\]
Annexation No. 18 - Westwood Village Mobile Home Park Phase 1
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $787.35

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 5 ea. @ 16,000 lumens. $394.80
Project Management, 1 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $2,478.57
Maintenance: lighting: 5 ea. @ 16,000 lumens. $241.38
Project Management, 1 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $403.00
Reserves $32.22
Estimated Cost Per Year $676.60
Previous Year Assessment $672.37
New Assessment $672.37

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
\[ \text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} \]
\[ A = \frac{\$672.37}{1} = \$672.37 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 1.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $672.37 per lot
Annexation No. 19 - Castle Woods Phase 1 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $919.20

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 9 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens. $959.38
Project Management, 30 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $2,938.35
Maintenance: lighting: 9 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens. $324.79
Project Management, 30 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $490.00
Reserves $40.94
Estimated Cost Per Year $855.73
Previous Year Assessment $849.83
New Assessment $849.83

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = \( \frac{Cost (C)}{Number \ of \ Lots \ (L)} \)

\[ A = \frac{849.83}{30} = 28.33 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 30.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[ A = 28.33 \text{ per lot} \]
District No. 2 - North Creek Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 1998
(Adjusted 1998)
Maximum Assessment $17,425.72

*ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010*

Maintenance: 12,677 sq. ft. of landscaping area $10,014.60
Project Management, 104 lots

*ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011*

Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $24,614.59

Maintenance: 12,677 sq. ft. of landscaping area $12,424.14
Project Management, 104 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,416.00

Reserves $2,076.02

Estimated Cost Per Year $15,916.16
Previous Year Assessment $12,611.05
New Assessment $12,611.05

**ASSESSMENT**

1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{12,611.05}{104} = 121.26 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 104.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $121.26 per lot
District No. 3 - New Expressions Phase 1 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 1998
(Adjusted 1998)
Maximum Assessment $1,329.18

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 10 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $707.49
Project Management, 56 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $3,163.76
Maintenance: lighting: 10 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $307.24
Project Management, 56 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $568.00
Reserves $43.76

Estimated Cost Per Year $919.00
Previous Year Assessment $913.61
New Assessment $913.61

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{913.61}{56} = 16.31 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 56.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = 16.31 \text{ per lot}
\]
District No. 4 - River Springs Phase 1 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $3,134.58

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 2,100 sq. ft. of landscaping area $2,313.97
Project Management, 51 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $3,886.31
Maintenance: 2,100 sq. ft. of landscaping area $2,335.18
Project Management, 51 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,204.00
Reserves $530.88

Estimated Cost Per Year $4,070.06
Previous Year Assessment $2,719.14
New Assessment $2,719.14

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

\[
A = \frac{\$2,719.14}{51} = \$53.32 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 51.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $53.32 per lot
District No. 5 - Castle Woods Phase 2 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2002
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $1,021.48

*ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010*
Maintenance: 1,715 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 8 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 25 lots

$1,221.41

*ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011*
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance

($986.55)

Maintenance: 1,715 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 8 ea. @ 5,800 lumens

$1,308.26

Project Management, 25 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot

$1,100.00

Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years

$99.75

Reserves

$361.24

Estimated Cost Per Year

$2,869.25

Previous Year Assessment

$1,004.41

New Assessment

$1,004.41

*ASSESSMENT*

1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.

2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.

3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

*FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:*

Assessment (A) = \[
\frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{1,004.41}{25} = 40.18 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 25.

Estimated Annual Assessment

A = $40.18 per lot
District No. 6 - Creekview Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 1999
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $4,869.30

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 23,600 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 5 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 19 lots $5,443.15

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance ($21,153.08)

Maintenance: 23,600 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 5 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $5,763.67
Project Management, 19 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,076.00
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $2,115.31
Reserves $1,025.95

Estimated Cost Per Year $9,980.93
Previous Year Assessment $4,787.91
New Assessment $4,869.30

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

A = $4,869.30 = $256.28 per lot
19

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 19.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $256.28 per lot
District No. 7 - Ford Estates Phase 1 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 1999
(Adjusted 1999)
Maximum Assessment $2,857.88

*ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010*
Maintenance: 1,365 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens, Project Management, 20 lots
$2,561.71

*ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011*
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance
$8,987.92

Maintenance: 1,365 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 20 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot
$1,872.07
$1,080.00

Reserves
$442.81

Estimated Cost Per Year
$3,394.88

Previous Year Assessment
$2,163.40

New Assessment
$2,163.40

**ASSESSMENT**
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

---

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

Unit Cost = Cost (C) / Number of front feet

Phase 1 = $2,163.40 / 311.72 feet = $6.94 per foot

Ultimate cost to maintain entire Westwood Street frontage:
1,065.95 feet X $6.94 per foot = $7,397.69

Ultimate cost per lot to maintain entire Westwood Street frontage:
$7,397.69 / 109 lots = $67.88 per lot

Estimated Assessment
$2,163.40 - ($67.88 X 20) = $805.80 = remainder parcel assessment

Phase 1 Assessment = $67.88 per lot
Remainder Parcel Assessment = $805.80
District No. 8 - River Breeze Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $5,043.35

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**
Maintenance: 1,000 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 25,600 sq. ft. of fire break, and
lighting: 8 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 37 lots

**$3,717.59**

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance

$18,042.10

Maintenance: 1,000 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 25,600 sq. ft. of fire break, and
lighting: 8 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 37 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot

$4,478.62
$1,148.00

Reserves

$843.99

Estimated Cost Per Year

$6,470.61

Previous Year Assessment

$4,374.93

New Assessment

$4,374.93

**ASSESSMENT**

1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic
   appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the
   development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

Assessment (A) = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}

A = \frac{\$4,374.93}{37} = $118.24 per lot

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 37.

Estimated Annual Assessment

A = $118.24 per lot
District No. 9 - Orchard Ridge Phase 3 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 1999
(Adjusted 1999)
Maximum Assessment $1,301.23

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 10 ea. @ 5,800 lumens,                           $728.74
Project Management, 56 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance                                  $4,444.86
Maintenance: lighting: 10 ea. @ 5,800 lumens                         $307.24
Project Management, 56 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot                 $568.00
Reserves                                                            $43.76
Estimated Cost Per Year                                             $919.00
Previous Year Assessment                                            $913.61
New Assessment                                                       $913.61

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic
   appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the
   development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
                 Number of Lots (L)

A = $913.61 / 56 = $16.31 per lot

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is
56.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $16.31 per lot
District No. 10 - Orchard Ridge Phase 4 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $359.99

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $371.44
Project Management, 19 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $287.75
Maintenance: lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $122.89
Project Management, 19 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $457.00
Reserves $28.99

Estimated Cost Per Year $608.88
Previous Year Assessment $312.28
New Assessment $312.28

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

\[
A = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{\$312.28}{19} = \$16.44 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 19.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = \$16.44 \text{ per lot}
\]
**District No. 11 - Orchard Ridge Phase 5 Subdivision**  
**2010-2011 Fiscal Year**  
**Approved CPI 1999**  
(Adjusted 1999)  
Maximum Assessment $1,591.70

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**  
Maintenance: lighting: 14 ea. @ 5,800 lumens,  
Project Management, 76 lots  
$915.61

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**  
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance  
$5,387.68

Maintenance: lighting: 14 ea. @ 5,800 lumens  
$430.13

Project Management, 76 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot  
$628.00

Reserves  
$52.91

Estimated Cost Per Year  
$1,111.04

Previous Year Assessment  
$1,103.49

New Assessment  
$1,103.49

**ASSESSMENT**  
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.  
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.  
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**  
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)  
Number of Lots (L)

\[
A = \frac{C}{L} = \frac{1,103.49}{76} = 14.52 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 76.

Estimated Annual Assessment  
A = $14.52 per lot
District No. 12 - Westwood Estates Unit 5, Phase 2 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 1999
(Adjusted 1999)
Maximum Assessment $9,734.35

*ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010*
Maintenance: 19,112 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 12 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 4 ea. @ 16,000 lumens and Project Management, 34 lots

*ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011*
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $16,304.52
Maintenance: 19,112 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 12 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 4 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 34 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $8,290.17
Reserves $1,136.00

Estimated Cost Per Year $10,840.10
Previous Year Assessment $7,368.84
New Assessment $7,368.84

**ASSESSMENT**
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[
A = \frac{Cost (C)}{Number of Lots (L)}
\]

\[
A = \frac{7,368.84}{34} = 216.74 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 34.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $216.74 per lot
District No. 13 - River Ranch Phase 3 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $2,478.95

Estimated Accumulated Costs 2009-2010
Maintenance: 1,000 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 7 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 35 lots

$499.56

Estimated Costs 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance

$13,559.21

Maintenance: 1,000 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 7 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 35 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot

$2,047.37
$1,140.00

Reserves

$478.11

Estimated Cost Per Year

$3,665.48

Previous Year Assessment

$2,150.40

New Assessment

$2,150.40

Assessment
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

Formula for Assessment:

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{2,150.40}{35} = 61.44 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 35.

Estimated Annual Assessment

A = $61.44 per lot
District No. 14 - River Springs Phase 2 Subdivision  
2010-2011 Fiscal Year  
Approved CPI 2003  
(Adjusted 2003)  
Maximum Assessment $1,199.37

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**
Maintenance: lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $721.98  
Project Management, 50 lots

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2009-2010**
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $4,269.36

Maintenance: lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $337.96  
Project Management, 50 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $550.00

Reserves $44.40

Estimated Cost Per Year $932.36

Previous Year Assessment $926.43

New Assessment $926.43

**ASSESSMENT**
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

---

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[ \text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} \]

\[
A = \frac{$926.43}{50} = $18.53 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 50.

Estimated Annual Assessment  
\[ A = $18.53 \text{ per lot} \]
District No. 15 - Meadowood Phase 1 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2001
(Adjusted 2001)
Maximum Assessment $8,191.95

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 7,723 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 10 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, 3 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 48 lots

$6,636.04

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance

$24,090.48

Maintenance: 7,723 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 10 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, 3 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 48 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot

$6,693.98
$1,192.00

Reserves

$1,182.90

Estimated Cost Per Year

$9,068.88

Previous Year Assessment

$6,810.24

New Assessment

$6,810.24

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

Assessment (A) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

A = \frac{6,810.24}{48} = 141.88 \text{ per lot}

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 48.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = 141.88 \text{ per lot}
District No. 16 - New Expressions Phase 2 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2001
(Adjusted 2001)
Maximum Assessment $6,712.19

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 5,800 sq. ft. of landscaping area, playground area 30%, and lighting: 13 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 54 lots $2,864.49

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $25,914.12
Maintenance: 5,800 sq. ft. of landscaping area, playground area 30%, and lighting: 13 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $5,351.67
Project Management, 54 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,216.00
Reserves $985.15

Estimated Cost Per Year $7,552.82
Previous Year Assessment $5,580.07
New Assessment $5,580.07

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

A = $5,580.07 / 54 = $103.33 per lot

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 54.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $103.33 per lot
District No. 17 - Orchard Ridge Phase 6 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2007)
Maximum Assessment $633.36

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 7 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $520.73
Project Management, 32 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $60.65
Maintenance: lighting: 7 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $215.06
Project Management, 32 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $496.00
Reserves $35.55

Estimated Cost Per Year $746.61
Previous Year Assessment $617.82
New Assessment $617.82

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

A = $617.82 / 32 = $19.30 per lot

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 32.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $19.30 per lot
District No. 18 - Ohio North Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $190.26

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**

- Maintenance: lighting: 2 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $270.84
- Project Management, 10 lots

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2009-2010**

Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance ($261.36)

- Maintenance: lighting: 2 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $61.45
- Project Management, 10 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $430.00
- Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $26.14
- Reserves $24.57

- Estimated Cost Per Year $542.16
- Previous Year Assessment $187.08
- New Assessment $190.26

**ASSESSMENT**

1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[
A = \frac{C}{L}
\]

\[
A = \frac{190.26}{10} = 19.03 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 10.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = 19.03 \text{ per lot}
\]
District No. 19 - Williams Ranch Phase 1 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2002
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $7,027.83

*ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010*
Maintenance: 13,910 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 2 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, Project Management, 41 lots $6,366.92

*ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011*
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $3,693.26

Maintenance: 13,910 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 2 ea. @ 9,500 lumens $6,285.47
Project Management, 41 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,164.00

Reserves $1,117.42

Estimated Cost Per Year $8,566.89
Previous Year Assessment $6,910.35
New Assessment $6,910.35

*ASSESSMENT*
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

*FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:*

\[
A = \frac{\text{Cost} (C)}{\text{Number of Lots} (L)}
\]

\[
A = \frac{$6,910.35}{41} = $168.54 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 41.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = $168.54 \text{ per lot}
\]
District No. 20 - West View Place Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2007)
Maximum Assessment $280.32

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 3 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, $345.08
Project Management, 10 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $137.95
Maintenance: lighting: 3 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 9,500 lumens $129.08
Project Management, 10 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $430.00
Reserves $27.95

Estimated Cost Per Year $587.03
Previous Year Assessment $265.74
New Assessment $265.74

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

A = $265.74 = $26.56 per lot
10

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 10.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $26.56 per lot
District No. 21 - Orchard Ridge Phase 7 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $1,728.51

*ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010*
Maintenance: 2,142 sq. ft. of landscaping area (30/74 of 5950 sq. ft.) and lighting: 6 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 30 lots $1,576.53

*ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011*
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance (170.79)

Maintenance: 2,142 sq. ft. of landscaping area (30/74 of 5950 sq. ft.) and lighting: 6 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $1,706.95
Project Management, 30 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,120.00
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $17.08
Reserves $424.04

Estimated Cost Per Year $3,268.07
Previous Year Assessment $1,699.62
New Assessment $1,699.62

**ASSESSMENT**
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

---

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{$1,699.62}{30} = $56.66 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 30.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $56.66 per lot
District No. 22 - Meadowood Phase 2 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $5,604.37

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**

Maintenance: 4,940 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 14 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 3 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, 2 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 55 lots

$865.23

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**

Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance

$22,367.73

Maintenance: 4,940 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 14 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 3 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, 2 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 55 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot

$4,760.63

$1,220.00

Reserves

$897.09

Estimated Cost Per Year

$6,877.72

Previous Year Assessment

$4,861.60

New Assessment

$4,861.60

**ASSESSMENT**

1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[
A = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{$4,861.60}{55} = $88.39 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 55.

Estimated Annual Assessment

\[
A = $88.39 \text{ per lot}
\]
District No. 23 - River View Phase 3 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2002
(Adjusted 2002)
Maximum Assessment $840.44

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $674.19
Project Management, 36 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $2,273.40
Maintenance: lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $337.96
Project Management, 36 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $508.00
Reserves $42.30

Estimated Cost Per Year $888.26
Previous Year Assessment $713.36
New Assessment $713.36

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

A = $713.36 = $19.16 per lot
36

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 36.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $19.16 per lot
District No. 24 - Orchard Ridge Phase 8 Subdivision  
2010-2011 Fiscal Year  
Approved CPI 2003  
(Adjusted 2008)  
Maximum Assessment $2,607.14

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**

Maintenance: 3,538 sq. ft. of landscaping area (44/74 of 5950 sq. ft) and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 44 lots  

$5,021.33

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**

Projected July 1, 2009 fund balance  

($3,017.12)

Maintenance: 3,538 sq. ft. of landscaping area (44/74 of 5950 sq. ft) and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens  
Project Management, 44 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot  
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years  
Reserves

$2,137.21  
$1,176.00  
$301.71  
$496.98

Estimated Cost Per Year  

$4,111.90

Previous Year Assessment  

$2,563.56

New Assessment  

$2,607.14

**ASSESSMENT**

1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.  
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.  
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

Assessment (A) = \( \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} \)

\[ A = \frac{2,607.14}{44} = 59.25 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 44.

Estimated Annual Assessment  

\[ A = 59.25 \text{ per lot} \]
District No. 25 - Casas del Rio Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $33,112.96

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 55,950 sq. ft. of landscaping area $8,048.81
Project Management, 118 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $72,221.71
Maintenance: 55,950 sq. ft. of landscaping area $25,406.20
Project Management, 118 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,472.00
Reserves $4,031.73
Estimated Cost Per Year $30,909.93
Previous Year Assessment $28,724.33
New Assessment $28,724.33

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

\[
A = \frac{\text{Assessment (A) = Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{28,724.33}{118} = 243.42 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 118.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $243.42 per lot
District No. 26 - Orchard Ridge Phase 9 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2004
(Adjusted 2004)
Maximum Assessment $910.98

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 10 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $676.78
Project Management, 47 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $1,467.59
Maintenance: lighting: 10 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $307.24
Project Management, 47 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $541.00
Reserves $42.41

Estimated Cost Per Year $890.65
Previous Year Assessment $790.62
New Assessment $790.62

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

A = $790.62 = $16.82 per lot
47

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 47.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $16.82 per lot
ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 748 sq. ft. of landscaping area berm, wall, and 30% of playground, and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 50 lots $1,391.32

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $4,670.39

Maintenance: 748 sq. ft. of landscaping area berm, wall, and 30% of playground, and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $1,682.93
Project Management, 50 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,200.00

Reserves $432.44

Estimated Cost Per Year $3,315.37
Previous Year Assessment $1,860.09
New Assessment $1,860.09

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

A = $1,860.09 / 50 = $37.20 per lot

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 50.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $37.20 per lot
District No. 28 - Meadowood Phase 3 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2004
(Adjusted 2004)
Maximum Assessment $1,808.45

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 17 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 9 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, Project Management, 78 lots $1,262.99

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $2,409.28

Maintenance: lighting: 17 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 9 ea. @ 9,500 lumens $854.46
Project Management, 78 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $634.00

Reserves $74.42

Estimated Cost Per Year $1,562.88
Previous Year Assessment $1,547.89
New Assessment $1,547.89

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

\[ \text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} \]

\[ A = \frac{1,547.89}{78} = 19.84 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 78.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $19.84 per lot
District No. 29 - River Springs Phase 3 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2007)
Maximum Assessment $751.74

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 9 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $604.31
Project Management, 36 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $749.67
Maintenance: lighting: 9 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $276.51
Project Management, 36 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $508.00
Reserves $39.23

Estimated Cost Per Year $823.74
Previous Year Assessment $712.64
New Assessment $712.64

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{712.64}{36} = 19.80 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 36.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = \$19.80 \text{ per lot}
\]
District No. 30 - Sierra Meadows Phase 1 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2006
(Adjusted 2006)
Maximum Assessment $16,773.66

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 26,639 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 2739 feet of wall, and lighting: $12,638.27
23 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 4 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, 5 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 56 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $22,975.03

Maintenance: 26,639 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 2739 feet of wall, and lighting: $14,949.89
23 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 4 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, 5 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 56 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,224.00
Reserves $2,426.08

Estimated Cost Per Year $18,599.97
Previous Year Assessment $15,408.17
New Assessment $15,408.17

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

\[
A = \frac{15,408.17}{56} = 275.14 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 56.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $275.14 per lot
District No. 31 - Williams Ranch Phase 2 & 3 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2006
(Adjusted 2006)
Maximum Assessment $2,303.51

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 6,512 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 437 feet of wall, and lighting: $2,776.05
24 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 2 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 85 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $305.21

Maintenance: 6,512 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 437 feet of wall, and lighting:
24 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 2 ea. @ 16,000 lumens. $1,674.51
Project Management, 85 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,340.00
Reserves $452.18

Estimated Cost Per Year $3,466.69
Previous Year Assessment $2,265.00
New Assessment $2,265.00 $2,303.51

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = \[ \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} \]
\[ A = \frac{\$2,265.00}{85} = \$26.64 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 85.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[ A = \$26.64 \text{ per lot} \]
\[ \$2,303.51 \]
District No. 32 - Sunrise Villa Phases 1-3 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2006
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $1,513.54

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 13 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 54 lots $2,067.36

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance ($29.95)

Maintenance: lighting: 13 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $399.41
Project Management, 54 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $562.00
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $3.00
Reserves $48.07

Estimated Cost Per Year $1,012.48
Previous Year Assessment $1,003.75*

New Assessment $1,513.54
*: See Note 4 below. 46 lots were added to this district.

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.
4. Added 46 lots to the district this year, resulting in a higher total assessment, but maintained the per lot assessment.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{$1,513.54}{54} = $28.02 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 54.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = $28.02 \text{ per lot}
\]
District No. 33 - New Expressions Phase 4 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2006
(Adjusted 2006)
Maximum Assessment $1,504.87

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 220 ft. of wall and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 2 ea. @
9,500 lumens, Project Management, 58 lots
$827.90

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance
$2,522.19
Maintenance: 220 ft. of wall and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 2 ea. @
9,500 lumens
$547.60
Project Management, 58 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot
$574.00
Reserves
$56.08

Estimated Cost Per Year
$1,177.68
Previous Year Assessment
$1,168.07
New Assessment
$1,168.07

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic
appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the
development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

A = $1,168.07 = $20.14 per lot
58

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is
58.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $20.14 per lot
District No. 34 - Meadow Breeze Phase 1 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2006
(Adjusted 2006)
Maximum Assessment $1,928.30

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 14 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 5 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, $825.99
Project Management, 78 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $2,582.92
Maintenance: lighting: 14 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 5 ea. @ 9,500 lumens $614.66
Project Management, 78 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $634.00
Reserves $62.43
Estimated Cost Per Year $1,311.09
Previous Year Assessment $1,300.31
New Assessment $1,300.31

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

A = $1,300.31 = $16.68 per lot
78

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 78.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $16.68 per lot
District No. 35 - Meadow Breeze Phase 2 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2006
(Adjusted 2006)
Maximum Assessment $1,001.39

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 9 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $1,002.81
Project Management, 44 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $787.54
Maintenance: lighting: 9 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $276.51
Project Management, 44 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $532.00
Reserves $40.43
Estimated Cost Per Year $848.94
Previous Year Assessment $844.08
New Assessment $844.08

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}

A = \frac{\$844.08}{44} = \$19.18 \text{ per lot}

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 44.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $19.18 \text{ per lot}
**District No. 37 - Riverview Estates Phase 4 Subdivision**

**2010-2011 Fiscal Year**

**Approved CPI 2006**

(Adjusted 2007)

Maximum Assessment $508.84

---

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**

- Maintenance: lighting: 5 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $399.60
- Project Management, 17 lots

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**

- Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $354.06
- Maintenance: lighting: 5 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $153.62
- Project Management, 17 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $451.00

Reserves $30.23

- Estimated Cost Per Year $634.85
- Previous Year Assessment $496.36
- New Assessment $496.36

**ASSESSMENT**

1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

---

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[ \text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} \]

\[ A = \frac{$496.36}{17} = $29.20 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 17.

- Estimated Annual Assessment
- \[ A = $29.20 \text{ per lot} \]
District No. 38 - Ranch Victoria, Phase One Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $529.89

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: lighting: 2 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $257.20
Project Management, 6 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance ($314.77)
Maintenance: lighting: 2 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $61.45
Project Management, 6 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $418.00
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $31.48
Reserves $23.97

Estimated Cost Per Year $534.90
Previous Year Assessment $516.86
New Assessment $516.86

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)
A = $516.86 / 6 = $86.14 per lot

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 6.
Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $86.14 per lot
District No. 39 - Williams Ranch Phase 4 Subdivision  
2010-2011 Fiscal Year  
Approved CPI 2007  
(Adjusted 2007)  
Maximum Assessment $1,207.85

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**

Maintenance: lighting: 17 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $962.42  
Project Management, 59 lots

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**

Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $1,063.42

Maintenance: lighting: 17 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $522.30  
Project Management, 59 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $577.00

Reserves $54.97

Estimated Cost Per Year $1,154.27

Previous Year Assessment $1,145.10

New Assessment $1,145.10

**ASSESSMENT**

1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[
A = \frac{\text{Assessment (A) = Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{1,145.10}{59} = 19.40 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 59.

Estimated Annual Assessment  
\[
A = 19.40 \text{ per lot}
\]
District No. 40 - Amalene Estates Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2007)
Maximum Assessment $7,648.22

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 5,445 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 736 ft. of wall, and lighting: 16 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 53 lots

$2,842.07

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance

$7,809.02

Maintenance: 5,445 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 736 ft. of wall, and lighting: 16 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 53 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot

$4,705.55

Reserves

$1,212.00

$887.63

Estimated Cost Per Year

$6,805.18

Previous Year Assessment

$6,714.72

New Assessment

$6,714.72

ASSESSMENT

1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

Assessment (A) = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}

A = \frac{\$6,714.72}{53} = \$126.70 \text{ per lot}

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 53.

Estimated Annual Assessment

A = \$126.70 \text{ per lot}

Assessment of Remainder (AR) = A \times \text{Number Lots proposed Remainder (LR)} - \text{Number Lights proposed for Remainder} \times \$30.21

AR= 126.70 \times 29 - 6 \times 30.21 = \$3493.82

Assessment = \$126.70 \text{ ea for 24 developed lots and } \$3493.82 \text{ for the remainder}
Total Assessment for 2010-2011 = $6,534.62

Total developed lot count is 24 lots plus a remainder.
**District No. 41 - Beverly Glenn Subdivision**  
2010-2011 Fiscal Year  
Approved CPI 2008  
(Adjusted 2008)  
Maximum Assessment $645.60

**Estimated Accumulated Costs 2009-2010**
Maintenance: lighting: 3 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $336.53  
Project Management, 19 lots

**Estimated Costs 2010-2011**
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance $310.42  
Maintenance: lighting: 3 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $92.17  
Project Management, 19 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot $457.00  
Reserves $27.46

Estimated Cost Per Year $576.63  
Previous Year Assessment $575.01  
New Assessment $575.01

**Assessment**
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.  
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.  
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

---

**Formula for Assessment:**

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{\$575.01}{19} = \$30.26 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 19.

Estimated Annual Assessment  
A = $30.26 per lot
District No. 42 - Sierra Estates Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2008
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $24,331.14

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 43,873 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 330 ft. of wall, and lighting:
14 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 48 lots

$4,438.97

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance

$22,442.22

Maintenance: 43,873 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 330 ft. of wall, and lighting:
14 ea. @ 5,800 lumens
Project Management, 48 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot

$20,878.24
$1,192.00

Reserves

$3,310.54

Estimated Cost Per Year

$25,380.78

Previous Year Assessment

$23,734.54

New Assessment

$23,734.54

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:

Assessment (A) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

A = $23,734.54 / 48 = $494.46 per lot

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 48.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $494.46 per lot
District No. 43 - Sierra Meadows Phase 2 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2008
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $18,564.42

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**
Maintenance: 27,960 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 2614 ft. of wall, and lighting:
28 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 8 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 61 lots

$1,510.37

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance

$16,499.20

Maintenance: 27,960 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 2614 ft. of wall, and lighting:
28 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 8 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 61 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot

$14,857.74
$1,244.00

Reserves

$2,415.26

Estimated Cost Per Year

$18,517.00

Previous Year Assessment

$18,231.39

New Assessment

$18,231.39

**ASSESSMENT**

1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{18,231.39}{61} = 298.88 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 61.

Estimated Annual Assessment

A = $298.88 per lot
District No. 44 - Summit Estates Phase 1 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2008
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $5,629.48

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010
Maintenance: 4,300 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 242 ft. of wall, and lighting: 20
ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 3 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, Project Management, 70 lots
$2,381.55

ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance
$4,347.44
Maintenance: 4,300 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 242 ft. of wall, and lighting: 20
ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 3 ea. @ 9,500 lumens
$3,577.23
Project Management, 70 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot
$1,280.00
Reserves
$728.58
Estimated Cost Per Year
$5,585.81
Previous Year Assessment
$5,491.45
New Assessment
$5,491.45

ASSESSMENT
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic
appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the
development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

A = $5,491.45 / 70 = $78.44 per lot

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 70.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $78.44 per lot
District No. 45 - New Expressions Phase 5 Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2008
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $14,396.67

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**
Maintenance: 15,250 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 880 ft. of wall and berm, and lighting: 22 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, Project Management, 88 lots

$969.44

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance

$12,982.32

Maintenance: 15,250 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 880 ft. of wall and berm, and lighting: 22 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 9,500 lumens

$11,127.16

Project Management, 88 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot

$1,352.00

Reserves

$1,871.87

Estimated Cost Per Year

$14,351.03

Previous Year Assessment

$14,043.67

New Assessment

$14,043.67

**ASSESSMENT**
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**

\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}}
\]

\[
A = \frac{14,043.67}{88} = 159.58 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 88.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = 159.58 \text{ per lot}
\]
District No. 46 – Moorea Manor Subdivision
2010-2011 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2009
(Adjusted 2009)
Maximum Assessment $

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2009-2010**
Maintenance: 1,460 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 286 ft. of wall, and lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800 lumens
Project Management, 88 lots

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Projected July 1, 2010 fund balance: $0
Maintenance: 1,460 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 286 ft. of wall, and lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800 lumens
Project Management, 16 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot
Reserves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost Per Year</td>
<td>$4,202.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Year Assessment</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Assessment</td>
<td>$4,202.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASSESSMENT**
1. The purpose of the landscaping and lighting is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. All lots benefit equally from the landscaping and lighting.

**FORMULA FOR ASSESSMENT:**
Assessment (A) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

\[
A = \frac{4,202.28}{16} = 262.64 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2010-2011 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 16.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $262.64 per lot

This concludes the 2010-2011 Landscape and Lighting District Engineer's Report.
Baldomero Rodriguez, RCE 45304

\[\text{Signature}\]
RESOLUTION NO.:  

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE, COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DECLARING ITS INTENTION TO LEVY AND COLLECT ASSESSMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011 IN LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE ASSESSMENT DISTRICTS; DECLARING THE WORK TO BE OF MORE THAN LOCAL OR ORDINARY PUBLIC BENEFIT; SPECIFYING THE EXTERIOR BOUNDARIES OF THE AREAS WITHIN THE LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS AND TO BE ASSESSED THE COST AND EXPENSE THEREOF; DESIGNATING SAID DISTRICT AS LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS; DETERMINING THAT THESE PROCEEDINGS SHALL BE TAKEN PURSUANT TO THE LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING ACT OF 1972; AND OFFERING A TIME AND PLACE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS THERETO

The City Council of the City of Porterville, pursuant to the provisions of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, being Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California, does resolve as follows:

DESCRIPTION OF WORK

SECTION 1. That the public interest and convenience requires it is the intention of the City Council of the City of Porterville, California, to order the following work be done, to wit:

1. Maintenance and servicing of facilities and landscaping as authorized by Section 22525 of the Streets and Highways Code.

2. Any and all work and materials appurtenant thereto or which are necessary or convenient for the maintenance and servicing thereof.

LOCATION OF WORK

SECTION 2. The foregoing described work is to be located within the following areas:

1. Right-of-way and easement along the Westwood Street frontage of Unit I and II of Westwood Estates, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1."

2. Right-of-way and easements along street frontage along Hope Avenue, Newcomb Street, Thunderbolt Drive and Corsair Drives of the Airport Industrial Park, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 1 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1."

3. Hillcrest Street right-of-way, fire access road, Jasmine Drive entries; south perimeter west of fire access road, west perimeter including the parcel on which the water tank is located,
viewpoint look-out parcel at the northwest corner of Jasmine Ranch Subdivision, and the pedestrian access to each cul-de-sac from Hillcrest Street, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 2 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1".

4. Porter Creek Avenue right-of-way to the bank of the Porter Slough median entry, 15' landscape area between Porter Creek Subdivision block wall to Westwood Street, the pedestrian access bridge over Porter Slough and all of the maintenance area to the center line Porter Slough, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 3 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1".

5. LaVida Park green belt, east on Plum Way Street and the entries east along Beverly street, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 4 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1".

6. Westwood Estates #4, along the north and south entries adjacent to the block wall on Westwood Street and the median divider on White Chapel Lane including all trees in front yard planting strip, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 5 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1".

7. Northpointe includes subdivision lighting located south of Westfield Avenue and east of Matthew Street, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 6 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1".

8. Quail Park Phase II Subdivision includes payment of street lighting, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 7 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1".

9. Westwood Park Unit Three Subdivision includes the east side of Westwood Street and the fire access road on the south side of the subdivision, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 8 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1".

10. Map No. 4132 includes lighting, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 9 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1".

11. Westview Subdivision includes street lighting and landscaping on the east side of Cobb Street, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 10 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1".

12. New Horizons Phase One Subdivision includes lighting, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 11 to Landscape
and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1".

13. Sunrise Estates Phase Six Subdivision includes landscape maintenance, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 12 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1".

14. Wisconsin Manor I Subdivision includes landscape and lighting maintenance, more particularly described on maps, which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 14 to Landscape and Lighting District No. 1."

15. Northpointe Phase II Subdivision includes lighting maintenance, more particularly described on maps, which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 15 to Landscape and Lighting District No. 1."

16. New Horizon's Phase II Subdivision includes lighting maintenance, more particularly described on maps, which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 16 to Landscape and Lighting District No. 1."

17. "Annexation #17 Landscape and Lighting District" NOT FORMED.

18. Westwood Mobile Home Park includes landscape and lighting maintenance more particularly described on maps, which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 18 to Landscape and Lighting District No. 1."

19. Castle Woods Phase I Subdivision includes landscape and lighting maintenance more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 19 to Landscape and Lighting District No. 1."

20. District No. 2 = North Creek Estates Subdivision located on Westwood north of Westfield includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No.2.

21. District No. 3 = New Expressions Phase I Subdivision located along Indiana Street between Springville Avenue and Cleo Avenue includes lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 3.

22. District No. 4 = River Springs Phase I Subdivision located along Newcomb Street includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No.4

23. District No. 5 = Castle Woods Phase II Subdivision located on Castle Avenue, Salisbury Street, and Median Avenue includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District
24. District No. 6 = Creek View Estates located between Porter Creek Avenue and the property line in Porter Slough includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled District No. 6.

25. District No. 7 = Ford Estates located on the corner of Roby and Westwood Avenue includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled District No. 7.

26. District No. 8 = River Breeze Subdivision located on Newcomb Street, Patsy Street and Springs Street includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's Office entitled District No. 8.

27. District No. 9 = Orchard Ridge Phase 3 Subdivision located on Mathew Street, Nancy Avenue, Cheryll Avenue and Belmont Street includes lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's Office entitled District No. 9.

28. District No. 10 = Orchard Ridge Phase 4 Subdivision located on LaVida Court and Carmelo Street includes lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's Office entitled District No. 10.

29. District No. 11 = Orchard Ridge Phase 5 Subdivision located on Mathew Street, LaVida Avenue, Michael Street and Julieann Avenue includes lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's Office entitled District No. 11.

30. District No. 12 = Westwood Estates Unit 5, Phase 2, located along Henderson Avenue and Brandy Way includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled District No. 12.

31. District No. 13 = River Ranch 3, located along Newcomb Street, Lloyd Avenue and Patsy Street includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled District No. 13.

32. District No. 14 = River Springs, Phase 2 Subdivision located on River Avenue, Beverly Street, Date Avenue and River Springs Drive includes lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled District No. 14.

33. District No. 15 = Meadowood, Phase 1 Subdivision located on Newcomb Street, Cheryl Avenue and York Street includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled District No. 15.
34. District No. 16 = New Expressions, Phase 2 Subdivision located on the Lybarger Avenue Cul de Sac at the entry of the Tule River Parkway Trail includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 16.

35. District No. 17 = Orchard Ridge Phase 6 Subdivision located north of Westfield Avenue between Michael Street and Lombardi Street on Julieann Avenue and Michael Street includes lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 15.

36. District No. 18 = Ohio North Subdivision located on Ohio Way Street includes lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 18.

37. District No. 19 = Williams Ranch, Phase One located south of Westfield Avenue on Silver Maple Street, Wall Court and San Lucia Court includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 19.

38. District No. 20 = West View Place Subdivision located on Median Avenue includes lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 20.

39. District No. 21 = Orchard Ridge Phase Seven Subdivision located on Pioneer Avenue, Michael Street and Mathew Street includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 21.

40. District No. 22 = Meadowood Phase Two Subdivision located on Newcomb Street, Pioneer Avenue, Julieann Avenue, Greenfield Street, York Street, and Birch Street includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office.

41. District No. 23 = Riverview Estates Phase Three Subdivision located on Roby Avenue, Belmont Street, Orange Avenue and Parkwest Street includes lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 23.

42. District No. 24 = Orchard Ridge, Phase Eight Subdivision located on Mathew Street, Michael Street, Pamela Avenue, and Santa Maria Avenue includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 24.

43. District No. 25 = Casas Del Rio Subdivision located on Date Street, Casas Del Rio Avenue, Presidio Avenue, Rio Bonito Street, Alamo Court, Camellia Street, Tule Court and Rio Vista Avenue includes landscape and recreation area maintenance and more
particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 25.

44. District No. 26 = Orchard Ridge, Phase Nine Subdivision located on Belmont Street, Pamela, Santa Maria and Pioneer Avenues includes lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 26.

45. District No. 27 = New Expressions Phase 3 Subdivision located on Springville Avenue, Cleo Avenue and McIntire Avenue along Wisconsin Street includes landscape and lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 27.

46. District No. 28 = Meadowood Phase Three Subdivision located on Westfield Avenue, Cheryll Avenue, Salisbury Street, Julieann Avenue and Pioneer includes lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 28.

47. District No. 29 = River Springs Phase Three Subdivision located on Date Avenue, River Springs Drive and Atkins Court includes lighting maintenance and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 29.

48. District No. 30 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within Sierra Meadows, Phase One Subdivision, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 30.

49. District No. 31 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within Williams Ranch, Phase 2 and 3 Subdivision, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 31.

50. District No. 32 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within Sunrise Villa, Phase One, Two and Three Subdivision, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 32.

51. District No. 33 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within New Expressions, Phase Four Subdivision, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 33.

52. District No. 34 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within Meadow Breeze, Phase Two Subdivision, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 34.

53. District No. 35 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within Meadow Breeze, Phase One Subdivision, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 35.
54. District No. 36 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within Amalene Estates Subdivision, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 36. REFORMED TO DISTRICT NO. 40

55. District No. 37 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within Riverview Estates, Phase Four Subdivision, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 37.

56. District No. 38 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within Ranch Victoria, Phase One Subdivision located on the north side of Putnam Avenue and east of Mathew Street, and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 38.

57. District No. 39 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within Williams Ranch Phase 4 Subdivision, including Theta Avenue, Bel-Aire Court, Terry Court, Silver Maple Street and Red Oak Street, and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 39.

58. District No. 40 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within Amalene Estates Subdivision located on Westwood between the Tule River and Olive Avenue, including Vine Avenue, Clare Avenue, Clare Court, and Dogwood Street, and more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled District No. 40.

59. District No. 41 = Beverly Glenn Subdivision, located between Lotus and Beverly Streets, including Date Avenue.

60. District No. 42 = Sierra Estates Subdivision, located east of Leggett Street and including Grand Avenue, South Place, Doree Place and Maurer Street. It also includes stub streets for Bellevue and Kanai Streets.

61. District No. 43 = Sierra Meadows Phase Two Subdivision located on Jaye Street and Gibbons Avenue and including Stacie, Yates, and Melinda Avenues and Mesa Oak and Pearson Streets.

62. District No. 44 = Summit Estates, Phase One Subdivision located along Mathew Street and includes Orange Avenue and Lombardi and Argyle Streets.

63. District No. 45 = New Expressions Phase Five Subdivision located along Parkway Drive and Indiana Street and includes Cloverleaf, Wisconsin, Bay Oak and Milo Streets.

64. District No. 46 = Moorea Manor Subdivision located along Newcomb and includes San Lucia Lane.

65. Annexation No. 1 into District No. 32 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within
Sunrise Villa, Phase Two and Three Subdivisions, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Landscape and Lighting Annexation No. 1 to District No. 32".

66. Annexation No. 1 into District No. 34 = Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within Meadow Breeze, Phase Three more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk's office entitled "Annexation No. 1 to Maintenance District No. 34".

Reference is hereby made to said maps for further, full and more particular description of said assessment district, and the same maps so on file shall govern for all details as to the extent of said assessment district.

DESCRIPTION OF ASSESSMENT DISTRICT

SECTION 3. That the contemplated work, in the opinion of said City Council, is to be of more than local or ordinary public benefit, and the said City Council hereby makes the expense of the said work chargeable upon a district, which said district is described as follows:

1. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1," heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 26-89, indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the assessment district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

2. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 1 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1," heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 146-89, indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

3. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 2 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1," heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 42-92, indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

4. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 3 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1," heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 69-93, indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

5. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 4 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1," heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by
Resolution No. 100-93, indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the assessment district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

6. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 5 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1," heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 144-93, indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

7. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 6 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1," heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 54-94 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the assessment district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

8. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 7 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1," heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 45-95 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

9. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 8 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1," heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 97-94 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

10. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 9 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1," heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 51-95 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

11. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 10 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1." heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 46-95 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

12. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 11 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 79-95 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included
within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

13. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 12 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 80-95 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

14. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 14 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 24-96 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

15. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 15 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 140-95 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

16. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 16 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 33-96 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

17. Annexation No. 17 Not Formed.

18. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 18 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 50-96 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

19. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary shown upon that certain "Map of Annexation No. 19 to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 1" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 56-96 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

20. All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 2" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 126-98 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included within the assessment district and which map is on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.
21. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 3" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 127-98 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

22. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 4" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 128-98 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

23. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 5" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 29-2002 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

24. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 6" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 89-99 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

25. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 7" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 67-99 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

26. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 8" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 120-99 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

27. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 9" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 15-2000 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

28. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 10" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 28-2000 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

29. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 11" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 22-2000 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.
30. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 12" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 65-2000 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

31. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No 13" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 133-2000 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

32. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 14" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 166-2000 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

33. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 15" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 55-2001 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

34. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 16" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 91-2001 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

35. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 17" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 114-2001 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

36. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 18" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 22-2002 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

37. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 19" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 23-2002 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

38. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 20" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 30-2002 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.
39. All that certain “Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 21” heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 44-2002 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

40. All that certain “Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 22” heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 93-2002 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

41. All that certain “Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 23” heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 94-2002 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

42. All that certain “Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 24” heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 191-2002 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

43. All that certain “Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 25” heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 58-2003 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

44. All that certain “Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 26” heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 59-2004 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

45. All that certain “Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 27” heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 60-2004 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

46. All that certain “Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 28” heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 61-2004 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

47. All that certain “Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 29” heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 90-2004 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

48. All that certain “Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 30” heretofore approved by
the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 52-2006 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

49. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 31" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 52-2006 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

50. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 32" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 52-2006 and Resolution No. indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

51. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 33" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 52-2006 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

52. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 34" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 52-2006 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

53. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 35" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 52-2006 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

54. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 36" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 52-2006 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

55. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 37" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 52-2006 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

56. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 38" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 38-2007 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

57. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 39" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 38-2007 indicating by said boundary line
the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

58. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 40" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 38-2007 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

59. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 41" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 37-2008 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

60. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 42" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 37-2008 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

61. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 43" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 37-2008 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

62. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 44" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 37-2008 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

63. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 45" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 37-2008 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

64. All that certain "Map of Landscape and Lighting District No. 45" heretofore approved by the City Council of said City by Resolution No. 91-2009 indicating by said boundary line the extent of the territory included with the assessment district and which map is on file in the office of the City Clerk of said City.

REPORT OF ENGINEER

SECTION 4. The City Council of said City has ordered preparation of the annual report of the Engineer of Work, which report indicates the amount of the proposed assessment, the district boundary, detailed description of improvements, and the method of assessment. The report titled "Engineer's Report, Landscape and Lighting Maintenance Districts 2010-2011 Fiscal Year" will be filed in the Office of the City Clerk of said City, and prepared for the 2010-2011 Fiscal Year in accordance with the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972. Reference to said report is hereby made
for all particulars for the amount and extent of the assessments and for the extent of the work.

COLLECTION OF ASSESSMENTS

SECTION 5. The assessment shall be collected at the time and in the same manner as County taxes are collected.

TIME AND PLACE OF HEARING

SECTION 5. Notice is hereby given that on the 3rd day of August, 2010, at the hour of 7:00 p.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard in the City Council Chambers at 291 North Main Street, in the City of Porterville, any and all persons having any objections to the work or extent of the assessment district, may appear and show cause why said work should not be done or carried out in accordance with this Resolution of Intention. The City Council will consider all oral and written protests.

LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING ACT OF 1972

SECTION 6. All the work herein proposed shall be done and carried through in pursuance of an act of the legislature of the State of California designated The Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, being Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California.

PUBLICATION OF RESOLUTION OF INTENTION

SECTION 7. Published notice shall be made pursuant to Section 6061 of the Government Code. The publication of the Notice of Hearing shall be completed at least 10 days prior to the date of hearing.

CERTIFICATION

SECTION 8. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED 20th day of July 2010.

______________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: ____________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
SUBJECT: CONSIDER RESOLUTIONS PERTAINING TO ENGINEER'S REPORTS AND THE SETTING OF A PUBLIC HEARING FOR INCLUSION WITHIN LIGHTING AND LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF TAX ASSESSMENTS UPON PARCELS LOCATED WITHIN GARDEN COURT VILLAS SUBDIVISION, MEADOW BREEZE PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION, AND MOOREA MANOR SUBDIVISION

SOURCE: PARKS AND LEISURE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: New subdivisions within the City are required to petition for the formation of a Maintenance Assessment District. The districts are formed to secure funding from parcels within the subdivisions for operational and maintenance expenses of public lighting and any public landscape areas. The City utilizes the authority governed by the 1972 Lighting and Landscape Assessment Act to establish the assessments for lots located within each subdivision. Thereafter, every year a process must be followed of evaluating maintenance needs and establishing an assessment to be placed upon the tax rolls for every parcel within each district.

This year it is proposed that existing District #23 be amended as the result of a resubdivision of a portion of the district lots; that an additional phase of a subdivision be annexed into District #34; and that a new District #46 be created. Amendment No. 1 to District #23 consists of four fixtures, 5,800 lumens. Prior to the amendment this lighting district consisted of seven fixtures, 5,800 lumens. District #34 is a lighting district consisting of 17 fixtures, 5,800 lumens. The additional phase being annexed in contains five fixtures, 9,500 lumens. District #34 is phase 2 of Meadow Breeze and is on three sides of phase 3, thus the annexation rather than the creation of another small district. District #46 is a new subdivision consisting of lighting and landscape maintenance district. No other districts were identified for this district to annex into. There are four fixtures, 5,800 lumens for the electricity/lighting. The landscaped area consists of 286.12 L.F. of masonry wall, four pistacia trees, two photinia trees, daylilies and gazanias totaling 1,460 S.F.

City staff and Council have had discussion regarding the establishment of an alternative fee schedule during the formation of new districts. In lieu of an annual cost index, one option would be for homeowners to pay a flat fee over five years with a "re-vote" on the district after this
time period. Council has also made it clear that a standard of care needs to be established for landscape maintenance districts. City staff recently have begun this effort utilizing CSET workers to begin the process of bringing districts up to standard focusing on districts with negative fund balances. Attached to this report is the City approved “Landscape Maintenance Plan” that addresses establishing the standard of care.

The first Resolution is to order amendment and annexation processes for the two existing districts and the formation of the one new district, and order the preparation of Engineer’s Reports. The Engineer’s Reports accompany this staff report. The second Resolution is provided to give preliminary approval to the Reports as the basis for creation of proposed assessments. The last Resolution declares the intent to amend, annex, and form the districts, levy and collect tax assessments, and sets August 3, 2010 for a Public Hearing.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council adopts:
1. A Resolution Ordering the Proceedings and the preparation of the Engineer’s Reports for Amendment No. 1 to District #23; Annexation No. 1 to District #34; and Formation of Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District number 46; and
2. A Resolution Giving Preliminary Approval to the Engineer’s Reports; and

ATTACHMENTS: Resolutions
Engineer’s Reports
Landscape Maintenance Plan
5. That the Engineer of Work is hereby ordered to prepare a report for each District in accordance with Article 4, Division 15 of said 1972 Act.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 20th DAY OF JULY 2010.

________________________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:
John Lollis, City Clerk

By: _________________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
RESOLUTION NO. -2010

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE, COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ORDERING PROCEEDINGS FOR THE AMENDMENT OF LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NUMBER 23, ANNEXATION OF PARCELS INTO LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING DISTRICT NUMBER 34, FORMATION OF LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING DISTRICT NUMBER 46, ORDERING PREPARATION OF DISTRICT MAPS INDICATING THE PROPOSED DISTRICT BOUNDARIES FOR EACH OF THE DISTRICTS, ASSIGNING AN ENGINEER OF WORK, AND ORDERING THE PREPARATION OF ENGINEER’S REPORTS

WHEREAS, it has been determined by the City Council of the City of Porterville that the public interest, convenience and necessity required the installation and planting of landscape materials, the installation and construction of irrigation systems, the installation of lighting and other facilities set forth in Section 22525 of the Streets and Highways Code, State of California; and

WHEREAS, the cost for operation and maintenance of the landscaping and lighting improvements is to be determined and considered for assessment to the benefiting properties; and

WHEREAS, Section 22622 requires that an Engineer’s Report be prepared to establish new Landscape and Lighting Maintenance Districts, and outlining the initial assessments to be levied against the properties within each assessment district.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Porterville as follows:

1. That the public interest, convenience and necessity required the amendment to Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District number 23, annexation of parcels to Landscape and Lighting District number 34, and formation of Landscape and Lighting District number 46 as authorized by Section 22525 of the Streets and Highways Code, State of California.

2. That proceedings are to be conducted for the amendment, annexation, and formation of said Landscape and Lighting Maintenance Districts.

3. That the properties to be specifically charged for maintenance of landscaping and lighting improvements shall be located within the boundary of the proposed districts, and maps to illustrate said boundaries are hereby ordered to be prepared.

4. That the cost of maintaining the landscape and lighting facilities in each of said Landscape and Lighting Maintenance Districts shall be borne by the property owners within the district, and said cost shall be assessed according to said 1972 Act.
RESOLUTION NO. -2010

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE, COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, GIVING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF ENGINEER’S REPORTS FOR LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS ENCOMPASSING GARDEN COURT VILLAS SUBDIVISION, MEADOW BREEZE PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION, AND MOOREA MANOR SUBDIVISION

WHEREAS, on the 20th day of July, 2010 said City Council did direct by Resolution that the Engineer of Work was to make and file with the City Clerk of said City a report in writing for each subdivision as required by the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972; and

WHEREAS, said Engineer of Work has made and filed with the City Clerk of said City each report in writing as called for in said Resolution and under and pursuant to said Act, which reports have been presented to this Council for consideration; and

WHEREAS, said Council has duly considered said reports and each and every part thereof; and finds that each and every part of said reports is sufficient, and that said reports nor any part thereof, requires or should be modified; and

WHEREAS, reference is hereby made to said Engineer’s Reports for further, full and more particular description of proposed Assessment Districts, and the same Engineer’s Reports so on file, shall govern for all details as to the extent of said Assessment Districts.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Porterville as follows:

1. That the Engineer’s Estimate of the itemized costs and expenses of said work and of the incidental expenses in connection therewith, contained in said reports be, and each of them are hereby preliminarily approved and confirmed.

2. That the diagram showing the Assessment District referred to and described in said reports, the boundaries of the subdivision of land within said Assessment District as the same existed at the time of passage of said Resolution, are hereby preliminarily approved and confirmed.

3. That the proposed assessments upon the subdivisions of land in each said Assessment District is in proportion to the estimated benefit to be received by said subdivisions, respectively, from said work and of the incidental expenses thereof, as contained in said report, is hereby preliminarily approved and confirmed.
4. That said reports shall stand as the Engineer's Report for the purposes of all subsequent proceedings pursuant to each of the proposed districts.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 20th DAY OF JULY 2010.

________________________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:
John Lollis. City Clerk

By: ______________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
RESOLUTION NO. -2010

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE, COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DECLARING ITS INTENTION TO AMEND, ANNEX, AND FORM ASSESSMENT DISTRICTS AND TO LEVY AND COLLECT ASSESSMENTS IN THE LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE ASSESSMENT DISTRICTS; DECLARING THE WORK TO BE OF MORE LOCAL THAN ORDINARY PUBLIC BENEFIT; SPECIFYING THE EXTERIOR BOUNDARIES OF THE AREAS WITHIN THE LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS, THE COST AND EXPENSE THEREOF, AND THE AMOUNT EACH PARCEL THEREIN IS INITIALLY TO BE ASSESSED; DESIGNATING SAID DISTRICTS AS LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS, DETERMINING THAT THESE PROCEEDINGS SHALL BE TAKEN PURSUANT TO THE LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING ACT OF 1972; OFFERING A TIME AND PLACE FOR HEARING OBJECTIONS THERETO; WITH SAID PROCEEDINGS PERTAINING TO: GARDEN COURT VILLAS SUBDIVISION, MEADOW BREEZE PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION, AND MOOREA MANOR SUBDIVISION

The City Council of the City of Porterville, pursuant to the provisions of the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, being Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California, does resolve as follows:

SECTION 1. DESCRIPTION OF WORK
That the public interest and convenience requires it is the intention of the City Council of the City of Porterville, California, to order the following work be done, to wit:

1. Maintenance and servicing of street lighting facilities and landscaping as authorized by Section 22424 of the Streets and Highways code.

2. Any and all work and materials appurtenant thereto or which are necessary or convenient for the maintenance and servicing thereof.

SECTION 2. LOCATION OF WORK
The foregoing described work is to be located within the following areas:

1. Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within River View Phase 3 Subdivision and the roadways fronting Garden Court Villas Subdivision, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City Clerk’s office entitled “Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 23, Original and Amendment No. 1.”

2. Right-of-way, easements, and public lands within Meadow Breeze Phase 3 Subdivision, more particularly described on maps which are on file in the City
Section 3. Description of Assessment District
That the contemplated work is of more local than ordinary public benefit, and the expense of said work is chargeable upon districts, which districts are to be assessed to pay the cost and expenses thereof, and said districts are described as follows:

All that certain territory of the City of Porterville, included within the exterior boundary line shown upon respective Maps of Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District numbers 23, 34, and 46, which Maps are on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City.

Section 4. Report of Engineer
The City Council of said City by Resolution has approved the reports of the Engineer of Work, which reports indicate the amount of the proposed assessment, the district boundary, detailed description of improvements, and the method of assessment. The Engineer's Reports for Landscape and Lighting Amendment No. 1 to Maintenance District No. 23, Landscape and Lighting Annexation No. 1 to Maintenance District No. 34, and Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 46 are on file in the Office of the City Clerk of said City, and were prepared for the 2010-2011 fiscal year in accordance with the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972. Reference to said reports is hereby made for all particulars for the amount and extent of the assessments and for the extent of the work.

Section 5. Collection of Assessments
The assessment shall be collected at the time and in the same manner as County taxes are collected. The Engineer of Work shall file a report annually with the City Council of said City and said Council will annually conduct a hearing upon said report at a regular meeting held between March and June, at which time assessments for the next fiscal year will be determined.

Section 6. Time and Place of Hearing
Notice is hereby given that on the 3rd day of August 2010 at the hour of 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers at 291 North Main Street, in the City of Porterville, any and all persons having any objections to the work or extent of the assessment districts may appear and show cause why said work should not be done or carried out in accordance with Resolution of Intention. The City Council will consider all oral and written protests.
SECTION 7. LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING ACT OF 1972
All the work herein proposed shall be done and carried through in pursuance of an act of the legislature of the State of California designated the Landscaping and Lighting Act of 1972, being Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California.

SECTION 8. PUBLICATION OF RESOLUTION OF INTENTION
Published notice shall be made pursuant to Section 6061 of the Government Code. The publication of the Notice of Hearing shall be completed at least 10 days prior to the date of hearing.

SECTION 9. CERTIFICATION
The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 20th DAY OF JULY 2010.

________________________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:
John Lollis, City Clerk

By: ________________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
ENGINEER’S REPORT FOR LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO
MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 23

SECTION 1. Authority for Report

This report is prepared by order of the City Council of the City of Porterville Resolution No. ________. The report is in compliance with the requirement of Article 4, Chapter 1, Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code, State of California (Landscape and Lighting Act of 1972).

SECTION 2. General Description

The City Council has elected to retain the lighting at Garden Court Villas Subdivision, which consists of a resubdivision of a portion of River View Phase 3 Subdivision in the Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 23 which includes all of River View Phase 3 Subdivision. The City Council has determined that the areas to be lighted will have an affect upon all parcels within the proposed boundaries of the District 23. The existing District 23 includes lighting on Roby Street, Belmont Avenue, Orange Avenue, Forest Avenue, and Parkwest Street as a part of the River View Phase 3 Subdivision. The resubdivision includes converting 11 lots within District 23 into an area utilizing a homeowners association to fund enhancements for Garden Court Villas Subdivision. The homeowners association will retain ownership of three common areas within Garden Villas. The 11 lots being resubdivided represent 30.6% of the original 36 lots within River View Phase 3 Subdivision (District 23).

SECTION 3. Plans and Specifications

The plans and specifications for the lighting were prepared by the developer of River View Phase 3 Subdivision and are in conformance with the requirements of the City of Porterville. All lights to be maintained will be shown on the subdivision maps as roadway
rights-of-way, or easements to be granted to the City of Porterville. The total street lights to be maintained in the existing District 23 are 11 and will continue to be 11 after the resubdivision

SECTION 4. Improvements

Landscape and lighting improvements in the existing District 23 were made by the developer of River View Phase 3 Subdivision. No additional lighting and landscape improvements are required for the resubdivision.

SECTION 5. Estimated Costs

The maximum assessment is based upon the maximum assessment for District 23 before the amendment. Maximum Assessment for 2009-10 is $826.39 for 36 lots. The construction cost for the annexation will be borne by the developer and will not be assessed. The subdivision map for the annexation has been filed for record and it is intended that the improvements will be constructed during or before the 2010 – 2011 fiscal year and certain additional lighting costs will be incurred during fiscal year 2010 – 2011. It is appropriate that the assessments be made in advance of the anticipated expenditure to provide working capital for the maintenance effort. District 34 assessments during the 2010-2011 Fiscal Year are as follows.

Estimated Assessment 2010-2011

**Electricity/Lighting***

11 fixtures, 5,800 lumens @ $30.21 per year $ 332.31

**Project Management Costs**

36 Lots @ $400 + $3 per lot $ 508.00

Sub Total 2010-2011 $ 840.31

**Incidental Expenses**
15% Reserve Fund  $ 42.02
Total Calculated 2010-2011 Assessment  $ 882.33
Maximum Assessment 2010-2011  $ 826.39

*Lighting costs are based on 29% benefit of total cost because lights are spaced closer together resulting in 40% more lights than the city standard outside the maintenance district.

After the 2010-2011 fiscal year, the assessments shall be increased with the cost of service. The increased cost of services shall be the lesser of the actual prior year’s cost or the prior year’s estimated cost adjusted according to the annualized Consumer price Index rate. The Consumer Price Index is based on the San Francisco Model, and any increase for the year 2010-2011 will refer back to the prior year’s CPI. In the event that the costs of services provided do not increase to exceed the full amount of CPI from one year, such excess CPI percentage shall be carried over from year to year and may be utilized to increase the amount of assessment in future years.

SECTION 6. Assessment Diagram

A copy of the proposed assessment diagram is attached in two parts and by reference is made part thereof. The first part is entitled “Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 23 Original” and the second is entitled “Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 23 Amendment No. 1”.
SECTION 7. Assessment

The initial cost of constructing improvements has been borne by the developer. The improvement areas are established for the benefit of all properties within the proposed Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 23. The establishment and maintenance of the improvements is a vital part of the development of River View Phase 3 and Garden Court Subdivision. The City Council of Porterville has determined that to ensure integrity of District 23, the resubdivided area should be assessed the 30.6% of the costs that would have been assessed to the 11 lots being resubdivided by Garden Villas Subdivision and that since the street lighting is a benefit shared by the homeowners, it is appropriate to assess 30.6% of the total assessment to the lots to be retained by the homeowners association. The lighting consists of 11 streetlights.

The existing Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 23 consists of an area comprising approximately 12.14 acres and 36 lots. The amendment effects approximately 4.25 acres of Landscape and Lighting District 23 through the resubdivision of 11 lots. A total of 12.14 acres will continue to be included in Landscape and Lighting District No. 23. The improvements will consist of those improvements described in Section 4 of this report. The maintenance of the improvements is a vital part of the development for the protection or safety, economic and humanistic values. The City Council has determined that, for the preservation of values incorporated within this development, all lots will receive equal benefit from the landscaping and street lighting.

The determination of benefits takes into consideration the following facts:

1. The purpose of the improvements is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. The lots not adjacent to the landscaping and lighting facility improvements benefit for the maintenance equally to those lots adjacent to the improvements.

**Estimated 2010-2011 Assessment**

Assessment Lots A, B, and C (retained by homeowners association = 30.6% of Total Assessment (TA))

Assessment Each Home Owners Association Lot (A HOL) = TA * 30.6%/3

\[
A\ HOL = \$826.39 \times 0.306 = \$84.29 \text{ rounded } \$84.30
\]

\[
\frac{3}{3}\ 
\]

Total Assessment for Home Owner Retained Lots (TA HOL) = $252.90

Remaining Assessment (RA) = TA - TA HOL

RA = 826.39 - 252.90 = 573.49

Assessment Original Lots (AOL) = \( \frac{RA}{Number\ of\ Remaining\ Lots\ (L)} \)

AOL = \( \frac{\$573.49}{25} \) = \$22.94 per lot for remaining lots from original River View Phase 3 Subdivision

Total Assessment for the lots remaining from original River View Phase 3 Subdivision = $573.50

Total Assessment for 2010-2011 = $252.90 + $573.50 = $826.40

**SECTION 8. Order of Events**


2. City Council Adopts Resolution of Preliminary Approval of Engineer’s Report.

3. City Council Adopts Resolution of Intention to Order the Amendment of Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 23 and determines the district.
4. City Council adopts Resolution Ordering the Improvements and the Amendment of Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 23.

5. Every year between April and June the Engineer of Work file a report with the City Council.

6. Every year between April and June, the City Council conducts a public hearing and approves, or modifies the individual assessments.

Douglas Wilson
Engineer of the Work
BEING A SUBDIVISION OF THE REMAINDER OF PARCEL MAP No. 4265 PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 43, PAGE 69 OF PARCEL MAPS, SITUATED WITHIN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 SECTION 33, T.21S., R.27E., M.D.B. & M., IN THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE, COUNTY OF TULARE AND STATE OF CALIFORNIA.
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SECTION 1. Authority for Report

This report is prepared by order of the City Council of the City of Porterville Resolution No. _________. The report is in compliance with the requirement of Article 4, Chapter 1, Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code, State of California (Landscape and Lighting Act of 1972).

SECTION 2. General Description

The City Council has elected to include lighting at Meadow Breeze Phase 3 Subdivision, which consists of a division of the remainder parcel for Meadow Breeze Phase 2 Subdivision into the Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 34. The City Council has determined that the areas to be lighted will have an affect upon all parcels within the proposed boundaries of the District. The existing District includes lighting on Mathew Street, Michael Place, Verdugo Place, Lu Ann Place Belmont Place and Brian Avenue as a part of the Meadow Breeze Phase 2 subdivision. The Annexation includes lighting on Castle Avenue.

SECTION 3. Plans and Specifications

The plans and specifications for the additional lighting were prepared by the developer and are in conformance with the requirements of the City of Porterville. All lights to be maintained will be shown on the subdivision maps as roadway rights-of-way, or easements to be granted to the City of Porterville. The total street lights to be maintained in the existing District 34 are 19. A total of 3 lights will be added through this annexation resulting in a total of 22 lights.
SECTION 4. Improvements

Landscape and lighting improvements in the existing District 34 were made by the developer of Meadow Breeze Phase 2 Subdivision. Landscape and lighting improvements to be annexed were made by the developer of Meadow Breeze, Phases 3 Subdivision.

SECTION 5. Estimated Costs

The maximum assessment is based upon the maximum assessment for District 34 before the annexation. Maximum Assessment for 2009-10 is $1,896.07 for 78 lots or $27.56 per lot. New maximum assessment for 2009-10 is $27.56 per lot for 92 lots or $2,236.52. The construction cost for the annexation will be borne by the developer and will not be assessed. The subdivision map for the annexation has been filed for record and it is intended that the improvements will be constructed during or before the 2010 – 2011 fiscal year and certain additional lighting costs will be incurred during fiscal year 2010 – 2011. It is appropriate that the assessments be made in advance of the anticipated expenditure to provide working capital for the maintenance effort. District 34 assessments during the 2010-2011 Fiscal Year are as follows.

Estimated Assessment 2010-2011

Electricity/Lighting*

17 fixtures, 5,800 lumens @ $30.21 per year $ 513.57
5 fixtures, 9,500 lumens @ $36.27 per year $ 181.35

Project Management Costs

92 Lots @ $12 per lot $1,104.00

Sub Total 2009-2010 $1,798.92
Incidental Expenses

15% Reserve Fund $269.84

Total 2009-2010 Assessment $2,068.76

*Lighting costs are based on 29% benefit of total cost because lights are spaced closer together resulting in 40% more lights than the city standard outside the maintenance district.

After the 2009-2010 fiscal year, the assessments shall be increased with the cost of service. The increased cost of services shall be the lesser of the actual prior year’s cost or the prior year’s estimated cost adjusted according to the annualized Consumer price Index rate. The Consumer Price Index is based on the San Francisco Model, and any increase for the year 2010-2011 will refer back to the prior year’s CPI. In the event that the costs of services provided do not increase to exceed the full amount of CPI from one year, such excess CPI percentage shall be carried over from year to year and may be utilized to increase the amount of assessment in future years.

SECTION 6. Assessment Diagram

A copy of the proposed assessment diagram is attached in two parts and by reference is made part thereof. The first part is entitled “Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 34 Original” and the second is entitled “Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 34 Annexation No. 1”.

SECTION 7. Assessment

The initial cost of constructing improvements has been borne by the developer. The improvement areas are established for the benefit of all properties within the proposed
Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 34. The establishment and maintenance of the improvements is a vital part of the development of Meadow Breeze Phase 3 Subdivision. The City Council of Porterville has determined that to ensure satisfactory levels of street lighting at Meadow Breeze Phase 3 Subdivision, it should be annexed into Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 34. The lighting consists of 22 streetlights.

The existing Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 34 consists of an area comprising approximately 17.70 acres and 78 lots. The annexation consists of approximately 2.86 acres and 14 lots to be developed in Meadow Breeze, Phase 3. A total of 20.56 acres and 92 lots will be included in Landscape and Lighting District No. 34. The improvements will consist of those improvements described in Section 4 of this report. The maintenance of the improvements is a vital part of the development for the protection or safety, economic and humanistic values. The City Council has determined that, for the preservation of values incorporated within this development, all lots will receive equal benefit from the landscaping and street lighting.

The determination of benefits takes into consideration the following facts:

1. The purpose of the improvements is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. The lots not adjacent to the landscaping and lighting facility improvements benefit for the maintenance equally to those lots adjacent to the improvements.
Estimated 2010-2011 Assessment

Assessment (A) = \( \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} \).

\[
A = \frac{\$2068.76}{92} = 22.48 \text{ per lot for Meadow Breeze, Phase 2, and 3 Subdivision.}
\]

Total Assessment for 2010-2011 = $2,068.16

Total developed lot count is 92 lots.

SECTION 8. Order of Events


2. City Council Adopts Resolution of Preliminary Approval of Engineer's Report.

3. City Council Adopts Resolution of Intention to Order the Formation of Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 34 and determines the district.

4. City Council adopts Resolution Ordering the Improvements and the Formation of Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 34.

5. Every year between April and June the Engineer of Work file a report with the City Council.

6. Every year between April and June, the City Council conducts a public hearing and approves, or modifies the individual assessments.

Signed:

Douglas Wilson
Engineer of the Work
LANDSCAPE & LIGHTING DISTRICT NO. 34

CITY OF PORTERVILLE

BEING A PORTION OF THE NORTH 1/2 OF THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 21, T.21S., R.27E., M.D.B.&M.,
CITY OF PORTERVILLE, COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

LEGEND

Street Lights (19 ea.)
Fire Hydrant

SCALE: 1" = 200'

Meadow Breeze
Phase Two
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
ENGINEER'S REPORT FOR LANDSCAPING AND LIGHTING
MAINTENANCE DISTRICT NO. 46

SECTION 1. Authority for Report

This report is prepared by order of the City Council of the City of Porterville Resolution No. ___________. The report is in compliance with the requirement of Article 4, Chapter 1, Division 15 of the Streets and Highways Code, State of California (Landscape and Lighting Act of 1972).

SECTION 2. General Description

The City Council has elected to include landscaping and lighting at Moorea Manor Subdivision into the Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 46. The City Council has determined that the areas to be landscaped and lighted will have an effect upon all parcels within the proposed boundaries of the District. The areas for street lights are included on each side of San Lucia Lane within the subdivision. The landscaping includes 286 feet of masonry wall along Newcomb on the west side of the subdivision as well as a landscaped area along the Newcomb frontage. The landscape and wall maintenance includes: irrigation, mowing, pruning, cleaning, repairing, painting, vegetation and rodent control, and a set aside for replacement.

SECTION 3. Plans and Specifications

The plans and specifications for the lighting were prepared by the developer and are in conformance with the requirements of the City of Porterville. All lights to be maintained will be shown on the subdivision maps as roadway rights-of-way, or easements to be granted to the City of Porterville. The total street lights to be maintained are 4. Total landscaped area to be maintained is 286.12 lineal feet of masonry wall, and 1460 square feet of landscaped area.
Maintenance activities within the Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No.
are to include landscape and lighting maintenance.

SECTION 4. Improvements

Landscape and lighting improvements were made by the developer of Moorea Manor Subdivision.

SECTION 5. Estimated Costs

The construction cost will be borne by the developer and will not be assessed. The subdivision map has been filed for record and the improvements have been installed and certain maintenance on the areas will be necessary during fiscal year 2010-2011. It is appropriate that the assessments be made in advance of the anticipated expenditure to provide working capital for the maintenance effort. In this District assessments will be made during the 2010-2011 Fiscal Year.

Estimated Assessment 2010-2011

**Landscaped Area**

- Masonry Wall 286.12 L.F. @ $0.51 per L.F. $ 145.92
- Landscape Area 1460 S.F. @ $1.56 per S.F. $2,277.60

**Electricity/Lighting**

- 4 fixtures, 5,800 lumens @ $41.66 per year $ 166.64

**Project Management Costs**

- 16 Lots @ $1,000 plus $4 per lot $ 1,064.00
- Subtotal $3,654.16
- Reserve Fund (15%) $ 548.12
- Subtotal $4,202.29
- Overhead (9%) $ 378.21
Total 2010-2011 Initial Assessment $4,580.49

**Lighting costs are based on 40% benefit of total cost because lights are spaced closer together resulting in 40% more lights than the city standard outside the maintenance district.

After the 2010-2011 fiscal year, the assessments shall be increased with the cost of service. The increased cost of services shall be the lesser of the actual prior year’s cost or the prior year’s estimated cost adjusted according to the annualized Consumer Price Index rate. The Consumer Price Index is based on the San Francisco Model, and any increase for the year 2011/2012 will refer back to the prior year’s CPI. In the event that the costs of services provided do not increase to exceed the full amount of CPI from one year, such excess CPI percentage shall be carried over from year to year and may be utilized to increase the amount of assessment in future years.

SECTION 6. Assessment Diagram

A copy of the proposed assessment diagram entitled “Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 46 is attached to this report and by reference is made part thereof.

SECTION 7. Assessment

The initial cost of constructing improvements has been borne by the developer. The improvement areas are established for the benefit of all properties within the proposed Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 46. The establishment and maintenance of the improvements is a vital part of the development of Moorea Manor Subdivision. The City Council of Porterville has determined that to insure satisfactory levels of maintenance for the landscape and lighting at Moorea Manor Subdivision, it should become Landscape and Lighting
Maintenance District No. 46. The subdivision consists of 16 Lots. The Landscape area, which benefits the 16 lots, is located along the westerly boundary of the district along Newcomb.

Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 46 will consist of an area comprising approximately 4.30 acres. A total of 16 lots are proposed to be developed. The improvements will consist of those improvements described in Section 4 of this report. The maintenance of the improvements is a vital part of the development for the protection or safety, economic and humanistic values. The City Council has determined that, for the preservation of values incorporated within this development, all lots will receive equal benefit from the landscaping and street lighting.

The determination of benefits takes into consideration the following facts:

1. The purpose of the improvements is to provide a favorable aesthetic appearance of the area.
2. Properly maintained landscaping and lighting benefits all properties in the development.
3. The lots not adjacent to the landscaping and lighting facility improvements benefit for the maintenance equally to those lots adjacent to the improvements.

Estimated 2010-2011 Assessment

\[ \text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} \]

\[ A = \frac{4,580.49}{16} = \$238.02 \text{ per lot for Moorea Manor Subdivision} \]

Total Assessment for 2010-2011 = $4,580.48
Total developed lot count is 16 lots.

SECTION 8. Order of Events

2. City Council Adopts Resolution of Preliminary Approval of Engineer’s Report.

3. City Council Adopts Resolution of Intention to Order the Formation of Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 46 and determines the district.

4. City Council adopts Resolution Ordering the Improvements and the Formation of Landscape and Lighting Maintenance District No. 46.

5. Every year between April and June the Engineer of Work file a report with the City Council.

6. Every year between April and June, the City Council conducts a public hearing and approves, or modifies the individual assessments.

________________________________________
Douglas Wilson
Engineer of the Work
LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE PLAN

New District
Setting the standard level of care
- Landscape Plan
- Photographs
  Take pictures of how the district looks at the time of transfer to the City
- Inventory
  Detailed listing of everything within the district

Factors for the assessment
- Replacement Costs
- Maintenance
- Contingency

Existing District
- Photographs
  Showing the current condition of the district
- Inventory
  What the district currently consists of
- Improvements
  Listing of projects completed and things that need to be done