CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
CITY HALL, 291 N. MAIN STREET
PORTERVILLE, CALIFORNIA
JULY 19, 2011, 5:30 P.M.

Call to Order
Roll Call

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

JOINT CITYCOUNCIL/PORTERVILLE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AGENDA
291 N. MAIN STREET, PORTERVILLE, CA
JULY 19, 2011

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/Agency, all commentary shall be limited to three minutes.

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

CITY COUNCIL CLOSED SESSION:
B. Closed Session Pursuant to:
   3- Government Code Section 54956.9(a) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation: Donald Sipple v. City of Alameda, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC462270.

6:30 P.M. RECONVENE OPEN SESSION
REPORT ON ANY COUNCIL ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

Pledge of Allegiance Led by Vice Mayor Hamilton
Invocation
**PROCLAMATIONS**

Steve Tree

**PRESENTATIONS**

Employee Services Awards  
Continuum of Care – Ten Year Plan

**REPORTS**

This is the time for all reports from the City Council, including but not limited to, reports pursuant to AB1234, reports from subcommittees, committees, commissions and boards on which the Council Members serve, and other miscellaneous informational reports.

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

This is the opportunity to address the Council on any matter of interest, whether on the agenda or not. Please address all items not scheduled for public hearing at this time. 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 February 1, 2011 and June 28, 2011**

2. **Reject All Bids – Skate Park Lighting Project**
   Re: Considering the rejection of the three (3) bids received for the project consisting of the installation of a power sub-panel, conduit, four lighting standards and related appurtenances at the City’s Skate Park.

3. **Agreement for Transit Services Between the Tulare County Association of Governments and the City of Porterville**
   Re: Consideration of entering into an agreement for transit services between the Tulare County Association of Governments and the City of Porterville relative to the reimbursement of T-Pass revenues.

4. **Plano Bridge Widening Project: Approval of Resolution Approving Addendum to the Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact**
   Re: Considering adopting the draft resolution approving the addendum of the Negative Declaration for the Plano Street Bridge Widening Project which was approved by the Council at its meeting of July 5, 2011.

5. **Resolution Opposing the Transfer of the Sequoia National Monument to the National Park Service**
   Re: Considering resolution in opposition to the proposed transfer of the Giant Sequoia National Monument’s management from the U.S. Forest Service to the National Park Service
6. **Adoption of the Kings/Tulare County Continuum of Care on Homelessness "Connecting the Dots" Plan for Addressing Homelessness in Kings and Tulare Counties**
   Re: Considering the adoption of the Kings/Tulare County Continuum of Care on Homelessness “Connecting the Dots” Plan for addressing homelessness in Kings and Tulare Counties.

7. **This Item has been removed.**

8. **Airport Lease Renewal – Lot 32C**
   Re: Considering approval of extending Lease Agreement between City of Porterville and William Parham at the Municipal Airport.

9. **Assign Airport Lease – Lot 38**
   Re: Considering approval of the assignment of a Lease Agreement between the City of Porterville and Mr. And Mrs. Roy Cundiff to Mr. Raymond Broad.

10. **Emergency Replacement – Air Conditioning Unit**
    Re: Ratifying the emergency replacement of the air conditioning unit at the City’s “block house,” and authorizing payment to Gray’s Air Conditioning in the estimated amount of $6,280.

11. **Ratification of Approval of City Council Procedural Handbook**
    Re: Considering the ratification of the Council’s July 5, 2011 approval of the Procedural Handbook as amended.

12. **State Budget Impacts to the City of Porterville**
    Re: Informational report outlining the negative impacts various components of the State’s budget signed on June 30, 2011 will have on the City budget adopted June 19, 2011.

13. **Review of Local Emergency Status**
    Re: Reviewing the City’s status of local emergency pursuant to Article 14, Section 8690 of the California Emergency Services Act.

_A Council Meeting Recess Will Occur at 8:30 p.m., or as Close to That Time as Possible_

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

14. **Budget Adjustment/Citizens’ Option for Public Safety (COPS) Program Funding**
    Re: Considering acceptance of $100,000 in grant funds to be utilized to support personnel assigned to the Police Department’s Patrol Division.

**SCHEDULED MATTERS**

15. **Authorization to Roll Weed Abatement Balances to the Property Tax Rolls**
    Re: Consideration of the option to authorize the County Auditor to place uncollected weed abatement charges on the property tax rolls for collection and file “Notice of Lien” with the Tulare County Recorder’s Office, as appropriate.
16. Consideration to Negotiate Agreement for a Golf Professional for the Municipal Golf Course
   Re: Authorizing staff to negotiate an agreement with Mr. Casey Butler for professional services
   at the Municipal Golf Course.

17. Consideration to Maintain the Porterville Redevelopment Agency
   Re: Consideration of four options for the future of the Porterville Redevelopment Agency based
   on legislation ABX1 26 and ABX1 27 adopted by the State.

18. Preliminary Annual Engineer’s Report of Assessments for Lighting & 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 2011-2012, the levying and collection of
   assessments for Fiscal Year 2011-2012, and setting a Public Hearing for August 2, 2011.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
OTHER MATTERS

CLOSED SESSION
   Any Closed Session Items not completed prior to 6:30 p.m. will be considered at this time.

ADJOURNMENT - to the meeting of August 2, 2011 at 5:30 p.m.

   Pursuant to Ordinance No. 1766, the Council Meeting shall adjourn no later than 9:45 p.m.,
   unless otherwise approved by a majority of the Council Members present.

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.
Call to Order at 5:32 p.m.
Roll Call: Council Member McCracken, Vice Mayor Hamilton, Council Member Shelton, Council Member Ward, Mayor Irish

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

JOINT CITYCOUNCIL/PORTERVILLE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AGENDA
291 N. MAIN STREET, PORTERVILLE, CA

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

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
None

City Attorney Julia Lew advised of a conflict of interest that Vice Mayor Hamilton had with Item B-1. Ms. Lew advised that Mr. Hamilton served on the Board of Directors for Walk with Me Family Services, and would therefore recuse himself from the discussion, and exit the closed session while the Council discussed the item.

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

During Closed Session, the Joint Redevelopment/City Council Meeting adjourned to a City Council Meeting.

CITY COUNCIL CLOSED SESSION:
B. Closed Session Pursuant to:

3- Government Code Section 54956.9(c) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation – Initiation of Litigation: One Case.


5- Government Code Section 54957-Public Employee Performance Evaluation- Title: City Manager

6:30 P.M. RECONVENE OPEN SESSION

REPORT ON ANY COUNCIL ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION

City Attorney Julia Lew reported that no reportable action took place.

Pledge of Allegiance Led by Council Member Shelton

Invocation: A moment of silence was observed in memory of Mr. Jim Cone who passed away on Monday, January 31, 2011.

PROCLAMATIONS

Tule River Tribal Council

PRESENTATIONS

Employee of the Month – Brian Herrera

Introduction of New Employees

REPORTS

- Council Member Shelton spoke of the ground-breaking ceremony at Happy Trails.
- Vice Mayor Hamilton reported on a recent Indian Gaming Local Community Benefit Committee meeting during which the committee selected a chairperson and authorized the submittal of a grant application.
- Mayor Irish reported on the recent TCAG meeting and of the issue of impact fees, and requested that Porterville residents watch the issue and provide input.
- Council Member Ward spoke of the sesquicentennial committee’s meeting during which three subcommittees were formed to target ideas and events for the celebration. He advised that the next meeting would be held on February 9th at the Chamber of Commerce and invited those interested to attend.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

- Ben Harvey, spoke of the history of a lease agreement for the Fire Station property at the Municipal Airport, and indicated that the Porterville Area Pilots Association was interested in either selling its interest in the lease, or subleasing the property to another group.
- Bob Nuckols, requested that he be afforded the opportunity to speak on Item 24 during the Council’s consideration of the item. The Council voiced no objections.
CONSENT CALENDAR
Items 2, 4, 6, 8, 13, 16-19, and 21 were removed for further discussion.

1. CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF APRIL 20, 2010
Recommendation: That the City Council approve the City Council Minutes of April 20, 2010.
Documentation: M.O. 01-020111
Disposition: Approved.

3. AWARD OF CONTRACT REVISITED – CNG POWERED REFUSE COLLECTION TRUCKS
Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Award the contracts for one (1) new CNG powered front load refuse collection truck in the amount of $242,611.51 and three (3) new CNG powered side load refuse collection trucks in the amount of $796,358.20 to Tharp’s of Porterville;
2. Authorize a 1% contingency to allow an upgrade to the axle system of all vehicles purchased, if available;
3. Further, that Council authorize payment upon satisfactory delivery of the equipment; and
4. Direct the Finance Director to prepare a budget adjustment to the 2010/2011 Annual Budget to insure that $119,169.83 from the Equipment Replacement Fund is available to satisfy the City’s funding obligation.
Documentation: M.O. 02-020111
Disposition: Approved.

5. COOPERATIVE WORK AGREEMENT (CWA) – PLANO BRIDGE PROJECT
Recommendation: That the City Council authorize the Mayor to execute the Cooperative Work Agreement (CWA) affirming the City of Porterville’s request for an extension to the Design (Preliminary Engineering) phase of the project.
Documentation: M.O. 03-020111
Disposition: Approved.

7. CITY EASEMENT CONVEYANCE TO BURTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Accept Burton School District’s request to have the City convey an easement for the installation and maintenance of a District sanitary sewer lift station;
2. Authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to sign the Grant of Easement; and 
3. Authorize the City Clerk to mail the signed Grant of Easement to Burton School District for recordation.

Documentation: Resolution No. 04-2011 
Disposition: Approved.

9. QUARTERLY PORTFOLIO SUMMARY 
Recommendation: That the City Council accept the quarterly Portfolio Summary. 

Documentation: M.O. 05-020111 
Disposition: Approved.

10. STREET PERFORMANCE MEASURE – 2ND QUARTER REPORT 
Recommendation: Information only. 

Documentation: M.O. 06-020111 
Disposition: Report Accepted.

11. CODE ENFORCEMENT UPDATE 
Recommendation: None. Informational report only. 

Documentation: M.O. 07-020111 
Disposition: Approved.

12. ATTENDANCE RECORDS FOR COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES – 2ND QUARTER UPDATE 
Recommendation: Information report only. 

Documentation: M.O. 08-020111 
Disposition: Approved.

14. CBDG CITIZENS’ ADVISORY AND HOUSING OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN 
Recommendation: That the City Council: 
1. Adopt the 2011 Citizen Participation Plan; and 
2. Appoint the existing committee members Pat Contreras, Linda Olmedo, Grace Munoz-Rios, Rudy Roman, John Dennis, Rebecca Vigil, and Kelle Jo Lowe to the Citizens’ Advisory and Housing Opportunity Committee for a one-year term.
15. REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATIVE BODY

Recommendation: That the City Council accept the Redevelopment Agency Annual Report for 2009-2010.

Documentation: M.O. 10-020111
Disposition: Approved.

20. REVIEW OF LOCAL EMERGENCY STATUS AND SCHEDULING OF STUDY SESSION

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Receive the status report and review of the designated local emergency;
2. Pursuant to the requirements of Article 14, Section 8690 of the California Emergency Services Act, determine that a need exists to continue said local emergency designation; and
3. Schedule a study session for February 24, 2011 at 6:00 p.m. to review staff’s analysis of the response to the local emergency and discuss options for future mitigation of any identified issues.

Documentation: M.O. 11-020111
Disposition: Approved.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member McCracken, SECONDED by Vice Mayor Hamilton that the Council approve Items 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 through 12, 14, 15, and 20. The motion carried unanimously.

2. BUDGET ADJUSTMENT TO ACCEPT HUD-SCI GRANT FUNDS FOR SMART VALLEY PLACES

Recommendation: That the City Council authorize a budget adjustment to revenue in the Community Development Department in the amount of $137,460, and in the Public Works Department in the amount of $62,540, to account for the funds received from the HUD-SCI grant.

City Manager Lollis presented the item. A brief discussion ensued during which staff elaborated on the grant and indicated that regardless of the funding mechanism, the City would be required to perform the planned work.
COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Ward, SECONDED by Vice Mayor Hamilton that the Council authorize a budget adjustment to revenue in the M.O. 12-020111 Community Development Department in the amount of $137,460, and in the Public Works Department in the amount of $62,540, to account for the funds received from the HUD-SCI grant. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved.

Mayor Irish acknowledged the arrival of Boy Scout Troop 114 and invited them to step forward and introduce themselves. Those present were:

- Eric Ward
- Moses Power
- Mason McCracken
- Jack Sourza
- Gavry Montevan
- Isaac Nash

4. RATIFICATION OF EXPENDITURE – STREET LIGHT INSTALLATION FOR THE INDIANA STREET AND SCRANTON AVENUE RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Approve the costs associated with the installation of street lights; and
2. Authorize the City Engineer to sign the SCE application and issue a $30,920.89 payment.

City Manager John Lollis presented the item. Council Member Shelton lauded staff on the project’s progress.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Shelton, SECONDED by Council Member McCracken that the Council approve the costs associated with the installation of street lights; and authorize the City Engineer to sign the SCE application and issue a $30,920.89 payment. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved.

6. REQUEST FOR WATER SERVICE OUTSIDE CITY (SCHMID FAMILY DESCENDENT TRUST – LOT 11 OF TRACT NO. 467)

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Approve the request on the facts presented herein; and
2. Require the requesting party to comply with all herein stated MSP
requirements and pay all applicable fees.

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

Vice Mayor Hamilton inquired about the trigger for prevailing wage, and a discussion ensued comparing this situation to that of Roby. Staff clarified that the City had purchased the water company, which served the area; and that the area could be annexed in the event the County approves the proposed Urban Development Boundary. City Attorney Lew requested additional time to research the item.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member McCracken, SECONDED by Council Member Ward that the City Council continue the item to the next meeting; and direct the City Attorney to research the issue of prevailing wage. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Item continued.

8. INTERIM FINANCIAL STATUS REPORTS

Recommendation: That the City Council accept the interim financial status reports as presented.

The City Manager introduced the item, and the staff report was waived at the Council’s request. Council Member McCracken lauded the budget report and staff’s efforts.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member McCracken, SECONDED by Vice Mayor Hamilton that the City Council accept the interim financial status reports as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved.

13. REPORT ON CHARITABLE CAR WASHES

Recommendation: For information only.

The City Manager introduced the item, and noted that Mayor Irish had pulled the item for discussion. The staff report was waived at the Council’s request, and Mayor Irish spoke of the need to monitor these permits closely in an effort to give everyone equal opportunity. Staff was directed that permits in excess of that which is allowed by the ordinance be brought to Council for consideration.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Mayor Irish, SECONDED by Vice Mayor Hamilton that the City Council approve the informational report; and direct staff to bring all permits that exceed the number allowed by ordinance to the Council for consideration. The motion carried unanimously.
16. COMMUNITY CLEAN UP EVENTS

Recommendation: That the City Council:
2. Encourage all residents to clean up their properties and take advantage of these special opportunities offered by the City;
3. Authorize the City to accept trash, litter, and yard clippings delivered by City residents receiving City refuse service to the Spring and Fall Clean Up Events for free disposal; and
4. Authorize the cost of both events to be funded from the Solid Waste Operating budget.

The City Manager introduced the item, and noted that the item had been pulled by Council Member Ward. The staff report was waived by the Council, and Council Member Ward voiced his concern with the proposed date of April 9th conflicting with the Jack Ass Mail Run. He requested that the item be continued to allow staff the opportunity to propose another date.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Ward, SECONDED by Council Member Shelton that the City Council continue the item to the next meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Item continued.

17. AIRPORT LEASE RENEWAL - LOT 37

Recommendation: That the Council approve the extension of the Lease Agreement between the City of Porterville and Ernest Freeman, for Lot 37 at the Porterville Municipal Airport.

The City Manager introduced the item, and the staff report was waived at the Council’s request. Council Member Shelton indicated that he had pulled the item to commend staff for their efforts.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Shelton, SECONDED by Council Member McCracken that the City Council approve the extension of the Lease Agreement between the City of Porterville and Ernest Freeman, for Lot 37 at the Porterville Municipal Airport. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved.

18. AUTHORIZATION TO TRAVEL

Recommendation: That the City Council approve travel to Las Vegas, Nevada, for the purpose
of attending the International Council of Shopping Centers Conference.

The City Manager introduced item, and the staff report was waived at the Council’s request. Council Member Shelton, who had pulled the item, asked which staff would be attending, and shared his concern regarding the benefit of such conferences. Staff and members of the Council shared their experiences at such conferences, spoke of the importance of establishing connections, and the use of the Buxton data.

Council Member McCracken made a motion to approve with an additional allocation to allow for Council Member Shelton’s attendance at the conference. The motion died for lack of a second.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Vice Mayor Hamilton, SECONDED by Council Member Ward that the City Council approve travel to Las Vegas, Nevada, for the purpose of attending the International Council of Shopping Centers conference. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved.

19. APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MEMBER’S TRAVEL TO WASHINGTON D.C.

Recommendation: That the Council, consistent with past practice, confirm the proposed out-of-state travel for Mayor Ronald Irish on February 28 – March 4, 2011.

The City Manager introduced the item, and noted that the item had been removed from the Consent Calendar at Council Member Shelton’s request. Council Member Shelton requested staff to identify the Council Member with the least travel expenses, which staff advised was Mayor Irish.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Ward, SECONDED by Mayor Irish that the City Council confirm the proposed out-of-state travel for Mayor Ronald Irish on February 28 – March 4, 2011. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved.

21. YEAR-END REVIEW OF 2010 CITY COUNCIL PRIORITY PROJECTS AND OBJECTIVES

Recommendation: None – Information Only.

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

Council Member Ward inquired about the absence of Phase I of the Library remodel on the list. It was noted that the project had not been identified as a priority by the Council, and that the Council would be considering goal setting at the next meeting.
COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Ward, SECONDED by Council Member McCracken that the City Council accept the informational report. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved.

The Council recessed for ten minutes.

SCHEDULED MATTERS

22. CONSIDER ‘WALL OF FAME’ HONOR DESIGNATIONS

Recommendation: Consider the nominations and designate new ‘Wall of Fame’ honoree(s).

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and Parks and Leisure Services Director Milt Stowe presented the staff report.

The following nominations were made:

- Council Member McCracken NOMINATED Mona Alyce Young Gauger
- Vice Mayor Hamilton NOMINATED Alice Seal and Forrest “Doc” Mock
- Mayor Irish NOMINATED Brett Land
- Council Member Shelton NOMINATED Jim Cone

Vice Mayor Hamilton proposed amending the policy to include a biography of each individual and to allow for those honored to remain on the wall. The Council was directed to bring back the policy for amendment.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member McCracken, SECONDED by Vice Mayor Hamilton that the City Council approve all nominations for placement. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Designations approved; and direction given.

23. APPROVAL OF ZALUD PARK CONCESSION BUILDING

Recommendation: That the City Council consider approval of the Zalud Park Concession Building with Richard Sanchez, authorize and direct staff to create a Zalud Park Concession License Agreement for execution.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and Parks and Leisure Services Director Stowe presented the staff report.

Council Member McCracken expressed concern with approving a remodel prior to approving a license agreement.
COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Vice Mayor Hamilton, SECONDED by Council Member Ward that the City Council approve a Zalud Park Concession Building with Richard Sanchez, contingent upon the execution of a License Agreement prior to any construction. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved.

24. RECLAMATION AREA LEASE LAND ADJUSTMENT

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Adjust the Reclamation Area Lease to an annual amount of $64,824;
2. Authorize the reimbursement of $23,272 for the pro-rated 2009/2010 lease year to Rick Perigo Roadsiding; and
3. Authorize the mayor to sign the proposed Amendment No.1 to the Lease Agreement.

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

Council Member McCracken identified two issues at hand for Council’s consideration: 1) the restructuring of the lease due to a change in the calculation of acreage; and 2) the variable quantities of discharged effluent on a year to year basis. A discussion ensued with regard to the customary method in calculating acreage in agricultural contracts, the various methods utilized in calculating acreage; and the varying amount of discharged effluent, and lack of guarantee therefore, in the subject agreement.

- Bob Nuckols, 13144 Road 216, spoke against the proposal, voicing concern with the proposed change in acreage; the current’s lessee’s stewardship of the land, and the lessee’s concern with the amount of effluent discharged.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member McCracken, SECONDED by Vice Mayor Hamilton that the Council continue the item to the next meeting, and direct staff to provide additional information including a copy of the original Lease Agreement; the Request for Proposals, and the survey, or method utilized in calculating the acreage. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Item continued to February 15, 2011.

25. MODIFICATIONS TO ASPHALT SPECIFICATION

Recommendation: None – Information Only.

The City Manager introduced the item, and the staff report was presented by the Public Works Director.
A discussion ensued regarding the nuances between the different asphalt concrete specifications American Association of State Highway & Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and a “Performance” specification, and the bonding requirements of the contractor for the work. Council Member Ward spoke in favor of increasing the required warranty to three years, which staff confirmed could be done.

Disposition: Informational Report only.

26. GOVERNOR’S PROPOSED STATE BUDGET IMPACTS

Recommendation: None – Information Only.

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

Disposition: No action required.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

OTHER MATTERS

• Council Member Ward lauded the efforts of his wife and Millie Andrews for the Robbie Burns Supper.
• Council Member Shelton: thanked Mayor Irish for bringing 12-year-old scotch to the Robbie Burns Supper; spoke of the Wolf Program in which at-risk youth work 100 hours for participating employers to gain workforce experience; advised of upcoming events including the Mixer at the Boys & Girls Club on February 27th, a PARA meeting scheduled at Helping Hands on February 20th, First Friday Coffee at the Galaxy Theater on February 4th; and Town Talk at noon on Monday, February 7th at Cherry Tree; and requested the following: 1) a report on the Fair’s capital campaign; an update on Sidley’s Chrysler; a potential Code amendment pertaining to overflow parking on dirt lots; a status report on the Neighborhood Stabilization Program; and PRC fees. Council Member Shelton then commented that the sewer bonds had sold.
• City Manager John Lollis spoke of the Tribe’s groundbreaking ceremony scheduled for February 18th at 10:00 a.m.; and of the Dedication at Edison’s Solar Farm on February 24th.

The Council recessed for ten minutes at 9:31 p.m. then reconvened in Closed Session.

CLOSED SESSION

It was reported that no reportable action took place in Closed Session.
**ADJOURNMENT**

The Council adjourned at 10:05 p.m. to the meeting of February 15, 2011 at 5:30 p.m.

__________________________________
Luisa Herrera, Deputy City Clerk

SEAL

____________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor
Called to Order at 5:30 p.m.
Roll Call: Council Member Ward, Vice Mayor Hamilton, Council Member Shelton, Council Member McCracken, Mayor Irish

Pledge of Allegiance Led by Council Member Pete McCracken

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

- John Coffee, Porterville resident, expressed concerns regarding the speed of vehicle traffic on North Grand Avenue and parking of vehicles in bike lanes in the vicinity of Morton and F Street.
- Dave Paynter, Paynter Realty Investments, requested permission to speak during consideration of Item No. 2; informed the Council that the Pet Fair would remain open; and voiced support for approval of Item No. 3.
- Brock Neeley, Porterville resident, requested permission to speak during consideration of Item No. 3.
- Greg Woodard, 1055 W. Morton, spoke in support of Item No. 2 as a representative of the Chamber’s Economic Development Committee.

SCHEDULED MATTERS

3. COUNCIL MEMBER REQUESTED AGENDA ITEM – CONSIDERATION OF LETTER OR RESOLUTION OPPOSING SB 469 (VARGAS)

Recommendation: That the Council provide direction to staff.

City Manager John Lollis presented the item and indicated that the item has been requested by Mayor Irish. Mayor Irish then allowed the opportunity for public comment.

- John Coffee, spoke in favor of SB 469 and questioned why a company would be opposed to providing the proposed report.
- Brock Neeley, presented the Council with information regarding the economic impact of Wal-Mart stores and the retailer’s use of safety net programs; and voiced his support for SB 469, financial accountability and informed communities.
- Dave Paynter, spoke in opposition of SB 469, noting that it was redundant, targeted specific retailers, and would allow additional opportunity for litigation.

A discussion ensued regarding the number of regulations currently in place. During which it was noted that the opportunity for local municipalities to require such a report of a retailer already existed.
COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Vice Mayor Hamilton, SECONDED by Council Member McCracken that the City Council approve the drafting of a resolution in opposition of SB 469. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved

Mayor Irish indicated that he had a conflict of interest with regard to Item Nos. 1 and 2. He recused himself and left the meeting. He indicated that he would not return for Oral Communications.

1. AWARD OF CONTRACT – SPORTS COMPLEX LIGHTING PROJECT

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder, provided the lowest responsible bid is within 10% of the Engineer’s estimate;
2. Authorize a 10% Construction Contingency and a 5% Construction Management and Inspection contingency; and
3. Authorize payments to the Contractor up to 90% of the contract amount.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and Public Works Director Baldo Rodriguez presented the staff report. Following which he addressed questions regarding the last bid amounts.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member McCracken, SECONDED by Council Member Ward that the City Council award a contract to G & S Electric in the amount of $65,333.00.

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

Disposition: Approved

2. AMENDMENT TO LOAN AGREEMENT AND APPROVAL OF REQUEST FOR PARTIAL RELEASE OF LAND

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

Council Member McCracken MOVED to approve staff’s recommendation, which was SECONDED by Vice Mayor Hamilton.

Council Member Shelton voiced his opposition to the original loan agreement, and expressed his concerns with the decrease in property value.
Vice Mayor Hamilton spoke in favor of the amendment, the creation of jobs, and stated that the addition of 19,000 square feet of retail would increase the value.

Council Member Ward disclosed that he had met with Mr. Paynter and they had discussed the loan to value ratio. He indicated that he had reservations with the proposed options and spoke in favor of finding a means of securing the loan to protect the City’s position.

Council Member McCracken asked the Council to consider whether or not the approval of staff’s recommendation would improve the City’s position by creating more jobs, adding to the land, and improving the probability of being paid.

The Council discussed the idea of securing or protecting the loan, but were unable to identify an instrument by which to achieve it. Council Member McCracken suggested that staff research requirements of banking institutions and meet with Mr. Paynter to identify a feasible alternative that addresses Council’s concerns.

- Dave Paynter, expressed his disappointment in the discussion; indicated that he had never been asked to provide mortgage insurance on a commercial loan, and had not had sufficient time to research the option. He then stated that he was offended by Council Member Shelton’s comments and spoke of his reliable payment history.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member McCracken, SECONDED by Council Member Ward that the City Council continue the item to the next regular meeting.

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

Staff was directed staff to meet with Mr. Paynter to explore additional options which would secure the loan.

Disposition: Approved

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
- Dave Paynter, thanked the Council for their time, and stated that he would work with staff as directed.

OTHER MATTERS
- Council Member Ward spoke about the upcoming Freedom Fest on July 2nd, lauded the Pioneer Days event; and expressed his hope in finding an amicable solution to Item No. 2.
- Vice Mayor Hamilton requested that an item for consideration of a resolution in opposition of Representative Farr’s proposal to shift the management responsibilities for the Giant Sequoia National Monument from the U.S. Forest Service to the National Park Service be on the next regular agenda.
ADJOURNMENT
The Council adjourned at 6:35 p.m. to the meeting of July 5, 2011 at 5:30 p.m.

SEAL

Luisa Herrera, Deputy City Clerk

Ronald L. Irish, Mayor
COUNCIL AGENDA: JULY 19, 2011

SUBJECT:  REJECT ALL BIDS – SKATE PARK LIGHTING PROJECT

SOURCE  Public Works Department - Engineering Division

On July 12, 2011, staff received three (3) bids for the Porterville Skate Park Lighting Project. The project includes installation of power sub-panel, conduit, four (4) light standards and related appurtenances at the City of Porterville Skate Park located at 1501 W. Henderson Avenue.

The Engineer's Estimate for the project is $51,345.00. The low bid exceeded the Engineer's Estimate by 71.6%.

The bids are as follows:

1. Lane Electric, Inc.  Fresno, CA  $88,123.00
2. G & S Electric  Porterville, CA  $88,997.77

It is City Council's policy to reject all bids when the low bid exceeds 10 percent of Engineer's Estimate.

RECOMMENDATION:  That the City Council reject all bids and direct City Engineer to re-advertise the project.

ATTACHMENT:  Locator Map

P:\pub\works\General\Council\Reject All Bids - Skate Park Lighting Project - 2011-07-19.doc

Appropriated/Funded

Item No. 2
COUNCIL AGENDA: July 19, 2011

SUBJECT: AGREEMENT FOR TRANSIT SERVICES BETWEEN THE TULARE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS AND THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Transit

COMMENT: Currently the City of Porterville’s T-Pass agreement is authorized by our Local Transit Fund (LTF) agreement with the County of Tulare.

The T-Pass is Tulare County’s regional monthly transit pass, which all county agencies have agreed to accept. Reimbursement of T-Pass revenues, to transit agencies, is performed on an annual basis through the LTF agreement. The County of Tulare has administered this agreement for the past two years.

The Transit Forum group, comprised of transit officials from the City of Porterville, City of Visalia, City of Tulare, City of Dinuba, and the County of Tulare, agreed that it would be in the best interests of all agencies to administer the program through the Tulare County Association of Government (TCAG).

Although the County of Tulare has done an exceptional job administering the current agreement, transit agencies were not able to formally claim T-Pass revenues as transit revenues, as they were collected as LTF funds.

The agreement between TCAG and the City of Porterville authorizes TCAG to administer the T-Pass agreement while allowing the transit department to claim T-Pass revenues as transit revenues during the fiscal year.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council enter into an agreement for transit services between the Tulare County Association of Governments and the City of Porterville and authorize the Mayor to sign the agreement.

ATTACHMENT: T-PASS AGREEMENT
AGREEMENT

FOR TRANSIT SERVICES

BETWEEN THE TULARE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (TCAG)

AND THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE

This Agreement is made and entered into this 19th Day of July, 2011, by and between the Tulare County Association of Governments, hereinafter referred to as “TCAG”, and the City of Porterville, hereinafter referred to as “AGENCY”.

RECATALS

WHEREAS, the T-Pass is a regional monthly pass for unlimited fixed route rides on transit systems in Tulare County; and

WHEREAS, the Tulare County fixed route transit providers include: City of Visalia (Visalia Transit, Visalia Towne Trolley), City of Tulare (Tulare Intermodal Express), City of Dinuba (Dinuba Area Regional Transit), City of Porterville (Porterville Transit), and the County of Tulare (Tulare County Area Transit) transit services; and

WHEREAS, the T-Pass is available for purchase for $45.00 at agency outlets throughout the County; and

WHEREAS, TCAG and AGENCY desire for TCAG to provide certain services related to the administration of the T-Pass program, concerning the collection and distribution of program funds based upon ridership; and

WHEREAS, TCAG has a similar agreement with the City of Visalia, City of Tulare, City of Dinuba, and the County of Tulare; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

1. TERM. The Term of the Agreement shall be effective for fiscal year 2010/11 and continue until terminated or succeeded. The agreement will be renewable for similar or different terms and conditions upon mutual agreement between TCAG and AGENCY and City of Visalia, City of Tulare, City of Dinuba, and the County of Tulare.

2. INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR. While engaged in carrying out and complying with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, TCAG is an independent contractor, and not an officer, agent, or employee of AGENCY.
3. **PAYMENT.** Tulare County will serve as the LEAD AGENCY of the T-Pass program. LEAD AGENCY will manage distribution of the T-Pass and will continue to distribute the pass to participating sales outlets monthly. The County of Tulare will manage the data associated with ridership and sales and provide to TCAG quarterly in a tracking method approved by TCAG. TCAG agrees to calculate adjustments to be made by agencies to balance the number of T-Pass sales and the agency ridership. Prior to the close of the fiscal year, agencies will be required to make payments to agencies as recommended by TCAG, and as further discussed below.

TCAG will calculate a balance between sales and ridership amounts and provide the differences to transit agencies and AGENCY agrees to pay the amount owed to agencies, as provided by TCAG to other agencies. Funds shall be calculated for redistribution based on total percentage of countywide T-Pass ridership data minus administrative and printing/marketing expense up to 6% of revenue as provided to TCAG by the LEAD AGENCY for the following transit agencies annually: Visalia Transit, Porterville Transit, Tulare County Area Transit, Dinuba Area Rural Transit, and Tulare Intermodal Express.

The generated revenue will continue to be divided by percentage of ridership by each system minus administration and printing/marketing expense up to 6% of revenue (i.e.: If in a month an agency generates 10% of all T-Pass Ridership it will be paid 10% of eligible T-Pass fares for that month). AGENCY transit will track transit ridership using valid T-Passes using a tracking method approved by TCAG, and Lead Agency will track sales of the T-Pass by agency and provide to TCAG. The revenues collected from the T-Pass sales will be collected by agencies. TCAG agrees to calculate adjustments to be made by agencies to balance the number of T-Pass sales and the agency ridership. TCAG will calculate the total funds minus administration and printing/marketing expense up to 6% of revenue to be received by transit agencies based upon the percentage of ridership for the fiscal year. TCAG will calculate the differences in revenues from passes sold and annual T-Pass ridership and present to all transit agencies the findings. AGENCY is required to adjust their revenues accordingly in the fiscal year in which the T-Pass funds were received. Funds received by agencies are to be counted as fare revenue. TCAG will account for up to 2% of funds per year for administration to be paid to LEAD AGENCY for management of the T-Pass and up to an additional 4% for printing and marketing costs of the T-Pass. TCAG will distribute a minimum of 94% of the funds to AGENCIES based on actual ridership data collected and submitted by July 10. If AGENCY fails to submit appropriate T-Pass ridership data by July 13, the agency agrees to accept payment based on data provided in the eleven (11) months of the fiscal years ridership data (July-May).

4. **SERVICES.** In consideration of the above payments, agencies including AGENCY shall track their T-Pass ridership monthly as discussed above and submit ridership data to the LEAD AGENCY. After the third quarter of each fiscal year TCAG shall analyze the funds collected and compare it to ridership for the year. Transit agencies will provide unlimited rides on fixed routes in Tulare County including Dinuba Area Regional Transit, Visalia Transit, Visalia Towne Trolley, Tulare Intermodal Express, Tulare County Area Transit, and Porterville Transit with a valid T-Pass. The T-Pass shall not be valid on
demand-response routes or Sequoia Shuttle. The T-Pass administration shall be provided by LEAD AGENCY including the distribution and tracking of Monthly T-Passes. The amount of administration time and expenses to be charged to the T-Pass by the lead agency is not to exceed 2 percent of revenues. Monthly T-Passes shall be printed and are to be reimbursed on an actual expense basis, not to exceed a cost of 4 percent of the fees collected annually. Costs of administration and printing and marketing shall be evaluated annually.

5. **DEFAULT.** If default is made by either party in any of the covenants or conditions of this Agreement, TCAG or AGENCY may terminate Agreement upon giving 60 days advance written notice.

6. **AMENDMENTS.** This Agreement cannot be changed or supplemented orally and may be modified or superseded only by written instrument executed by both parties.

7. **GOVERNING LAW.** This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California. This Agreement is entered into and is to be performed in Tulare County, California.

8. **BINDING EFFECT.** This Agreement is for the benefit of and shall be binding on all parties and their respective successors, heirs, and assigns.

9. **ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND COSTS.** Each party shall bear its own attorneys’ fees and costs for all such fees and costs incurred prior to the date of execution of this Agreement.

10. **BREACH OF AGREEMENT.** If either party breaches this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to all damages reasonably flowing from the breach. Each party shall bear its own attorneys’ fees and costs for all such fees and costs related to the breach of this Agreement.

11. **INDEMNIFICATION.** AGENCY shall hold harmless, defend and indemnify TCAG, its agents, officers and employees for claims that arise out of, pertain to, or relate to the AGENCY’s performance of its obligations (or failure of performance) under this Agreement. To the extent that TCAG treats AGENCY as an independent contractor this indemnification specifically includes any claims that may be made against TCAG by any taxing authority asserting that an employer-employee relationship exists by reason of this Agreement, and any claims made against TCAG alleging civil rights violations by AGENCY under Government Code sections 12920 et seq. (California Fair Employment and Housing Act), and any fines or penalties imposed on TCAG for AGENCY’s failure to provide form DE-542, when applicable. This indemnification obligation shall continue beyond the term of this Agreement as to any negligent acts or omissions occurring under this Agreement or any extension of this Agreement. TCAG shall hold harmless, defend and indemnify AGENCY, its agents, officers and employees for claims that arise out of, pertain to, or relate to TCAG’s performance of its obligations (or failure of performance) under this Agreement. To the extent that AGENCY treats TCAG as an independent contractor this indemnification specifically includes any claims that may be made against AGENCY by any taxing authority asserting that an employer-employee relationship exists by reason of this Agreement, and any claims made against AGENCY alleging civil
rights violations by TCAG under Government Code sections 12920 et seq. (California Fair Employment and Housing Act), and any fines or penalties imposed on AGENCY for TCAG's failure to provide form DE-542, when applicable. This indemnification obligation shall continue beyond the term of this Agreement as to any negligent acts or omissions occurring under this Agreement or any extension of this Agreement.

12. **EXECUTION IN COUNTERPARTS.** This Agreement may be executed in counterparts such that the signatures may appear on separate signature pages. A copy of an original, with all signatures appended together, shall be deemed a fully executed Agreement.

13. **SEVERABILITY.** If any provision of this Agreement is held to be void, voidable, or unenforceable, the remaining portions of the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

14. **INTERPRETATION.** The language of all parts of this Agreement shall, in all cases, be construed as a whole, according to its fair meaning, and not strictly for or against either party.

15. **COMPLIANCE WITH LAW.** TCAG agrees to perform the services contemplated by this Agreement in a professional and a competent manner and in compliance with all state or federal laws or regulations governing the services to be rendered pursuant to this Agreement.

16. **BOARD APPROVAL.** The parties recognize that the effectiveness of this Agreement is contingent upon approval by the AGENCY and TCAG Board.

17. **OTHER DOCUMENTS/ACTS.** The parties agree to work together diligently and to execute related documents and perform related acts necessary for the successful performance of this Agreement.

18. **ENTIRE AGREEMENT.** This Agreement and its attachments, if any, constitute the entire agreement and understanding between the parties. There are no oral understandings, terms, or conditions, and neither party has relied upon any representation, express or implied, not contained in this Agreement. All prior understandings, terms or conditions are deemed merged into this Agreement and its attachments.

19. **NOTICES TO PARTIES.** All notices to be given to the parties to this Agreement shall be in writing and served by depositing same in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, registered or certified mail.

Notices to TCAG should be addressed to:
Ted Smalley, Executive Director
Tulare County Association of Governments
5955 S. Mooney Blvd.
Visalia, CA 93277
Notices to AGENCY should be addressed to:

City of Porterville
Transit Department
291 N. Main St.
Porterville, CA 93257
(559) 782-7448

TCAG or AGENCY may change its address of record for receipt of official notice by giving the other written notice of such change and any necessary mailing instructions.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement in duplicate the day and year first herein above written.

TULARE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive Director
Title

AGENCY:

Ronald L. Irish
Name
Date

Mayor
Title

APPROVED AS TO FORM
COUNTY COUNSEL

Deputy
Date
SUBJECT: PLANO BRIDGE WIDENING PROJECT: APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION APPROVING ADDENDUM TO THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT- PLANNING DIVISION

COMMENT: On July 5, 2011, the Porterville City Council approved an addendum to a Negative Declaration for the Plano Bridge Widening Project. The recommendation and motion should have included the adoption of a draft resolution which approves the addendum. This item requests that the City Council adopt the draft resolution approving the addendum.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council adopt the draft resolution approving an addendum to the Negative Declaration for the Plano Street Bridge Widening Project.

ATTACHMENTS: Draft Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
APPROVING AN ADDENDUM TO A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE PLANO
STREET BRIDGE WIDENING PROJECT

WHEREAS: The City Council of the City of Porterville at its regularly scheduled
meeting of June 17, 2003, considered the potential environmental impact of the proposed Plano
Street Bridge widening project and adopted Resolution 79-2003; and

WHEREAS: The project was subsequently put on hold, but efforts to proceed with the
Project have resumed. As a result of the lapse in time, this Addendum has been prepared to address
the adequacy and applicability of the previously prepared MND and to disclose and analyze any
changes to the Project and/or the environment that have occurred since the date of original adoption
in 2003; and

WHEREAS: This Negative Declaration Addendum demonstrates that the environmental
analysis, impacts, and mitigation requirements identified in the Negative Declaration remain
substantively unchanged by the situation described herein, and supports the finding that the proposed
project does not raise any new issues and does not exceed the level of impacts identified in the
previous Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS: The purpose of this addendum is to address the adequacy and applicability of
the previously prepared negative declaration and to disclose and analyze any changes to the project
and/or the environment that have occurred since the date of original adoption in 2003; and

WHEREAS: The proposed project meets the criteria established in Public Resources Code
Sections 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines for an addendum to a Negative Declaration. In order to
approve the addendum, the following findings must be made based on substantial evidence:

- No substantial changes have occurred or are proposed which would require
  major revision of the previous MND due to the involvement of new
  significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of
  previously identified significant effects. The Project will not in itself create
  new substantial environmental impacts above and beyond what was already
  analyzed in the previous environmental document. The determination is
  based on the following analysis:

  o Aesthetics: There is no change in the project design and therefore
    there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the
    MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required.

  o Agricultural Resources: There is no change in the project design and
    therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed
    in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required.
Air Quality: There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required. However, the Project will be subject to current San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District rules and regulations. Regulation VIII, Rule 8021 was amended most recently in August of 2004. Rule 8021 was adopted by the District to limit dust emissions from construction, excavation and other earthmoving activities. Prior to the start of construction activities, the City will be required to file a Dust Control Plan with the District in accordance with Section 6.3 of Rule 8021.

Biological Resources: The previous MND included a Biological Assessment and survey that was done in 2001. That report indicated presence of 19 elderberry shrubs within 100 feet of established work areas. However, due to the lapse in time, a new biological survey was conducted in February 2011 which identified approximately 30 elderberry shrubs within 100 feet of established work areas, an increase of 11 elderberry shrubs.

In early 2008, the City established a 7.7 acre VELB mitigation site in an effort to help offset the loss of VELB in the City due to various development projects. The site is maintained under the direction of the City and monitoring reports are prepared twice a year. The original biology report, prepared in 2002, identified fewer elderberry shrubs that would have been impacted by the proposed project. As a result, original mitigation recommendations were made for 78 elderberry cuttings or seedlings and 44 native tree or plant species. The original mitigation measures have been implemented. Based on the results of the survey done in February 2011, recommended mitigation measures include an additional 193 elderberry cuttings or seedlings and 308 native trees or plantings as compensation for the impacts to the increased number of elderberries that are currently located in the project area. Mitigation measures for elderberries will be implemented in accord with U.S. Fish & Wildlife requirements.

Although there is an increase in the number of elderberry shrubs and associated mitigation requirements, the severity of the impact and mitigation measures remains significantly the same as in the previous MND. The project will be required to compensate for loss of shrubs in the same manner that was previously identified in the MND (i.e. replanting, establishment of compensation area, construction flagging, etc.). Therefore, there are no new significant impacts that were not previously identified.
- **Cultural Resources:** There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required. However, an updated Cultural Resources Report was prepared (April 2011) as part of Caltrans NEPA compliance requirements. The report identified no new cultural or historical resources.

- **Geology/Soils:** There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required.

- **Hazards/Hazardous Materials:** There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required.

- **Hydrology/Water Quality:** There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required. However, an updated Water Quality Report (April 2011) was prepared as part of Caltrans NEPA compliance requirements. The report identified no water quality impacts.

- **Land Use/Planning:** There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required. However, as part of the City’s 2030 General Plan Update process, portions of the project area have been redesignated to accommodate more intense land uses (i.e., from Single Family Residential to Multi-Family Residential as well as the addition of General and Service Commercial areas). This does not result in any additional land use impacts associated with the proposed project.

- **Mineral Resources:** There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required.

- **Noise:** There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required. However, an updated Noise Study (May 2011) was prepared as part of Caltrans NEPA compliance requirements. The report identified no new noise mitigation requirements.
○ Population/Housing: There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required.

○ Public Services: There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required.

○ Recreation: There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required.

○ Transportation/Traffic: There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required.

○ Utilities/Service Systems: There is no change in the project design and therefore there are no new impacts above those previously disclosed in the MND: no additional mitigation measures would be required.

• The current Project does not cause one or more significant impacts not analyzed previously in the MND.
• The current Project does not substantially increase the severity of one or more significant impacts analyzed previously in the MND.
• The current Project does not necessitate substantial changes to the mitigation measures stated in the MND.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the City Council of the City of Porterville does hereby approve this Addendum to the Negative Declaration prepared for the Plano Street Bridge Widening Project.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of July 2011.

________________________________________
Ronald L Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:
JOHN D. LOLLIS, CITY CLERK

By: Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
SUBJECT: RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE TRANSFER OF THE GIANT SEQUOIA NATIONAL MONUMENT TO THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

SOURCE: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: At its meeting of July 5, 2011, the City Council approved proceeding with a resolution in opposition to the transfer of the Giant Sequoia National Monument from the U.S. Forest Service to the National Park Service. A draft resolution opposing said transfer is presented for Council’s approval.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Council approve the draft resolution opposing the transfer of the Giant Sequoia National Monument to the National Park Service.

Attachment: Draft Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. _____-2011


WHEREAS, U.S. Representative Sam Farr (D-CA) and a group of approximately 80 other members of Congress are urging President Obama to transfer the management of the Giant Sequoia National Monument from the U.S. Forest Service to the National Park Service; and

WHEREAS, the purpose and magnitude of the forest restoration activities within the monument have been greatly exaggerated and misrepresented by the proponents of the transfer so as to give the false impression that the U.S. Forest Service has conducted logging operations along the Trail of 100 Giants; and

WHEREAS, in fact, the U.S. Forest Service, consistent with its charge to protect, restore and preserve, has employed responsible land management activities thereby protecting these majestic Giant Sequoias from fire and disease; and

WHEREAS, in the event the Monument was transferred to the National Park Service, many existing activities Porterville residents, along with tourists from around the world, currently enjoy may be severely restricted or outright prohibited, including: camping outside of developed campgrounds; horseback riding; mountain biking; free entrance into the monument; hunting; snowmobiling; recreational cabins; firewood cutting; and livestock grazing; and

WHEREAS, when President Clinton designated the Giant Sequoias National Monument in April 2000, he specifically proclaimed that the lands would continue to be managed by the U.S. Forest Service.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Porterville that the Council does hereby find that the lands which now make up the Giant Sequoia National Monument have been well managed by the U.S. Forest Service for over 100 years, and the City of Porterville hereby strongly opposes the transfer of the Giant Sequoia National Monument management to the National Park Service.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ______ day of July, 2011.

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk

Ronald L. Irish, Mayor
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA: JULY 19, 2011

SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF THE KINGS/TULARE COUNTY CONTINUUM OF CARE ON HOMELESSNESS “CONNECTING THE DOTS” PLAN FOR ADDRESSING HOMELESSNESS IN KINGS AND TULARE COUNTIES

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: In 2008, the Kings/Tulare Continuum of Care on Homelessness (“Continuum”) identified the need for a local version of the nationally-led movement to establish regional Ten-Year Plans to End Homelessness, which are strongly encouraged and supported by the U. S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The goal of the effort was to create a roadmap for service providers, local governments, and all community stakeholders to implement in order to find solutions for preventing and ending homelessness.

The Continuum held three stakeholder meetings, facilitated by HomeBase, with the communities of Kings and Tulare counties to gather information on the needs and current status of services. Invitations were sent via email several times to 350 organizations representing service providers, faith-based community organizations, elected officials, community leaders and other stakeholders. Meetings were held on September 9, October 14, and November 18, 2010. There were a total of 103 people who attended these meetings, representing the following organizations or groups:

- Three elected officials from the Tulare and Kings County Board of Supervisors and Visalia City Council
- Seven local city government staff
- Four local law enforcement agencies (two sheriff departments and two police departments)
- Fifteen homeless service providers including Family Services of Tulare County, Salvation Army, St. Vincent de Paul, Visalia and Hanford Rescue Missions, soup kitchens, and Community Action Agencies
- Seven churches or faith-based organizations
- Eight non-profits including two United Ways, Community Services Employment Training (CSET), Habitat for Humanity, and various recovery programs
- Tulare County Health and Human Services
- Kings County Behavioral Health
- Housing Authority of Tulare County

Appropriated/Funded Item No. 10
• Three of the area’s largest school districts and two County Office’s of Education
• Interested citizens including individuals currently experiencing homelessness
• Two of the area’s largest hospitals (Adventist Health in Kings County and Kaweah Delta Health District)
• VA Central California Health Care System

The outcome of these meetings is the 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness which was formally named “Connecting the Dots: A Proactive Approach to Addressing Homelessness”. A draft of the plan was circulated for public comment on March 24, 2011. Comments were received for 30-days. The final Connecting the Dots plan was presented at two “launch” events in Tulare and Kings County, on June 14 and June 15, 2011.

Annual data indicates that over 77% of the homeless in Kings/Tulare Counties lived here prior to becoming homeless; therefore, it is essential that local programs are established to meet the needs of our community members. Connecting the Dots focuses on three target areas:

1) Housing
2) Supportive Services and Income Supports
3) Prevention and Outreach

Within the focus area of Housing, there are four strategies. One main focus within this section is a Housing first approach, based on the belief that vulnerable and at-risk homeless individuals and families are more responsive to interventions and social services after they are in their own housing, rather than while living in temporary facilities. Additional action steps include ensuring an adequate supply of affordable housing and connecting individuals experiencing homelessness with current affordable housing opportunities. Thus the Connecting the Dots plan is focused on increasing the amount of affordable housing and supportive housing.

The overall goal of Supportive Services and Income Supports is to link individuals and families with mainstream benefits and income supports, gain access to employment services, and help navigate the often intimidating protocol of existing programs intended to assist very low income residents. There are four goals included in supportive services, all of which aim to refine and expand local capacity to effectively connect those who are at-risk and those who are homeless with necessary services.
Prevention is one of the main focuses of the *Connecting the Dots* plan. Prevention is cost-effective and protects community members from the social, emotional, health and economic impacts of homelessness.

There are two strategies in the prevention section, including improving early identification and intervention, and decreasing discharge from publically funded institutions into homelessness.

The Continuum is in the process of presenting *Connecting the Dots* to local jurisdictions, in the hopes that each city/county will adopt *Connecting the Dots*, and support community-wide efforts to implement the plan. The Continuum is requesting that the City adopt *Connecting the Dots* as the guiding local document for addressing homelessness in Kings and Tulare counties and designate a staff member and/or elected official to participate as a member of the Action Committee to begin implementation of the plan.

The Continuum is not requesting any specific financial commitment for the plan. It will be up to the members of the Action Committee to determine which steps can be implemented immediately, and which items require longer planning and potentially the commitment of funds. It will be at the discretion of each committee member, agency, and local jurisdiction to determine what level of participation they would like to commit moving forward. It is important to note, however, that the City of Porterville, in collaboration with the cities of Tulare and Visalia, has already committed to funding the match of $15,000 annually for five years for the HUD grant for the permanent supportive housing voucher program. This program has been established as an action item in the plan.

The Action Committee will coordinate implementation, be responsible for monitoring and accountability, and providing quarterly updates on the status of the action items. In addition, the Action Committee will suggest ongoing revisions and updates to *Connecting the Dots*, in order to ensure that the plan evolves and continues to respond to the dynamic needs of our community.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the City Council:

1. Approve the draft resolution adopting *Connecting the Dots* as the guiding local document for addressing homelessness in Kings and Tulare Counties; and
2. Designate the Community Development Director, or his designee, to participate as a member of the Action Committee, to begin implementation of *Connecting the Dots*.

ATTACHMENTS:  
1. Draft Resolution  
2. *Connecting the Dots: a Proactive Approach to Addressing Homelessness*
RESOLUTION NO._______


WHEREAS, safe and decent shelter is one of the most basic of all human needs; and

WHEREAS, inadequate housing and homelessness make it more difficult for children to learn, adults to be productive, and people of all ages to stay healthy; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Government has adopted a 10-Year goal to end homelessness, and has asked local jurisdictions to join this effort; and

WHEREAS, it was determined that Kings/Tulare Counties could benefit from a regional plan to address homelessness;

WHEREAS, the Kings/Tulare Continuum of Care on Homelessness, through community and stakeholder participation, developed Connecting the Dots: A Proactive Approach to Addressing Homelessness.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, the City Council of the City of Porterville adopts Connecting the Dots: A Proactive Approach to Addressing Homelessness as the local guiding document to establish programs and policies to prevent and end homelessness; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City of Porterville supports the Kings/Tulare Continuum of Care on Homelessness in efforts to implement Connecting the Dots: A Proactive Approach to Addressing Homelessness; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City of Porterville designate the Community Development Director, or his designee, as a member to participate with the Action Committee for the implementation of Connecting the Dots: A Proactive Approach to Addressing Homelessness.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of July, 2011

________________________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:

John Lollis, City Clerk

By _______________________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
Kings/Tulare Continuum of Care on Homelessness

*Connecting the Dots: a Proactive Approach to Addressing Homelessness*

This document is available for review at the following locations:

- Community Development Department at City Hall located at 291 N. Main Street
- City Clerk’s Office at City Hall located at 291 N. Main Street
THIS ITEM HAS BEEN REMOVED.
COUNCIL AGENDA: JULY 19, 2011

SUBJECT: AIRPORT LEASE RENEWAL – LOT 32C

SOURCE: FINANCE DEPARTMENT/PURCHASING DIVISION

COMMENT: William Parham is the current leaseholder of Lot 32C at the Porterville Municipal Airport, having acquired the lease pursuant to an assignment from Wayne Ross in 2008. The lease will expire on September 30, 2011; however, the lease terms allow for an option to extend the lease for an additional five (5) years, provided the City receives a request to exercise the option 120 days prior to expiration. Paragraph 2 of the Lease Agreement (attached) further states the City’s granting of the option is discretionary, but will not be unreasonably withheld. We received a request from Mr. Parham dated July 1, 2011, asking to continue the lease on Lot 32C. Staff recommends that Council waive the 120-day notice requirement and grant the five-year option to extend the lease to 2016.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Council approve the extension of the Lease Agreement between the City of Porterville and William Parham of Porterville, CA, for Lot 32C at the Porterville Municipal Airport.

ATTACHMENT: Locator Map
Note from Mr. Parham requesting renewal
Paragraph 2 of original Lease Agreement

D.D. Appropriated/Funded C.M. Item No. 8
June 27, 2011

Mr. William Parham  
P. O. Box 664  
Porterville, CA  93258

Re: Airport Lease Renewal

Dear Mr. Parham:

Your Lease Agreement for Lot 32C at Porterville Municipal Airport will expire on September 30, 2011. The lease terms provide for an option to extend the lease for another five years, provided we receive a written request from you indicating your desire to exercise your option. If it is your intent, please send me a letter to that effect as soon as possible so that I may obtain the approval of the Porterville City Council at a regularly scheduled meeting.

If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Susan Hartman  
Purchasing Agent  
Airport Contracts Admin.

cc: Jim McDonald, Airport Mgr.

Yes I want to renew the lease on Lot 32C

[Signature]

July 1-2011
LEASE AGREEMENT

PORTERVILLE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

THIS LEASE AGREEMENT ("Lease"), executed at Porterville, California the first day of October 2001 by and between the CITY OF PORTERVILLE, a charter city and municipal corporation of the State of California, hereinafter referred to as "City" and WAYNE ROSS, hereinafter referred to as "Lessee".

WHEREAS, City owns and operates an airport in the City of Porterville, State of California, commonly known and described as "Porterville Municipal Airport"; and

WHEREAS, Lessee desires to lease a portion of said airport for the purpose of operating an existing aircraft hangar to be used for the parking and storage of aircraft and other activities incidental thereto; and

WHEREAS, it is the desire of City to utilize said airport for the general public by its development and use in providing aeronautical-related facilities and service.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS MUTUALLY AGREED as follows:

1. Premises: Demised Premises: City, for and in consideration of the covenants, conditions, agreements, and stipulations herein set forth, does hereby demise and lease to Lessee, and Lessee hereby hires from City, those certain premises situated in the City of Porterville, State of California, described as Lot 32C at the Porterville Municipal Airport, more particularly described in Exhibit A being attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof.

2. Term: The term of this lease shall commence on February 20, 2002, both parties having executed the same, and shall terminate on September 30, 2011, provided Lessee is not in default with respect to any of the conditions or covenants of this lease, Lessee shall have an option to request an extension of the terms hereof for an additional period of five (5) years, by giving written notice thereof to Lessor not less than 120 days prior to expiration of this agreement or any five (5) year extension. Lessor is not obligated to grant any extension but said option shall not be unreasonably withheld.
SUBJECT: ASSIGN AIRPORT LEASE — LOT 38

SOURCE: Finance Department/Purchasing Division

COMMENT: Mr. & Mrs. Roy Cundiff, the current leaseholders of Lot 38, have sold their hangar to Raymond Broad, Manager of Lighten Up Aviation LLC, of Farmersville, CA. The new owner is requesting Council authorization to assume the existing lease between the City of Porterville and the Cundiffs commencing July 1, 2000, and expiring on June 30, 2015. A five-year option was exercised by the leaseholders in 2010. No further options remain.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council approve the assignment of the Lease Agreement for Airport Hangar Lot 38 between the City of Porterville and Mr. & Mrs. Roy Cundiff to Raymond Broad, Manager of Lighten Up Aviation LLC of Farmersville, CA.

Attachments: Current Airport Map showing Lot 38 Assignment of Lease Lessor's Consent to Assignment of Lease Letters of Request from the parties
ASSIGNMENT OF LEASE
PORTERVILLE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

THIS AGREEMENT, made this 1st day of August, 2011, by and between Roy S. and Carol J. Cundiff, 361 Avenida Granada, Long Beach, CA 90814, owners of a hangar on Lot 38 at the Porterville Municipal Airport, as the Assignors, and Lighten Up Aviation LLC, 660 N. Farmersville Blvd., Farmersville, CA 93223, as the Assignee.

In consideration of the mutual covenants herein contained, each act to be performed hereunder, and for other valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the parties agree as follows:

1. Effective August 1, 2011, Assignors hereby assign, transfer and convey to Assignee all of their right, title and interest as Lessee, in, to and under a certain Lease Agreement dated June 20, 2000 (hereinafter "Lease"), executed by and between the City of Porterville, as Lessor, and Barbara Dillard, as original Lessee, providing for the letting of certain premises located at the Porterville Municipal Airport, Porterville, California, being more particularly described as follows:

An airport hangar known as No. 38, and containing a total area of approximately 4,200 square feet, and establishing an original Lease terminating June 30, 2015.

2. Effective August 1, 2011, Assignee hereby accepts and assumes all of the obligations, responsibilities and liabilities of Assignors under said Lease, and agrees to perform said Lease Agreement according to its terms, covenants and conditions, without exception, and Assignee understands and agrees that Landlord makes no warranty or representation that either Assignors or Assignee would be given an exclusive use in the Porterville Municipal Airport for the use thereof by Assignors and/or Assignee, except as provided in the Lease.

3. Upon execution of this Assignment of Lease and Landlord’s consent hereto, the parties’ Noticed Address shall be as set forth herein above. The parties further understand there is a $150 assignment fee, payable to the City of Porterville, and the Assignee must provide proof of aircraft and hangar owner’s liability insurance within thirty (30) days of Council approval.

4. Assignors hereby covenant said Lease as valid and existing and hereby warrant that Assignors are not in default as of the date of this Assignment.

5. This Assignment shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of the respective parties, their successors and assigns.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Assignment of Lease as of the date first above written.

ASSIGNORS:

By: Roy S. Cundiff
By: Carol J. Cundiff

ASSIGNEE:

By: Raymond Broad
Raymond Broad, Mgr.
Lighten Up Aviation, LLC
LESSOR'S CONSENT TO ASSIGNMENT OF LEASE AGREEMENT
PORTERVILLE MUNICIPAL AIRPORT
AIRPORT HANGAR LOT NO. 38

The City of Porterville, a municipal corporation of the State of California, being the Landlord under the Lease for Airport Hangar Lot No. 38, described in the foregoing Assignment, hereby consents to the foregoing Assignment of Lease upon the expressed condition, however, that there shall be no further assignment without the prior written consent of the Landlord.

Dated this 19th day of July, 2011.

CITY OF PORTERVILLE

BY: ____________________________
    Ronald L. Irish
    MAYOR, CITY OF PORTERVILLE

"LESSOR"

ATTEST: ________________________
    John Lollis, CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BY: ____________________________
    Julia Lew, City Attorney
Lighten Up Aviation LLC
660 N Farmersville Blvd
Farmersville, CA 93223
Phone (559)799-6720
Fax (559)747-1522

July 8, 2011

Sue Hartman
City of Porterville
Porterville Airport
1893 S. Newcomb
Porterville, CA 93257

Subject: Assumption of Lease on Airport Hangar Lot 38

Dear Sue,

I have purchased the hangar on City Lot 38 formerly owned by Roy and Carol Cundiff. I request to assume their lease under the original existing terms, conditions and rates. Enclosed is a letter from them relinquishing their lease to Lighten Up Aviation LLC. Also please find enclosed a copy of the Bill of Sale for the hangar.

The lease will be held in the name of Lighten Up Aviation LLC with the above mailing address.

Your consideration in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Raymond Broad, Manager
Lighten Up Aviation LLC
July 8, 2011

Sue Hartman
City of Porterville
Porterville Airport
1893 S. Newcomb
Porterville, CA 93257

Subject: Relinquish of Lease on Airport Hangar Lot 38

Dear Sue,

We have sold the hangar on City Airport Lot 38 to Lighten Up Aviation LLC. We wish to relinquish the lease to allow them to assume my lease under the original existing terms, conditions and rates. If you need to contact us please do so at either of the numbers:
Roy  562-310-7638
Carol  562-544-6897

Your consideration in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Roy S. Cundiff
COUNCIL AGENDA: JULY 19, 2011

SUBJECT: EMERGENCY REPLACEMENT – AIR CONDITIONING UNIT

SOURCE: FINANCE DEPARTMENT/PURCHASING DIVISION

COMMENT: On June 28, 2011, the air conditioning system responsible for cooling the IT Division’s “Block House” failed. Professional inspection revealed the accumulator inside condensing unit and filter dryer rusted out, leaking all refrigerant. Additionally, the fan motor blade was determined to be broken and motor bearings were failing. This facility houses the City’s Departmental and City-wide servers and is the distribution hub for all LAN and WAN communications throughout the City.

Due to the sensitive nature of the equipment housed in the facility, room temperature should never exceed 85 degrees for an extended period. This situation was complicated by weather reports forecasting temperatures exceeding 100 degrees. The City Manager, therefore, authorized emergency repairs at a cost of approximately $6,280.00.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Council ratify the emergency replacement of the air conditioning unit at the City’s “Block House” and authorize payment to Gray’s Air Conditioning in the estimated amount of $6,280.00.

SUBJECT: RATIFICATION OF APPROVAL OF CITY COUNCIL PROCEDURAL HANDBOOK

SOURCE: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: At its meeting of July 5, 2011, the City Council approved the Procedural Handbook as amended to revise Section C(1)(c), page 8, to read, "Council shall have the opportunity for discussion on the item prior to requiring a motion and a second," and adding a Preamble addressing the Council's commitment to ethical behavior and adherence to all laws. The City Council Procedural Handbook has been amended as directed and is herein presented for Council's ratification of its previous adoption.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Council ratify its previous action to adopt the City Council Procedural Handbook.

CITY COUNCIL
PROCEDURAL HANDBOOK

Compiled by:
The Office of City Clerk
291 North Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257
Tel: (559) 782-7442
Fax: (559) 782-7452
www.ci.porterville.ca.us

Adopted July 5, 2011 via Minute Order 21-070511
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PREAMBLE

The residents and businesses of the City of Porterville are entitled to have fair, ethical, and accountable local government. Such a government requires that:

- Public Officials comply with both the letter and spirit of the laws and policies affecting operations of the government;
- Public Officials be independent, impartial, and fair in their judgment and actions;
- Public office be used for the public good, not for personal gain; and
- Deliberations and processes be conducted openly, unless legally confidential, in an atmosphere of respect and civility.

No part of this Handbook shall be interpreted so as to violate any federal or state law; a Council Member's Oath of Office; a Council Member's moral or ethical responsibilities; or the exercise of a Council Member's individual rights afforded him/her by the U.S. Constitution.

To this end, the City Council of the City of Porterville hereby approves of and affirms the above to encourage public confidence in the integrity of local government and its operations.
II. MEETINGS OF COUNCIL

The Council shall provide by ordinance the time and place of holding regular meetings and the manner in which special meetings may be called. Public interest and convenience shall be primary consideration when decisions are made as to time, location and frequency.

Except as otherwise provided by law, all meetings of the Council shall be open to the public.

A. REGULAR MEETINGS

1. Regular meetings shall be held the first and third Tuesday of each month beginning at 5:30 p.m. Closed Session Items shall be considered at 5:30 p.m., with open session to commence at 6:30 p.m. In the event that a regular meeting of the Council shall fall on a legal holiday, that regular meeting shall be held at the same place and time on the next succeeding working day, or as determined by Council. (Ordinance 1766, approved August 17, 2010.)

2. Regular meetings shall be held in the Council Chambers, 291 North Main Street, in the City of Porterville.

3. Regular meeting open sessions shall be between the hours of 6:30 p.m. and 9:45 p.m. The Council Meetings shall adjourn no later than 9:45 p.m. unless otherwise approved by a majority vote of the Council Members present. Following the mid-meeting break (around 9:00 p.m.) the Mayor, with assistance from the City Manager, will review the balance of the agenda with Council to discuss how it can be handled in the allowed time. If it is necessary to continue any items, it will be announced at that time. (Ordinance 1766, approved August 17, 2010.)

B. ADJOURNED MEETINGS/STUDY SESSIONS (Open to the public)

1. The purpose of these meetings shall be for informal discussions between staff, advisory bodies or consultants and the City Council regarding specific programs, projects or policies. If noticed, formal action may be taken at such a meeting.

2. Adjourned Meetings/Study Sessions will be held at a time and place convenient to Council and advantageous for public participation.
3. Participation of the public shall be at the discretion of the Presiding Officer, upon consensus of the Council.

C. SPECIAL MEETINGS

1. Special meetings may be called by the Mayor or three members of the City Council. (GC § 54956) Written notice of each special meeting must be given not less than twenty-four (24) hours before such meeting to each member of the City Council not joining the call.

2. Written notice must be given to the City Council and to the media 24 hours prior to each meeting. (GC § 54956)

3. A supplemental telephone call shall be made if necessary to notify each Council Member.

4. No business other than that announced shall be discussed.

5. Any special meeting held at a place other than City Hall shall be open to the public. Notice requirements of the Brown Act shall be complied with for any such meetings; regular minutes shall be taken by the City Clerk and shall be available for public inspection.

D. ORDER OF BUSINESS:

Call to Order  
Roll Call  
Oral Communications  
Closed Session(s)  
Reconvene at 6:30 p.m.  
Closed Session Report  
Pledge of Allegiance  
Invocation  
Presentations/Proclamations  
Reports (AB1234 Reports, Committee/Commission/Board Reports; Subcommittee Reports; Information Items and Reports)  
Oral Communications  
Consent Calendar  
Approval of Minutes  
Claims Against the City  
Payment of Bills  
Payments on Public Works Projects  
Authorization to Purchase  
Authorization to Call for Bids
Award of Bids  
Acceptance of Projects  
Acceptance of Dedications/Property  
Approval of Final Tract Maps  
Annexations  
Requests for City Services  
Reports  
Other Routine Matters  
Public Hearings  
Second Reading of Ordinances  

Scheduled Matters  
Oral Communications (on any matter of interest)  
Council Comments  
Adjournment  

(Pursuant to Resolution 101-2010, approved August 17, 2010.)

E. CONSENT ITEMS

Consent items are the first items on the open session portion of the agenda (items that are routine, have been discussed before, relate to implementation of approved budget items, or to City operations or item to be later set for public hearing).
III. MEETING PROCEDURES

A. PRESIDING OFFICER

1. The Mayor is the Presiding Officer and acts as Chair at Council meetings.

2. In the absence or incapacity of the Mayor, the Mayor Pro Tempore will serve as Presiding Officer.

3. Seating arrangement of the Council:

   The Mayor Pro Tempore shall always be seated immediately next to the Mayor.

4. Signing of City Documents:

   The Mayor, unless unavailable, shall sign all ordinances, resolutions, contracts and other documents which have been adopted by the City Council and require an official signature; except when the City Manager, or his or her designee, has been authorized by Council action to sign documents. In the event the Mayor is unavailable, the Mayor Pro Tempore's signature may be used.

B. QUORUM

A majority of the Council Members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. (Charter)

C. DISCUSSION RULES

1. Obtaining the floor:

   a. A member of the City Council, staff, or public shall first address the Presiding Officer and gain recognition.

   b. Comments and questions shall be limited to the issue before Council except when members of the public are addressing the Council under Oral Communications.

   c. Council shall have the opportunity for discussion on the item prior to requiring a motion and a second. (Minute Order 18-050311, approved May 3, 2011.)
d. Cross-exchange between Council Members, staff or public shall be avoided.

e. Any citizen may arise and address the City Council on any business especially concerning them or affecting their interests during Oral Communications, but preference will be given to those who have first presented matters in the form of a written communication or who have personally notified the presiding officer of their desire to speak.

f. Any member or other person using profane, vulgar, loud or boisterous language at any meeting, or otherwise interrupting the proceedings, who refuses to be seated or keep quiet when ordered to do so by the Mayor or Mayor Pro Tem of the City Council, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. It shall be the duty of the Chief of Police, upon order of the presiding officer, to eject any such member or person from the council room. (Ordinance 1537)

2. Questions to staff:

A Council Member shall, after recognition by the Presiding Officer, address questions to duly designated staff members through the City Manager.

3. Interruptions:

a. Once recognized, a Council Member shall not be interrupted while speaking except to make a point of order or personal privilege.

b. If a Council Member is called to order while speaking, the individual shall cease speaking until the question of order is determined.

c. Upon being recognized by the Presiding Officer, members of staff shall hold the floor until completion of their remarks or until recognition is withdrawn by the Presiding Officer.
IV. COUNCIL REQUESTS FROM THE PUBLIC

A. Response to Letters from the Public

Periodically Council Members receive letters requesting their response. If a Council Member wishes to answer the letter, the matter can be handled in either of three ways:

1. The Council Member can give the letter to the City Manager's Secretary along with direction on how they wish their response to be worded. The City Manager's staff will then prepare the letter on City Council stationery and forward it to the appropriate Council Member for approval and signature. Copies of both letters are kept on file in the City Manager's Office, and copies are available upon request.

2. If the letter requires specific information or details only available from another City Department, the City Manager may refer the letter to the appropriate Department Head for response by them or their designee. Copies of the letters will then be forwarded to the City Manager's Office for filing.

3. If the Council Member wishes to answer their own correspondence, City stationery is available upon request from the City Manager's secretary. Copies of all such letters on City Letterhead shall be provided to all other Council members, and the letter shall include a provision clearly defining that the correspondence represents the views and/or feelings of the specific Council member signing the letter. If the Council Member wishes to have a copy of the letters in their file, they should submit a copy to the City Manager's staff for filing.

If a Council Member receives an informational item and wants a copy to be given to the other Council Members and the City Manager or other Directors, the item should be given to the City Manager's staff and copies will be made and sent out.

B. Referrals to Council agenda

Periodically Council Members receive correspondence or verbal requests for items to be acted upon, or considered, by the City Council. If a Council Member wishes to respond to the request, the matter should be referred to the City Manager. The request can then be handled as follows:
1. The Council Member may request the City Manager to place the item on the Council agenda as a written communication (however, the request must be stated on the agenda face sheet for Council to be able to act on it at the meeting); or

2. Upon research, the request may be determined to be a violation of City, State or Federal law, policy, or previous Council determination, in which case an appropriate response as to why the matter can not be heard will be provided to the requesting party.

Correspondence requesting that an item be acted upon, or considered, by the City Council, which is received directly by the City Manager, is handled in either of two ways:

1. The City Manager shall place any routine and/or legitimate written request under written communications*, or have a staff report prepared if time permits, for the next City Council agenda; or

2. The City Manager shall place any request which has already been acted upon by Council, cannot legally be accomplished, or which has a potential for litigation, in an Administrative Memorandum.

C. Telephone Calls

Citizens attempting to communicate with the City Council often call the offices at City Hall. Such calls are referred to the City Manager's Office. The City Manager's staff will take a message and refer it to the appropriate Council Member, or give the caller the telephone number of the City Council Member so they may call them directly, according to instructions given by the Council Member [see VII-C(1)].

D. Personal Meetings

Council Members who wish to meet with their constituents may use various rooms at City Hall. The Council Member should call the City Manager's Secretary as soon as they know a room is needed so that it can be reserved for their use. No more than two Council Members may attend a meeting to discuss City matters without the meeting becoming a public meeting and therefore falling under the requirements of the Brown Act Open Meeting Laws.
E. Personal Correspondence

Council Members who wish to send their own correspondence using City stationery shall include a provision clearly defining that the correspondence represents the views and/or feelings of the specific Council member signing the letter. Copies of all such letters on City Letterhead shall be provided to all other Council members. Letterhead stationary is available upon request from the City Manager's secretary, and if the Council Member wishes to have a copy of their letter in their file, they should submit a copy to the City Manager's staff for filing.
V. COUNCIL MEMBER REQUESTS TO STAFF

A. General Information

All City Council Member requests for information or documents shall be referred through the City Manager. Any Department Head who receives a direct request from a Council Member shall submit the request, including the name of the requesting Council Member, to the City Manager.

B. Research

All City Council Member requests for information or documents which require extensive research shall be referred through the City Manager to the Council for direction. The City Manager will discuss the matter with the appropriate department and relay the approximate time table for completion to the City Council for discussion and action at the next available meeting of the City Council. If the request is approved by the Council, upon completion of the research, the item will be forwarded to the City Council Members by the City Manager.

C. Items for inclusion in Council Agenda

The City Manager shall compile the agenda for each meeting and shall include as agenda items, business in the normal course of City affairs, including but not limited to staff proposals to improve services, support the economy and land use, and enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the City organization, items relating to current, past, and proposed City contracts, leases, franchises, agreements and similar documents, and matters affecting future or proposed City equipment and property, items relating to City employees, agents and contractors, and such other matters as are defined in this handbook or otherwise directed by the City Council.

All City Council Member requests for an item to be placed on the Council agenda should be referred to the City Manager. Pursuant to Minute Order No. 11-022096, such request shall be submitted prior to Monday noon of the week before the Council meeting in order to be placed on the next regularly scheduled meeting.

The City Manager will refer any routine items to the appropriate department for a staff report. If necessary, items will be referred to the City Attorney for a determination on legality. If an item is determined to be a legitimate request, the item will be referred for a staff report. Items having already been acted upon by the Council previously will be deferred to the Mayor for approval before being placed on the agenda.
VI. COUNCIL AGENDA

A. Preparation:

Each Department Head submits agenda items regarding their Department to the City Manager for approval. Upon the City Manager's approval, the items are returned to the appropriate department for copying and collation.

The City Council meeting agendas are prepared on the Thursday prior to the Tuesday meeting. Any questions regarding whether items have been scheduled for consideration at a particular meeting may be directed to the Chief Deputy City Clerk and/or Deputy City Clerk.

B. Deadlines:

The deadlines for the agenda are the Monday preceding the Thursday preparation day. Public hearing items, scheduled matter items, Consent calendar items, and written communications must be submitted by the Monday deadline. The deadline for a Council member request for any item shall be Monday noon preceding the Thursday preparation day.

C. Delivery:

Agendas will be delivered to Council on the Thursday prior to the Tuesday meeting. The agenda shall include a complete copy of the agenda on compact disc suitable for loading on a laptop computer, with provisions for annotating materials with the use of a suitable Acrobat Reader. No items, or additional materials, shall be delivered after the initial delivery to Council on Thursday, except in the instance of a designated emergency item.

Council agendas shall be delivered to the Council Member's home or business, as requested. If no one is available to receive the agenda, the agenda shall be left in an area designated by the Council Member, unless other arrangements have been previously made with the City Clerk's staff. [See X(D)(1)(2).]

The agendas for staff, public and the news media are available after Council receives their agendas, usually on Friday.
VII. THE RALPH M. BROWN ACT

The Ralph M. Brown Act (California Government Code § 54950 et seq.) governs meetings conducted by local legislative bodies such as city councils, boards of supervisors, special districts, and school boards. The Act represents the State Legislature's determination of how the balance should be struck between the public access to meetings of multi-member public bodies on one hand, and the need for confidential candor, debate, and information gathering on the other.

The Act contains specific exceptions from the open meeting requirements where government has a demonstrated need for confidentiality. Where matters are not subject to a closed meeting exception, the Act has been interpreted to mean that all of the deliberative processes by legislative bodies, including discussion, debate and the acquisition of information, be open and available for public scrutiny.

Meetings are defined as any gathering of a quorum of a legislative body (which includes newly elected but unsworn members of the body) to discuss or transact business under the body's jurisdiction and serial meetings are prohibited. Exemptions are individual contacts between board members and others which do not constitute serial meetings, attendance at conferences and meetings which are open to the public so long as legislative bodies do not discuss amongst themselves business of a specific nature under the body's jurisdiction, and attendance at social or ceremonial events where no business of the body is discussed.

The Act requires that notices of regular meetings must be posted at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting, and twenty-four (24) hour notice must be provided to members of the legislative body and media outlets for special meetings.

A user's guide to the Ralph M. Brown Act is provided to Council Members for their information. If a Council Member has a specific question which does not seem to be covered in the guide, the Council Member should contact the City Attorney for a legal opinion.
VIII. TRAVEL, MEETINGS AND EXPENSES

This policy would satisfy the requirements of California Government Code §§ 53232.2 and 53233.3 in the event such requirements could be constitutionally applied to charter cities.

The City Manager, or his staff, will notify the City Council Members about any League of California Cities' Conferences, Redevelopment Conferences, Committee meetings, and/or local meetings that may be of interest to the Council. If a Council Member is interested in attending any such meeting, the following procedures should be followed:

A. Requests for Reservations:

   1. The date(s) of the conference or meeting;
   2. If the Council Member will be accompanied by anyone else, i.e. spouse, child;
   3. Any personal preferences for hotel reservations, such as smoking or non-smoking, king or double beds, etc.; and
   4. Whether special travel arrangements need to be made, i.e. airplane tickets, ride-sharing, etc.

   A disbursement will then be prepared and the payment for the conference or meeting will be forwarded, and, if applicable, the hotel will be contacted to make the appropriate reservations. When making hotel reservations to attend a conference or meeting, a request for a room sales tax waiver shall be made on behalf of the applicable Council member. If a prior room reservation request is not made, the Council member shall request a room sales tax waiver prior to payment for a room.

   For lodging in connection with a conference, lodging expenses must not exceed the group rate published by the conference sponsor for the meeting in question, if such rates are available at the time of booking. If the group rate is not available, government rates must be used when available. Lodging rates that are equal or less than the government rates are presumed to be reasonable and allowed per this policy. In the event that government rates are not available at a given time or in a given area, lodging rates that do not exceed the IRS per diem rates for a given area are presumed reasonable and hence allowed.
B. Travel and Expense Form:

A Travel and Expense Form will then be prepared for the Council Member which indicates the following:

1. The amount of money to be issued to the traveler as per diem*; and
2. Mileage expense* (if a personal vehicle is used for travel and cost is paid in advance).

* Amount set in Administrative Policy Manual Sec. II-E-1, Travel &Conference Expenses. In regard to the per diem amount, if payments for expenses are made in advance pursuant to the specified per diem amounts, the disbursement shall not be considered to be "reimbursable expense" under AB 1234.

The Council Member will then be issued a packet of materials several days prior to the meeting which contains the following:

1. A check for per diem and mileage;
2. Confirmation notification and informational materials regarding the conference;
3. Confirmation notification for any hotel reservations; and
4. A City credit card to pay for the room charges at the end of the meeting.

C. Receipts:

The Council Member shall then bring the receipt for the hotel charges to the City Manager's staff upon his/her return, together with the credit card, and any refund due the City. The Council Member shall sign the original Travel and Expense Form at that time, which shall then be filed with the Finance Department for final processing.

If a refund is due the Council Member, a check will be issued by the Finance Department and then distributed to the Council Member.

D. Eligibility:

The City shall pay for any Council Member to attend any meetings or conferences of their choice. When accompanied by a spouse or child, the Council Member shall pay for expenses incurred above that which would otherwise have been paid for the Council Member. Any charge placed on a City credit card for someone other than a Council Member shall also be considered a refund due the City, payable within 10 days of the receipt of the charges.
IX. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A. City Council Members Filing Requirements

City Council Members are under the provisions of the Political Reform Act (Gov. Code, § 81000 et seq. known as "the Act") as enforced by the Fair Political Practices Commission. The Act applies to campaign contributions requirements, as well as matters of conflict of interest while in office.

1. Disclosure of Economic Interests:

City Council Members must file assuming office and leaving office statements, as well as annual statements while in office. The statements basically require the disclosure of the following information:

- Investments or interests in real property and its fair market value;

- Income, and the name and address of each source of income aggregating five hundred dollars ($500) or more, or fifty ($50) or more if a gift, and a general description of the business activity, if any of each source;

- Interests in real property held by a business entity or trust;

- Loans, and its annual interest rate and the security, if any, given for the loan;

2. Disqualification of Participation (Conflict of Interest):

A Council Member shall not make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use his official position to influence a governmental decision in which he knows or has reason to know he has a financial interest. This might include decisions which affect property within up to 500 feet of the subject property in which the Council Member has an interest.

A financial interest in a decision, within the meaning of Section 87100 of the Act, is if it is reasonably foreseeable that the decision will have a material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public generally, on the Council Member or:

- A member of his or her immediate family;
• A business entity in which the Council Member has a direct or indirect investment worth $2000 or more;

• Any real property in which the Council Member has a direct or indirect interest worth $2,000 or more;

• Any source of income, other than gifts or commercial lending institutes loans, aggregating $500 or more received or promised to the City Council Member within twelve months prior to the time when the decision is made;

• Any business entity in which the City Council Member is a director, partner, trustee, employee, or holds any position of management;

• Any donor, or any intermediary or agent for a donor, or a gift or gifts aggregating $420 or more in value provided to, received by, or promised to the City Council Member within 12 months prior to the time when the decision is made.

Indirect investment or interest means any investments or interest owned by the spouse or dependent child of a City Council Member, by an agent on behalf of a Council Member, or by a business entity or trust in which the Council Member, the Council Member's agents, spouse, and dependent children own directly, indirectly, or beneficially a 10% interest or greater.

Section 87100 of the Act does not prevent any Council Member from making or participating in the making of a governmental decision to the extent his participation is legally required for the action or decision to be made. The fact that a Council Member's vote is needed to break a tie does not make his participation legally required for purposes of this section.

Pursuant to Section 87105 of the Act, a public official who holds an office specified in Section 87200 who has a financial interest in a decision within the meaning of Section 87100 shall, upon identifying a conflict of interest or a potential conflict of interest and immediately prior to the consideration of the matter, do all of the following:

a. Publicly identify the financial interest that gives rise to the conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest in detail sufficient to be understood by the public, except that disclosure of the exact street address of a residence is not required.
b. Recuse himself or herself from discussing and voting on the matter, or otherwise acting in violation of Section 87100.

c. Leave the room until after the discussion, vote, and any other disposition of the matter is concluded, unless the matter has been placed on the portion of the agenda reserved for uncontested matters.

d. Notwithstanding paragraph (3), a public official may speak on the issue during the time that the general public speaks on the issue.

B. Other Agencies:

Whenever a Council Member is required to file a Statement of Economic Interest for an outside agency, the Deputy City Clerk will provide the correct form, and using the Statement of Economic Interest Form 700 filed in the City Clerk's Office for the City of Porterville, prepare a duplicate statement for signature, and forward the appropriate form to the requesting agency.

C. Redevelopment Agency Filing Requirements:

Upon assuming office, a City Council Member will also serve as a Redevelopment Agency Member. As an Agency Member, they must file a Conflict of Interest statement for the Porterville Redevelopment Project area. After assuming office, an Agency Member may not acquire any property within the Redevelopment Project area. If prior interests exist within the Project area, the Agency Member must disqualify themselves from any action taken which would constitute a benefit to them.

D. City of Porterville Conflict of Interest Code:

Certain designated City employees are also required to file conflict of interest forms under the provisions of the Political Reform Act Code, § 87100-87500 et seq. The City of Porterville Conflict of Interest Code was adopted by the City Council and is reviewed biennially to make sure it is kept current.

If Council Members have a question on whether an interest they have is sufficient for disqualification, they should contact the Fair Political Practices Commission at (866) 275-3772, or http://www.fppc.ca.gov, for a ruling or opinion.
X. GENERAL ITEMS

A. Different Hats

Members of the City Council also serve as the governing bodies for the following local agencies:

1. Redevelopment Agency
2. Industrial Development Authority
3. Public Financing Authority
4. Public Improvement Corporation
5. Planning Commission
6. Conflicts and Disclosure Monitor Agency

B. Compensation

As stated in the City Charter, Section 9, City Council Members shall receive $20 per Council meeting, $25 per Council meeting for the Mayor, with a maximum of seven paid Council meetings per month.

Redevelopment Agency Members shall receive $30 per Redevelopment meeting.

Council Members receive no benefits other than the amounts per meeting stated above.

C. Issuance of Laptop Computers to Council Members

A Wireless Communications Policy for the laptop computers is being developed as set forth in Minute Order 14-090605. [See Appendix B]

D. Direction to Support Staff:

Upon assuming office, Council Members should notify the City Manager's staff regarding the following items:

1. Where to deliver Council agendas and Administrative Reports and Memorandums, i.e. home or business.

2. Where to leave Council agendas if the business is closed and/or if no one is home, i.e. City Manager's Office Council mail box, front porch, back door, etc.
3. How to direct citizens who wish to speak to Council Members, i.e. take a message, give out home telephone numbers, give out business telephone numbers, etc.

E. City Attorney

The City Attorney is the legal advisor of the City Council, and all other City officials. The City Attorney shall prosecute all violations of City ordinances and shall draft all contracts and other legal documents and instruments, required by the Council or the City Manager. The City Attorney shall perform such other legal services as the Council may direct and shall attend all meetings of the Council unless excused therefrom by three members or by the Mayor.

The types of questions referred to the City Attorney are as follows:

1. Generally whether a conflict of interest exists for a Council Member and whether they should abstain from voting on a specific matter.

   Please note: Any advice received from the City Attorney relating to Conflicts of Interests is informal only and not binding; the Council Member must seek and obtain a formal written opinion from the FPPC in order to be afforded any statutory immunities.

2. Whether an issue has a legal standing, and what type of action would be appropriate.

3. Legal recommendations for matters of litigation.

F. Annual City Manager/City Attorney Evaluations

The City Council shall provide for annual evaluations for the City Manager and the City Attorney. A standardized evaluation form shall be used which shall address the areas of importance as set forth by the City Council. Said evaluation form shall be included as Appendix A.

G. Response to President/Governor Directives

Directives issued by the President of the United States and/or Governor of the State of California shall not be considered a mandatory directive to the City of Porterville except as authorized and/or approved by the City Council. The one exception to this rule is that flags on City buildings shall be flown at half mast upon orders by the President, Governor and/or Mayor, or by majority approval of the City Council.
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A. Annual City Manager/City Attorney Evaluation Forms
B. Laptop Computer and Cell Phone Policy (to be attached upon adoption)
C. Email Retention Policy (to be attached upon adoption)
CITY MANAGER
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
(specify annual period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Providing Information</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the City Manager keep you informed, in a timely manner, of the things you want to know about?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you feel that you receive information on an equal basis with other Council members?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do reports provide adequate information and analysis to help you make sound decisions?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are agenda items and supporting documents appropriate and brought to Council in sufficient time for deliberations?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the City Manager regularly consult with the Council before setting the agenda to determine appropriate topics and timing?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the City Manager follow up promptly on Council requests for information or action without having to be reminded?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are Council packets relatively free of errors and omissions?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score
### B. Providing Advice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the City Manager have adequate knowledge of municipal affairs?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does he exercise good judgment?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you feel that the City Manager considers alternatives before making recommendations?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the City Manager plan ahead, anticipate needs and recognize potential problems?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do you feel about the quality of analysis that accompanies recommendations?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does he have a good sense of timing in bringing issues to the Council for action?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average score**

### INTERNAL ADMINISTRATION

### A. Financial Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you comfortable with the City Manager's approach to budget preparation and review?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the City Manager effective in controlling costs through economical utilization of manpower, materials, and equipment?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the City Manager have sufficient knowledge of financial matters?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the City Manager provide you with sufficient information on the financial status of the City government?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the budget submitted on time?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average score**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Personnel Management</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the City Manager successful in guiding people so that they work together as a team toward common objectives?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the City Manager effective in selection and placing personnel?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the City Manager develop and motivate personnel so that they are increasingly effective in performing their duties?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the City Manager willing to face up to disciplinary problems and take action when warranted?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the City Manager effective in promoting positive employer-employee relations?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the City Manager respond to Council suggestions on employee training, work priorities and productivity? Are the decisions explained to Council?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is the City Manager effective on assuring that staff makes a positive impression on citizens?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does the City Manager ensure that every City employee receives a written annual performance review?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Getting the Job Done</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have the feeling that things the Council decides or directs get done?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the City Manager organize or assign work so that it is performed efficiently and effectively?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the City Manager pay sufficient attention to detail to avoid error or things “slipping through the cracks”?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the City Manager put in sufficient time and effort to perform to your expectations?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the City Manager have a good sense of priorities in the way he spends his time on the job?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is the City Manager able to analyze problems or issues and identify causes, reasons, and implications?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the City Manager develop and carry out short- and long-term action plans?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score
### EXTERNAL RELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Citizen Relations</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the City Manager generally make a positive impression on citizens and is he respected in Porterville?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is he effective in handling disputes or complaints involving citizens?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the City Manager have appropriate visibility or identity in the community?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the City Manager represent Council positions and policies accurately and effectively?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the City Manager give sufficient credit to Council?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the City Manager think and act in a manner reflecting an attitude that client (Council, staff, or citizens) perceptions and satisfactions are key?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Intergovernmental Relations</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the City Manager effective representing the City's interests in dealing with other agencies?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the City Manager participate in enough intergovernmental activity to have an impact on behalf of the City?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Personality</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the City Manager's personality suited to effective performance of his duties?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Communications</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the City Manager easy to talk to?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you feel he is a good listener?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are communications thoughtful, clear, and to the point?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the City Manager show sensitivity to the concerns of others?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Management Style</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the City Manager demonstrate interest and enthusiasm in performing his duties?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does he have sufficient leadership characteristics to command respect and good performance from employees?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the City Manager show initiative and creativity in dealing with issues, problems, and unusual situations?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the City Manager open to new ideas and suggestions for change?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the City Manager create an atmosphere in which employees can enjoy working for the City?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is the City Manager honest and ethical?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the City Manager work well under pressure?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the City Manager able to change his approach to fit new situations?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Can the City Manager consistently put aside personal views and implement Council policy and direction?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average score**

### ACHIEVEMENTS

List the top three achievements or strong points of the City Manager for the past twelve (12) months:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

List three performance objectives for the City Manager that you feel are the most important targets for this year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TOTAL OVER ALL SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RATING</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date:

---

Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

Cameron Hamilton, Vice Mayor

Pete V. McCracken, Council Member

Brian Ward, Council Member

Greg Shelton, Council Member
# CITY ATTORNEY PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
## CITY OF PORTERVILLE
(specify annual period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Providing Information</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the City Attorney keep you informed, in a timely manner, of the legal issues affecting the City?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the City Attorney demonstrate initiative and resourcefulness in identifying legal problems, and advising and recommending resolutions?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do reports/memoranda from the City Attorney provide adequate information and analysis to help you make sound decisions?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do the legal solutions that are developed appropriately address the issues to be resolved?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the City Attorney follow up promptly on Council requests for information or action without having to be reminded?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Providing Advice</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the City Attorney have adequate knowledge of municipal legal affairs?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does he/she exercise good judgment?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you feel that the City Attorney considers alternatives before making recommendations?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the City Attorney plan ahead, anticipate needs and recognize potential legal problems?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do you feel about the quality of analysis that accompanies recommendations?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score
### C. Getting the Job Done

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have the feeling that things the Council decides or directs get done?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the City Attorney pay sufficient attention to detail to avoid error or things “slipping through the cracks”?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the City Attorney put in sufficient time and effort to perform to your expectations?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the City Attorney have a good sense of priorities in the way he/she spends his/her time on the job?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the City Attorney able to analyze problems or issues and identify causes, reasons, and implications?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does the City Attorney perform well under pressure?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. When work is delegated to staff/deputy attorneys, is the project/issue handled appropriately?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score

### EXTERNAL RELATIONS

### A. Citizen Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the City Attorney generally make a positive impression on citizens and is he/she respected in Porterville?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is he/she effective in handling disputes or complaints involving citizens?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the City Attorney have appropriate visibility or identity in the community?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the City Attorney think and act in a manner reflecting an attitude that client (Council, staff, or citizens) perceptions and satisfactions are key?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score
### B. Intergovernmental Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the City Attorney effective representing the City's interests in dealing with other agencies?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score

### PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

#### A. Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the City Attorney's personality suited to effective performance of his/her duties?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score

#### B. Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the City Attorney easy to talk to?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel he/she is a good listener?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are communications thoughtful, clear, and to the point?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the City Attorney show sensitivity to the concerns of others?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score

#### C. Management Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the City Attorney demonstrate interest and enthusiasm in performing his/her duties?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the City Attorney show initiative and creativity in dealing with issues, problems, and unusual situations?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the City Attorney honest and ethical?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the City Attorney work well under pressure?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the City Attorney able to change his/her approach to fit new situations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Can the City Attorney consistently put aside personal views and implement Council policy and direction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score

**ACHIEVEMENTS**

List the top three achievements or strong points of the City Attorney for the past twelve (12) months:

1. 

2. 

3. 

**FUTURE DEVELOPMENT**

List three performance objectives for the City Attorney that you feel are the most important targets for this year:

1. 

2. 

3. 
# TOTAL OVER ALL SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RATING</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 

________________________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

________________________________________
Cameron Hamilton, Vice Mayor

________________________________________
Pete V. McCracken, Council Member

________________________________________
Brian Ward, Council Member

________________________________________
Greg Shelton, Council Member
STATE BUDGET IMPACTS TO THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE

City Manager

On Thursday, June 30, 2011, Governor Jerry Brown signed a number of legislative articles that constitute the State’s budget for the 2011-2012 fiscal year, a couple of components of which have significant impact to the City’s recently-adopted budget.

The City Council approved the City’s budget for the current 2011-2012 fiscal year at its meeting on June 19, 2011. As was presented and approved by the Council (the State not yet having approved its budget), the City’s General Fund budget for the 2011-12 fiscal year was conservatively estimated to be $1.6 million in deficit, though the budget-balancing solution successfully employed for the past couple difficult budget years has been to curtail Departmental spending to either 94% or 95% of budgeted expenditures, which will continue to be employed to “save” between $1.15 million (95%) to $1.38 million (94%), with a remaining estimated deficit of between $230,000 (94%) and $450,000 (95%). Of the estimated deficit, $100,000 was attributable to the State’s proposed elimination of the Community-Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program, which the City had used to previously fund two (2) Community Services Officer (CSO) positions in the Police Department.

With the Governor’s subsequent approval of the State budget, the COPS program was funded for the 2011-2012 fiscal year, however, resulting in significant impact to the City. In “eleventh hour” State budget legislation, the Governor approved the complete and unilateral transfer of Vehicle License Fees (VLF) funds from cities, the total state-wide impact of which was $130 million in “stolen” revenue to California cities, and $415,000 specifically to the City of Porterville. The net effect of the State’s VLF transfer is a resulting $545,000 (given 94% expenditure authorization) to $765,000 (95% expenditure authorization) estimated General Fund deficit. Although significant legislative efforts are underway toward correcting the VLF transfer, as well as anticipated litigation, staff is concerned as to the magnitude of the funds transfer and the resulting anticipated ongoing General Fund budget deficit.
As the Council is aware, through the Meet & Confer process with the City's employee associations, staff is working to address the anticipated General Fund budget deficit, especially given the single largest increase in the budgeted expenditures is attributed to an approximate $400,000 increase in Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) pension costs.

RECOMMENDATION: None – Information Only
SUBJECT: REVIEW OF LOCAL EMERGENCY STATUS

SOURCE: Administration

COMMENT: In accordance with the City Council's Resolution of Local Emergency adopted on December 21, 2010, and pursuant to Article 14, Section 8690 of the California Emergency Services Act, the Council must review the status of its local emergency at every regularly scheduled meeting and make a determination whether to continue or terminate the local emergency declaration.

Since its last review on July 5, 2011, City staff has continued its coordination with both State and Federal representatives in having made claims for reimbursement for public areas reported as suffering flood damage. An estimated total of $361,750 in damage repair projects (please see attachment) were defined and accepted by both State (CEMA) and Federal (FEMA) emergency agencies, which after final FEMA administrative review, a total of approximately $270,000 was approved. All repair projects are to be completed by no later than July 2012.

Staff has recently been made aware of a State Office of Emergency Services (OES) grant opportunity, which will provide financial assistance for mitigating repetitive flooding conditions. Considering the preliminary flood prevention measures previously presented to the Council, staff is evaluating the grant application criteria, with an application deadline of August 8, 2011.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Council:

1. Receive the status report and review of the designated local emergency; and
2. Pursuant to the requirements of Article 14, Section 8690 of the California Emergency Services Act, determine that a need exists to continue said local emergency designation.

ATTACHMENT: CEMA/FEMA List of Projects

Item No. 13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF DAMAGE</th>
<th>COST ESTIMATE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anaele</td>
<td>Aerial view of Grand Ave. Damaged asphalt concrete, &quot;X&quot; other.</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hawthorne Ave. Damaged asphalt concrete, sidewalk</td>
<td>$160,000.00</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tempe Ave.</td>
<td>Damaged asphalt concrete, sidewalk</td>
<td>$46,000.00</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Meridian St.</td>
<td>Damaged asphalt concrete, sidewalk</td>
<td>$63,760.00</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OHV</td>
<td>Damaged asphalt concrete, sidewalk</td>
<td>$25,600.00</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pinnacle Pkwy</td>
<td>Damaged asphalt concrete, shoulder on both sides of the road</td>
<td>$17,000.00</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tempe Towne at West Pkwy</td>
<td>Damaged asphalt concrete, shoulder on both sides of the road</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ave 8 &amp; Thirteenth Ave.</td>
<td>Damaged asphalt concrete, shoulder on both sides of the road</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>West Pkwy at Grand Ave.</td>
<td>Damaged asphalt concrete, shoulder on both sides of the road</td>
<td>$24,000.00</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pinnacle Pkwy &amp; Grand Ave.</td>
<td>Damaged asphalt concrete, shoulder on both sides of the road</td>
<td>$95,000.00</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ave 11 &amp; north of motion</td>
<td>Damaged asphalt concrete, shoulder on both sides of the road</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>West Pkwy at section Ave.</td>
<td>Damaged asphalt concrete, shoulder on both sides of the road</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The item #12 was added.
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA: JULY 19, 2011

SUBJECT:      BUDGET ADJUSTMENT/CITIZENS’ OPTION FOR PUBLIC SAFETY (COPS) PROGRAM FUNDING

SOURCE:      Police Department

COMMENT: For the past several years the City of Porterville has annually received funding from the State of California through the Citizens’ Option for Public Safety (COPS) Grant Program. The City of Porterville is again slated to receive $100,000 this upcoming fiscal year and a public hearing on the intent of the expenditures is required. In the past, the Police Department has used these funds in support of personnel assigned to the department’s Patrol Division, including all necessary training, equipment, and overtime costs. The expenditure of these funds in this manner is in proper adherence with the requirements as specified in the Assembly Bill.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1) Conduct the public hearing to receive public comment; and
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 a budget adjustment reducing the Police Department’s 2011-2012 General Fund budget by $100,000 and increasing the Police Department’s Special Safety Grants-Citizens’ Option for Public Safety (COPS) budget by $100,000.

Attachment: Draft Resolution

D.D. Appropriated/Funded C.M. Item No. 14
RESOLUTION NO. ______-2011

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE ACCEPTING CITIZENS’ OPTION FOR PUBLIC SAFETY (COPS) 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 accepts the 2011/2012 Citizens’ Option for Public Safety (COPS) Grant Funds; and

2. Police Department’s 2011-2012 General Fund budget is decreased by $100,000 and the Police Department’s Special Safety Grants-Citizens’ Option for Public Safety (COPS) budget is increased by $100,000 to allow for expenditure of those Grant Funds in support of personnel assigned to the Patrol Division and their operational costs.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of July, 2011.

______________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:

John Lollis, City Clerk

By: Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
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.

At the July 20, 2010 meeting, Council directed staff to provide options for the collection of the over due weed abatement charges instead of placing them on the property tax rolls. One option is to record a ‘Notice of Lien’ on the subject properties with the Tulare County Recorder’s Office. This option, in addition to rolling to the tax rolls, may be beneficial as more properties are becoming “bank owned,” and would aid in protecting the City’s ability to recover its costs.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council adopt the attached resolution authorizing the County Auditor to place these items on the property tax rolls for collection, and to authorize Staff to file ‘Notice of Lien’ as appropriate.

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 2011-2012

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 2011/2012 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 19th day of July 2011.

__________________________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
City Clerk
### Weedy Hazard Abatement

**FY2011-2012 Tax Roll**

(from FY10-11 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>Lynn Trueblood</td>
<td>240-230-048 1065 N Brandy Way</td>
<td>637.92</td>
<td>638.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim &amp; Howell Robin Marchall</td>
<td>245-092-010 1634 W Morton Ave</td>
<td>2,149.09</td>
<td>2,149.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Rather</td>
<td>245-174-002 426 N Belmont St</td>
<td>874.19</td>
<td>874.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guild Mortgage Co</td>
<td>246-093-027 1050 N San Carlos St</td>
<td>2,572.09</td>
<td>2,572.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Iracheta</td>
<td>247-130-052 NW Corner of Mulberry &amp; Lime</td>
<td>1,614.19</td>
<td>1,614.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert &amp; Lori Phillips</td>
<td>248-100-027 966 N Esther St</td>
<td>1,408.40</td>
<td>1,408.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Mendoza</td>
<td>251-302-009 1410 W Tomah Ave</td>
<td>2,183.26</td>
<td>2,183.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe/Brian Lemus/Norrod</td>
<td>252-102-008 360 W Kanai</td>
<td>2,103.02</td>
<td>2,103.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Della Mae O'Dell</td>
<td>254-073-044 810 E Putnam Ave</td>
<td>6,197.50</td>
<td>6,198.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael &amp; Iris Radusinovich</td>
<td>254-110-018 Jasmine Ranch Phase I</td>
<td>473.26</td>
<td>473.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Yoshida</td>
<td>254-110-019 Jasmine Ranch Phase I</td>
<td>473.26</td>
<td>473.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Valle Capitol Corp., Inc</td>
<td>255-170-020 E Olive East of Granite Hills HS</td>
<td>4,444.14</td>
<td>4,444.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose &amp; Mary Rosalez</td>
<td>260-102-020 246 S Ohio</td>
<td>2,548.20</td>
<td>2,548.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus &amp; Mary Lou Lopez</td>
<td>260-184-013 200 S G St</td>
<td>1,408.40</td>
<td>1,408.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Silva</td>
<td>260-187-001 347 W Orange</td>
<td>1,255.46</td>
<td>1,255.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WEED/HAZARD ABATEMENT

**FY2011-2012 Tax Roll**  
(from FY10-11 balances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessee</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Amount Per Parcel</th>
<th>Assessment Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad account #01-016134</td>
<td>16 260-215-008</td>
<td>NW corner of Orange &amp; Hockett</td>
<td>1,511.88</td>
<td>1,512.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad account #01-016134</td>
<td>17 260-223-010</td>
<td>W side of D St, S from Olive</td>
<td>1,438.77</td>
<td>1,439.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad account #01-016134</td>
<td>18 260-232-007</td>
<td>W side of D St, N from Orange</td>
<td>1,438.77</td>
<td>1,439.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad account #01-016134</td>
<td>19 260-242-012</td>
<td>Locust &amp; E St</td>
<td>2,358.76</td>
<td>2,359.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad account #01-016134</td>
<td>20 260-242-013</td>
<td>Locust &amp; Hockett</td>
<td>6,170.53</td>
<td>6,171.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Bank National Trust account #01-000612</td>
<td>21 261-190-005</td>
<td>Corona Dr</td>
<td>532.45</td>
<td>532.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gnekow account #01-000096</td>
<td>22 261-190-006</td>
<td>N side Corona Dr</td>
<td>8,328.81</td>
<td>8,329.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total amount of assessments  
52,122.35  52,121.00

Total number of assessments  
22
SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION TO NEGOTIATE AGREEMENT FOR A GOLF PROFESSIONAL FOR THE MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE

SOURCE: Parks and Leisure Services Department

COMMENT: At the direction of City Council, staff solicited proposals for Golf Course Management services to replace Mr. Stephen J. Gilwitz, who resigned last month due to his serious illness.

Staff conducted a nationwide search for a replacement, and after several inquiries, one individual qualified as a certified golf professional submitted a proposal. The applicant is Mr. Casey Butler, who has been a teaching professional and first assistant at the Rio Bravo Country Club in Bakersfield, Wasco Valley Rose Golf Course, Stockdale Country Club in Bakersfield and currently at the Hidden Valley Country Club in Reno, Nevada.

Mr. Butler’s proposal is very similar to the City’s current agreement with Mr. Gilwitz. The agreement would entail a sharing between the City of Porterville and Golf Pro of green fees and cart rentals, exclusive rights to operate the pro shop, driving range, food concession and to give golf instruction.

Staff has interviewed him and contacted references listed by him and were impressed in both scenarios.

RECOMMENDATION: That City Council authorizes staff to negotiate an Operating Agreement with Mr. Butler for Management of the Municipal Golf Course.

ATTACHMENTS (1): Submitted Proposal
Presentation of Qualifications
For
City of Porterville
Municipal Golf Course

Casey Lance Butler, PGA
10204 Oldham Ln
Bakersfield, California 93306
(661) 900-3997
Table of Contents

Statement of Qualifications..........................3

Specific Provisions..................................

Golfer Development Programs.........................

Resume..................................................

References.............................................

Proof of Financial Responsibility....................
Statement of Qualifications

My name is Casey L. Butler. I was born and raised here in Porterville, California. In 1995, after graduating from Monache High School, I entered the United States Navy where I remained on active duty until 2001. After being honorably discharged from the Navy, I returned to California and entered the Golf Industry.

I began my work in the golf business at Wasco Valley Rose Golf Course in 2001 where I remained until 2003. While at Wasco Valley, I served as a First Assistant Golf Professional. I was in charge of daily operations which included green fees, carts fees, and golf shop sales. I was the direct supervisor of the outside staff. I assisted in the ordering and receiving for the pro shop merchandise. I also assisted in junior clinics and helped organize weekly events, i.e. men’s club, outside tournaments, and weekly skins game. Thereafter, in 2003 I moved to Stockdale Country Club.

While employed as an Assistant Golf Professional with Stockdale Country Club I was involved with daily sales, junior clinics, ladies beginner clinics, merchandising, and organized evening mixers. Seeing the potential to grow professionally, I moved to Rio Bravo Country Club in 2006.

In 2006, as a First Assistant Golf Professional with Rio Bravo I was the merchandiser and direct supervisor of all pro shop staff and outside services. I organized all junior clinics, ladies beginner clinics, hosted the “Top Gun” invitational for the Rio Bravo C.C. men’s club.

While employed at Rio Bravo, I obtained an Associates of Liberal Arts at Bakersfield College. In addition, I also obtained my Class A
Membership with the PGA. After a move to Nevada in 2010, I was hired at Hidden Valley Country Club.

As a First Assistant Golf Professional with Hidden Valley, I assisted in merchandising, daily sales, junior clinics, ladies beginner clinics, and directly supervised outside service staff. I assisted in the operation of hosting an LPGA "Patty Sheehan" Legends Tournament.

I have now returned to California with the desire to continue my professional growth in a more significant manner. To that end, I have secured financial backing for the necessary operating costs of the Porterville Municipal Golf Course. I intend on using these funds to obtain the requisite equipment and inventory as well as to employ a team of professionals, including myself, to operate the facility. Furthermore, I am able to obtain the necessary insurance coverage as detailed in the 'Insurance Requirements' section of the Request for Qualifications as published on June 7, 2011 and June 14, 2011.

As you can see from my employment history, I have over 10-years experience in the golf industry as well as a very solid foundation and work ethic which I learned while in the military. My experience paired with my skills and qualifications make me a prime candidate for the management of Porterville Municipal Golf Course. I look forward to the opportunity to return to Porterville and will work to further enhance my hometown.
• One to three shop employees (full-time/part-time)
• One to three cart/range employees (part-time)
• One kitchen employee/cook (part-time)

6. Restaurant Services
• Supervise the restaurant operations to provide quality food and drinks during the hours of golf course operations.
• Maintain a high standard of cleanliness and proper food handling.
• Supervise the training and health certification of the kitchen staff.
• Supervise and train employees in the regulations set forth by the ABC governing alcohol sales and consumption.

7. Clubhouse Improvements
• General clean-up of clutter and excess storage.
• Kitchen cupboards and floors re-painted, and re-designed for better flow for employees.

8. Golf Instructions
• PGA Class A professional
• Private lessons or group lessons by appointment
• Free beginner golf clinics will be held on the 1st Saturday of the month.

9. Management/Operations Compensation for Services
• 21% of all fees collected for green fees, monthly/yearly tickets, and lockers.
• 25% of all cart fees collected.
• 100% of Pro shop, restaurant, pull-cart rentals, club rentals, driving range, lessons, and food & beverage.
• Complementary play for Head Golf Professional and employees at the discretion of the Head Golf Professional.

10. Recordkeeping
• Starter sheets will be kept and recorded on a daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly total.
• Daily cart rentals will be recorded.
Specific Provisions

Specific Provisions:

1. Current Certification of Proposer
   - Class A PGA member “2008”
   - 10 years of golf course work experience
   - Currently enrolled in the PGA Certified Program “golf operations”

2. Golf shop inventory
   - Minimum of $12,000-$15,000 inventory. The amount will fluctuate depending on season.
   - Equipment to be stocked, i.e. Titleist, Footjoy, Taylormade, Ping, and Callaway etc.
   - Inventory to include: putters, wedges, drivers, fairway woods, hybrids, golf shoes, golf balls, clothing, golf gloves and miscellaneous golf items.

3. Rental Inventory
   - Pull-carts (11-12)
   - Club rentals (6-8 sets)

4. Proposed days and hours of operation
   - Open six days a week; closed on Mondays
   - Open every Monday that is declared to be a state and/or federal holiday, except the following holidays, whether falling on a Monday, or otherwise: Thanksgiving, Christmas and New Year’s Day.
   - Open Monday for special events, tournaments or promotions at the discretion of the Head Golf Professional with the approval of the Parks and Recreational Director.
   - Open 6:30/7:00 to dusk. Times will vary with the season.

5. Staffing
• One to three shop employees (full-time/part-time)
• One to three cart/range employees (part-time)
• One kitchen employee/cook (part-time)

6. Restaurant Services
• Supervise the restaurant operations to provide quality food and drinks during the hours of golf course operations.
• Maintain a high standard of cleanliness and proper food handling.
• Supervise the training and health certification of the kitchen staff.
• Supervise and train employees in the regulations set forth by the ABC governing alcohol sales and consumption.

7. Clubhouse Improvements
• General clean-up of clutter and excess storage.
• Kitchen cupboards and floors re-painted, and re-designed for better flow for employees.

8. Golf Instructions
• PGA Class A professional
• Private lessons or group lessons by appointment
• Free beginner golf clinics will be held on the 1st Saturday of the month.

9. Management/Operations Compensation for Services
• 21% of all fees collected for green fees, monthly/yearly tickets, and lockers.
• 25% of all cart fees collected.
• 100% of Pro shop, restaurant, pull-cart rentals, club rentals, driving range, lessons, and food & beverage.
• Complementary play for Head Golf Professional and employees at the discretion of the Head Golf Professional.

10. Recordkeeping
• Starter sheets will be kept and recorded on a daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly total.
• Daily cart rentals will be recorded.
   - Revenues will be deposited daily/weekly with the City Finance Department, with independent audit functions provided by the City. Weekend receipts will be deposited on the following Monday/Tuesday.
   - Daily reports of player type, number of rounds, cart rentals, and daily receipts will be supplied with daily deposits.

12. In the event of termination of Operator's contract the city shall purchase all merchandise in stock or on order at the Operators cost including shipping and all personal property and equipment of the Operator at Operator's cost less depreciation as set forth in standard accounting practices.
Golfer Development Programs

1. Specialized Golf Clinics
   - Juniors: Learn life values through the game of golf
   - Seniors: Health issues i.e. back problems
   - Women: Golf for business networking
   - Training in golf skills, rules, etiquette, strategy, sportsmanship
   - Choice of private, small group, or buddy clinics

2. Junior golf programs
   - Boys and girls camp, one to two weeks/ two to five days a week. Camps will teach the game of golf through instruction, rules of the game, golf course etiquette, and teaching life values.

3. Golf Leagues: Juniors, Seniors, Women
   - Schools
   - Clubs
   - Associations
   - Businesses
   - Teacher’s Associations
   - Travel Leagues

4. Tournaments
   - Get acquainted tourney
   - Junior tourney
   - Mixed Foursome “Mixers”
   - Parent/Child
   - Skills contest: chipping, pitching, and putting
• Long drive
• Closest to the pin
• Weekly Senior group play days
• Weekly Woman group play days

5. Porterville Men’s Club
• Develop and run monthly tournaments and outings
• Develop Home and Home
• Weekly 9-hole mixers i.e. skins game, shoot-out, blind draw scramble
Casey L. Butler  
10204 Oldham Lane  
Bakersfield CA, 93306  
(661) 900-3997  
caseybutler@pga.com

PGA PROFESSIONAL

Profile  
PGA Class-A Golf Professional with public and private club experience seeking a Head Golf Professional position which requires great diversity of skills and experience yet provides a challenging environment which encourages continued professional growth.

Summary of Qualifications  
Golf Operations Management  
- Assist in golf operations with over one-million dollar operating budget;  
- Supervise staff of 20 including: assistant golf professional, golf shop assistants and outside services;  
- Manage Member Services including club storage, driving range and locker room;  
- Direct maintenance of golf car fleet and oversee driving range operations.

Merchandising  
- Manage all aspects of retail of golf merchandise;  
- Assist in open-to-buy purchasing, merchandise assortment and overall business plan for retail sales;  
- Assist accounting department with inventory management, payment of invoices, accruals and member billing.

Tournament Operations  
- Assist in implementation and operation of several successful annual corporate and charity events;  
- Manage organization and execution of 186-days of annual golf tournaments for juniors, seniors, men, women and couples;  
- Implement use of Excel software and USGA software and TPP to create specific tournament operation which include scorecards, cart signs, player lineup, scoreboard and result sheet as well as profit and loss statements;  
- Play and compete consistently with a diversity of members in local pro-am events throughout year.  
- Hosted the LPGA Legends Patty Sheehan Tour event: Pro-am and two day tour event.

Teaching  
- Provide over 100 private lessons annually to players of all abilities;  
- Assist in development, fundraising and coordination of junior programs with over 250 junior participants including weekly clinics and five-week junior camps;  
- Organize weekly Ladies Clinics.

Employment  
Hidden Valley Country Club, Reno, Nevada  
First Assistant Golf Professional  
2010 – Present

Rio Bravo Country Club, Bakersfield, California  
First Assistant Golf Professional  
2006-2009

Stockdale Country Club, Bakersfield, California  
Assistant Golf Professional  
2003-2006

Wasco Valley Rose Golf Course, Wasco, California  
First Assistant Golf Professional  
2001-2003

United States Navy, USS Theodore Roosevelt CVN-71  
A03 (AW)  
1996 - 2001
References

1. Mr. Ward H. Sutton
   3575 E Hidden Valley Dr
   Reno, NV 89502
   Phone: (775) 636-4388

   I have known Mr. Sutton for approximately twenty (20) years. Mr. Sutton was the Head Golf Professional at Hidden Valley C.C. when I served as a First Assistant Golf Professional.

2. Mr. Jim Kiger
   15200 Casa Club Dr
   Bakersfield, CA 93306
   Phone: (661) 889-7379

   I have known Mr. Kiger for approximately seven (7) years. Mr. Kiger was the Head Golf Professional at Rio Bravo when I served as a First Assistant Golf Professional.

3. Mr. Kevin McNeece
   7001 Stockdale Hwy
   Bakersfield, CA 93309
   Phone: (661) 832-0587

   I have known Mr. McNeece for approximately seven (7) years. Mr. McNeece was the Head Golf Professional at Rio Bravo when I served as Assistant Golf Professional.
June 18th, 2011

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter serves as a personal and professional recommendation on behalf of Casey Butler. Casey has been under my employ for the past year, was a coworker for five years at Stockdale Country Club and a close personal friend for the past 20 years. During his employment Casey has demonstrated outstanding ability in the areas of customer relations, acquiring and learning new skills and providing outstanding service. Casey is a pleasure to anyone that comes in contact with him, is well liked by both the staff and the membership and has yet to do anything but provide excellent work.

Casey will be a success in anything he chooses to accomplish with his life. It is my hope that the bearer of this letter is fortunate enough to include/hire/associate with him in their organization. If I can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Ward Sutton, PGA Master Professional
Head Golf Professional
Hidden Valley Country Club
3575 E. Hidden Valley Dr.
Reno, NV 89502
775-857-4742 Ext. 137
June 24, 2011

James E. Kiger  
P.G.A. Head Professional  
Rio Bravo Country Club  
15200 Casa Club Drive  
Bakersfield, CA 93306

IE: Casey Butler

To Whom It May Concern:

Mr. Butler was my first assistant at RBCC for several years and became a close personal friend. Casey is a rare individual with the highest degree on integrity. He is dependable and maintains a positive attitude towards his position. Casey was well liked by all. I can recommend Casey, he would be an asset to any association he would be a part of. Any questions, feel free to call me at Rio Bravo Country Club (661)871-4653.

Most Sincerely,

James Kiger, P.G.A.
To Whom It May Concern:

This Letter in my personal recommendation for Casey Butler. I have had the privilege to work under Casey for 3 Years at Stockdale CC and 2 years at Rio Bravo CC. Casey was one of my immediate supervisors who has trained me to be the most professional golf pro that I am today. Casey has taught me great written and verbal communication skills, also the value of being organized so I can work independently so I can follow through to get the job done. Casey Butler will most certainly be a most valuable edition to any business.

Adrien Rosales
1st Assistant
Rio Bravo Country Club

[Signature]
After knowing Robert Butler for 40 years, he has not only been a great friend, but also a great golfer. Robert’s son Casey has been a good friend of mine for 20 years now. He’s always been a hard worker and he has always exhibited good sportsmanship. Casey has followed in Robert’s footsteps and with a lot of hard work and practice he has become a professional golfer. With my personal knowledge, I believe Casey would make an excellent addition to the Porterville Municipal Golf Course because; he is fair, honest, and he has always had great leadership skills.

VP of Porterville Men’s Club

[Signature]
Proof of Financial Responsibility
6/27/2011
City of Porterville
Porterville, Ca. 93257

Subject: Letter of Verification of Business Account Balance for Casey Butler

Please accept this letter as verification of the opening of a business account for the Porterville Municipal Golf Course by Casey Butler. The account was opened on 06/20/11. As of today, the current balance between checking and savings is $27,200.

Please call for any further verification.

Patrick Lincoln
Vice President & Manager
June 27, 2011

City of Porterville
Purchasing Department
291 North Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257

Re: RFP No. 05/06-SR1602
Casey Butler

Dear Sirs:

As you are aware, our agency has been the agent of record for insurance purposes for Arlie Morris, L. Dale Bartlett, and Stephen Jeffrey Gilwitz as respects their operations at the Porterville Municipal Golf Course.

This letter is written to inform your staff that our agency would be in a position to provide the same type of business coverages as required should Casey Butler be successful in his bid for management duties as outlined in your bid specifications indicated above.

If you have any further questions, please don’t hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,

Shannon Lamb
Account Executive

SL/csk
Attachment 1 Golf Courses

Kings River Golf and Country Club

(559) 897-5661
3100 Avenue 400
Kingsburg, CA 93631

Population: 11,257 as of 2009
Holes: 18
Price: N/A members only
Twilight: N/A
Distance: 53.85 miles

Visalia Country Club

(559) 734-1458
625 N Ranch St,
Visalia, CA 93291

Population: 122,111 as of 2009
Holes: 18
Price: N/A members only
Twilight: N/A
Distance: 31.7 miles

Woodlake Golf Course

(559) 564-1503
21730 Avenue 332
Woodlake, CA 93286
Population: 7,688 as of 2009

Holes: 18

Price: **Mon-Wed** (9 holes w/cart $20 solo $15 w/friend) (18 holes w/cart $25 solo $20 w/friend)
Walking $10 all day

**Thurs:** (9 & 18 Holes w/cart $20 all day)

Walking (9 holes $14) (18 holes $18)

**Fri:** (9 holes w/cart $19) (18 holes w/cart $25)
Walking (9 holes $14) (18 holes $18)

**Sat-Sun:** (9 holes w/cart $26 solo $21 w/friend) (18 holes w/cart $35 solo $30 w/friend)
Walking (9 holes $16) (18 holes $20)

Twilight: N/A

Distance: 28 miles

---

**Valley Oaks Golf Course**

(559) 651-1441

1800 S. Plaza Street

Visalia, CA 93277

Population: 122,111 as of 2009

Holes: 27

Price: Mon-Fri (9 holes w/cart $27) (18 holes w/cart $40)
Walking (9 holes $18) (18 holes $27)
Sat-Sun (9 holes w/cart $29) (18 holes w/cart $47)
Walking (9 holes $20) (18 holes $29)

Twilight: Yes

Distance: 37.8 miles
**Tulare Golf Course**

(559) 686-5300

5320 S Laspina st

Tulare, CA 93274

Population: 57,521 as of 2009

Holes: 18

Price: Mon-Fri (9 holes w/cart $24) (18 holes w/cart $36)

   Walking (9 holes $16) (18 holes $24)

   Sat-Sun (9 holes w/cart $27) (18 holes w/cart $42)

   Walking (9 holes $19) (18 holes $30)

Twilight: N/A

Distance: 26.2 miles

---

**River Island Golf and Country Club**

(559) 781-2917

31989 River Island Lane

Porterville, CA 93257

Population: 44,726 as of 2007

Holes: 18

Price: Flat rate: Before 10:00 $50

   Between 10:00-2:00 $35

   After 2:00 $25

Twilight: N/A

Distance: 12.2 miles
**Ridge Creek Golf Course**

3018 Ridge Creek Drive  
Dinuba, CA 93618  
(877) 465-3891  
Population: 20,792 as of 2009

Holes: 18

Price: Mon-Fri (9 holes w/cart $28) (18 holes w/cart $55)  
  Walking (9 holes $20) (18 holes $41)  
  Sat-Sun (9 holes w/cart $33) (18 holes w/cart $75)  
  Walking (9 holes $25) (18 holes $61)

*Mondays are ladies day and if anyone wears pink (18 holes w/cart is only $35). No affiliation with a charity “pink”.

Twilight: Yes

Distance: 57.6 miles

---

**Sherwood Forest Golf Club**

79 North Frankwood Ave  
Sanger, CA 93657  
(559) 787-2611  
Population: 25,506 as of 2009

Holes: 18

Price: Mon-Thu (9 holes w/cart $28) (18 holes w/cart $36)  
  Walking (9 holes $14) (18 holes $22)  
  Fri-Sun (9 holes w/cart $29) (18 holes w/cart $43)  
  Walking (9 holes $18) (18 holes $29)

Twilight: Yes
Distance: 74.8 miles

**Lindsay Municipal Golf Course**

801 N. Elmwood Ave

Lindsay, CA 93247

(405) 756-3611

Population: 10,705 as of 2009

Holes: 9

Price: $16 to walk all day “endless play” (18 holes w/cart $35)

Twilight: Yes, after 5:00pm

Distance: 12.6 miles

**Exeter Public Golf Course**

510 W. Visalia Rd

Exeter, CA 93221

(559) 592-4783

Population: 9,973 as of 2009

Holes: 9

Price: Mon-Fri (9 holes w/cart $12) (18 holes w/cart $23)

Walking (9 holes $8) (18 holes $15)

Sat-Sun (9 holes w/cart $13) (18 holes w/cart $24)

Walking (9 holes $9) (18 holes $16)

Twilight: N/A

Distance: 19.6 miles
CONSIDERATION TO MAINTAIN THE PORTERVILLE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Over the past few months, staff has updated the Council on the status of the State budget and the efforts of some at the state level, including the Governor, that have proposed eliminating the authority for redevelopment at the local government level. Eventually, with the adoption of a draft budget, on June 29, 2011, the Governor signed several budget-related bills, including ABX1 26, which eliminates redevelopment agencies, and ABX1 27, which requires agencies to make $1.7 billion in payments next year to maintain the authority for redevelopment and the local administration of tax increment funds generated through the redevelopment process. In an effort to determine the actual cost to each agency, the California Redevelopment Association has produced estimates based on the convoluted methodology included in the legislation. Based on these estimates, it is anticipated that Porterville's payment would be approximately $317,000 for fiscal year 2011-12 and approximately $76,000 in subsequent years.

Under the adopted legislation, agencies are prohibited from entering into any new agreements until they have enacted an Ordinance committing to make payments as required by ABX1 27. The language in ABX1 27 states that the City would be responsible for the payments identified above and the Agency would pay the City. Funds paid by the Agency to the City, would be obligated to be used to finance activities and implement projects that accomplish goals of the RDA. A primary goal of the Agency has been to see the redevelopment of the deteriorated Porterville Hotel. These funds would afford the opportunity to see this project continued.

Since this has been a fluid process in attempting to determine the actions of the State, staff has developed a number of alternatives for consideration by the City Council. Following are four options for the City Council to consider:

1. Adopt an Ordinance requiring the Agency to make payment in the estimated amount of $317,000 this year and continue making annual payments in the estimated amount of $76,000 per year to maintain the authority to undertake redevelopment activities. This would allow the Agency to accomplish the following:

   a. Sell the Fourth Street property.
   b. Sell the Stout building.
c. Transfer all other Agency owned properties to the City of Porterville.

d. Per the agreement, as a tax increment becomes available, annual payments will be made to the City, in the amount of approximately $165,000, for operation and administrative charges for the Agency for fiscal years 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14.

e. Continue to make the infrastructure payback payment to the City, in the amount of $150,000 per year, for infrastructure projects that were completed in, or adjacent to, the Redevelopment Project area.

f. Continue working with the Department of Housing and Community Development and the Porterville Hotel property owner to complete the Hotel Redevelopment Project. Continue receiving tax increment for the next 44± years to put towards projects which would eliminate blight and increase job opportunities.

2. Adopt an Ordinance requiring the Agency to make payment in the estimated amount of $317,000 this year to maintain redevelopment authority and continue making annual payments for two years (the term of the loan agreement approved by the City Council on June 21, 2011) in the estimated amount of $76,000 per year. This would allow the Agency to complete items mentioned in Option 1 "a through c"; however, it would allow loan payments and receipt of tax increment for only a three year period which would not accumulate enough funds to put towards a project. Staff would continue to work with HCD and the Porterville Hotel owner to complete the project.

3. Adopt an Ordinance requiring the Agency to make payment in the estimated amount of $317,000 for fiscal year 2011-12. This would allow the Agency to complete items mentioned in Option 1 “a through c”; however, it would allow loan payments and receipt of tax increment for only one year which would not accumulate enough funds to put towards a project. Staff would continue to work with HCD and the Porterville Hotel owner to complete the project.

4. Do not adopt an Ordinance and allow the State to eliminate the authority of the Porterville Redevelopment Agency
Below is a table showing the financial effect to the Agency for Fiscal Year 2011/12, comparing the elimination of the Agency with maintaining elimination of the Agency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDA Estimated Revenue if Maintained at Current Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Tax Increment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABX1 27 Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is an estimate calculated by CRA using the formula from ABX1 27. Estimate for fiscal year 2012/13 is $80,000 but given the actions of the State to eliminate RDA, staff cannot assure that future years will remain at this level.

Comparison of Estimated Property Tax Received by the City With and Without RDA

(Generated from the total project area as amended)

| Property Tax with RDA (statutory pass through) | $3,471 |
| Property Tax without RDA                      | $201,594 |

ABX1 26 and ABX1 27 became effective immediately upon being signed by the Governor. CRA and the League of California Cities are preparing the lawsuit to challenge the constitutionality of the State’s recent actions. When filed, the lawsuit will also make a request for injunction, or stay, to enable agencies to continue operating while the case is being decided. Attachment 1 contains a more thorough listing of financial and operational impacts to the Redevelopment Agency/City in the event the City chooses to not retain the authority for redevelopment.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Approve Option 1 directing staff to bring back an Ordinance maintaining Redevelopment Project Area No. 1 as amended; and
2. Direct staff to make payments subject to ABX1 27.

ATTACHMENTS: 1. Slide Presentation
OBJECTIVES OF KEEPING REDEVELOPMENT
OBJECTIVES

- Keep Redevelopment alive until lawsuits are resolved (1 year minimum)
- Allow Agency to sell Remaining properties (4th St. and Stout)
- Transfer public parking lots to City
- Maintain local authority without having an oversight committee comprised of representatives throughout the County and/or Agencies within the County.
- In the amended area alone, RDA will generate $110 million in tax increment (net for projects), $77 million is for non-housing projects over a 45 year period
Objectives continued:

- **RDA retains a much greater amount of property tax in the City, otherwise a larger share goes to County and other taxing entities:**
  - **A. City share of property tax currently is 16.1% of 1%.**¹
  - **B. Agency receives 67% of 1% on increased property value plus the City will receive passthrough funds from RDA (estimated at approximately $8.8 million from amended area)¹**
  - **C. Without RDA, the General Fund would receive $17 million over 45 years.**¹ (RDA would receive $110 million).

¹ Numbers are for the Amended Area Only and do not include revenues associated with the original Project Area No. 1.
Objectives continued:

- Elimination of RDA will result in the loss of the loan payback amount of $1.8± million paid to the City in March, 2011 and the $4.2 million pledged as payback for public projects that benefitted the Redevelopment Project Area.

- Payments to schools under adopted legislation equates to approximately $5 million over 45 years.

- With RDA the County General Fund receives $19.5 Million, without RDA County General Fund would receive an additional $40 Million. There are also additional County Funds that would receive greater apportionments.

- The total amount distributed to other agencies outside of the community without RDA is $52 Million.
Objectives continued:

- Substantial investment made by the City to extend Redevelopment into blighted areas in order to provide improved infrastructure and other improvements.
FUNDING PLAN TO PAY STATE
ABX1 27
(Estimates)

2011/2012 Anticipated Payment to Schools: $317,000
2012/2013 Anticipated Payment to Schools: $ 80,000

2011/12:
Already Budgeted $ 80,000
Use Portion of Housing Set Aside 2011/12 $121,000
Sale of Agency Properties $116,000
$317,000

2012/2013:
Already Budgeted $ 80,000
COUNCIL AGENDA: JULY 19, 2011

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 2011-2012 Fiscal Year. The second Resolution provides preliminary approval to the Engineer’s Report for Fiscal Year 2011-2012. 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 2011-2012, and sets a Public Hearing on the assessments for August 2, 2011.

City Council has expressed concerns in the past regarding the lack of maintenance in several Landscape Maintenance Districts. City staff has initiated steps to improve those Districts. Examples of some improvements performed are District #5 at Westwood Estates, Wisconsin Manor and Porter Creek which include pruning of trees, planting and replacement of shrubbery, relocating and replacing irrigation. 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 2011-2012 was produced by City staff which saved approximately $7,700 in outside contractual expenses.
Staff recently went out for bid regarding the maintenance of each Landscape Maintenance District, the bids were very favorable and staff anticipates approximately $1,000 in savings per month. The result of the process is scheduled to be presented to council at a future meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS: 1. That the City Council adopt Resolutions:
   a. Ordering the preparation of an Engineer’s Report for the Landscape and Lighting Maintenance Districts for the Fiscal Year 2011-2012
   b. Giving preliminary approval to the Engineer’s Report for the Landscape and Lighting Maintenance Districts for Fiscal Year 2011-2012
   c. Declaring the intent to levy and collect assessments for Fiscal Year 2011-2012, and offering a time and place for hearing objections thereto.

2. Further, that the City Council set a public hearing for 6:30 PM on August 2, 2011 regarding the Engineer’s Report and proposed assessments for the Landscape and Lighting Maintenance Districts for Fiscal Year 2011-2012.

ATTACHMENTS: Resolution ordering preparation of Engineer’s Report

Resolution of preliminary approval to Engineer’s Report

Engineer’s Report for Fiscal Year 2011-2012

Resolution declaring intent to levy assessments & set public hearing
RESOLUTION NO.: ______

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
ORDERING THE PREPARATION OF AN ENGINEER’S REPORT FOR LANDSCAPE
AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012

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:

1. Baldomero Rodriguez is appointed “Engineer of Work” for preparation of the
   Engineer’s Report.

2. The Engineer of Work is ordered to prepare the report for Fiscal Year 2011-2012 in
   accordance with Article 4, Division 15, of the Streets and Highways Code,

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of July 2011.

________________________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: ___________________________________________
    Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
RESOLUTION NO.: ______-2011

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE GIVING
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF ENGINEER’S REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011-2012
FOR LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS

WHEREAS, on the 19th day of July, 2011 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 19th day of July 2011.

______________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: ____________________________
   Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
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 Julianne 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 2011-2012 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  
2011-2012 Fiscal Year  
Approved CPI 2000  
(Adjusted 2008)  
Maximum Assessment $15,625.27

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Maintenance: 13,650 sq. ft. of landscaping area $12,713.18  
Project Management, 126 lots

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**  
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $(89.55)
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 $15,520.43  
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:**

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

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

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $3,833.00

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 1,024,967 sq. ft. of landscaping area $920.45
Project Management, 7 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance ($2,338.99)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance: 1,024,967 sq. ft. of landscaping area</td>
<td>$2,958.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management, 7 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot</td>
<td>$1,028.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years</td>
<td>$314.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>$597.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost Per Year</td>
<td>$4,898.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Year Assessment</td>
<td>$3,833.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Assessment</td>
<td>$3,833.00</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. 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:

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

\[ A = \frac{$3,833.00}{1,024,967} = $0.00374 \text{ per sq. ft.} \]

Assess $0.00374 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  
2011-2012 Fiscal Year  
Maximum Assessment $8,000.00

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance: 22,100 sq. ft. of landscaping area</td>
<td>$5017.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management, 22 lots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance</td>
<td>$1,415.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance: 22,100 sq. ft. of landscaping area</td>
<td>$8,201.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management, 22 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot</td>
<td>$1,088.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years</td>
<td>$252.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>$1,431.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:**

\[ A = \frac{\text{Assessment per lot} \times L}{\text{Number of lots} + \text{Assessment for remainder parcel}} \]

The 2011-2012 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

\[ F = 8,000 \times 0.20 = 1,600.00 \text{ for remainder} \]

\[ A = \frac{8000 - 1600}{22} = 290.92 \text{ per lot in Unit One} \]
Annexation No. 3 - Porter Creek
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $27,255.81

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance: 89,200 sq. ft. of landscaping area, includes slough clean up</td>
<td>$23,757.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management, 177 lots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance</td>
<td>$6,163.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance: 89,200 sq. ft. of landscaping area, includes slough clean up</td>
<td>$24,971.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management, 177 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot</td>
<td>$1,708.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>$4,001.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:**

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

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

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 177.

**Estimated Annual Assessment**

- $133.58 per lot
Annexation No. 4 - La Vida Park
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $2,469.42

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 3,790 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: $1,957.35
Project Management, 17 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $308.33

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:

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

\[ A = \frac{2,469.42}{17} = 145.26 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 17.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[ A = 145.26 \text{ per lot} \]
Annexation No. 5 - Westwood Estates Unit 4, Unit 5 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $6,697.65

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 14,700 sq. ft. of landscaping area and $6,867.94
Project Management, 47 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance ($11,239.81)
Maintenance: 14,700 sq. ft. of landscaping area $6,524.80
Project Management, 47 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,188.00
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $1,041.54
Reserves $1,156.92
Estimated Cost Per Year $9,911.26
Previous Year Assessment $6,600.00
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:

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

\[
A = \frac{\$6,600.00}{47} = \$140.44 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 47.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = \$140.44 \text{ per lot}
\]
Annexation No. 6 - Northpointe Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $1,722.52

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 8 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, $753.96
Project Management, 81 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $6,310.11

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

A = \frac{$1,328.91}{81} = $16.42 per lot

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 81.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $16.42 per lot
Annexation No. 7 - Quail Park Phase II
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $410.40

*ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011*

- Maintenance: lighting: 2 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $111.66
- Project Management, 12 lots

*ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012*

Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $782.99

- 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 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 12.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = \$34.20 \text{ per lot}
\]
Annexation No. 8 - Westwood Park Unit 3 Subdivision  
2011-2012 Fiscal Year  
Maximum Assessment $2,481.27

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 28,460 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 5 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.  
Project Management, 36 lots  
$1420.96

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance  
$10,682.77

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) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

A = $2,481.27 / 36 = $68.92 per lot

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 36.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $68.92 per lot
Annexation No. 9 - Parcel Map 4132
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $396.47

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens. $87.59
Project Management, 2 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $1,943.94
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.

P1 = Portion to be assessed to Parcel 1 (developed parcel)
P2 = Portion to be assessed to Parcel 2
TA = Total Assessment ($)
AE = Administration and Engineering Cost
A1 = Area of Parcel 1 (acres)
L = Lighting Cost
T = Total area (acres)

\[
P2 = \frac{AE \times A1}{T} = \frac{349 \times 4.81}{6.61} = 253.96
\]

\[
P1 = AE - P2 + L = 349 - 253.96 + 47.47 = 142.52
\]

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

Estimated Assessment
P2 = $253.96
P1 = $142.52
ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 1,307 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 16 lots $1,170.06

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $4,707.55
Maintenance: 1,307 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $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) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

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

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $1,045.80

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**

Maintenance: lighting: 6 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 11 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, 2 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 63 lots

$790.79

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**

Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance

$5,320.14

Maintenance: lighting: 6 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 11 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, 2 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 63 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot

$686.87

Reserves

$589.00

$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 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 63.

Estimated Annual Assessment

A = $16.60 per lot
Annexation No. 12 - Sunrise Estates Phase 6 Subdivision  
2011-2012 Fiscal Year  
Maximum Assessment $1,429.00

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011  
Maintenance: 2,840 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 7 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 32 lots  
$1,938.67

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012  
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance  
($1,131.39)

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:

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

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

The total 2011-2012 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  
2011-2012 Fiscal Year  
Maximum Assessment $1,824.69

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**

Maintenance: 3,030 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 3 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 8 lots

$1,847.45

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**

Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance ($2,367.43)

| 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:**

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

\[
A = \frac{1,824.69}{8} = 228.08 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $2,816.00

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 5 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, Project Management, 59 lots
$258.77

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $7,277.58
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 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $1,803.34

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 8 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 8 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, $647.11
Project Management, 81 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $5,799.12

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

A = $1,233.75 = $15.24 per lot
81

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 81.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $15.24 per lot
Annexation No. 18 - Westwood Village Mobile Home Park Phase 1
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Maximum Assessment $787.35

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Maintenance: lighting; 5 ea. @ 16,000 lumens. $276.11
Project Management, 1 lots

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $3,036.83

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:**

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

\[ A = \frac{$672.37}{1} = $672.38 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 1.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[ A = $672.38 \text{ per lot} \]
Annexation No. 19 - Castle Woods Phase 1 Subdivision  
2011-2012 Fiscal Year  
Maximum Assessment $919.20

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Maintenance: lighting: 9 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.  
Project Management, 30 lots  
$779.29

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance  
$2,755.02

Maintenance: lighting: 9 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.  
Project Management, 30 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot  
$324.79  
$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) = Cost (C)  
Number of Lots (L)

\[ A = \frac{C}{L} \]

\[ A = \frac{849.83}{30} = 28.34 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 30.

Estimated Annual Assessment  
\[ A = 28.34 \text{ per lot} \]
District No. 2 - North Creek Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 1998
(Adjusted 1998)
Maximum Assessment $17,425.72

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011

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

$5,903.67

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012

Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance  

$33,144.54

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

$12,424.14  
$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:

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

A = $12,611.05 / 104 = $121.26 per lot

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 1998
(Adjusted 1998)
Maximum Assessment $1,329.18

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 10 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $396.63
Project Management, 56 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $3,704.46

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:
\[
A = \frac{Cost (C)}{Number of Lots (L)}
\]
\[
A = \frac{913.61}{56} = 16.32 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 56.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = 16.32 per lot
**District No. 4 - River Springs Phase 1 Subdivision**  
**2011-2012 Fiscal Year**  
**Approved CPI 2003**  
(Adjusted 2003)  
Maximum Assessment $3,134.58

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**  
Maintenance: 2,100 sq. ft. of landscaping area  
Project Management, 51 lots  
$3,558.18

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**  
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance  
$3,073.56

Maintenance: 2,100 sq. ft. of landscaping area  
Project Management, 51 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot  
$2,335.18  
$1,204.00  
$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 = $2,719.14 = $53.32 per lot  
51

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2002
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $1,021.48

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 1,715 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 8 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 25 lots

\[ \text{Maintenance cost} = 1,715 \times 5,800 \times 8 = 1,083.11 \]

Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance

\[ \text{Projected fund balance} = $1,336.96 \]

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

\[ \text{Maintenance cost} = 1,715 \times 5,800 \times 8 = 1,308.26 \]

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

\[ \text{Project Management cost} = 25 \times 1000 + 25 \times 4.00 = 1,100.00 \]

Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years

\[ \text{Reserves} = 1,004.41 \times 10 = 361.24 \]

Estimated Cost Per Year

\[ \text{Estimated Cost Per Year} = 2,869.25 \]

Previous Year Assessment

\[ \text{Previous Year Assessment} = 1,004.41 \]

New Assessment

\[ \text{New Assessment} = 1,004.41 \]

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:

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

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

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 25.

Estimated Annual Assessment

\[ A = 40.18 \text{ per lot} \]
**District No. 6 - Creekview Subdivision**
**2011-2012 Fiscal Year**
**Approved CPI 1999**
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $4,869.30

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Maintenance: 23,600 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 5 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 19 lots

$4,567.95

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance

($21,643.67)

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

$4,869.30

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:**

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

\[ A = \frac{\$4,869.30}{19} = \$256.28 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 19.

Estimated Annual Assessment

\[ A = \$256.28 \text{ per lot} \]
District No. 7 - Ford Estates Phase 1 Subdivison
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 1999
(Adjusted 1999)
Maximum Assessment $2,857.88

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 1,365 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800
lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens, Project Management, 20 lots $1,402.32

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $7,595.80
Maintenance: 1,365 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800
lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens. $1,872.07
Project Management, 20 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $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 = $6.94 per foot
311.72 feet

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 = $67.88 per lot
109 lots

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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $5,043.35

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
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

$1,505.57

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance

$19,905.53

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 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 1999
(Adjusted 1999)
Maximum Assessment $1,301.23

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 10 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $396.63
Project Management, 56 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $4,777.81
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:

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

\[
A = \frac{$913.61}{56} = $16.32 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 56.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $16.32 per lot
District No. 10 - Orchard Ridge Phase 4 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $359.99

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting; 4 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $204.17
Project Management, 19 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $281.77

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:

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

A = $312.28 / 19 = $16.44 per lot

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 19.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $16.44 per lot
District No. 11 - Orchard Ridge Phase 5 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 1999
(Adjusted 1999)
Maximum Assessment $1,591.70

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 14 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $539.07
Project Management, 76 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $5,691.75
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) = \[ \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}} \]

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

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 1999
(Adjusted 1999)
Maximum Assessment $9,734.35

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 19,112 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 12 ea. @ 5,800 $4,547.67
lumens, 4 ea. @ 16,000 lumens and Project Management, 34 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $19,900.25
Maintenance: 19,112 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 12 ea. @ 5,800 $8,290.17
lumens, 4 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 34 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,136.00
Reserves $1,413.93
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:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
                Number of Lots (L)

A = $7,368.84 = $216.74 per lot
    34

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003 (Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $2,478.95

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Maintenance: 1,000 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 7 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 35 lots

$358.17

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance

$15,546.45

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 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 35.

Estimated Annual Assessment

\[ A = \$61.44 \text{ per lot} \]
District No. 14 - River Springs Phase 2 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $1,199.37

*Estimated Accumulated Costs 2010-2011*
Maintenance: lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $432.23
Project Management, 50 lots

*Estimated Costs 2009-2010*
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $4,820.24
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:*
Assessment (A) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

A = $926.43 / 50 = $18.54 per lot

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 50.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $18.54 per lot
District No. 15 - Meadowood Phase 1 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2001
(Adjusted 2001)
Maximum Assessment $8,191.95

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
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

$6,430.30

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance

$23,436.89

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 = $6,810.24 / 48 = $141.88 per lot

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 48.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $141.88 per lot
District No. 16 - New Expressions Phase 2 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2001
(Adjusted 2001)
Maximum Assessment $6,712.19

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Maintenance: 5,800 sq. ft. of landscaping area, playground area 30%, and lighting: 13 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 54 lots

$4,011.67

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance

$28,131.96

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:**

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

\[
A = \frac{5,580.07}{54} = 103.34 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 54.

Estimated Annual Assessment

\[
A = 103.34 \text{ per lot}
\]
**District No. 17 - Orchard Ridge Phase 6 Subdivision**
**2011-2012 Fiscal Year**
**Approved CPI 2007**
(Adjusted 2007)
Maximum Assessment $633.36

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Maintenance: lighting: 7 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $421.80
Project Management, 32 lots

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $488.39
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:**

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

\[
A = \frac{$617.82}{32} = $19.30 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 32.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = $19.30 \text{ per lot}
\]
District No. 18 - Ohio North Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $190.26

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 2 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $111.66
Project Management, 10 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2009-2010
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance ($292.32)
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 $190.26
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:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

A = $190.26 ÷ 10 = $19.04 per lot

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 10.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $19.04 per lot
**District No. 19 - Williams Ranch Phase 1 Subdivision**
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2002
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $7,027.83

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Maintenance: 13,910 sq. ft. of landscaping area and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 2 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, Project Management, 41 lots

$6,284.23

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance

$4,856.67

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:**

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

\[ A = \frac{6,910.35}{41} = 168.54 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2007)
Maximum Assessment $280.32

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 3 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 1 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, Project Management, 10 lots $187.49

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $122.32
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)

\[ A = \frac{\$265.74}{10} = \$26.56 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 10.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[ A = \$26.56 \text{ per lot} \]
District No. 21 - Orchard Ridge Phase 7 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $1,728.51

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
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

$1,354.14

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $101.11

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

A = $1,699.62

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $5,604.37

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
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
$753.99

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance
$28,922.44

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.
$4,760.63
Project Management, 55 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot
$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:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

A = $4,861.60 = $88.40 per lot
55

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 55.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $88.40 per lot
District No. 23 - River View Phase 3 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2002
(Adjusted 2002)
Maximum Assessment $840.44

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $574.80
Project Management, 36 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $2,330.42
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 / 36 = $19.82 per lot

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 36.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $19.82 per lot
District No. 24 - Orchard Ridge Phase 8 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $2,607.14

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
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 $4,109.28

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2009 fund balance ($7,679.91)

Maintenance: 3,538 sq. ft. of landscaping area (44/74 of 5950 sq. ft) and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $2,137.21
Project Management, 44 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,176.00
Eliminate Deficit Fund Balance over 10 years $301.71
Reserves $496.98

Estimated Cost Per Year $4,111.90
Previous Year Assessment $2,607.14
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{Cost (C)}{Number of Lots (L)}
A = \frac{$2,607.14}{44} = $59.26 \text{ per lot}

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 44.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $59.26 \text{ per lot}
District No. 25 - Casas del Rio Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2003
(Adjusted 2003)
Maximum Assessment $33,112.96

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 55,950 sq. ft. of landscaping area $11,694.12
Project Management, 118 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $107,611.67
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:

\[
A = \frac{28,724.33}{118} = 243.42 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 118.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[
A = 243.42 \text{ per lot}
\]
District No. 26 - Orchard Ridge Phase 9 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2004
(Adjusted 2004)
Maximum Assessment $910.98

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 10 ea. @ 5,800 lumens,
Project Management, 47 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance
Maintenance: lighting: 10 ea. @ 5,800 lumens
Project Management, 47 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot
Reserves
Estimated Cost Per Year
Previous Year Assessment
New Assessment

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 / 47 = $16.82 per lot

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 47.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $16.82 per lot
District No. 27 - New Expressions Phase 3 Subdivision  
2011-2012 Fiscal Year  
Approved CPI 2004  
(Adjusted 2004)  
Maximum Assessment $2,133.62

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Maintenance: 748 sq. ft. of landscaping area berm, wall, and 30% of playground, and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 50 lots  
$1,202.23

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance  
$5,678.69

Maintenance: 748 sq. ft. of landscaping area berm, wall, and 30% of playground, and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, Project Management, 50 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot  
$1,682.93
$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:**

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

\[
A = \frac{$1,860.09}{50} = $37.20 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 50.

Estimated Annual Assessment  
\[
A = $37.20 \text{ per lot}
\]
District No. 28 - Meadowood Phase 3 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2004
(Adjusted 2004)
Maximum Assessment $1,808.45

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 17 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 9 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, $887.22
Project Management, 78 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $3,222.46
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:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

A = $1,547.89 / 78 = $19.84 per lot

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2007)
Maximum Assessment $751.74

*ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011*

Maintenance: lighting: 9 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $360.99
Project Management, 36 lots

*ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012*

Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $1,148.58

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:**

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

\[
A = \frac{\$712.64}{36} = $19.80 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2006
(Adjusted 2006)
Maximum Assessment $16,773.66

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 26,639 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 2739 feet of wall, and lighting:
23 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 4 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, 5 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 56 lots $12,103.38

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $28,472.39

Maintenance: 26,639 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 2739 feet of wall, and lighting:
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 $14,949.89
$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) = \text{Cost (C)} \div \text{Number of Lots (L)}
A = \frac{15,408.17}{56} = $275.14 per lot

The total 2011-2012 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**

**2011-2012 Fiscal Year**

**Approved CPI 2006**

(Adjusted 2006)

Maximum Assessment $2,303.51

---

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**

Maintenance: 6,512 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 437 feet of wall, and lighting: $2,617.33

24 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 2 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.

Project Management, 85 lots

---

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**

Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $(707.86)

Maintenance: 6,512 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 437 feet of wall, and lighting: $1,674.51

24 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 2 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.

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 $2,303.51

New Assessment $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:**

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

\[
A = \frac{$2,303.51.00}{85} = $27.10 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 85.

Estimated Annual Assessment

A = $27.10 per lot
District No. 32 - Sunrise Villa Phases 1-3 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2006
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $1,513.54

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 13 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $ 638.49
Project Management, 54 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance ($576.90)

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 $1,513.54*
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:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C) / Number of Lots (L)

\[ A = \frac{\$1,513.54}{54} = \$28.02 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 54.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $28.02 per lot
District No. 33 - New Expressions Phase 4 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2006
(Adjusted 2006)
Maximum Assessment $1,504.87

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Maintenance: 220 ft. of wall and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 2 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, Project Management, 58 lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$512.67</td>
<td>$512.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3,440.31</td>
<td>$3,440.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance: 220 ft. of wall and lighting: 11 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 2 ea. @ 9,500 lumens
Project Management, 58 lots at $400 + $3.00 per lot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$547.60</td>
<td>$547.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$574.00</td>
<td>$574.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reserves**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$56.08</td>
<td>$56.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Cost Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,177.68</td>
<td>$1,177.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Year Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,168.07</td>
<td>$1,168.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,168.07</td>
<td>$1,168.07</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:**

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

\[A = \frac{\$1,168.07}{58} = \$20.14\text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 58.

Estimated Annual Assessment

\[A = \$20.14\text{ per lot}\]
District No. 34 - Meadow Breeze Phase 1 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2006
(Ajusted 2006)
Maximum Assessment $1,928.30

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**
Maintenance: lighting: 14 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 5 ea. @ 9,500 lumens, Project Management, 78 lots $1,378.57

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $2,872.44

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:**

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

\[
A = \frac{$1,300.31}{78} = $16.68 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2006
(Adjusted 2006)
Maximum Assessment $1,001.39

*Estimated Accumulated Costs 2010-2011*
Maintenance: lighting: 9 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $740.17
Project Management, 44 lots

*Estimated Costs 2011-2012*
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $638.05
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:
\[
\text{Assessment (A)} = \frac{\text{Cost (C)}}{\text{Number of Lots (L)}},
\]
\[
A = \frac{$844.08}{44} = $19.18 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2006
(Adjusted 2007)
Maximum Assessment $508.84

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 5 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $218.50
Project Management, 17 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $681.47
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 $243.00

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:

\[
A = \frac{C \times L}{17}
\]

\[A = \frac{496.36 \times 17}{17} = 29.20 \text{ per lot}\]

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $529.89

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 2 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $111.66
Project Management, 6 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $970.67

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 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2007)
Maximum Assessment $1,207.85

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 17 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $645.92
Project Management, 59 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $1,288.55
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:

\[
A = \frac{C}{L} \times L
\]

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

\[
A = \frac{1,145.10}{59} = 19.40 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 59.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $19.40 per lot
District No. 40 - Amalene Estates Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2007
(Adjusted 2007)
Maximum Assessment $7,648.22

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
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

$2,810.65

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance

$14,919.53

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

$1,212.00

Reserves

$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:

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

\[
A = \frac{6,714.72}{53} = 126.70 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 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 x Number Lots proposed Remainder (I.R) - Number Lights proposed for Remainder x $30.21

\[
AR = 126.70 \times 29 - 6 \times 30.21 = 3493.82
\]

Assessment = $126.70 ea for 24 developed lots and $3493.82 for the remainder
Total Assessment for 2011-2012 = $6,534.62
Total developed lot count is 24 lots plus a remainder.
District No. 41 - Beverly Glenn Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2008
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $645.60

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: lighting: 3 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, $147.30
Project Management, 19 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $737.80
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:
Assessment (A) = Cost (C)
Number of Lots (L)

A = $575.01 = $30.26 per lot
19

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2008
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $24,331.14

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 43,873 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 330 ft. of wall, and lighting:
14 ea. @ 5,800 lumens,
Project Management, 48 lots
$4,237.41

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance
$39,289.96

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 = $494.46 per lot
48

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2008
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $18,564.42

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 27,960 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 2614 ft. of wall, and lighting: $1,459.79
28 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 8 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 61 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $31,442.32

Maintenance: 27,960 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 2614 ft. of wall, and lighting: $14,857.74
28 ea. @ 5,800 lumens, 8 ea. @ 16,000 lumens.
Project Management, 61 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $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:

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

\[ A = \frac{18,231.39}{61} = 298.88 \text{ per lot} \]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is 61.

Estimated Annual Assessment
\[ A = 298.88 \text{ per lot} \]
District No. 44 - Summit Estates Phase 1 Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2008
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $5,629.48

**ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011**
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 $2,350.12

**ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012**
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $10,086.70
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:**

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

\[
A = \frac{5,491.45}{70} = 78.44 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 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
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2008
(Adjusted 2008)
Maximum Assessment $14,396.67

*ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011*
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

*ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012*
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $16,645.65
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:**

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

\[
A = \frac{14,043.67}{88} = 159.58 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 assessment will be spread based upon the number of lots. Total lot count is
88.

Estimated Annual Assessment
A = $159.58 per lot
District No. 46 – Moorea Manor Subdivision
2011-2012 Fiscal Year
Approved CPI 2009
(Ajusted 2009)
Maximum Assessment $

ESTIMATED ACCUMULATED COSTS 2010-2011
Maintenance: 1,460 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 286 ft. of wall, and lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $1,246.05
Project Management, 88 lots

ESTIMATED COSTS 2011-2012
Projected July 1, 2011 fund balance $1,898.34
Maintenance: 1,460 sq. ft. of landscaping area, 286 ft. of wall, and lighting: 4 ea. @ 5,800 lumens $2,590.16
Project Management, 16 lots at $1000 + $4.00 per lot $1,064.00
Reserves $548.12
Estimated Cost Per Year $4,202.28
Previous Year Assessment $4,202.28
New Assessment $4,202.28

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

\[
A = \frac{\$4,202.28}{16} = \$262.64 \text{ per lot}
\]

The total 2011-2012 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 2011-2012 Landscape and Lighting District Engineer’s Report.
Baldomero Rodriguez, RCE 45304

[Signature]
RESOLUTION NO.: _____-2011

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 2011-2012 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
No. 5.

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. 46" 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 2011-2012 Fiscal Year" will be filed in the Office of the City Clerk of said City, and prepared for the 2011-2012 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 2nd day of August, 2011, at the hour of 6:30 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 19th day of July 2011.

__________________________________________
Ronald L. Irish, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk
By:
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk