Call to Order
Roll Call

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

JOINT CITY COUNCIL / SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE PORTERVILLE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AGENDA
291 N. MAIN STREET, PORTERVILLE, CA

Roll Call: Agency Members/Chairman

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
This is the opportunity to address the City Council and/or Successor 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.

JOINT CITY COUNCIL/AGENCY CLOSED SESSION:
A. Closed Session Pursuant to:
   1- Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation: County of Tulare v. All Persons Interested in the Matter of the Addition of the 2010 Amendment to Redevelopment Plan for the Redevelopment Project Area No. 1, as Adopted by Ordinance 1765 on June 15, 2010, by the City of Porterville, et al., Tulare County Superior Court Case No. 249877.

During Closed Session, the Joint Council/Successor Agency Meeting shall adjourn to a Meeting of the Porterville City Council.

CITY COUNCIL CLOSED SESSION:
B. Closed Session Pursuant to:
   1 - Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation: City of Porterville v. County of Tulare et al., Tulare County Superior Court No. 249043.

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

Pledge of Allegiance Led by Council Member Hamilton
Invocation
PRESENTATIONS

Employee of the Month
Downtown Library Turns 60

AB 1234 REPORTS

This is the time for all AB 1234 reports required pursuant to Government Code § 53232.3.

2. Consolidated Waste Management Authority (CWMA) – February 21, 2013 (cancelled)
3. Tulare County Economic Development Corporation – February 27, 2013
4. Indian Gaming Local Community Benefit Committee – February 21, 2013

REPORTS

This is the time for all committee/commission/board reports; subcommittee reports; and staff informational items.

I. City Commission and Committee Meetings:
   1. Arts Commission – February 20, 2013
   2. Youth Commission – February 25, 2013

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. Minutes of February 19, 2013
2. Request for Approval to Purchase a Storage Area Network Appliance
   Re: Considering approval to purchase one “Dell EqualLogic PS6510X” SAN appliance at a cost of $31,675.97.
3. Authorization to Distribute Requests for Qualifications for the Design of an Integrated Security System
   Re: Considering authorization to distribute a Request for Qualifications for the architectural/engineering design of an integrated security system.
4. Authorization to Distribute Requests for Qualifications for Transit Program Updates
   Re: Considering authorization to distribute a Request for Qualifications for transit program updates.
5. **Award of Contract – West Street CalEMA Repair Project**  
Re: Considering awarding contract in the amount of $29,997.25 to Greg Bartlett Construction of Porterville, for the project consisting of the repair of areas on West Street damaged during the December 2010 floods.

6. **Award of Contract – Veteran’s Park Booster Pump Project – Additions of Pump #2 & #3**  
Re: Considering awarding contract in the amount of $155,215.00 to Valley Pump & Dairy Systems of Tulare, for the project consisting of the installation of above ground 12” water main, booster pumps, electrical equipment, SCADA integration and related appurtenances at the booster pump plant located within Veteran’s Park.

7. **Rescheduling the Public Hearing on the Formation of the Sewer Utility District Area 458**  
Re: Considering approval to reschedule the Public Hearing from April 2, 2013, to April 16, 2013, pursuant to Proposition 218 Guidelines, for consideration to form Sewer Utility District 458.

8. **Short-Term Work Plan for the Arts Commission and Approval of the Proposed Mural Theme**  
Re: Considering approval of a proposed Work Plan and Mural Theme, and authorization to negotiate the term of a façade easement with the property owner at 134 E. Oak Avenue.

9. **Jaye Street Bridge Widening Project – Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Mitigation**  
Re: Considering authorization to finalize a purchase agreement with Wildlands to provide a mitigation solution for Jaye Street Bridge Widening Project.

10. **Authorization to Travel**  
Re: Considering approval of staff travel to Las Vegas, Nevada, for an estimated cost of $2,400, for the purpose of attending the International Council of Shopping Centers Conference.

11. **Central Valley Racing Proposal**  
Re: Considering approval of the Motocross Race Proposal to hold a series of races at the Porterville OHV Park in 2013.

12. **Approval for Community Civic Event – Porterville Pregnancy Resource Center – Bike and Skate for Life – April 6, 2013**  
Re: Considering approval of an event to take place at the Skate Park on April 6, 2013, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m..

13. **Review of Local Emergency Status**  
Re: Reviewing the City’s status of local emergency pursuant to Article 14, Section 8630 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. **Vacation of Easements for Ingress, Egress, Storm Drain Pipeline and Storm Water Retention Related to Sierra Meadows Subdivision (Nicholson & Smee, LLC)**
Re: Consideration of a Resolution of Vacation of easements generally located between Indiana Street and State Route 65, north of Gibbons Avenue.

15. Consideration of Modification or Revocation of Conditional Use Permit 8-82 (Resolution 13-2008)
Re: Consideration of circumstances relative to deviations from approved plans for the construction of a drive-through restaurant and drive-thru coffee kiosk located 815 E. Putnam Avenue.

16. Pacific Rim Commercial Mixed Use Project (PRC 2012-002), Generally Located West of the Southwest Corner of Henderson Avenue and Newcomb Street
Re: Consideration of General Plan Amendment 2012-002, Zone Change 2012-002, and Tentative Parcel map 2012-002 to facilitate development of a vacant 23.4± acre site with a commercial mixed use project.

SECOND READINGS
17. Ordinance 1795, Interference with Administrative Functions of the City
Re: Second Reading of Ordinance No. 1795, An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Porterville Adding Sections 2-6.1 and 2-6.2 to Chapter 2, Article I of the Porterville Municipal Code regarding Council Manic Interference with Administrative Functions of the City, which was given first reading on February 19, 2013, and has been printed.

SCHEDULED MATTERS
18. Consider Adoption of a Resolution of Support for the Enterprise Zone Program and Opposition to Regulatory Reform that Adversely Effects the Program
Re: Consideration of a resolution supporting the Enterprise Zone Program and opposing proposed regulatory changes.

Adjourn to a meeting of the Porterville Public Improvement Corporation.

PORTERVILLE PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT CORPORATION AGENDA
291 N. MAIN STREET, PORTERVILLE, CA 93257

Roll Call: Directors/President

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

SCHEDULED MATTERS
PIC-01 Consideration of Refinancing 2005 Certificates of Participation (COP)
Re: Consideration of the refunding of the 2005 COP through direct lending by Rabobank.

Adjourn to a Joint Meeting of the Porterville City Council and Successor Agency to the Porterville Redevelopment Agency.
Roll Call: Agency Members/Chairman

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

SCHEDULED MATTERS
SA-01. Amendment to the Administrative Budget and the Recognized Obligated Payment Schedule
Re: Informational report regarding the Successor Agency Oversight Board’s approval of an increase of $15,000 to the Professional Services budget.

SA-02. Supplemental Professional Legal Services Fee Agreement
Re: Considering approval of the Fee Agreement for Professional Legal Services with Stradling, Yocca, Carlson & Rauth for representation of the City, City Council and the Successor Agency in litigation with the County of Tulare regarding the 2010 Amendment to Redevelopment Plan for the Redevelopment Project Area No. 1.

Adjourn to a meeting of the Porterville City Council.

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 March 19, 2013.

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

Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the City Council after distribution of the Agenda packet are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Office of City Clerk, 291 North Main Street, Porterville, CA 93257, and on the City’s website at www.ci.porterville.ca.us.
Called to Order at 5:30 p.m.
Roll Call: Council Member Ward (arrived at 5:31 p.m.), Council Member Shelton, Council Member Hamilton, Vice Mayor McCracken, Mayor Gurrola

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

JOINT CITY COUNCIL / SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE PORTERVILLE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AGENDA
291 N. MAIN STREET, PORTERVILLE, CA

Roll Call: Agency Member Ward, Agency Member Shelton, Agency Member Hamilton, Vice Chair McCracken, Chair Gurrola

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
None

JOINT CITY COUNCIL/AGENCY CLOSED SESSION:
A. Closed Session Pursuant to:
   1- Government Code Section 54956.9(a) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation: County of Tulare v. All Persons Interested in the Matter of the Addition of the 2010 Amendment to Redevelopment Plan for the Redevelopment Project Area No. 1, as Adopted by Ordinance 1765 on June 15, 2010, by the City of Porterville, et al., Tulare County Superior Court Case No. 249877.

During Closed Session, the Joint Council/Successor Agency Meeting shall adjourn to a Meeting of the Porterville City Council.

CITY COUNCIL CLOSED SESSION:
B. Closed Session Pursuant to:
   1- Government Code Section 54956.9(a) – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation: City of Porterville v. County of Tulare et al., Tulare County Superior Court No. 249043.
6:30 P.M. RECONVENE OPEN SESSION
REPORT ON ANY COUNCIL ACTION TAKEN IN CLOSED SESSION
City Attorney Lew reported on the following action:

B-3: On a motion by Council Member Ward, seconded by Council Member Hamilton, the Council rejected the claim filed by Allstate Insurance Company, referred the matter to the City’s claims adjustor; and directed the City Clerk to give the Claimant proper notice. The motion carried unanimously.

Documentation: M.O. 01-021913
Disposition: Claim rejected.

B-4: On a motion by Council Member Hamilton, seconded by Vice Mayor McCracken, the Council rejected the claim filed by Ricardo Gonzalez, referred the matter to the City’s claims adjustor; and directed the City Clerk to give the Claimant proper notice. The motion carried unanimously.

Documentation: M.O. 02-021913
Disposition: Claim rejected.

(At the conclusion of Closed Session, Council Member Ward left the meeting for its remainder.)

Pledge of Allegiance Led by Council Member Shelton
Invocation – the Mayor participated.

AB 1234 REPORTS
This is the time for all AB 1234 reports required pursuant to Government Code § 53232.3.

1. Tulare County Local Agency Formation Committee (LAFCO) – February 6, 2013: Council Member Hamilton reported on discussion regarding Visalia’s Municipal Service Review.
2. Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) – February 19, 2013: Council Member Hamilton reported on the presentation of a Caltrans report of upcoming projects to the board.

REPORTS
This is the time for all committee/commission/board reports; subcommittee reports; and staff informational items.

I. City Commission and Committee Meetings:
   2. Youth Commission – February 11, 2013: Commissioners Bowles and Young of Monache High School reported on the commission’s recent dodge ball
tournament, and their upcoming Youth Voice Conference.

3. Library and Literacy Commission – February 12, 2013: Commissioner Bailey reported on the commission’s recent receipt of information relative to the site requirement process for a new library facility; and spoke of January highlights.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

- Brock Neeley, Porterville resident, advised of Suicide Prevention Task Force meeting dates and training opportunities relative to Parliamentary Procedures; spoke with regard to comments made by Mr. Joe Faure at the meeting of February 5, 2013; expressed concerns regarding Item Nos. 7 and 18.
- Patricia Young, spoke of concerns relative to Item 16, specifically the accessibility of the City Manager and staff to members of the public; and requested a copy of the draft ordinance in its entirety.
- Ken Lansford, Porterville, owner of the property located at 200 N. D Street, spoke of his discontent over interactions with City staff regarding the installation of a chain link fence around his property.
- Charlotte Salas, 685 W. Henderson, indicated that her daughter had worked as a communications dispatcher for the City of Porterville for ten years, and expressed her opinion that the dispatchers were understaffed and underappreciated.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Items 4, 5, 7, 10, 11 and 13 were pulled for further discussion. Council Member Shelton indicated that he would be abstaining from voting on Item No. 14 due to a conflict of interest relative to property ownership.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Vice Mayor McCracken, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton that the City Council approve Item Nos. 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 12 and 14; noting the abstention of Council Member Shelton from Item No. 14.

1. MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 5, 2013

Recommendation: That the City Council approve the Minutes of February 5, 2013.

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

Documentation: M.O. 03-021913
Disposition: Approved.

2. AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS – 2013/2014 FISCAL YEAR MICRO-SURFACING PROJECT

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Approve Staff’s recommended Plans and Project Manual for the 2013/2014 Micro-Surfacing Project;
2. Approve the advancement of 2013/2014 “Local” Measure ‘R’ Funds as approved by TCAG; and
3. Authorize staff to advertise for bids on the project.

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

Documentation: M.O. 04-021913
Disposition: Approved.

3. AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS – UNDERGROUND WASTE OIL STORAGE TANK MONITORING SYSTEM

Recommendation: That City Council authorize staff to advertise for bids on the installation of a new monitoring system for the underground waste oil storage tank.

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

Documentation: M.O. 05-021913
Disposition: Approved.

6. AUTHORIZE STAFF TO PURCHASE ADDITIONAL ROUTEMATCH PASSENGER INFORMATION MODULES

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Authorize staff to begin negotiations for the purchase of the three additional RouteMatch modules; and
2. Authorize payment upon satisfactory delivery of the equipment.

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

Documentation: M.O. 06-021913
Disposition: Approved.

8. AUTHORIZATION TO DISTRIBUTE REQUESTS FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE DESIGN OF TRANSIT SIGNAL PRIORITY
Recommendation: That the City Council authorize staff to distribute a Request for Qualifications for the design of a transit signal priority system.

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

Documentation: M.O. 07-021913
Disposition: Approved.

9. CITIZENS’ ADVISORY AND HOUSING OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Adopt the 2013 Citizen Participation Plan; and
2. Appoint existing committee members Pat Contreras, Doug Heudsens, Linda Olmedo, Grace Munoz-Rios, John Dennis, Rebecca Vigil, and Kelly Jo Lowe to the Citizens’ Advisory and Housing Opportunity Committee for a one-year term.

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

Documentation: M.O. 08-021913
Disposition: Approved.

12. LANDSCAPE AND LIGHTING MAINTENANCE DISTRICTS CONSOLIDATION

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Authorize staff to take steps to consolidate Westwood Estates, Westwood Estates Unit 4, Phase 5, and Westwood Estates Unit 5, Phase 2;
2. Authorize staff to prepare an Engineer’s Report reflecting the consolidation;
3. Set a Public Hearing for April 16, 2013; and
4. Adopt a resolution ordering the proceedings for the consolidation.

AYES: Shelton, Hamilton, McCracken, Gurrola
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Ward
14. REVIEW OF LOCAL EMERGENCY STATUS

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Receive the status report and review of the designated local emergency; and
2. Pursuant to the requirements of Article 14, Section 8630 of the California Emergency Services Act, determine that a need exists to continue said local emergency designation.

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

Documentation: M.O. 09-021913
Disposition: Approved.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

15. CONSIDERATION OF FACTFINDING REPORT PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 3505.5 AND 3505.7

Recommendation: That the City Council consider and accept the advisory factfinding report; and reaffirm the status quo.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and the staff report was presented by Administrative Services Director Hildreth.

The public hearing was opened at 7:06 p.m.

- Doug Gorman, spoke in opposition to the report’s findings, and spoke of the importance of dispatchers.
- Brock Neeley, Porterville, spoke in favor of staffing the dispatch center for hypothetical situations that could occur.
- Charlotte Salas, 685 W. Henderson, indicated that her daughter had worked as a communications dispatcher for the City of Porterville for ten years, and expressed her opinion that the dispatchers were understaffed and underappreciated.

The public hearing was closed at 7:12 p.m.

The Council discussed: comments made by Mr. Gorman; dispatcher work load prior to and subsequent to providing dispatching services to the City of Lindsay; the findings of the report; and the importance of the work performed by dispatchers.
COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Vice Mayor McCracken, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton that the City Council accept the advisory factfinding report; and reaffirm the status quo.

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

Documentation: M.O. 10-021913
Disposition: Approved.

16. CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE ADDING PENALTY PROVISIONS TO THE MUNICIPAL CODE RELATED TO CHARTER SECTION 67 PERTAINING TO INTERFERENCE

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Hold the public hearing to receive public comments;
2. Adopt the draft Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Porterville Adding Sections 2-6.1 and 2-6.2 to Chapter 2, Article I of the Porterville Municipal Code Regarding Council Manic Interference with Administrative Functions of the City; and
3. Give first reading of the ordinance, and order it to print.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and the staff report was presented by Administrative Services Director Hildreth. Following the report, City Attorney Lew clarified that the draft Ordinance would not change existing Charter provisions, but add penalty provisions to the Municipal Code for violations.

The public hearing was opened at 7:29 p.m.

- Patricia Young, Porterville, spoke of concerns regarding the accessibility of the City Manager and staff to members of the public; and requested clarification regarding the Council’s ability to communicate with department heads and staff.

The public hearing was closed at 7:33 p.m.

The Council elaborated on the difference between contacting and directing members of staff.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Vice Mayor McCracken, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton that the City Council adopt the draft Ordinance, being AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE ADDING SECTIONS 2-6.1 AND 2-6.2 TO CHAPTER 2, ARTICLE I OF THE PORTERVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING COUNCIL MANIC INTERFERENCE WITH
ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS OF THE CITY; give first reading of the ordinance, and order it to print.

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

The ordinance was read by title only.

Documentation: Ordinance 1795
Disposition: Approved.

The Council recessed for ten minutes at 7:37 p.m.

17. MODIFICATION OF VESTED PARCEL MAP NO. 4996 (JAYE STREET CROSSING COMMERCIAL CENTER)

Recommendation: That the City Council review and consider adoption of the draft resolution approving the modification to Vested Parcel Map 4996 subject to conditions of approval.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and the staff report was presented by Community Development Manager Philips.

The public hearing was opened 7:48 p.m.

- John Hale, JLH Properties, requested approval of the item and stated that he was available for questions.

The public hearing was closed at 7:49 p.m.

Following an inquiry from Council Member Shelton, staff elaborated on the benefits and disadvantages of vesting.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Vice Mayor McCracken, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton that the City Council adopt the draft resolution approving the modification to Vested Parcel Map 4996 subject to conditions of approval.

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

Documentation: Resolution 10-2013
Scheduled Matters

18. Parks and Leisure Services Commission Vacancy

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Appoint Mr. Eric Mendoza to fill the seat vacated by Mr. James Carson with a term scheduled to expire in October 2015; or
2. Direct staff to solicit applications to fill the seat vacated by Mr. Carson, and bring the item back to the Council for appointment.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and the staff report was presented by Parks and Leisure Services Director Moore. Mr. Moore added that Mr. Mendoza had initially requested appointment back in 2011, and had since become a registered voter.

Council Member noted Mr. Mendoza’s attendance at the meeting and spoke in favor of his appointment.

Council Action: MOVED by Vice Mayor McCracken, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton that the City Council appoint Mr. Eric Mendoza to fill the seat vacated by Mr. James Carson with a term scheduled to expire in October 2015.

Ayes: Shelton, Hamilton, McCracken, Gurrola
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Ward

Consent Calendar (Items Removed for Further Discussion)

4. Award of Contract – Jaye Street Bus Turnout

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Award the Jaye Street Bus Turnout Project to Halopoff & Sons in the amount of $72,906.46; and
2. Authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen construction costs and $7,000 for construction management, quality control and inspection.

City Manager Lollis 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 state that he was happy to see a local contractor awarded the project.

Council Action: MOVED by Council Member Shelton, SECONDED by Vice Mayor McCracken that the City Council award the Jaye Street Bus Turnout
Project to Halopoff & Sons in the amount of $72,906.46; and authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen construction costs and $7,000 for construction management, quality control and inspection.

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

Documentation: M.O. 12-021913
Disposition: Approved.

5. REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO PURCHASE SPECIALIZED EQUIPMENT

Recommendation: That the City Council approve the purchase of one “Phase 1 Drager Swede System-Flashover” at a cost of $37,080.00, plus applicable sales tax.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and the staff report was waived at the Council’s request. Council Member Shelton, who pulled the item for discussion, commended staff for the proposed assembly and site work.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Shelton, SECONDED by Vice Mayor McCracken that the City Council approve the purchase of one “Phase 1 Drager Swede System-Flashover” at a cost of $37,080.00, plus applicable sales tax.

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

Documentation: M.O. 13-021913
Disposition: Approved.

7. NEGOTIATE A CONTRACT – DESIGN SERVICES FOR THE SOFTBALL AND SPORTS FIELD LIGHTING PROJECT

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Authorize the Public Works Director and/or City Engineer to negotiate a contract with Electrical Power Systems for design services related to the Softball and Sports Field Lighting Project;
2. Authorize the Public Works Director and/or City Engineer to negotiate a contract with Sala's O'Brien if negotiations with the top rated firm are not successful; and
3. Authorize the Mayor to execute a Professional Services Agreement with the selected Engineering firm once negotiations are successfully
completed.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and the staff report was waived at the Council’s request. Council Member Shelton stated that he had pulled the item to ask if there would be any funds left after the project was complete.

**COUNCIL ACTION:** MOVED by Council Member Shelton, SECONDED by Vice Mayor McCracken that the City Council authorize the Public Works Director and/or City Engineer to negotiate a contract with Electrical Power Systems for design services related to the Softball and Sports Field Lighting Project; authorize the Public Works Director and/or City Engineer to negotiate a contract with Sala's O'Brien if negotiations with the top rated firm are not successful; and authorize the Mayor to execute a Professional Services Agreement with the selected Engineering firm once negotiations are successfully completed.

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

Documentation: M.O. 14-021913
Disposition: Approved.

10. MONSTER ENERGY DRINK MOTOCROSS RACE PROPOSAL

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Approve the Motocross Race Proposal for March 16-17, 2013, with 2x Promotions at the OHV Park; and
2. Approve overnight camping for this event.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and the staff report was waived at the Council’s request. Parks and Leisure Services Director Moore addressed questions from Council Member Shelton regarding revenues associated with last year’s event.

**COUNCIL ACTION:** MOVED by Council Member Shelton, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton that the City Council approve the Motocross Race Proposal for March 16-17, 2013, with 2x Promotions and the OHV Park; and approve overnight camping for this event.

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

Documentation: M.O. 15-021913
11. OVER THE HILL GANG MOTOCROSS RACE PROPOSAL

Recommendation: That the City Council approve the Over the Hill Gang Race Proposal.

The staff report was waived at the Council’s request, and Council Member Shelton inquired about anticipated revenues. Parks and Leisure Services Director Moore spoke of factors which could result in a decrease of revenues from the previous year.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Shelton, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton that the City Council approve the Over the Hill Gang Race Proposal.

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

Documentation: M.O. 16-021913

Disposition: Approved.

13. LEGAL SERVICES AGREEMENT – CITY ATTORNEY

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Approve the Legal Services Agreement; and
2. Authorize the mayor to execute the Legal Services Agreement on behalf of the City Council.

City Manager Lollis introduced the item, and the staff report was waived at the Council’s request. Council Member Shelton indicated that he had pulled the item for a separate vote.

Council Member Hamilton and Mayor Gurrola lauded City Attorney Lew and the firm for their work over the years, and noted that rates have not been increased in six years.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Vice Mayor McCracken, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton that the City Council approve the Legal Services Agreement; and authorize the mayor to execute the Legal Services Agreement on behalf of the City Council.

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

Documentation: M.O. 17-021913
The Council adjourned at 8:08 p.m. to a meeting of the Successor Agency to the Porterville Redevelopment Agency. Council Member Shelton advised of a conflict of interest, recused himself, and exited the Council chambers.

**SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE PORTERVILLE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

**MINUTES**

291 N. MAIN STREET, PORTERVILLE, CA 93257

Roll Call: Member Hamilton, Vice Chair McCracken, Chair Gurrola
Absent: Member Shelton, Member Ward

**WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

None

**SCHEDULED MATTERS**

**SA-01. SUCCESSOR AGENCY REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET**

Recommendation: That the Successor Agency:
1. Approve the Successor Agency’s proposed Administrative Budget for the period of July 1, 2013, through December 31, 2013, prepared pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 34177(j); and
2. Adopt a Resolution approving the Administrative Budget and directing Successor Agency staff to submit the Administrative Budget to the Oversight Board.

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

**AGENCY ACTION:** MOVED by Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Vice Chair McCracken that the Successor Agency approve the Successor Agency’s proposed Administrative Budget for the period of July 1, 2013, through December 31, 2013, prepared pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 34177(j); and adopt a Resolution approving the Administrative Budget and directing Successor Agency staff to submit the Administrative Budget to the Oversight Board.

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

Documentation: Successor Agency Resolution 2013-01
SA-02. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF DRAFT RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE (ROPS)

Recommendation: That the Successor Agency:

1. Approve the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for the first half of fiscal year 2013-14 (ROPS 13-14 A) provided that should any modification be required to the ROPS 13-14 A by the DOF, the Community Development Director and/or the Finance Director or their authorized designees shall be authorized to make any augmentation, modification, additions or revisions as may be necessary to conform the ROPS 13-14 A to requirements imposed by the DOF; and

2. Adopt a Resolution approving the ROPS 13-14 A for the period of July 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013 and directing Successor Agency staff to submit the ROPS 13-14 A to the Oversight Board.

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

AGENCY ACTION: MOVED by Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Vice Chair McCracken that the Successor Agency approve the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for the first half of fiscal year 2013-14 (ROPS 13-14 A) provided that should any modification be required to the ROPS 13-14 A by the DOF, the Community Development Director and/or the Finance Director or their authorized designees shall be authorized to make any augmentation, modification, additions or revisions as may be necessary to conform the ROPS 13-14 A to requirements imposed by the DOF; and adopt a Resolution approving the ROPS 13-14 A for the period of July 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013 and directing Successor Agency staff to submit the ROPS 13-14 A to the Oversight Board.

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

Documentation: Successor Agency Resolution 2013-02
Disposition: Approved.

The Successor Agency adjourned at 8:11 p.m. to a meeting of the Porterville City Council. Council Member Shelton returned to the Council chambers.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
None
OTHER MATTERS
• Council Member Shelton spoke of his attendance at the Ag Expo, Round Dance at the Tule River Reservation, and a funeral for Mr. Severa; and lauded staff for their Murry Park clean-up efforts. He then advised of upcoming events which included: StepUp activities an Arts Commission meeting, the Annual Crime Prevention Dinner, and a mixer at Sierra Hills.
• Council Member Hamilton recognized Parks and Leisure Services Director Moore for Lighting Landscape and Maintenance District consolidation efforts, and Murry Park clean-up efforts.
• Mayor Gurrola reported her attendance at the LP Reception and the art exhibit of Diego Monerrubio. She added that she and the Vice Mayor had visited the Tribal Council to introduce themselves to new members.
• City Manager Lollis advised of an upcoming Indian Gaming Local Benefit Committee meeting, and of approximately $275,000 in available funding. He then spoke of hearings in Sacramento regarding the Governor’s efforts to reduce tax credits available to small businesses.
• Vice Mayor McCracken advised of upcoming CWMA and Council of Cities meetings in Visalia.

ADJOURNMENT
The Council adjourned at 8:17 p.m. to the meeting of March 5, 2013, at 5:30 p.m.

________________________________
Luisa M. Herrera, Deputy City Clerk

SEAL

________________________________
Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor
SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO PURCHASE A STORAGE AREA NETWORK APPLIANCE

SOURCE: Finance Department

COMMENT: The Finance Department – Information Technology (IT) Division would like to request approval to purchase a Storage Area Network (SAN) appliance. We currently have a Dell PowerVault 132T tape backup unit that is nine years old and is beginning to fail on occasion. We have a nine hour window of opportunity (9:00 pm to 6:00 am) to backup data on a nightly basis. However, because the amount of data being backed up is so large, the backup process sometimes spills over to 7:00 am - 9:00 am when the majority of staff is active on the network. Backing up data when in use (by staff) slows down network access and could lock the file until the backup is complete. The SAN solution will allow us to store data on the appliance and capture a snapshot of all data at that instance. That data can then be backed up at any time and without interrupting staff productivity. This will also increase our window of opportunity to 24 hours to back-up the data and not inconvenience staff.

Staff received three quotes as follows:

- Dell $31,675.97 (including tax and free shipping)
- KIS $36,995.91 (including tax and shipping)
- CDW $35,814.11 (not including tax and shipping)

Dell has also offered concessions concerning some future features that will be available as a patch update at no additional charge.

We currently have a standardized network system with Dell servers and workstations. Acquiring the Dell EqualLogic PS6510X will allow us to easily implement and integrate with the existing network infrastructure. The acquisition of a SAN is also significant in our goal of server virtualization. With a SAN, we can achieve a high-availability server platform for providing critical IT services to our public safety sector and better ensure system reliability for the rest of the City’s staff.

Funds are available in the Technology Enhancements project funded by carryover funds approved in the 2012/2013 Annual Budget.

RECOMMENDATION: That City Council approve the purchase of one “Dell EqualLogic PS6510X” SAN appliance at a cost of $31,675.97.

ATTACHMENTS: SAN Price Quotations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUOTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quote #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Agreement #:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quote Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Name:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 02/20/2013

Thanks for choosing Dell! Your quote is detailed below; please review the quote for product and informational accuracy. If you find errors or desire certain changes, please contact your sales professional as soon as possible.

Sales Professional Information

| SALES REP: | ALLIE L ROLISON |
| PHONE: | 1800-4563355 |
| Email Address: | Jeremy.Sexton@Dell.com |
| Phone Ext: | 80000 |

GROUP: 1  QUANTITY: 1  SYSTEM PRICE: $29,434.09  GROUP TOTAL: $29,434.09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dell EqualLogic PS6510X, 10GbE, High Performance, High density, 10K SAS Drives (224-7571)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 X 600GB 10k SAS DUAL CONTROLLER (342-0367)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EqualLogic array may not be returned (468-8817)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchronous and Point-in-Time Replication (468-7110)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snaps/Clones with integration for MS SQL, Exchange, Hyper V and VMware (468-7155)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN HQ multi group monitoring software (468-7156)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProSupport for your Enterprise: 7x24 HW / SW Tech Support and Assistance for Certified IT Staff, 1 Year (908-6750)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote Implementation of a Dell Equallogic Array (961-3859)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Maintenance Service Declined (926-2979)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EqualLogic Reference Architecture, S4810, PS6510, up to 3 arrays (995-7189)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Installation Declined (900-9997)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Purchase Price:** $31,675.97

- **Product Subtotal:** $29,434.09  
- **Tax:** $2,241.88  
- **Shipping & Handling:** $0.00  
- **State Environmental Fee:** $0.00  
- **Shipping Method:** LTL 5 DAY OR LESS

*(Amount denoted in $)*

Statement of Conditions

The information in this document is believed to be accurate. However, Dell assumes no responsibility for inaccuracies, errors, or omissions, and shall not be liable for direct, indirect, special, incidental, or consequential damages resulting from any such error or omission. Dell is not responsible for pricing or other errors, and reserves the right to cancel orders arising from such errors. Dell may make changes to this proposal including changes or updates to the products and services described, including pricing, without notice or obligation.

This proposal is not intended to create a contractual relationship. Unless expressly agreed otherwise in a writing signed by the parties, all orders by CITY OF PORTERVILLE for Dell products and services shall be subject to Dell's Terms and Conditions of Sale-Direct, which can be found at www.dell.com/terms, and which incorporate Dell's U.S. Return Policy, at www.dell.com/returnpolicy#total. Please read these terms carefully and in their entirety, and note in particular that Dell EqualLogic and EqualLogic-branded products, Dell|EMC and EMC-branded products, PowerVault ML6000 tape libraries, non-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>EXT PRICE</th>
<th>PART#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tegile HA2100 Zebi Storage Appliance, Dual Controllers, 22TB Raw Capacity,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,695.00</td>
<td>$26,695.00</td>
<td>Z HA2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22TB Raw Capacity, Dual Intel XEON E5620 CPUs, 600GB SSD, 48GB RAM, Full Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10Gb Ethernet SFP+ Optical Card Upgrade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$999.00</td>
<td>$1,998.00</td>
<td>Z UPG-1000PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Site Installation Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,250.00</td>
<td>$2,250.00</td>
<td>Z ONSITE-INSTALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Support &amp; Maintenance w/ NBD Parts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,239.00</td>
<td>$3,239.00</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Freight Charges via GROUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$375.00</td>
<td>$375.00</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Taxable Amount of $28,693.00)

Brad Goubeaux
Enterprise Accounts Manager
bradg@kiscc.com

SUBTOTAL: $34,557.00
TAX @ 8.5%: $2,438.91
TOTAL: $36,995.91
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>PART NUMBER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>End-User / Unit</th>
<th>End User Extended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FAS2240-2-R5</td>
<td>FAS2240A,HA CFO Software,R5</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FAS2240A-HA-SW-R5</td>
<td>SW, SnapRestore, 2240A,-C</td>
<td>$1,294.16</td>
<td>$2,588.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SW-2240A-SRESTORE-C</td>
<td>SW, CIFS,-C</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SW-FCP-C</td>
<td>SW, FCP,-C</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SW-ISCSI-C</td>
<td>SW, ISCSI,-C</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SW-NFS-C</td>
<td>SW, NFS,-C</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SW-2240A-ONTAP8-P</td>
<td>SW, Data ONTAP Essentials, 2240A,-P</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F2240-2-24X900-R5</td>
<td>FAS2240-2, HA, 24x900GB, Dual CTL</td>
<td>$30,416.17</td>
<td>$30,416.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X5526A-R6</td>
<td>Rackmount Kit, 4-Post, Universal, R6</td>
<td>$41.47</td>
<td>$41.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X800E-R6</td>
<td>Power Cable North America, R6</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X6557-R6</td>
<td>Cable, SAS Cntlr-Shelf/Shelf-Shelf/HA, 0.5m</td>
<td>$45.68</td>
<td>$91.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X6560-R6</td>
<td>Cable, Ethernet, 0.5m RJ45 CAT6</td>
<td>$2.74</td>
<td>$2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Months SupportEdge Premium NBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CS-O2-NBD</td>
<td>Onsite and Installation</td>
<td>$2,674.04</td>
<td>$2,674.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total** $35,814.11

**Quote is good for 30 Days. Tax and Shipping will be calculated at time of purchase.**
SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO DISTRIBUTE REQUESTS FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE DESIGN OF AN INTEGRATED SECURITY SYSTEM

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Transit

COMMENT: On November 6, 2012, Council authorized staff to issue a request for proposals for the purchase and installation of security equipment. Since that time, staff has been unable to determine the appropriate architectural design of the project.

Because of this issue, staff is requesting authorization to distribute a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the architectural/engineering design of an integrated security system (ISS).

ISS is a fairly recent concept in the world of security. In the past, security systems were discreet and operated independently of each other over dedicated media. Individual devices, cameras, alarm sensors and door access, required their own cable and signaling protocol. Monitoring each individual device requires multiple third party companies, screens, or individuals.

Ideally, an integrated security system seamlessly integrates electronic security devices and systems over one network. The purpose is to mesh and manage all of these so that, if desired, all systems can be monitored and controlled at a single workstation.

It is staff's desire to design an ISS that is both flexible and scalable to accommodate existing and future investments in cabling and equipment.

The services to be rendered under this contract would consist of, but not be limited to, the preparation of complete design and specification of an integrated security system consisting of the following: security cameras, intrusion detection and door access. In addition to the preparation of the design, it is anticipated that the consultant would also perform field and building surveys, network and computer assessments, preparation of an engineer's estimate, and contract documents.
The integrated security plan is funded in full by FTA 5303 Planning funds with no local match required. The construction portion of the security system is funded in full by CalEMA Prop 1B funds with no local match.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council authorize staff to distribute a Request for Qualifications for the design of an integrated security system.
AUTHORIZATION TO DISTRIBUTE REQUESTS FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR TRANSIT PROGRAM UPDATES

Public Works Department - Transit

As a recipient of Urbanized Area Formula Program funds, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) examines how recipients meet statutory and administrative requirements, especially those that are included in the Annual Certifications and Assurances that grantees submit. Consistent with SAFETEA-LU, at least once every three years the Secretary of Transportation shall review and evaluate the performance of a recipient in carrying out the recipient's program.

On July 6, 2012, President Obama signed into law P.L. 112-141, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). On August 28, 2012, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) published a notice in the Federal Register announcing changes to the Title VI Circular (4702.1B) that went into effect, under MAP-21, on October 1, 2012. The City received notice on September 13, 2012, that the City's Title VI program is required to be updated and submitted by July 1, 2013.

Because of the changes to several civil rights areas, including Title VI, EEO, and DBE programs, staff is requesting authorization to distribute a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for an outside agency to complete the updates to the City's Transit program.

The services to be rendered under this contract would consist of, but not be limited to, Title VI notices to the public; instructions on how to file a Title VI discrimination complaint; public participation plan; limited English proficiency; equity analysis; DBE; EEO and ADA.

Staff estimates that the updates to transit's civil rights programs will cost $40,000 and will be funded in full by FTA 5303 Planning funds.

That the City Council authorize staff to distribute a Request for Qualifications for transit program updates.
COUNCIL AGENDA: MARCH 5, 2013

SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT – WEST STREET CALEMA REPAIR PROJECT

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: On February 13, 2013, staff received nine (9) bids for the West Street CalEMA Repair Project. The proposed project includes repairing areas on West Street damaged during the December 2010 floods.

- West Street south of Scranton Avenue – remove and replace 2,033 square feet of deteriorated asphalt and appurtenances.
- West Street north of Tea Pot Dome Avenue – remove and replace 1,400 square feet of deteriorated asphalt and appurtenances, including installation of a storm drain siphon system to prevent future run-off problems.

**West Street CalEMA Reimbursable Items of Work**

The Engineer’s Estimate of Probable Cost for construction of the flood damaged areas within the two locations is $28,098. The low bid for this portion of the project is $17,247.25, which is 38.6% below the Engineer’s estimate. An additional $1,724.72 is required for the construction contingency (10%).

**West Street Non-Reimbursable Item of Work**

The Engineer’s Estimate of Probable Cost for installation of the storm drain siphon system is $12,000. The low bid for this portion of the project is $12,750, which is 6.2% above the Engineer’s estimate. An additional $1,275 is required for the construction contingency (10%).

**West Street Initial Construction Budget Estimate**

It is anticipated that an additional $8,000 is required for construction management, quality control and inspection services for all components of the project. Of this amount, $4,599.69 is reimbursable and the remaining $3,400.31 is non-reimbursable. The estimated budget for the reimbursable items of work is $23,571.67 and $17,425.31 for the non-reimbursable items of work. The total estimated probable cost for the project is $40,996.98.

**Funding Sources**

CalEMA Disaster Relief is the funding source for a majority of this project, and it will reimburse the City for construction costs associated with repair of the flood damaged areas. The funding allocation was approved in the 2012/2013 Annual Budget.
As stated above, the storm drain siphon system is not a reimbursable component of the allocated CalEMA funds. Staff is requesting a partial appropriation from the (State Transportation Funds) Miscellaneous Curb and Gutter Project account, which was also approved in the 2012/2013 Annual Budget. The amount being requested is $17,425.31 to fund the drainage control portion of this project, which includes construction management, quality control and inspection costs for this item of work.

**Bidders List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Greg Bartlett Construction - Porterville, CA</td>
<td>$29,997.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bowman Asphalt - Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>$36,036.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Central Valley Asphalt - Lindsay, CA</td>
<td>$39,498.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Halopoff &amp; Sons - Porterville, CA</td>
<td>$39,584.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mitch Brown Construction - Porterville, CA</td>
<td>$42,321.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RC General Engineering - Visalia, CA</td>
<td>$44,104.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Serna Construction - Fresno, CA</td>
<td>$48,382.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HPS Mechanical - Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>$50,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Todd Companies - Visalia, CA</td>
<td>$68,065.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff has found the low bid acceptable.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That City Council:

1. Award the CalEMA Repairs Project to Greg Bartlett Construction in the amount of $29,997.25;

2. Authorize progress payments up to 95% of the contract amount;

3. Authorize staff to appropriate $17,425.31 from the Miscellaneous Curb and Gutter Project account (89-9104) to fully finance the West Street CalEMA Repair Project; and

4. Authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen construction costs and $8,000 for construction management, quality control and inspection services.

**ATTACHMENT:** Locator Map
SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT – VETERANS PARK BOOSTER PUMP PROJECT – ADDITIONS OF PUMP #2 & #3

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: On February 19, 2013, staff received three (3) bids for the Veterans Park Booster Pump Project, Addition of Pumps #2 & #3. The project consists of installing above ground 12" water main, booster pumps, electrical equipment, SCADA integration and related appurtenances. The booster pump plant is located on the east side of Newcomb Street, north of Morton Avenue within Veterans Park. The purpose of the booster pump station is to draw water from our more prominent water source within the West Pressure Zone and pump it to the Central Pressure Zone where the City's storage facilities are located. The addition of Pump #2 and Pump #3 will increase capacity and redundancy to the pumping plant.

The engineer's estimate of probable cost is $197,637 and the overall construction budget estimate is $254,401 for the project. The low bid for the project is 21.5% below the Engineer’s estimate. An additional $15,521.50 is required for the construction contingency (10%). An additional $40,000 is required for construction management, quality control and inspection, per a June 19, 2012, City Council approval to secure consultant services. In light of the relatively low bid, the total estimated project cost is now $210,736.50.

Initially the Water Replacement Fund will finance the project as approved in the 2012/2013 Annual Budget. These funds will be reimbursed via the City’s CIEDB Loan.

The bids are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Valley Pump &amp; Dairy Systems, Tulare, CA</td>
<td>$155,215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Smith Construction, Fresno, CA</td>
<td>$191,629.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HPS Mechanical, Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>$235,564.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1. Award the Veterans Park Booster Pump Project — Additions of Pump #2 & #3 to Valley Pump & Dairy Systems in the amount of $155,215.00;

2. Authorize progress payments up to 95% of the contract amount; and

3. Authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen construction costs and $40,000 for construction management, quality control and inspection.

ATTACHMENT: Locator Map

P:\pub\works\General\Council\Award of Contract - Veterans Park Booster Pump Project Additions of Pump #2 & #3 - 2013-03-05.doc
RESCHEDULING THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE FORMATION OF THE SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT AREA 458

Public Works Department - Engineering Division

Staff respectfully requests that the City Council reschedule the Public Hearing on the formation of Sewer Utility District 458 from April 2, 2013, to April 16, 2013. The Public Hearing will allow for "protest hearing" from property owners who live or own property within Sewer Utility District Area 458. The property owners had to receive a minimum 45 days of marked notice per Proposition 218 guidelines.

Regrettably, the effort needed to mail out 450 certified letters with ballots was greater than anticipated and a number of notices were mailed late resulting in only 41 days of marked notice.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Reschedule the Public Hearing to April 16, 2013, pursuant to Proposition 218 Guidelines, for consideration to form Sewer Utility District 458.

February 5, 2013, Staff Report - Intent to set a Public Hearing to Consider the Formation of Sewer Utility District Area 458

"P:\pubwork\General\Council\Rescheduling Public Hearing - Formation of Sewer Utility District 458 - 2013-03-05.doc"
SUBJECT: INTENT TO SET A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE FORMATION OF SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT AREA 458

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: Staff respectfully requests that the City Council set a public hearing for April 2, 2013. The Public Hearing is to allow for “protest hearing” from property owners who live or own property within Sewer Utility District Area 458. Proposition 218 guidelines require forty-five days marked notice of the Public Hearing. A ballot must be included in the notice for property owners to vote for or against formation of the sewer utility district.

A Resolution declaring the Council’s intent to create a sewer utility district is attached for Council’s action. Proposition 218 Guidelines specify that the Public Works Director must prepare and present an Engineer’s Report to the City Council prior to the public hearing. The Engineer’s Report must provide:

1. A description of the improvements,
2. A cost estimate of the improvements,
3. Maps and/or drawings describing the boundaries of the utility district,
4. Methodology used by the Engineer of Record to equitably spread the cost of the improvements throughout the utility district, and
5. An assessment roll listing all parcels in the district and the proposed assessment against each parcel in the district.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Set a Public Hearing for April 2, 2013, pursuant to Proposition 218 Guidelines, for consideration to form Sewer Utility District 458;
2. Approve the Engineer’s Report for Sewer Utility District Area 458; and
3. Authorize staff to notify all affected property owners of the Public Hearing, via certified mail, including the sewer connection assessment amount, length of time provided on the assessment, reason for the assessment and a summary on how the voting will function.

ATTACHMENTS: Locator Map, Draft Resolution, Engineer’s Report w/ Attachments, Draft Resolution.
RESOLUTION NO.: ______ - 2013

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE APPROVING INTENT TO FORM AN ISLAND ANNEXATION AREA 458 SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT, LEVYING THE ASSESSMENT, AND AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE IMPROVEMENTS

WHEREAS, Island Annexation Area 458, was annexed into the City in November 2006; and

WHEREAS, the parcels in this area utilize individual septic tanks that are failing; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Porterville unanimously approved the design of the Island Annexation 458A & 458B Project contingent upon the establishment of the Island Annexation Area 458 Sewer Utility District; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with California Streets and Highways Code Section 10000 et seq. and other applicable law, the property owners were provided with Notice of the public hearing and assessment ballot proceeding; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the City Council to hold a public hearing to receive comment from the public, accept and tabulate ballots; and

WHEREAS, the property owners within the proposed District will be given the opportunity to cast ballots at the end of the public hearing to be held on April 2, 2013, and approve the imposition of the assessment and the formation of the District;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that it is the intention of the City Council of the City of Porterville to:

1) Approve the formation of the Island Annexation Area 458 Sewer Utility District establishing an assessment to pay for the installation of new sewer mains and laterals. A diagram of the District setting forth the boundaries and parcels located within the District is attached hereto as Exhibit “B;”

2) Authorize the levying of the assessment as set forth in Exhibit “C;”

3) Authorize the City to permit property owners to pay the total one-time assessment on a bi- yearly basis through property taxes over a period of 30 years, with 3% interest. This cost shall be as set forth in Exhibit “C.”
PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of February, 2013.

Virginia R. Gurrola, 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 No.__________. This assessment is authorized pursuant to the Municipal Improvement Act of 1913 (California Streets and Highways Code Section 10000 et seq.) and California Constitution Article XIIIID, Section 4. The report is in compliance with the requirements of California Streets and Highways Code Section 10204.

SECTION 2. General Description

The City Council has elected to finance the Island Annexation Area 458 Sewer Facility District (hereinafter referred to as “District”) which includes the installation of approximately 170’ of 8” sewer main, 16,540’ of 6” sewer mains, 412 sewer laterals and 43 manholes. The City Council has determined that the new sewer system will have a positive effect upon all parcels within the proposed boundaries of the “District”. Proposed sewer laterals will be provided on both sides of the streets to all parcels located within the district. The installed sewer system will be maintained and operated by the City of Porterville.

SECTION 3. Plans and Specifications

The plans and specifications for the “District” were prepared by the City of Porterville’s Public Works Department, Engineering Division and are in conformance with City Standards and Specifications. The sewer mains, laterals and manholes are shown on the plans approved by the City Council on November 06, 2012. The total length of 8” & 6” sewer mains to be maintained is 16,710 L.F. The plans and specifications for the project are on file with the Public Works Department of the City and are hereby incorporated by reference.
SECTION 4. Improvements

Improvements to be constructed include:

170 LF of 8" sewer main, 16,540 LF of 6" sewer main, 412 sewer laterals and 43 manholes and other sewer related appurtenances.

SECTION 5. Estimated Costs

The initial construction cost will be borne by the City through a loan from re-financed Certificate of Participation Bond Sewer funds. Payment on the loan will be made by a “one-time” assessment on the properties within the district receiving sewer facilities and paid annually over thirty (30) years by agreement between the City of Porterville and the Property Owner. A “District” map will be filed for record purposes upon voter approval of the “District” and installation of the improvements. The assessments are appropriate and will be used to pay the loan for construction and construction management of the Island Annexation Area 458 Sewer Project. District assessments will begin in the 2013-2014 Fiscal Year and will end in the 2043/2044 Fiscal Year. Assessments are based on the cost of construction and includes all or a portion of a 10% Construction Contingency and a Construction Management fee component.

The “Actual Cost of Construction” is shown in Exhibit “C” attached herein.

SECTION 6. Assessment Legal Description & Boundary Map

A legal description and copy of the proposed assessment Boundary Map titled “Island Annexation Area 458 Sewer Facility District”, referenced as Exhibit “A” and Exhibit “B” respectively is attached herein for review.
SECTION 7. Assessment

The initial cost of constructing improvements will be borne by the City of Porterville. The improvements are established for the benefit of all properties within the proposed Island Annexation Area 458 Sewer Facility District. The maintenance of the improvements (sewer mains and manholes) shall be performed by the City in perpetuity. The City Council of Porterville has determined that in order to pay for the construction of the 8" and 6" sewer main and related appurtenances, those properties in Exhibit ‘A’, should form a sewer facility district and that said district pay a semi-annual fee incorporated into the County’s tax roll to cover the cost of construction and construction management of the Island Annexation Area 458 Sewer Project.

The determination of benefits takes into consideration the following facts:

1. The purpose of the improvements is to provide a reliable, consistent and safe method of sewer disposal.
2. A safe and reliable sewer system benefits all properties within the “District”.
3. The parcels (lots) not adjacent to the newly installed 8” and 6” sewer mains shall have the opportunity to connect to a sewer lateral located at or near the Public Right of Way and extend private sewer laterals to those parcels (lots) in question.

Exhibit “C”, attached herein provides the following information:

Column 1 - Identifies the Property Number of the parcel located within the “District”.

Column 2 – Identifies the street address of the parcel within the “District”.

Column 3 - Identifies the Property Owner of the parcel within the “District” based on latest Tulare County Tax Roll.
Column 4 – Identifies the parcel within the “District” by County Assessor Number.

Column 5 – Identifies the parcel within the “District” by square footage.

Column 6 – Identifies the parcel within the “District” based on acreage.

Column 7 – Identifies the acreage fee per acre for each lot within the “District” based on actual construction cost. This cost includes a 10% “Construction Contingency”

Column 8 – Identifies the Zoning for each parcel within the “District”.

Column 9 – Identifies the width of each parcel within the “District”

Column 10 – Identifies the number of residential units per lot.

Column 11 – Identifies “Acreage” fee per lot based on the construction cost (Col. 6 x Col. 7) with the 10% construction contingency included.

Column 12 – Identifies Sewer Lateral cost per lot within the “District” based on actual construction cost plus a 10% construction contingency.

Column 13 – Identifies Plumbing Permit fee per lot within the “District”. This fee will not be assessed and must be paid by the property owner prior to connecting to the City sewer system.

Column 14 – Identifies Construction Management cost per lot within the “District” based on 5% of the construction cost.

Column 15 – Identifies the Total Connection Fee per lot within the “District”

NOTE: Column 15 identifies the actual assessment per parcel (lot) based on construction and construction management costs and is the sum of Columns 11, 12 & 14. This fee (cost) is the amount to be assessed each parcel over the life of the Island Annexation Area 458 Sewer Facility District loan.
The "Assessed Cost" per "typical" parcel is calculated as follows:

**Column 11** = Construction bid + 10% contingency / Total Acreage within "District" x
Individual Parcel Size = ($1,384,466.24 + $138,446.62)/113.2606 Ac. x 0.28 Ac. = $3,764.91

**Column 12** = Cost of sewer lateral per parcel = $921.60 + 92.16 = $1,013.76

**Column 14** = Construction Management Cost = ($1,831,759.04 x 5%) / 449 Serviceable Lots = $203.98 per lot. Use $200/lot

**Column 15** = Total Assessment per Parcel (Lot) = Col 11 + Col. 12 + Col. 14 = $4,978.67

**Semi-Annual Payment Calculated As Follows:**

\[ A = P \frac{(r/12)}{(1+i/12)^n} - 1 \]

Where:

A = Semi-Annual Assessment (payment) per Residential Unit

P = Per Residential Unit Cost for Construction, Construction Management & Sewer Lateral Cost

= $4,978.67

i = Interest (3%) compounded semi-annually = .03/2 = .015

n = Number of payments over 30 years = 60

Per Residential Unit Assessment Calculated as follows:

A = $4,978.67 x .015 x [(1.015)^60/(1.0025)^60 - 1] = $126.43

____________________________________
Bob Rodriguez, P.E.
Public Works Director
City of Porterville
Engineer of Record

P:Pubwks\Projects\Island Sewer Annexation\Area 458 - Engineer's Report
EXHIBIT “A”
City of Porterville
Annexation No. 458, Area A
Description for Annexation

That portion of Section 27, Township 21 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, in the County of Tulare, State of California, described as follows:

Commencing at the Southwest corner of said Section 27, Township 21 South, Range 27 East; thence, easterly along the South line of the Southwest quarter of Section 27, a distance of 40 feet, more or less, to the intersection with the southerly prolongation of the East right of way line of Newcomb Street; thence, northerly, along said southerly prolongation of the East right of way line of Newcomb Street and said East right of way line, a distance of 330 feet, more or less, to an angle point on the existing City Limits Line, the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

A1 Thence, continuing northerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the East right of way line of Newcomb Street, a distance of 299 feet, more or less, to the South right of way line of Tomah Avenue, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A2 Thence, easterly, along the existing City Limits Line and South right of way line of Tomah Avenue, a distance of 354.67 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A3 Thence, northerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 540.90 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A4 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 82 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A5 Thence, northerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 174 feet, more or less, to the North right of way line of Putnam Avenue, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A6 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the North right of way line of Putnam Avenue, a distance of 273 feet, more or less, to the East right of way line of Newcomb Street, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A7 Thence, northerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the East right of way line of Newcomb Street, a distance of 1328 feet, more or less, to the North right of way line of Morton Avenue, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A8 Thence, easterly, along the existing City Limits Line and North right of way line of Morton Avenue, a distance of 1292 feet, more or less, to the intersection with the
northerly prolongation of the East line of Tract 264 as recorded in Volume 22 of Maps, Page 14, Tulare County Records, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A9 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the northerly prolongation of the East line of said Tract 264 and the East line of said Tract 264, a distance of 1394.31, more or less, to the South right of way line of Putnam Avenue, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A10 Thence, easterly, along the existing City Limits Line and the South right of way line of Putnam Avenue, a distance of 199.27 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A11 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 308 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A12 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 66.52 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A13 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 303.44 feet, more or less, to the North right of way line of Tomah Avenue, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A14 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the North right of way line of Tomah Avenue, a distance of 132.85 feet, more or less, to the intersection with the southerly prolongation of the East line of said Tract 264, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A15 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits and the southerly prolongation of the East line of said Tract 264, a distance of 50 feet, more or less, to the South right of way line of Tomah Avenue, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A16 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the South right of way line of Tomah Avenue, a distance of 331 feet, more or less, to the intersection with the East line of West half of the East half of the Southwest quarter of said Section 27, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A17 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the East line of West half of the East half of the Southwest quarter of said Section 27, a distance of 254 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A18 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 100 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;
A19 Thence, northerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 254.14 feet, more or less, to the South right of way line of Tomah Avenue, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A20 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the South right of way line of Tomah Avenue, a distance of 129.22 feet, more or less, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A21 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 254.16 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A22 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 100 feet, more or less, to the intersection with the East line of the Southwest quarter of the Southwest quarter of the Southwest quarter of said Section 27, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A23 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the East line of the Southwest quarter of the Southwest quarter of the Southwest quarter of said Section 27, a distance of 50 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

A24 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 200 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line, the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

ACREAGE = 63 ± ACRES
EXHIBIT “A”
City of Porterville
Annexation No. 458, Area B
Description for Annexation

That portion of Section 28 and 27, Township 21 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, in the County of Tulare, State of California, described as follows:

Commencing at the Southeast corner of said Section 28, Township 21 South, Range 27 East; thence, westerly along the South line of the Southeast quarter of Section 28, a distance of 40 feet, more or less, to the intersection with the southerly prolongation of the West right of way line of Newcomb Street; thence, northerly, along said southerly prolongation of the West right of way line of Newcomb Street and said West right of way line, a distance of 276 feet, more or less, to an angle point on the existing City Limits Line, the Southeast corner of Lot 5 of Tract No. 257 as recorded in Volume 22 of Maps, Page 10, Tulare County Records, the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

B1 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the South line of Lots 5, 9, 10, and 11 of said Tract No. 257, a distance of 388.01 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B2 Thence, northwesterly, along the existing City Limits Line and the South line of Lots 11 and 12 of said Tract No. 257, a distance of 49.00 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B3 Thence, southwesterly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 20.00 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B4 Thence, northwesterly, along the existing City Limits, a distance of 30.00 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B5 Thence, southwesterly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 29.75 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B6 Thence, northwesterly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 225 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B7 Thence, continuing northwesterly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 153.60 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B8 Thence, continuing northwesterly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 85.78 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B9 Thence, continuing northwesterly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 106.32 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;
B10 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 93.27 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B11 Thence, northwesterly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 178.69 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B12 Thence, continuing northwesterly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 337.32 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B13 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 72.00 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B14 Thence, northerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 190.00 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B15 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 897.67 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B16 Thence, northerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 395.00 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B17 Thence, easterly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 917.03 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B18 Thence, northerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 114 feet, more or less, to the South right of way line of Putnam Avenue, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B19 Thence, easterly, along the existing City Limits Line and the South right of way line of Putnam Avenue, a distance of 80.06 feet, more or less, to the intersection with the southerly prolongation of the West line of Tract No. 14 per map recorded in Volume 19 of maps, at Page 50, Tulare County Records, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B20 Thence, northerly, along the existing City Limits Line, the southerly prolongation of the West line of said Tract No. 14, and said West line, a distance of 1328.80 feet, more or less, to the South right of way line of Morton Avenue, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B21 Thence, easterly, along the existing City Limits Line and the South right of way line of Morton Avenue, a distance of 496.45 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;
B22 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the South right of way line of Morton Avenue, a distance of 5.0 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B23 Thence, easterly, along the existing City Limits Line and the South right of way line of Morton Avenue, a distance of 111.58 feet, more or less, to the intersection with the southerly prolongation of the West line of Tract No. 270 as per map recorded in Volume 22 of maps, Page 16, Tulare County Records, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B24 Thence, northerly, along the existing City Limits Line, the southerly prolongation of the West line of said Tract No. 270, and said West line, a distance of 339.5 feet, more or less, to the South right of way line of Morton Avenue, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B25 Thence, easterly, along the existing City Limits Line and the West line of said Tract No. 270, a distance of 16.5 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B26 Thence, northerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the West line of said Tract No. 270, a distance of 49.5 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B27 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the West line of said Tract No. 270, a distance of 16.5 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B28 Thence, northerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the West line of said Tract No. 270, a distance of 560.7 feet, more or less, to the South line of the North half of the North half of the South East quarter of the Northeast quarter of Section 28, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B29 Thence, easterly, along the existing City Limits Line and said South line, a distance of 461 feet, more or less, to the East line of said Tract No. 270, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B30 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the East line of said Tract No. 270, a distance of 25.95 feet, more or less, to the approximate centerline of Porter Slough, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B31 Thence, southeasterly, along the existing City Limits Line and the approximate centerline of Porter Slough, a distance of 179.38 feet, more or less, to an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;
B32 Thence, continuing southeasterly, along the existing City Limits Line and the approximate centerline of Porter Slough, a distance of 330.92 feet, more or less, to the East line of the Northeast quarter of said Section 28, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B33 Thence, easterly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 40 feet, more or less, to the East right of way line of Newcomb Street (Road 232), an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B34 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits Line and East right of way line of Newcomb Street (Road 232), a distance of 653 feet, more or less, to a point being 10 feet North of the North right of way line of Morton Avenue, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B35 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line, a distance of 80 feet, more or less, to the West right of way line of Newcomb Street (Road 232), an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B36 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the West right of way line of Newcomb Street (Road 232), a distance of 1351 feet, more or less, to the North right of way line of Putnam Street, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B37 Thence, westerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the North right of way line of Putnam Street, a distance of 966 feet, more or less, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B38 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits, a distance of 727 feet, more or less, to the South right of way line of Tomah Avenue, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B39 Thence, easterly, along the existing City Limits Line and the South right of way line of Tomah Avenue, a distance of 939 feet, more or less, to the point of curvature of a 20 foot radius curve concave northeasterly, an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B40 Thence, southeasterly, along the existing City Limits Line and along said curve, a distance of 31 feet, more or less, to the point of tangency of said curve and the West right of way line of Newcomb Street (Road 232), an angle point in the existing City Limits Line;

B41 Thence, southerly, along the existing City Limits Line and the West right of way line of Newcomb Street (Road 232), a distance of 352 feet, more or less, to the South right of way line of Putnam Street, to an angle point on the existing City Limits Line, the Southeast corner of Lot 5 of said Tract No. 257, the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

ACREAGE = 86 ± ACRES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property No.</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Assessor's Parcel No.</th>
<th>Lot Area (SF)</th>
<th>Lot Area (AC)</th>
<th>Assessed/Passaic</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Lot Front Footage</th>
<th>_units per lot</th>
<th>Assessed Fees</th>
<th>Sewer Lateral Cost</th>
<th>Overall Management Cost</th>
<th>Total Connection Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>228 W SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110172</td>
<td>1443.00</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>$2,980.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,250.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>286 N SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110122</td>
<td>1385.00</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>$2,870.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,010.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>231 W SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110155</td>
<td>1205.00</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>$2,740.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,140.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>128 W SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110162</td>
<td>1389.00</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>$2,870.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,250.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>172 W SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110170</td>
<td>1470.00</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>$3,090.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>283 W SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110181</td>
<td>1470.00</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>$3,090.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>305 W SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110121</td>
<td>1389.00</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>$2,870.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,250.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>306 W SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110162</td>
<td>1389.00</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>$2,870.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,250.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>307 W SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110181</td>
<td>1470.00</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>$3,090.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>308 W SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110121</td>
<td>1389.00</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>$2,870.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,250.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>309 W SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110181</td>
<td>1470.00</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>$3,090.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>310 W SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110121</td>
<td>1389.00</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>$2,870.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,250.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>311 W SQUIRES</td>
<td>245110181</td>
<td>1470.00</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>$3,090.00</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$10,100.00</td>
<td>$211,200.00</td>
<td>$63,370.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes:**
- Assessed Fees: $7,250.00
- Sewer Lateral Cost: $10,100.00
- Overall Management Cost: $211,200.00
- Total Connection Fees: $63,370.00
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RESOLUTION NO.: _____ - 2013

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF PORTERVILLE ACCEPTING
THE ENGINEER'S REPORT FOR
ISLAND ANNEXATION AREA 458 SEWER PROJECT

WHEREAS, Island Annexation Area 458, was annexed into the City in November 2006; and

WHEREAS, the parcels in this area utilize individual septic tanks that are failing; and

WHEREAS, an Engineer's Report has been prepared by direction of the City Council of the City of Porterville; and

WHEREAS, the report states that the new sewer system will have a positive effect upon all parcels within the proposed boundary, and provide a reliable, consistent and safe method of sewer disposal; and

WHEREAS, the report states construction costs will initially be provided by a loan from re-financed Certificate of Participation Bond Sewer funds, and establishes repayment of the loan by property owners through a Sewer Utility District; and

WHEREAS, legal descriptions of properties and the proposed assessment Boundary Map is referenced in the report;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Porterville accepts the Engineer's Report for the Island Annexation Area 458 sewer project.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of February, 2013.

Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: __________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
CONSENT CALENDAR

SUBJECT: SHORT-TERM WORK PLAN FOR THE ARTS COMMISSION AND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED MURAL THEME

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: The Arts Commission was established in August 2012, with their primary duties identified as making recommendations to the City Council regarding development and promotion of practices and policies pertaining to the arts and fostering the development and enjoyment of visual, cultural, performing, and other arts in the City of Porterville. The Arts Commission has developed a Short-Term Work Plan to begin accomplishing their assigned duties and is requesting City Council approval of the Draft Plan. The initial Short-Term Plan identifies efforts to be pursued over the next six (6) to twelve (12) months.

The Arts Commission Work Plan is as follows:

a) Develop a Policy for Mural and Public Art Selection

b) Mail Request For Proposal’s to artists to secure a contract to paint the mural at 134 E. Oak Avenue (see attached “Canvas”)

c) Develop Bylaws

d) Develop Website

e) Develop Resource Directory (to be posted on website)

f) Develop a Long-Term Work Plan

Mural Theme

At its meeting of February 20, 2013, the Arts Commission received a recommendation from the Mural Committee regarding the proposed theme of the City-funded mural proposed on Oak Avenue. The site proposed for the mural is 134 E. Oak Avenue, which is the new Subway building. The theme recommended by the Mural Committee is Hot Air Balloons with a historical and patriotic flare. The theme ties into the launching of balloons downtown that occurred in June 1981. The Arts Commission considered the Mural Committee’s recommendation and voted unanimously to recommend that the City Council approve the theme.
The mural is funded through the Transportation Enhancement (TE) Grant the City received to improve the pedestrian corridor between the new courthouse and Main Street. Staff is also requesting authorization to negotiate approval of a façade easement for the mural to be located at the above location.

RECOMMENDATION:  That the City Council:

1. Approve the proposed Short-Term Work Plan as presented by the Arts Commission;

2. Approve the Mural Theme as recommended by the Arts Commission and Mural Committee; and

3. Authorize Staff to negotiate the terms of a façade easement with the property owner at 134 E. Oak Avenue.

ATTACHMENT: Oak Avenue Mural “Canvas”
OAK AVENUE MURAL "CANVAS"
AREA ON SUBWAY BLDG = 10.5 FT X 18 FT

"NORTH VIEW"
CONSENT CALENDAR

SUBJECT: JAYE STREET BRIDGE WIDENING PROJECT – VALLEY ELDERBERRY LONGHORN BEETLE MITIGATION

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: Staff has been working on plans for a number of years now to facilitate the widening of the Jaye Street Bridge over the Tule River. The project is funded through Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) bridge rehabilitation funds and a local match. The widening will expand the capacity of the bridge from two (2) to four (4) lanes matching roadway widths both north and south of the existing two (2) lane bridge. The City Council approved the mitigated negative declaration for the project in August 2012, at which time it was disclosed that the project will have an impact on the federally listed threatened species the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB). The limits of the project construction area have been modified to reduce the impacts to the greatest extent possible; however, there is a remaining impact.

Five elderberry shrubs with one or more stems greater than one inch in diameter are located within the project footprint and would need to be removed. In addition, standard compensation plantings require that 111 elderberry seedlings/cuttings and 209 container stocks of associated native plants be planted in a conservation area. Since the City’s mitigation site is near capacity and does not have remaining capacity to accommodate the requirements of the project mitigation, staff has worked with Caltrans and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to identify alternative mitigation. It is anticipated the USFWS will approve the City to purchase credits in a VELB mitigation bank in the Sacramento area at the River Ranch VELB Conservation Bank (Bank). The Bank is owned and operated by Wildlands, Inc. (Wildlands), and was approved by the USFWS. Under this scenario, the City would purchase VELB habitat conservation credits at the Bank and would not have to construct an additional mitigation site beyond that already constructed along State Route 190. This site is virtually at capacity and cannot accommodate the mitigation requirements of the proposed bridge project.

Based on the compensation numbers above, the City would be required to purchase 42 credits in a Conservation Bank to mitigate the impacts to VELB. Wildlands has a standard purchase price per credit and has offered to sell the City 42 credits for a price of $168,000 ($4,000 per credit) and an additional $10,750 to transplant the necessary shrubs to the mitigation bank. Staff is awaiting the final approval of the number of required credits from Caltrans and the USFWS. However, significant numbers of credits have been purchased by other governmental agencies over the past year reducing the number of available credits.
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in the only available bank. As such, staff is requesting approval to enter into an agreement with Wildlands to purchase approximately 42 credits and to transplant the required shrubs. Since the final approval has not been received from Caltrans and USFWS, staff is recommending that Council authorize staff to negotiate the terms within 10% of the above numbers and authorize the Community Development Director to sign the Agreement. The terms will only change based on changed mitigation requirements of USFWS. The funding source for the purchase of mitigation measures to accommodate the Jaye Street Bridge widening project is through the Jaye – Tule River Widening.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:
1. Authorize staff to finalize the purchase agreement based on terms outlined above to provide a mitigation solution for Jaye Street Bridge Widening Project; and
2. Authorize the Community Development Director to sign all documents.

Attachments:
1. Draft Purchase Agreement
2. Locator map of elderberry shrubs
AGREEMENT FOR SALE OF CONSERVATION CREDITS
RIVER RANCH VELB CONSERVATION BANK
SERVICE File No. ___________

This Agreement is entered into this ____ day of __________, 2013, by and between SACRAMENTO RIVER RANCH, LLC (Bank Owner) and the CITY OF PORTERVILLE (Project Applicant), jointly referred to as the “Parties,” as follows:

RECITALS

A. The Bank Owner has developed the River Ranch VELB Conservation Bank (Bank) located in Yolo County, California; and

B. The Bank was approved by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) on June 9, 2005, and is currently in good standing with this agency; and

C. The Bank Owner has received approval from the Service to offer valley elderberry longhorn beetle conservation credits (Conservation Credits) for sale as compensation for the loss of the federally listed valley elderberry longhorn beetle’s habitat as specified in the Conservation Bank Agreement through the River Ranch VELB Conservation Bank Agreement (Bank Agreement); and

D. Project Applicant is seeking to implement the project described on Exhibit “A” attached hereto (Project), which would unavoidably and adversely impact listed Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle habitat, and seeks to compensate for the loss of Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle habitat by purchasing Conservation Credits from Bank Owner; and

E. Project Applicant has been authorized by the Service under File No. ________, to purchase from the Bank Owner 42 Conservation Credits upon confirmation by the Bank Owner of credit availability/adequate balance of credits remaining for sale; and

F. Project Applicant desires to purchase from Bank Owner and Bank Owner desires to sell to Project Applicant 42 Conservation Credits.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PARTIES AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

1. Bank Owner hereby agrees to sell to Project Applicant and Project Applicant hereby purchases from Bank Owner 42 Conservation Credits for the purchase price of $168,000 (Purchase Price), in accordance with the terms hereof. The Purchase Price for the Conservation Credits shall be paid by wire transfer of funds or by check payable to “Sacramento River Ranch, LLC.” Upon receipt of the Purchase Price, Bank Owner will deliver to Project Applicant an executed Bill of Sale in the form attached hereto as Exhibit “B”.

2. The sale and transfer of the Conservation Credits described herein is not intended as a sale or transfer to Project Applicant of a security, license, lease, easement, or possessory or non-possessory interest in real property, nor the granting of any interest of the foregoing.

3. Project Applicant shall have no obligation whatsoever by reason of the purchase of the
Conservation Credits, to support, pay for, monitor, report on, sustain, continue in perpetuity, or otherwise be obligated or liable for the success or continued expense or maintenance in perpetuity of the Conservation Credits sold, or the Bank. Pursuant to the Bank Agreement and any amendments thereto, Bank Owner shall monitor and make reports to the appropriate agency or agencies on the status of any Conservation Credits sold to Project Applicant. Bank Owner shall be fully and completely responsible for satisfying any and all conditions placed on the Bank or the Conservation Credits by all state or federal jurisdictional agencies.

4. The Conservation Credits sold and transferred to Project Applicant shall be nontransferable and non-assignable, and shall not be used as compensatory mitigation for any other Project or purpose, except as set forth herein.

5. Project Applicant must deliver the Purchase Price to Bank Owner within 30 days of the date of this Agreement. After the 30 day period this Agreement be considered null and void and Bank Owner shall have no further obligations hereunder.

6. Upon purchase of the Conservation Credits specified above, Bank Owner shall complete the payment receipt form attached hereto as Exhibit “C”, and shall submit the completed payment receipt to the Service.

7. In addition to the purchase of the Conservation Credits, Bank Owner shall perform the required transplantation of the five elderberry shrubs for an additional fee of $10,750.

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

BANK OWNER: SACRAMENTO RIVER RANCH, LLC.

PROJECT APPLICANT: CITY OF PORTERVILLE

By: ___________________________ By: ___________________________

Its: ___________________________ Its: ___________________________

Date: _________________________ Date: _________________________
APPROVED

SERVICE:

This Agreement partially fulfills the conservation measure requiring the purchase of credits sufficient for ___ elderberry plantings and ___ associated native plantings on no less than 1.74 acres as specified under the Service Biological Opinion File No. ________________ dated _____________.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

By: ______________________________________

Title: _____________________________________

Dated: _____________________________________
Exhibit "A"

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT TO BE MITIGATED

The City of Porterville has proposed to widen the existing Jaye Street Bridge in Porterville, California. The Jaye Street Bridge crosses the Tule River and is located on Jaye Street between Date Street and Springville Street. The bridge will be widened from two lanes to four lanes, and the paved approaches to the bridge will be reconstructed.

****
Exhibit "B"

BILL OF SALE Contract # RRVCB-13-____

Service File # ________________

In consideration of $168,000.00, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, SACRAMENTO RIVER RANCH, LLC (Bank Owner) does hereby bargain, sell and transfer to the CITY OF PORTERVILLE 42 Conservation Credits in the River Ranch VELB Conservation Bank in Yolo County, California, developed, and approved by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Bank Owner represents and warrants that it has good title to the credits, has good right to sell the same, and that they are free and clear of all claims, liens, or encumbrances.

Bank Owner covenants and agrees with the buyer to warrant and defend the sale of the credits hereinbefore described against all and every person and persons whomsoever lawfully claiming or to claim the same.

DATED: ____________________________

SACRAMENTO RIVER RANCH, LLC

By: ________________

Title: ________________

Dated: ____________________________
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA: March 5, 2013

CONSENT CALENDAR

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO TRAVEL

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: The International Council of Shopping Centers (ICSC) will be hosting their annual conference in Las Vegas, Nevada, May 19 – 22, 2013. During the 2012 conference, staff made contact with ten (10) major national retailers and met with five (5) developers to discuss opportunities in Porterville.

Staff continues to communicate with the contacts made at ICSC conferences to promote Porterville and encourage retailers to locate in our community. Retail contacts at past ICSC conferences have included Kohls, Marshalls, Famous Footwear, Rue 21, Dollar General, and Family Dollar – all who have located (or have a signed lease) in Porterville within the past four years. There is an additional contact from last year’s event that is currently working on locating in a vacant building in one of our shopping centers. A continued presence is important while marketing Porterville to retailers, and staff would like to continue efforts by attending the 2013 ICSC conference.

The cost for the trip for two staff is estimated to be $2,400 and funding is available in the Economic Development budget.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council approve travel to Las Vegas, Nevada, for the purpose of attending the International Council of Shopping Centers conference.
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SUBJECT: CENTRAL VALLEY RACING PROPOSAL

SOURCE: PARKS AND LEISURE SERVICES DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: Staff has recently received a proposal from Mick Elsberry of Central Valley Racing to hold a series of races at the Porterville Off-Highway Vehicle Park in 2013.

Central Valley Racing is a group of local riders who frequent our local OHV Park as participants. The proposal coincides with the type of events staff is seeking to promote at the park, which is family oriented, one-day events with approximately 60-125 riders from ages 5 years and up. All conventional motocross races will be scheduled to allow for the highest possible participation. Six races are proposed to be scheduled throughout 2013.

Central Valley racing will provide insurance, score keepers, extra flaggers, awards, an EMT and race promotion. City staff will provide track prep before and after the races, flagging duties, and collection of money and waivers at the entry gate.

One hundred percent (100%) of the fees collected on practice days will be obtained by the City, and the City will retain fifty percent (50%) of the gate fees collected on race days.

Staff is also seeking permission to permit overnight camping in the open space adjacent to the park at $10 per unit.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council
1.) Approve the Motocross Race Proposal for 2013 with Central Valley Racing at the OHV Park; and
2.) Approve overnight camping for the event.

ATTACHMENT: Motocross Race Proposal
The City of Porterville in conjunction with Central Valley Racing will be holding up to six races in 2013.

The City of Porterville will provide:

- Insurance coverage for practice days
- Staff at the entry to take money and signatures on waivers
- Three staff flaggers
- Preparation and track maintenance for both days
- PA System
- 100% of Saturday's gate monies collected will be retained by the City of Porterville

Central Valley Racing will provide on Race Day:

- Insurance coverage for race days
- Score keepers on race day and extra flaggers if needed
- Provide and secure all entry forms
- Provide EMT on site during race events
- Provide awards for all race classes
- Secure and manage parking, spectators, and camping area
- Provide staff for clean-up of park following race event
- Promote the events – flyers, sponsors, radio and newspaper advertisement
- All costs covering race promotion will be the responsibility of Central Valley Racing
- Collection of monies collected at the gate will be distributed 50/50 between the City of Porterville and Central Valley Racing.

City of Porterville
Authorized Representative

Central Valley Racing
Authorized Representative

Date

Date
SUBJECT: APPROVAL FOR COMMUNITY CIVIC EVENT – PORTERVILLE PREGNANCY RESOURCE CENTER – BIKE AND SKATE FOR LIFE – APRIL 6, 2013

SOURCE: Finance Department

COMMENT: The Porterville Pregnancy Resource Center is requesting approval to hold a skateboard and bike contest at the Skate Park on April 6, 2013 from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

This request is made under the Community Civic Events Ordinance No. 1326, as amended. The application has been routed according to the ordinance regulations and reviewed by all departments involved. The requirements are listed on the attached copy of the Application, Agreement and Exhibit A.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Council approve the Community Civic Event Application and Agreement from the Porterville Pregnancy Resource Center subject to the Restrictions and Requirements contained in the Application, Agreement and Exhibit A of the Community Civic Event Application.

ATTACHMENT: Community Civic Event Application and Agreement, Map, Outside Amplifier Permit.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
291 N. Main Street, Porterville, CA 93257
559-782-7451 Fax: 784-4569 www.ci.porterville.ca.us

(Application and Agreement for a Permit to Hold a Community Civic Event or Other Activity to Be Held on Public Property)

**DO YOU HAVE?**
- Event Flyer? Yes
- E-mail address? Yes
- Website? Yes

**Application date:** 2-6-2013
**Event date:** 4-6-2013
**Event time:** 8:00 am- 5:00 pm

**Name of Event:** Porterville Pregnancy Center "Bike & Skate for Life"

**Sponsoring organization:** Porterville Pregnancy Resource
**Address:** 64 W. Putnam Center

**Authorized representative:** Cathy Rodriguez
**Address:** 731 W. Pioneer Ave. - Porterville, Ca.

**Event chairperson:** Frank P. Rodriguez
**Address:** 731 W. Pioneer Ave. - Porterville, Ca.

**Location of event:** Porterville Veterans Park - Skate Park

(Location map must be attached)

**Type of event:** Skateboard & Bike Best Trick Competition

**Non-profit organization status:** Lic # 3582 501 31E 7 on File

City services requested (fees associated with these services will be billed separately):
- Barricades (quantity):
- Police protection: Yes ☑ No ❌
- Street sweeping: Yes ☑ No ❌
- Refuse pickup: Yes ☑ No ❌

**Other:**

**Parks facility application required:** Yes ☑ No ❌ Attached
**Assembly permit required:** Yes ☑ No ☑ Attached

**STAFF COMMENTS** (list special requirements or conditions for event):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appr.</th>
<th>Deny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub. Works Dir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Dev. Dir.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Svcs. Mgr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Chief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Dir.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Svcs. Dir.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CITY OF PORTERVILLE
APPLICATION AND AGREEMENT FOR A PERMIT TO HOLD A COMMUNITY CIVIC EVENT OR OTHER ACTIVITY TO BE HELD ON PUBLIC PROPERTY

What constitutes a Community Civic Event?
A non-profit organization wishes to sponsor an event that is open to the community at large and will utilize public property. Most of the time, Community Civic Events require street or sidewalk closures. This application must be submitted NO LESS THAN 30 DAYS PRIOR to the date of the event in order to obtain City Council approval.

All City Code requirements are described in ordinance 15-20 (e) 1-23 and as amended in ordinance 1613. For a full description please visit our City of Porterville website at www.ci.porterville.ca.us/govt/CityClerk/. Porterville Municipal Codes. For questions or concerns please call 559-782-7451 or 559-782-7457. Any person who violates the provisions in this code, shall be deemed guilty of either a misdemeanor or an infraction, with penalties of one hundred ($100) for the first violation.

Liability insurance: The sponsoring organization/applicant agrees to provide and keep in force during the term of this permit a policy of liability and property damage insurance against liability for personal injury, including accidental death, as well as liability for property damage which may arise in any way during the term of this permit. The City of Porterville and Successor Agency to the Porterville Redevelopment Agency shall be named as additional insured. A Certificate of Liability Insurance and Additional Insured Endorsement sample forms are enclosed for your convenience. This original certificate and endorsement shall be submitted to the Finance Department prior to the City of Porterville Council’s approval. The council shall condition the granting of a CCE permit upon the sponsoring entity’s filing with the council a policy of public liability insurance in which the city has been named as insured or co-insured with the permitting entity. The policy of insurance shall insure the city, its officers, and its employees against all claims arising out of, or in connection with, the issuance of the CCE permit or the operation of the permittee or its agents or representatives, pursuant to the permit. The policy of insurance shall provide coverage of no less than one million dollars ($1,000,000.00) per occurrence of bodily injury and property damage, combined single limit. (Ordinance 15-20(e) 18)

Alcohol liability insurance: Organization/Applicant will obtain an alcohol permit if any alcoholic beverages are to be served. The insurance policy shall be endorsed to include full liquor liability in an amount not less than one million dollars ($1,000,000) per occurrence. The City of Porterville shall be named as additional insured against all claims arising out of or in connection with the issuance of this permit or the operation of the permitted, his/her agents or representatives pursuant the permit. Claims-made policies are not acceptable.

Health permit: Organization/Applicant will obtain or ensure that all participants obtain a ‘Temporary Food Facilities’ permit(s) from the Tulare County Public Health Department, if any food is to be served in connection with this Community Civic Event. To contact the Tulare County Environmental Health Department located at 5957 S. Mooney Blvd., Visalia, CA, 93277, call 559-733-6441, or fax information to 559-733-6932; or visit their website: www.tularehhsa.org.

First aid station: Organization/Applicant will establish a first aid station, with clearly posted signs, to provide basic emergency care, such as ice/hot packs, bandages, and compresses.

Agreement: The sponsoring organization/applicant agrees to comply with all provisions of the Community Civic Event Ordinance 15-20(e), as amended, and the terms and conditions set forth by City Council and stated in Exhibit ‘A.’ The sponsoring organization/applicant agrees, during the term of this permit, to secure and hold the City free and harmless from all loss, liability, and claims for damages, costs and charges of any kind or character arising out of, relating to, or in any way connected with his/her performance of this permit. Said agreement to hold harmless shall include and extend to any injury to any person or persons, or property of any kind whatsoever and to whomever belonging, including, but not limited to, said organization/applicant, and shall not be liable to the City for any injury to persons or property which may result solely or primarily from the action or non-action of the City or its directors, officers, or employees.

Porterville Pregnancy Resource Center  
(CName of Organization)  
(Cathy Rodriguez)  
(Date)  
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CITY OF PORTERVILLE

REQUEST FOR STREET CLOSURES AND PUBLIC PROPERTY USAGE IN CONNECTION WITH THE
APPLICATION AND AGREEMENT FOR A PERMIT TO HOLD A COMMUNITY CIVIC EVENT OR OTHER
ACTIVITY TO BE HELD ON PUBLIC PROPERTY

Name of event: "Bike & Skate for Life"

Sponsoring organization: Porterville Pregnancy Center

Event date: 4/6/2013 Hours: 8:50 pm

ATTACH MAP MARKING AREAS TO BE CLOSED OR USED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Closed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalks</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking lots and spaces | Location | Activity |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CITY OF PORTERVILLE

VENDOR/PARTICIPANT LIST IN CONNECTION WITH THE APPLICATION AND AGREEMENT FOR A PERMIT TO HOLD A COMMUNITY CIVIC EVENT OR OTHER ACTIVITY TO BE HELD ON PUBLIC PROPERTY

Name of event: Porterville Pregnancy Center "Give & Skate for Life"

Sponsoring organization: 

Location: Veterans Lane - Skate Park  Event date: 4/6/2013  Event time: 8:50 pm

All vendors are required to complete the business license permit form. List all firms, individuals, organizations, etc., that will engage in selling at or participate in the above-named event. **NO PERMIT WILL BE ISSUED WITHOUT THIS INFORMATION.** Vendors with no valid City of Porterville business license are required to pay $1 per day to the City, with the exceptions of non-profit organizations per "City of Porterville Municipal Code 15-20(E) Community Civic Events (16). This form should be completed at the time of application, but must be submitted NO LESS THAN ONE WEEK PRIOR TO THE EVENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor name</th>
<th>Address/Telephone</th>
<th>Business License required?</th>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambassador - Skate Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Promotional Team items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*City of Porterville Municipal Code 15-20(E) Community Civic Events (16): Business License Fee: Any individual, company, firm, concessionaire, fair operator, carnival operator, etc., who engages in, conducts, organizes, or promotes business for profit shall pay a business license fee of one dollar ($1.00) per day for amusement entertainment, exhibits, rides or per booth, space, stall, stand or other unenclosed location used for the purpose of advertising, promoting, or sale of, or taking orders for, goods or services; except that no individual, company, firm concessionaire, fair operator, carnival operator, etc., who possesses a valid city business license shall be subject to separate licensing pursuant to this subsection E16.  

The nonprofit sponsor shall collect said fee and remit the fee to the city within five (5) working days following the CCE. Said remittance shall be accompanied by a complete list of participants and consecutively numbered receipts written in triplicate containing the name, address and telephone number of the licensee, and the licensee's California seller's permit number. Said receipts shall be furnished by the city. One copy of the receipt shall be furnished to the licensee; one copy filed with the finance department of the city, and one copy retained by the CCE sponsor for a period of three (3) years for audit purposes. 
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REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNITY CIVIC EVENT
PORTERVILLE PREGNANCY RESOURCE CENTER
APRIL 6, 2013

Finance Director:  
M. Bemis

Public Works Director:  
B. Rodriguez

Community Development Director:  
B. Dunlap

Field Services Manager:  
B. Styles

Fire Chief:  
G. Irish

Parks and Leisure Services Director:  
D. Moore

Police Captain:  
D. Haynes

Administrative Services Director:  
P. Hildreth

No comments.

Approved with no comment.

No vehicles allowed to park in the park. Unloading/loading only on path

No requirements.

Risk Management requires waivers of liability to be signed by all participants. See Exhibit A, page 2.
REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNITY CIVIC EVENT

Sponsor: Porterville Pregnancy Resource Center
Event: Bike and Skate for Life
Event Chairman: Frank P. Rodriquez
Location: Skate Park
Date of Event: April 6, 2013
Time of Event: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

RISK MANAGEMENT: Conditions of Approval

That the Porterville Pregnancy Resource Center provide a Certificate of Commercial General Liability Insurance Coverage evidencing coverage of not less than $1,000,000 per occurrence, and having the appropriate Endorsement naming the City of Porterville, its Officers, Employees, Agents and Volunteers as “Additional Insured” against all claims arising from, or in connection with, the Permittee’s operation and sponsorship of the aforementioned Community Civic Event.

A. Said Certificate of Insurance shall be an original (fax and xerographic copies not acceptable), the Certificate shall be signed by an agent authorized to bind insurance coverage with the carrier, and the deductible, if any, shall not be greater than $1,000.

B. Said insurance shall be primary to the insurance held by the City of Porterville, be with a company having an A.M. Best Rating of no less that A:VII, and the insurance company must be an “admitted” insurer in the State of California.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
OUTSIDE AMPLIFIER PERMIT
(City Ordinances #18-9 & 18-14)

This application must be submitted ten (10) days prior to the date of the event. A copy of this permit must be at the operating premises of the amplifying equipment for which this registration is issued.

1 Name and home address of the applicant: Frank J. Rodriguez
   721 W. Pioneer Ave, Porterville, CA. 93257

2 Address where amplification equipment is to be used: Veterans Skate Park

3 Names and addresses of all persons who will use or operate the amplification equipment: Frank Chavez

4 Type of event for which amplification equipment will be used: Skate & Bike for Life

5 Dates and hours of operation of amplification equipment: 8:00 am - 5:00 pm April 6, 2013

6 A general description of the sound amplifying equipment to be used: 16 Channel Sound Board

Section 18-9 It shall be unlawful for any person within the city to use or operate or cause to be operated or to play any radio, phonograph, jukebox, record player, loudspeaker, musical instrument, mechanical device, machine, apparatus, or instrument for intensification or amplification of the human voice or any sound or noise in a manner so loud as to be calculated to disturb the peace and good order of the neighborhood or sleep of ordinary persons in nearby residences or so loud as to unreasonably disturb and interfere with the peace and comfort.

The operation of any such instrument, phonograph, jukebox, machine or device in such a manner as to be plainly audible at a distance of one hundred feet (100') from the building, structure, vehicle, or place in which, or on which it is situated or located shall be prima facie evidence of a violation of this section. (Ord. Code §6311)

Section 18-14 It shall be unlawful for any person to maintain, operate, connect, or suffer or permit to be maintained, operated, or connected any or sound amplifier in such a manner as to cause any sound to be projected outside of any building or out of doors in any part of the city, except as may be necessary to amplify sound for the proper presentation of moving picture shows, or exhibiting for the convenient hearing of patrons within the building or enclosure in which the show or exhibition is given, without having first procured a permit from the chief of police, which permit shall be granted at the will of the chief of police upon application in writing therefore, but which permit, when granted, shall be revocable by the city council whenever any such loudspeaker or sound amplifier shall by the council be deemed objectionable, and any such permit may be so revoked with or without notice, or with or without a formal hearing, at the option of the council, and in the event of the revocation of any such permit, the same shall not be renewed, except upon application as the first instance. (Ord. Code §6312)

Penal Code Section 415 (2) Any of the following persons shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail for a period of not more than 90 days, a fine of not more than four hundred dollars ($400), or both such imprisonment and fine: (2) Any person who maliciously and willfully disturbs another person by loud and unreasonable noise.

I hereby certify that I have read and answered all statements on this registration form and that they are true and correct.

Frank J. Rodriguez
Signature of Applicant

2-5-13
Date

THIS OUTSIDE AMPLIFIER PERMIT HAS BEEN APPROVED. HOWEVER, WE URGEP YOU TO REMAIN CONSIDERATE OF THE GENERAL PEACE AND ORDER OF THE NEIGHBORS IN THE AREA. FAILURE TO ABIDE BY THESE REGULATIONS CAN RESULT IN REVOCATION OF THE PERMIT.

City of Porterville, Chief of Police Designee

2-27-13
Date
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 8630 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 February 19, 2013, 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 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. Although all repair projects were originally to be completed by no later than July 2012, the City received a one (1)-year extension to July 2013.

At its meeting on October 16, 2012, the Council awarded a contract in the amount of $95,391.71 to Greg Bartlett Construction (Porterville), beginning CEMA repairs to Plano Street (south of Thurman Avenue), El Granito Street (near Zalud Park), E. Grand Avenue (at Henrahan Street), and W. Grand Avenue (at Hawail Street). At its meeting on December 18, 2012, the Council accepted the completion of these identified CEMA repairs, including $90,295.53 in final construction costs.

At its meeting on January 15, 2013, the Council authorized staff to begin advertising for bids the repair of West Street and related storm drain improvements between Scranton and Tea Pot Dome Avenues, with a total estimated probable project cost of $52,098. The final, and most significant, repair project is currently under design, which includes the repair and resurfacing of Henderson Avenue between Newcomb and Westwood Streets.

Item No. 13
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 8630 of the California Emergency Services Act, determine that a need exists to continue said local emergency designation.

ATTACHMENT: None
PUBLIC HEARING

SUBJECT: VACATION OF EASEMENTS FOR INGRESS, EGRESS, STORM DRAIN PIPELINE AND STORM WATER RETENTION RELATED TO SIERRA MEADOWS SUBDIVISION (Nicholson & Smee, LLC)

SOURCE: Public Works Department – Engineering Division

COMMENT: This is the time and place set for the hearing on the proposed vacation of easements for ingress, egress, storm drain pipeline and storm water retention related to the development of Sierra Meadows Subdivision. These easements are generally located between Indiana Street and State Route 65, north of Gibbons Avenue. The easements were necessary for the orderly development of the first phase of this subdivision. Construction of the recently completed storm drain pipeline along Indiana Street and the diversion of storm water flow north to a larger basin, ends the need for these easements. The City has authority to vacate these easements under Section 8320, Part 3, Division 9, of the Streets and Highways Code of the State of California.

Staff believes that there are no problems with any reversionary rights since these easements are in favor of the City of Porterville. Abandonment of these easements does not affect other agencies or other utility companies.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Conduct a Public Hearing;

2. Adopt the Resolution of Vacation for the easements described in the attached legal description; and

3. Authorize the City Clerk to record the Resolution of Vacation.

ATTACHMENTS: Resolution
Easements Legal Description
Map of Easement Vacation
RESOLUTION NO._____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
ORDERING THE VACATION AND CLOSING TO PUBLIC USE EASEMENTS FOR
INGRESS, EGRESS, STORM DRAIN PIPELINE AND STORM WATER RETENTION
RELATED TO SIERRA MEADOWS SUBDIVISION

WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 02-2013, passed on February 5, 2013, the City
Council of the City of Porterville declared its intention to vacate easements for ingress,
egress, storm drain pipeline and storm water retention located between Indiana Street
and State Route 65, north of Gibbons Avenue, hereinafter more particularly described,
and set the hour of 6:00 p.m. on the 5th day of March, 2013, or as soon thereafter as
the matter can be heard, in the Council Chambers of said City as the time and place for
hearing all persons objecting to the proposed vacation; and

WHEREAS, such public hearing has been held at said time and place, and there
were no protests, oral or written, to such vacation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of
Porterville as follows:

SECTION 1: The Council hereby finds, from all the evidence submitted, that the
easements hereinafter described are unnecessary for present or prospective use, and
the City Council hereby makes its order vacating said easements between Indiana
Street and State Route 65, north of Gibbons Avenue, which are described in the legal
description attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A" and by reference made a part hereof.

SECTION 2: The City Clerk shall cause a copy of this resolution to be recorded
in the office of the Clerk-Recorder of Tulare County, California.

SECTION 3: The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this
resolution and it shall thereupon take effect and be in force.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of March, 2013.

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk

Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor
EXHIBIT "A"

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Easement Vacation

Parcel 1 – Storm Water Retention

That portion of the Northeast quarter of the Southeast quarter of Section 3, Township 22 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, in the City of Porterville, County of Tulare, State of California, more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING AT a point in the East line of the Northeast quarter of said Southeast quarter, said point being South 00°38'54" West, 546.19 feet of the Northeast corner of said Southeast quarter;

THENCE, North 89°21'06" West, 249.22 feet, to the POINT OF BEGINNING;

THENCE, South 00°37'59" West, 416.28 feet;

THENCE, South 71°51'12" West, 258.91 feet;

THENCE, North 20°27'36" West, 93.56 feet;

THENCE, North 02°01'40" West, 220.15 feet;

THENCE, North 24°38'21" West, 84.44 feet;

THENCE, North 01°11'08" East, 262.39 feet;

THENCE, North 89°09'06" East, 273.73 feet;

THENCE, South 40°56'02" East, 73.70 feet;

THENCE, South 00°37'59" West, 98.23 feet, to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Parcel 2 – Ingress, Egress and Storm Drain

An easement 20 feet in width, the center line of said easement being described as follows:

BEGINNING AT a point in the East line of the Northeast quarter of said Southeast quarter, said point being South 00°38'54" West, 546.19 feet of the Northeast corner of said Southeast quarter;

THENCE, North 89°21'06" West, 300.00 feet to the terminus of the center line being described.

END OF DESCRIPTION
MAP OF EASEMENT VACATION

CITY OF PORTERVILLE
ENGINEERING DIVISION
281 N. MAIN ST.
PORTERVILLE, CALIFORNIA 93257
661 782-7462

A PORTION OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 3, TOWNSHIP 22 SOUTH, RANGE 27 EAST, MOUNT DIABLO BASE AND MERIDIAN, IN THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE, COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF.

OWNER: NICOLSON & SNEE, LLC
APNs: 268-110-025
268-110-026
DRAWN BY: Bw
CHK'D BY: DB

Parcel 1

Parcel 2
Wide Easement For Ingress, Egress and Storm Drainage Pipeline Recorded Dec. 28, 2004 As Instrument No. 2004-0134039

Ingress, Egress and S.D. Pipeline
Storm Water Retention
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA: MARCH 5, 2013

PUBLIC HEARING

SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF MODIFICATION OR REVOCATION OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 8-82 (RESOLUTION 13-2008)

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT – PLANNING DIVISION

COMMENTS: On February 19, 2008, the City Council adopted Resolution 13-2008, approving Modification No. 1 to Conditional Use Permit 8-82 General and Specific Plans Phase One to allow the construction of a drive-through restaurant and drive-through coffee kiosk located at the southeast corner of Putnam Avenue and Leggett Street, currently addressed as 815 E. Putnam Avenue. The subject site zoning classification at the time of project approval was PD-R1 (Planned Development - One Family Residential) and approved by resolution to be a five (5) phased residential and commercial development. On March 6, 2008, the developer submitted a set of plans to the Public Works Department to obtain permits for the construction of the drive-through restaurant and drive-through coffee kiosk as per City Council approved exhibits. As soon as all required information was obtained from the developer, the plans were approved by all required departments on November 29, 2010, and the building permits were issued to the developer on July 16, 2012.

On February 14, 2013, during the final inspection of 815 E. Putnam Avenue, more specifically the constructed drive-through restaurant, City staff observed deviations in the constructed building from the conditions and plans approved by City Council under Conditional Use Permit 8-82 (Resolution 13-2008). In addition to the deviations, some components of the built development are out of compliance with the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance established upon project approval.

Many of the deviations from the approved plans, listed herein as Attachment 5, are not easily correctable, therefore, the matter has been set for City Council consideration on March 5, 2013. On February 22, 2013, a letter was mailed to the developer stating that a public hearing was scheduled for City Council to consider modification or revocation of CUP 8-82 General and Specific Plans Phase One, and due to the deviations (listed herein) the Community Development Department - Planning Division was unable to approve the developer’s occupancy permit without City Council’s review and determination. Staff has met with the developer and she is working on resolving the defined code deficiencies and inconsistencies with the conditions of approval. However, the full revision of the project to the original design would be difficult, time consuming, and in some instances cost prohibitive.
It is the City's policy to schedule a public hearing pursuant to Section 3103 (reference is to prior Zoning Ordinance due to permits being issued under prior Code provisions) of the Zoning Ordinance where there is or has been a violation of or failure to observe the terms or conditions of the permit, or that the use has been conducted in violation of the provisions of the ordinance, law, or regulations.

Resolution No. 13-2008 (Attachment 2) contains the following preamble that is pertinent to the issue:

"WHEREAS: The project consists of two drive-through buildings providing restaurant (1,389 square feet) and coffee (600 square feet) services for a total combined square footage of 1,989 square feet of building space. The colors and finish of the proposed buildings will be brown and cream tones compatible to the convenience market on the adjacent parcel to the west. Additionally, landscaping will be installed along the frontage of the property, in front of both buildings, and along the restaurant's menu board; and"

The constructed development at this time has omitted the 600 square foot coffee kiosk. Additionally, the color and finish of the existing building does not incorporate cream tones to make it compatible to the convenience market (Sunnyside Handy Market) on the adjacent parcel to the west, nor is the architecture consistent with that approved by the City Council. The footprint of the building and the architectural treatment to the building including the building entrance enhancements, brick veneer, awning and landscaping are different from that approved by the City Council.

Resolution No. 13-2008 contains the following finding that is pertinent to the issue:

"7. The project as proposed complies with all design standards of the Zoning Ordinance."

Section 2206 (E) of the Zoning Ordinance states: "Lights: If the parking area is illuminated, lighting shall be deflected away from abutting residential sites so as to cause no annoying glare."

Section 2206 (F)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance states; "A minimum of five foot (5') wide screen planting strip shall be provided and permanently maintained adjacent to any property line separating a parking area from a public street."

The constructed development is not in compliance with the design standards of the Zoning Ordinance, due to the referenced sections above. The exterior lighting attached to the building is unshielded and faces residential sites to the north, east and south. The required five (5) foot wide screening planting strip is not installed at the northeast corner of the project site as per City Council findings of approval.
The developer is working on complying with the defined code issues and conditions of approval on lighting.

Resolution No. 13-2008 contains the following conditions that are pertinent issues:

“4. For safety and security, adequate lighting will be required during hours of operation that maintains visibility throughout the lot and designed to minimize glare and spillover onto adjacent parcels. Lighting is to be approved by the Police Chief or Community Development Director.”

As referenced above, the lighting is not designed to limit glare or spillover onto adjacent parcels. In addition, the lighting did not receive required review by the Police Chief or Community Development Director. The developer is working on complying with the defined code issues and conditions of approval on lighting.

“5. All mechanical and electrical equipment is to be screened and maintained from public view.”

The heating and air conditioning unit installed on the roof is not screened from public view. An architecturally compatible screen would need to be installed to obstruct views of the roof mounted equipment. The developer is working on complying with the defined code issues and conditions of approval on screening of mechanical equipment.

“15. The developer/applicant shall provide street lights on Marbelite poles following Southern California Edison Company specifications, as approved by the City Engineer. Do not use wood poles without prior written approval of the City Engineer. A 9500 lumen street light shall be installed at the northeast property corner.”

A street light is required to be installed along Putnam Avenue, which the developer has not indicated a willingness to install.

“16. The developer/applicant shall design and improve the parking lot in conformance with Section 2206 and 2211 (Exhibit A) of the Zoning Ordinance.”

The parking lot layout has been modified from that reviewed by staff and approved by the City Council. For example, a minimum five (5) foot wide landscape planter is required between the easterly row of parking spaces and the street.

“38. At all times, the facilities shall be constructed, operated and maintained to comply with State law, the City of Porterville Municipal Code, adopted Building Codes and all other applicable laws and ordinances.”
Due to the identified changes in the project, the development does not currently comply with the provision of the Municipal Code and Conditions of approval. With the exception of the changes in site layout and the architectural changes, the developer is working on complying with the defined code issues and conditions of approval on lighting (except the required street light) and screening of mechanical equipment.

"39. That the subject site will be developed in accordance with the site plan and elevation plan labeled Exhibit "A"."

Current constructed development is not in compliance with the above City Council conditions of approval under Resolution 13-2008 as indicated in the above comments.

It is the City's policy to consider modification or revocation of a Conditional Use Permit on any one or more of the grounds described herein after a public hearing is held and conducted as per Section 3103 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 3101 of the Zoning Ordinance states that grounds for such revocation shall be any of the following:

1. That approval was obtained by means of fraud or misrepresentation of a material fact;

2. That the permittee or holder of the variance has failed to undertake the use in question for an unreasonable period of time;

3. That the use in question has ceased to exist or has been suspended for one (1) year or more;

4. That there is or has been a violation of or failure to observe the terms or conditions of the permit or variance, or the use has been conducted in violation of the provisions of the Ordinance, law or regulation;

5. That the use to which the permit or variance applies has been conducted in a manner detrimental to the public safety, health and welfare, or so as to be a nuisance.

Section 3102 of the Zoning Ordinance states that grounds for modification shall be any of the following:

1. That the grounds which would otherwise justify a revocation of the permit or variance can be corrected or cured by modification imposing new or additional conditions;
2. That improvement of methods or technological advances permit conducted of the use with adequate safeguards under the proposed modification;

3. That one or more of the original conditions of the permit or variance is unworkable, impractical or otherwise fails to accomplish the original aims.

OPTIONS:  

1. Consider Modification No. 2 to CUP 8-82 to allow occupancy of the drive-through restaurant subject to the original conditions of approval, provided the specific code requirements are met. This would result in an approved revision to the approved site plan, building elevations and floor plans. Due to the time sensitivity of the project, a draft resolution is included for consideration to impose the original and appropriately amended conditions.

2. Consider Modification No. 2 to CUP 8-82 to allow occupancy of the drive-through restaurant and impose or remove new conditions of approval, under grounds that one or more of the original conditions of the permit is unworkable and impractical to accomplish the original aims.

3. Consider revocation of Modification No. 1 to CUP 8-82 and not permit occupancy of the drive-through restaurant based on lack of compliance with the approved plans and conditions of approval.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council consider the circumstances of the project and consider one of the above alternatives or provide other direction to staff.

ATTACHMENTS:  

1. Resolution No. 9746 (Approving CUP 8-82)  
2. Resolution No. 13-2008 (Modification No.1 to CUP 8-82)  
3. Letter to the developer  
4. Approved complete set of plans  
5. List of deviations  
6. Pictures (815 E. Putnam Avenue)  
7. Draft resolution for City Council consideration of Modification No. 2 to Cup 8-82
RESOLUTION NO. 9746

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF PORTERVILLE APPROVING CONDITIONAL
USE PERMIT NO. 8-82/GENERAL AND SPECIFIC
DEVELOPMENT PLANS

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of
Porterville that Conditional Use Permit No. 8-82/General Develop-
ment Plans is approved as recommended in Planning Commission
Resolution No. 1387, subject to the following conditions:

1. That all future on-site development shall conform to ap-
icable City of Porterville codes.

2. That all future on-site development shall conform to the
City's Zoning Ordinance.

3. That all future on-site uses shall conform to the City's
Fire Department Standards.

4. That the requirements of the City Engineer shall be com-
plied with, to-wit:

   1. Sewer service Phases 2, 3, and 4 shall be in
      accordance with the City Sewer Master Plan.

   2. That all improvements required shall be con-
      structed in accordance with the City of Porter-
      ville standard plans and specifications, that all
      applicable codes and ordinances along with the
      recommendations of the City Engineer are to be
      adhered to, and that all applicable fees required
      for same shall be paid in accordance with the

5. That the development shall be substantially as shown on
   the General Development Plans (Exhibit A). Where the zoning
   ordinance and conditions of a proval differ from the General
   Development Plans, the ordinance and conditions shall pre-
   vail.

6. That the residential development be limited to the Gen-
   eral Plan density of 7 units per acre plus the ten percent
density bonus allowed by Section 1708.B.1. of the zoning
   ordinance.

7. That the environmental impacts identified by the Environ-
   mental Review Committee be mitigated as follows:

   A. The City has insufficient sewer capacity pre-
      sently available to serve the area covered by this
      plan.

       This impact may be mitigated as follows:

       1. All uses allowed in Phase I of the Project
          shall be low volume generators of sewer flow.
          USE PERMIT NO.

       2. No development beyond Phase I shall be
          permitted until sewer capacity to serve the
          project area is assured.

ATTACHMENT
ITEM NO. 1
3. The developer is negotiating to use a portion of the excess capacity controlled by the Porter Vista Public Utility District to serve this site.

4. The City is pursuing means of constructing a relief line to serve this area either through its pending redevelopment project or by some other financing method.

B. There is a potential for an impact on the residential area to the north from the glare produced by the lighting of the convenience market in Phase I.

   This impact may be mitigated as follows:

   1. On-site lighting for the commercial portions of the project shall be so controlled to prevent direct or reflected glare as per Section 2618, F, of the Zoning Ordinance.

C. There is a potential flooding hazard due to water coming onto the site from adjacent areas.

   This impact may be mitigated as follows:

   1. Further studies and designs to mitigate any potential flooding hazard shall be required with any subsequent specific development plans.

D. The impact on various public services shall be further addressed at the time of future Specific Development Plan reviews. This shall include further review of circulation, traffic, fire and police protection and impacts on schools and other governmental services.

8. Prior to any development occurring, an agreement in writing must be made between the City and any other affected entity which will insure that the sewer problem identified is alleviated.

9. If Specific Development Plans are submitted for approval by phases, the developer may be required to construct reasonable improvements not located within the phase or area of development being proposed.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Porterville, that Conditional Use Permit No. 8-82/Specific Development Plans Phase I is hereby approved as recommended in Planning Commission Resolution No. 1388, subject to the following conditions:

   1. That all future on-site development shall conform to applicable City of Porterville codes.

   2. That all future on-site development shall conform to the City's Zoning Ordinance.

   3. That all future on-site uses shall conform to the City's Fire Department Standards.
4. That the requirements of the City Engineer shall be complied with, to-wit:

1. That all improvements required shall be constructed in accordance with the City of Porterville standard plans and specifications, that all applicable codes and ordinances along with the recommendations of the City Engineer are to be adhered to, and that all applicable fees required for same shall be paid in accordance with the Municipal Code of the City of Porterville.

2. That the subdivider shall pay all fees involved to have any existing utility poles set back behind the future sidewalk.

3. Additional improvements to be added to the specific plans are as follows:
   a. Cross gutter across Leggett to join with newly installed cross gutter.
   b. Street paveout along Leggett and Putnam after gutter is constructed.
   c. Handicap ramp at corner of Leggett and future street.

5. That the development shall be substantially as shown on the Specific Development Plans (Exhibit B). Where the zoning ordinance and conditions of approval differ from the Specific Development Plans, the ordinance and conditions shall prevail.

6. That the environmental impact pertaining to Phase I identified by the Environmental Review Committee be mitigated as follows:

   A. The City has sufficient sewer capacity presently available to serve the area covered by this plan.
      1) All uses allowed in Phase I of the Project shall be low volume generators of sewer flow.

   B. There is a potential for an impact on the residential area to the north from the glare produced by the lighting of the convenience market in Phase I.
      1) On-site lighting for the commercial portions of the project shall be so controlled to prevent direct or reflected glare as per Section 2618, P, of the Zoning Ordinance.

7. That landscaping shall be of the low profile type and shall not be a visual obstruction to vehicular and pedestrian traffic and shall be of the type which shall not cause damage to curbs, gutters and sidewalks.

8. That Specific Plans shall be accompanied by a proposed schedule indicating commencement and completion of construction.

9. Prior to issuance of building permits a proposed schedule of construction shall be submitted to and approved by the City Planner for referral to the City Engineer.
10. If Specific Development Plans are submitted for approval by phases, the developer may be required to construct reasonable improvements not located within the phase or area of development being proposed.

11. That Development of Phase I cannot be started until specific plans for street, gutter and sidewalk improvements in Phase III are submitted and approved by the Planning Commission.

Mary Dougherty, Mayor

ATTEST:

C. G. Huffaker, City Clerk

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF TULARE

I, C. G. HUFFAKER, the duly appointed City Clerk of the City of Porterville, do hereby certify and declare that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly and regularly passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the Porterville City Council regularly called and held on the 7th day of September, 1982.

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

AYES: COUNCILMEN: Durbin, Tree, Dougherty,
NOES: COUNCILMEN: Ferrell, Moran,
ABSENT: COUNCILMEN: None

C. G. HUFFAKER, City Clerk

Georgia Hawley, Deputy
RESOLUTION NO. 13-2008

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
CONTAINING FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF MODIFICATION NO. 1
TO CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 8-82 / GENERAL AND SPECIFIC
DEVELOPMENT PLANS, PHASE ONE, TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A DRIVE
THROUGH RESTAURANT AND COFFEE KIOSK LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST
CORNER OF PUTNAM AVENUE AND LEGGETT STREET

WHEREAS: The City Council at its regularly scheduled meeting of February 19, 2008,
reviewed the modified site plans for a modification to CUP 8-82/ General and Specific Plans
Phase One to allow proposed construction of a drive through restaurant and drive through
coffee kiosk located at the southeast corner of Putnam Avenue and Leggett Street. The
subject site is located in the PD-R1 (Planned Development-One Family Residential Zone);
and

WHEREAS: The project consists of two drive through buildings providing restaurant
(1,389 square feet) and coffee (600 square feet) services for a total combined square footage
of 1,989 square feet of building space. The colors and finish of the proposed buildings will be
brown and cream tones compatible to the convenience market on the adjacent parcel to the
west. Additionally, landscaping will be installed along the frontage of the property, in front of
both buildings, and along the restaurant's menu board; and

WHEREAS: This project is Categorically Exempt pursuant to Section 15332 of the
CEQA Guidelines — construction of in-fill development. Under the Permit Streamlining Act
(Section 65950 of the Government Code), the City has 60 days from the date the project was
accepted as complete to reach a determination regarding this project.

WHEREAS: The City Council made the following findings with respect to the subject
project:

1. The General Plan designates the subject site as Low Density Residential.

The subject site is zoned PD-R1 (Planned Development – One Family Zone)
which is supported by the General Plan. The proposed use is allowed pursuant
to approval of Conditional Use Permit Specific and General Plan.

2. That a conceptual plan was submitted for Phase Two at the time Phase One
was approved.

3. That the site is physically suited for the type of development proposed. The site
is level and vacant.

ATTACHMENT
ITEM NO. 2
4. That the design of the project nor the proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage. An onsite inspection was conducted by staff. No natural habitat was observed. As such, no endangered, threatened or rare species or habitats exist and no impact will occur.

5. That the proposed location of the proposed and the conditions under which it will be operated and maintained will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

Conditions of approval are included to ensure adequate development standards are met.

6. That the standards of population density, site area dimensions, site coverage, height of structures, distance between structures, off-street parking facilities, and landscaping areas will produce an environment of stable and desirable character consistent with the objectives of the Zoning Ordinance.

7. The project as proposed complies with all design standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the City Council of the City of Porterville does hereby approve Modification #1 to Conditional Use Permit 8-82 subject to the following conditions:

1. Reciprocal ingress/egress agreement is required with the adjacent convenience market to the west. A recorded agreement shall be submitted to the City prior to issuance of building permits for the proposed site.

2. The proposed project will be considered as Modification #1 to CUP 8-22, approved by City Council Resolution 9746 for Phase 1 (Specific Plans).

3. The hours of operation are as follows:

   Sunday - Saturday
   5:30am to 12:00am

4. For safety and security, adequate lighting will be required during hours of operation that maintains visibility throughout the lot and designed to minimize glare and spillover onto adjacent parcels. Lighting is to be approved by the Police Chief or Community Development Director.

5. All mechanical and electrical equipment is to be screened and maintained from public view.

7. The developer/applicant shall pay all applicable fees according to the Municipal Code and State law. The developer/applicant is hereby notified that you have the right to pay fees, dedications, reservations or other exactions, under protest, pursuant to Government Code Section 66020(a). You have 90 days from the date fees are paid to file a written protest.

8. The developer/applicant shall follow Appendix Chapter 33 of the California Building Code including provision of a grading and drainage plan signed by a licensed civil engineer or architect. The developer/applicant shall comply with City Retaining Wall Standards (adopted by City Council January 3, 1989) at lot lines where such standards are applicable.

9. Developer/applicant shall provide a Soils Report in conformance with Chapter 18 of the California Building Code. Expansive soils are known to be in the area of the proposed development. The Soils Report shall include R-Value testing, expansion indexes, etc required for the construction of public improvements.

10. The developer/applicant shall construct and/or repair street, curb, gutter, sidewalk, etc. along the full frontage of the parcel except where they exist and are in good condition in the opinion of the City Engineer (Ord. No. 1306).

11. The developer/applicant shall remove existing trees at all driveways serving the development for the purpose of provide appropriate visibility for vehicular traffic existing the property.

12. The developer/applicant shall construct drainage facilities as required to serve the property (Ord. No. 1306).

13. Easements shall be in place that allows for mutual ingress, egress and maintenance of the parking lots shared by the proposed development parcel and the adjacent westerly parcel, if none exists.

14. The developer/applicant shall move existing utility structures (For example, poles, splice boxes, vaults, etc.) to a position that provides a minimum of four feet (4') of clear space in the sidewalk area and a minimum of two feet (2') of clear space from the curb face to the structure, unless they are below grade (Title 24 OSA).

15. The developer/applicant shall provide street lights on Marbelite poles following Southern California Edison Company specifications, as approved by the City Engineer. Do not use wood poles without prior written approval of the City Engineer. A 9500 lumen street light shall be installed at the northeast property corner.
16. The developer/applicant shall design and improve the parking lot in conformance with Section 2206 and 2211 (Exhibit A) of the Zoning Ordinance.

17. The developer/applicant shall, under City inspection, remove all existing abandoned and unnecessary items, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, before the issuance of a certificate of occupancy (For example, foundations, septic tanks, irrigation pipes, etc.).

18. The developer/applicant shall abandon existing wells, if any, after first getting an abandonment permit from the County Department of Environmental Health, and providing the City Engineer with proof of compliance with County regulations before performing any grading or issuance of the building permit, whichever comes first.

19. The developer/applicant shall comply with Ordinance No. 1636 regarding Waste Water Discharge requirements and shall complete and submit the following:

Wastewater Discharge Permit Application, Part “A”; and

If monitoring is required, based on the responses to questions in Part “A” of the Wastewater Discharge Permit, then the developer/applicant shall complete and submit the remainder of the application along with the Permit Fee, and provide monitoring facilities to allow inspection, sampling, and flow measurement of the flows in the sewer and drainage system.

20. If hazardous materials are to be stored in jurisdictional quantities anywhere on the property, the developer/applicant shall develop and maintain a Hazardous Materials Business Plan Program, follow Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code, and shall tell the Hazardous Materials Unit of the Tulare County Division of Environmental Health. The developer/applicant shall provide proof of compliance with County requirements before issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

21. The developer/applicant shall install a refuse container enclosure according to City standards. The enclosure location to be approved by City prior to issuance of building permit. The developer/applicant shall also sign a waiver of liability for refuse truck damage to the parking lot if the refuse container location requires refuse trucks to travel on the parking lot.

22. The developer/applicant shall comply with the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance. The property is within a Flood Hazard Zone AO (1 foot depth). A Licensed Civil Engineer or Land Surveyor shall confirm that the finished floor will be constructed at or above the Base Flood Elevation in letter form or by providing a Preliminary Elevation Certificate. The same professional shall confirm that the finish floor is at or above the Base Flood Elevation by submitting an Elevation Certificate to the City Engineer for approval prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. Preliminary Elevation Certificates and Elevation Certificates are available within the Engineering Division upon request.

23. The developer/applicant shall comply with City standard for “backflow” prevention pursuant to Resolution No. 9615.
24. The developer/applicant is hereby notified that the installation of an additional water meter, servicing the irrigation system would be beneficial for monitoring actual water usage. The City will monitor actual water usage for one year and will bill the owner the impact fees based on the actual water usage.

25. A back-flow device is required on the water meter.

26. A grease trap or grease interceptor is required.

27. Submit three (3) complete sets of plans, signed by a licensed Architect or Engineer, to include two (2) sets of energy calculations and structural calculations.

28. Compliance with access laws (both State and Federal) is required.

29. Compliance with all applicable codes is required.

30. Plan check fees are required at the time of building permit submittal.

31. Soil report required.

32. School Development fees and all other City fees are due at the time of building permit issuance.

33. Prior to issuance of the building permit need approval from the Tulare County Health Department.

34. Restrooms and main entrance must comply with ADA access laws.

35. All construction offices, storage containers, etc. for temporary use must receive City Council approval.

36. Grease interceptor required.

37. Signs require separate permit.

38. At all times, the facilities shall be constructed, operated and maintained to comply with State law, the City of Porterville Municipal Code, adopted Building Codes and all other applicable laws and ordinances.

39. That the subject site will be developed in accordance with the site plan and elevation plans labeled Exhibit "A."

40. The conditional use permit shall become null and void if not under taken and actively and continuously pursued within one (1) year.
41. The applicant shall submit clearance from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, regarding groundwater and/or soils contamination prior to issuance of building permits for the proposed site.

Cameron Hamilton, Mayor

Attest:
John Longley, City Clerk

By
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )
CITY OF PORTERVILLE  )  SS
COUNTY OF TULARE  )

I, JOHN LONGLEY, the duly appointed City Clerk of the City of Porterville do hereby certify and declare that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution passed and adopted by the Council of the City of Porterville at a regular meeting of the Porterville City Council duly called and held on the 19th day of February, 2008.

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

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

JOHN LONGLEY, CITY CLERK

By Luisa Herrera, Deputy City Clerk
February 22, 2013

Mary McClure  
23149 Josef Court  
Porterville, CA 93257

Re: 815 E. Putnam Avenue

Dear Ms. McClure,

Thank you for taking the time to contact staff to express your concerns about the development project located at 815 E. Putnam Avenue. We regret any inconvenience you have experienced in the duration of your construction phase. During the final inspection of the above address, staff members observed deviations in the constructed building from the conditions and plans approved by City Council under Conditional Use Permit 8-82 (Resolution 13-2008) on February 19, 2008. Additionally, some components of the built development are out of compliance with the Zoning Ordinance in effect at the time of the project approval. Due to these deviations, the Planning Division is unable to approve your occupancy permit.

This letter is to inform you that a public hearing is scheduled on Tuesday, March 5, at 6:30 p.m. or as soon thereafter in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 291 N. Main Street in Porterville, in order to consider modification or revocation of Conditional Use Permit 8-82 approving the general and specific plans phase 1 (Resolution 13-2008) that approved the construction of a drive through restaurant and coffee kiosk (please see attachment).

Staff will send you a copy of the staff report which will contain a complete list of items identified for correction prior to the Tuesday, March 5, 2013 public hearing.

The Community Development Department is working hard to resolve the issues mentioned above. If you have any questions, feel free to contact Bradley D. Dunlap, Community Development Director.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Julie Phillips, AICP  
Community Development Manager
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Notice is hereby given, that the City Council of the City of Porterville will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, March 5, 2013 at 6:30 p.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 291 N. Main Street, Porterville, California, in order to consider modification or revocation of Conditional Use Permit 8-82 approving the general and specific plans phase 1 (Resolution 13-2008) that approved the construction of a drive through restaurant and coffee kiosk located at 815 E. Putnam Ave.

Pursuant to Section 15332 Class 32 (In-Fill Development Project), the proposed project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the California Ralph M. Brown Act, if you need special assistance to participate in these meetings, or to be able to access these agendas and documents in the agenda packets, please contact the Deputy City Clerk at (559) 782 - 7442. Notification 48 hours prior to these meetings will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to these meetings and/or provision of an appropriate alternative format of the agenda and documents in the agenda packets.

DATED: February 23, 2013

John Lollis, City Clerk
NEW RESTAURANT
MARY McCLURE
PUTNAM AVE. & LEGGETT ST.
PORTERVILLE CA. 93257

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTACHMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITEM NO. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHEET INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS COVER SHEET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1 SITE PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2 STANDARD NOTES/LEGENDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3 FLOOR/FOUNDATION PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4 ELEVATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-5 ROOF/MECHANICAL PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-6 EQUIPMENT PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1 ELECTRICAL PLAN &amp; NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1 HANDICAP DETAILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-2 HANDICAP DETAILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1 PLUMBING PLANS &amp; DETAILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-1 SECTIONS AND DETAILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2 SECTIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUILDING OCCUPANCY: B
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION: TYPE V-B
BUILDING HEIGHT MAX: 10'
SEISMIC DESIGN CATEGORY: D
BUILDING DESIGNED UNDER 2007 CBC.
List of Deviations

- The exterior lighting attached to the building are facing residential sites to the east and south. (Section 2006 (E) of the Zoning Ordinance)
- The required five foot (5’) wide screening planting strip is not installed at the northeast corner of the project site. (Section 2206 (F)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance)
- The Marbelite Pole street light was required but not installed as specified.
- The roof mounted mechanical equipment is not screened from public view as conditioned.
- The awning is not installed. (north elevation)
- The masonry veneer is not installed. (north and west elevation)
- The arch entry ways are not constructed. (north and west elevation)
- The window trims are not per plans.
- Additional windows on the east, north and west elevations have been added.
- The ten foot (10’) wide outdoor dining area and tables are not installed.
- The west elevation entry door is not constructed.
- The north elevation entry door has been shifted approximately 10 feet (10’) to the east.
- The two foot (2’) pop-out drive-thru window is not constructed per plans.
- The three foot (3’) wide landscaping strip along the east elevation is not installed.
- The loading zone has been relocated to the southeast corner.
- The landscaped island located adjacent to the ADA parking stall is not constructed.
- The 600 square foot proposed coffee kiosk is not constructed.

ATTACHMENT ITEM NO. 5
RESOLUTION NO._______

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
CONTAINING FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 8-82,
MODIFICATION NO. 2, GENERAL AND SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLANS, PHASE
ONE, TO ALLOW OCCUPANCY OF THE CONSTRUCTED DRIVE-THROUGH
RESTAURANT LOCATED AT 815 E. PUTNAM AVENUE

WHEREAS: On February 19, 2008, the City Council adopted Resolution 13-2008
containing findings and conditions in support of Conditional Use Permit 8-82, Modification No.
1, General and Specific Development Plans Phase One, to allow the construction of a drive-
through restaurant and drive-through coffee kiosk located at the southeast corner of Putnam
Avenue and Leggett Street, currently addressed as 815 E. Putnam Avenue; and

WHEREAS: On February 14, 2013, during the final inspection of 815 E. Putnam
Avenue, more specifically the constructed drive-through restaurant, staff members observed
deviations in the constructed building from the conditions approved by City Council under
Conditional Use Permit 8-82, Modification No. 1 (Resolution 13-2008) and approved plans
included as Exhibit A to the resolution; and

WHEREAS: The City Council of the City of Porterville at its scheduled meeting of
March 5, 2013, conducted a public hearing to review CUP 8-82, Modification No. 2, General and
Specific Plans Phase One, to allow occupancy of the constructed drive-through restaurant subject
to the conditions of approval; and

WHEREAS: This project is Categorically Exempt pursuant to Section 15332 Class 32
(In-Fill Development) of the California Environmental Quality Act guidelines; and

WHEREAS: The City Council has considered the proposed amendments to the
conditional use permit and has found that the specific requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and
other requirements of the City have been met, and that the revisions to the site layout and
building architecture can support the proposed use; and

WHEREAS: The City Council made the following findings with respect to the subject
modifications:

1. That Conditional Use Permit 8-82, Modification No. 2 is consistent with the
Zoning Ordinance provided the parking lot striping, mechanical equipment
screening and lighting are in compliance with City standards and original
conditions of approval.

2. That the design and improvements of the proposed modifications were consistent
with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance at the time of project approval.

3. That the site is physically suitable for the type of development constructed.

ATTACHMENT ITEM NO. 0
The subject site is flat. Conformance with the City Storm Drain Master Plan, and requirements relative to grading, the California Building Code, etc., will be and have been required.

4. That the proposed modifications and improvements will not cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

5. That the proposed modifications or improvements will not cause serious public health problems.

The location of the constructed building and the conditions under which it would be operated or maintained will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the area.

6. That the standard of population density, site area dimension, site coverage, height of structure, distance between structures, off-site parking facilities, and landscaping areas will produce an environment of stable and desirable character consistent with the objectives of the Zoning Ordinance.

7. That the subject site shall comply with all design standards of the Zoning Ordinance which was in effect at the time of project approval, more specifically Section 2206 (E) and Section 2206 (F)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the City Council of the City of Porterville does hereby approve Conditional Use Permit 8-82, Modification No. 2 to allow occupancy of the constructed drive-through restaurant subject to the following conditions:

1. The hours of operation are to remain as originally approved pursuant to CUP 8-82, Modification No. 1 as follows:

   Sunday through Saturday
   5:30 am to 12:00 am (midnight)

2. For safety and security, adequate light will be required during the hours of operation that maintains visibility throughout the lot and designed to minimize glare and spillover onto adjacent parcels. Lighting is to be approved by the Police Chief or Community Development Director. Exterior lighting mounted on existing building shall install deflectors to prevent direct and annoying glare to the residential uses to the east and south of the project location.

3. Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy, all roof mounted, mechanical and electrical equipment shall be screened and maintained from public view.
4. Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy, an accurate complete set of as-built plans (3 copies) shall be submitted to show all revisions and modifications made to the existing building to the Public Work Department.

5. Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy, the developer shall design and improve the parking lot in conformance with Section 2206 (E) and Section 2206 (F)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance.

6. Comply with all local, state and federal laws, rules and regulations.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ______ day of March, 2013

By: ____________________________
Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: ____________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
RESOLUTION NO. 13-2008

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
CONTAINING FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF MODIFICATION NO. 1
TO CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 8-82 / GENERAL AND SPECIFIC
DEVELOPMENT PLANS, PHASE ONE, TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A DRIVE
THROUGH RESTAURANT AND COFFEE KIOSK LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST
CORNER OF PUTNAM AVENUE AND LEGGETT STREET

WHEREAS: The City Council at its regularly scheduled meeting of February 19, 2008, reviewed the modified site plans for a modification to CUP 8-82/ General and Specific Plans Phase One to allow proposed construction of a drive through restaurant and drive through coffee kiosk located at the southeast corner of Putnam Avenue and Leggett Street. The subject site is located in the PD-R1 (Planned Development-One Family Residential Zone); and

WHEREAS: The project consists of two drive through buildings providing restaurant (1,389 square feet) and coffee (600 square feet) services for a total combined square footage of 1,989 square feet of building space. The colors and finish of the proposed buildings will be brown and cream tones compatible to the convenience market on the adjacent parcel to the west. Additionally, landscaping will be installed along the frontage of the property, in front of both buildings, and along the restaurant’s menu board; and

WHEREAS: This project is Categorically Exempt pursuant to Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines – construction of in-fill development. Under the Permit Streamlining Act (Section 65950 of the Government Code), the City has 60 days from the date the project was accepted as complete to reach a determination regarding this project.

WHEREAS: The City Council made the following findings with respect to the subject project:

1. The General Plan designates the subject site as Low Density Residential.
   The subject site is zoned PD-R1 (Planned Development – One Family Zone) which is supported by the General Plan. The proposed use is allowed pursuant to approval of Conditional Use Permit Specific and General Plan.

2. That a conceptual plan was submitted for Phase Two at the time Phase One was approved.

3. That the site is physically suited for the type of development proposed. The site is level and vacant.
4. That the design of the project nor the proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage. An onsite inspection was conducted by staff. No natural habitat was observed. As such, no endangered, threatened or rare species or habitats exist and no impact will occur.

5. That the proposed location of the proposed and the conditions under which it will be operated and maintained will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or, materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

Conditions of approval are included to ensure adequate development standards are met.

6. That the standards of population density, site area dimensions, site coverage, height of structures, distance between structures, off-street parking facilities, and landscaping areas will produce an environment of stable and desirable character consistent with the objectives of the Zoning Ordinance.

7. The project as proposed complies with all design standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the City Council of the City of Porterville does hereby approve Modification #1 to Conditional Use Permit 8-82 subject to the following conditions:

1. Reciprocal ingress/egress agreement is required with the adjacent convenience market to the west. A recorded agreement shall be submitted to the City prior to issuance of building permits for the proposed site.

2. The proposed project will be considered as Modification #1 to CUP 8-22, approved by City Council Resolution 9746 for Phase 1 (Specific Plans).

3. The hours of operation are as follows:

   Sunday - Saturday
   5:30am to 12:00am

4. For safety and security, adequate lighting will be required during hours of operation that maintains visibility throughout the lot and designed to minimize glare and spillover onto adjacent parcels. Lighting is to be approved by the Police Chief or Community Development Director.

5. All mechanical and electrical equipment is to be screened and maintained from public view.

7. The developer/applicant shall pay all applicable fees according to the Municipal Code and State law. The developer/applicant is hereby notified that you have the right to pay fees, dedications, reservations or other exactions, under protest, pursuant to Government Code Section 66020(a). You have 90 days from the date fees are paid to file a written protest.

8. The developer/applicant shall follow Appendix Chapter 33 of the California Building Code including provision of a grading and drainage plan signed by a licensed civil engineer or architect. The developer/applicant shall comply with City Retaining Wall Standards (adopted by City Council January 3, 1989) at lot lines where such standards are applicable.

9. Developer/applicant shall provide a Soils Report in conformance with Chapter 18 of the California Building Code. Expansive soils are known to be in the area of the proposed development. The Soils Report shall include R-Value testing, expansion indexes, etc required for the construction of public improvements.

10. The developer/applicant shall construct and/or repair street, curb, gutter, sidewalk, etc. along the full frontage of the parcel except where they exist and are in good condition in the opinion of the City Engineer (Ord. No. 1306).

11. The developer/applicant shall remove existing trees at all driveways serving the development for the purpose of provide appropriate visibility for vehicular traffic existing the property.

12. The developer/applicant shall construct drainage facilities as required to serve the property (Ord. No. 1306).

13. Easements shall be in place that allows for mutual ingress, egress and maintenance of the parking lots shared by the proposed development parcel and the adjacent westerly parcel, if none exists.

14. The developer/applicant shall move existing utility structures (For example, poles, splice boxes, vaults, etc.) to a position that provides a minimum of four feet (4') of clear space in the sidewalk area and a minimum of two feet (2') of clear space from the curb face to the structure, unless they are below grade (Title 24 OSA).

15. The developer/applicant shall provide street lights on Marbelite poles following Southern California Edison Company specifications, as approved by the City Engineer. Do not use wood poles without prior written approval of the City Engineer. A 9500 lumen street light shall be installed at the northeast property corner.
16. The developer/applicant shall design and improve the parking lot in conformance with Section 2206 and 2211 (Exhibit A) of the Zoning Ordinance.

17. The developer/applicant shall, under City inspection, remove all existing abandoned and unnecessary items, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, before the issuance of a certificate of occupancy (For example, foundations, septic tanks, irrigation pipes, etc.).

18. The developer/applicant shall abandon existing wells, if any, after first getting an abandonment permit from the County Department of Environmental Health, and providing the City Engineer with proof of compliance with County regulations before performing any grading or issuance of the building permit, whichever comes first.

19. The developer/applicant shall comply with Ordinance No. 1636 regarding Waste Water Discharge requirements and shall complete and submit the following:

   Wastewater Discharge Permit Application, Part “A”; and

   If monitoring is required, based on the responses to questions in Part “A” of the Wastewater Discharge Permit, then the developer/applicant shall complete and submit the remainder of the application along with the Permit Fee, and provide monitoring facilities to allow inspection, sampling, and flow measurement of the flows in the sewer and drainage system.

20. If hazardous materials are to be stored in jurisdictional quantities anywhere on the property, the developer/applicant shall develop and maintain a Hazardous Materials Business Plan Program, follow Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code, and shall tell the Hazardous Materials Unit of the Tulare County Division of Environmental Health. The developer/applicant shall provide proof of compliance with County requirements before issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

21. The developer/applicant shall install a refuse container enclosure according to City standards. The enclosure location to be approved by City prior to issuance of building permit. The developer/applicant shall also sign a waiver of liability for refuse truck damage to the parking lot if the refuse container location requires refuse trucks to travel on the parking lot.

22. The developer/applicant shall comply with the Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance. The property is within a Flood Hazard Zone AO (1 foot depth). A Licensed Civil Engineer or Land Surveyor shall confirm that the finished floor will be constructed at or above the Base Flood Elevation in letter form or by providing a Preliminary Elevation Certificate. The same professional shall confirm that the finish floor is at or above the Base Flood Elevation by submitting an Elevation Certificate to the City Engineer for approval prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. Preliminary Elevation Certificates and Elevation Certificates are available within the Engineering Division upon request.

23. The developer/applicant shall comply with City standard for “backflow” prevention pursuant to Resolution No. 9615.
24. The developer/applicant is hereby notified that the installation of an additional water meter, servicing the irrigation system would be beneficial for monitoring actual water usage. The City will monitor actual water usage for one year and will bill the owner the impact fees based on the actual water usage.

25. A back-flow device is required on the water meter.

26. A grease trap or grease interceptor is required.

27. Submit three (3) complete sets of plans, signed by a licensed Architect or Engineer, to include two (2) sets of energy calculations and structural calculations.

28. Compliance with access laws (both State and Federal) is required.

29. Compliance with all applicable codes is required.

30. Plan check fees are required at the time of building permit submittal.

31. Soil report required.

32. School Development fees and all other City fees are due at the time of building permit issuance.

33. Prior to issuance of the building permit need approval from the Tulare County Health Department.

34. Restrooms and main entrance must comply with ADA access laws.

35. All construction offices, storage containers, etc. for temporary use must receive City Council approval.

36. Grease interceptor required.

37. Signs require separate permit.

38. At all times, the facilities shall be constructed, operated and maintained to comply with State law, the City of Porterville Municipal Code, adopted Building Codes and all other applicable laws and ordinances.

39. That the subject site will be developed in accordance with the site plan and elevation plans labeled Exhibit “A.”

40. The conditional use permit shall become null and void if not under taken and actively and continuously pursued within one (1) year.
41. The applicant shall submit clearance from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, regarding groundwater and/or soils contamination prior to issuance of building permits for the proposed site.

Cameron Hamilton, Mayor

Attest:
John Longley, City Clerk

By Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
CITY OF PORTERVILLE  
COUNTY OF TULARE  

I, JOHN LONGLEY, the duly appointed City Clerk of the City of Porterville do hereby certify and declare that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution passed and adopted by the Council of the City of Porterville at a regular meeting of the Porterville City Council duly called and held on the 19th day of February, 2008.

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

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

JOHN LONGLEY, CITY CLERK

By Luisa Herrera, Deputy City Clerk
SITE PLAN
APN: 254-391-05
IN THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

NOT TO SCALE
SIGNS TO BE UNDER SEPARATE PERMIT

EXISTING BUILDING

PROPOSED TABLE DD RESTAURANT (1,500 SF)

EXISTING PARKING AREA

NEW DRIVE THROUGH
(1,500 SF)

SCALE: 1" = 20'

EXHIBIT A
RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE CONTAINING FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 8-82, MODIFICATION NO. 2, GENERAL AND SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLANS, PHASE ONE, TO ALLOW OCCUPANCY OF THE CONSTRUCTED DRIVE-THROUGH RESTAURANT LOCATED AT 815 E. PUTNAM AVENUE

WHEREAS: On February 19, 2008, the City Council adopted Resolution 13-2008 containing findings and conditions in support of Conditional Use Permit 8-82, Modification No. 1, General and Specific Development Plans Phase One, to allow the construction of a drive-through restaurant and drive-through coffee kiosk located at the southeast corner of Putnam Avenue and Leggett Street, currently addressed as 815 E. Putnam Avenue; and

WHEREAS: On February 14, 2013, during the final inspection of 815 E. Putnam Avenue, more specifically the constructed drive-through restaurant, staff members observed deviations in the constructed building from the conditions approved by City Council under Conditional Use Permit 8-82, Modification No. 1 (Resolution 13-2008) and approved plans included as Exhibit A to the resolution; and

WHEREAS: The City Council of the City of Porterville at its scheduled meeting of March 5, 2013, conducted a public hearing to review CUP 8-82, Modification No. 2, General and Specific Plans Phase One, to allow occupancy of the constructed drive-through restaurant subject to the conditions of approval; and

WHEREAS: This project is Categorically Exempt pursuant to Section 15332 Class 32 (In-Fill Development) of the California Environmental Quality Act guidelines; and

WHEREAS: The City Council has considered the proposed amendments to the conditional use permit and has found that the specific requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and other requirements of the City have been met, and that the revisions to the site layout and building architecture can support the proposed use; and

WHEREAS: The City Council made the following findings with respect to the subject modifications:

1. That Conditional Use Permit 8-82, Modification No. 2 is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance provided the parking lot striping, mechanical equipment screening and lighting are in compliance with City standards and original conditions of approval.

2. That the design and improvements of the proposed modifications were consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance at the time of project approval.

3. That the site is physically suitable for the type of development constructed.
The subject site is flat. Conformance with the City Storm Drain Master Plan, and requirements relative to grading, the California Building Code, etc., will be and have been required.

4. That the proposed modifications and improvements will not cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

5. That the proposed modifications or improvements will not cause serious public health problems.

The location of the constructed building and the conditions under which it would be operated or maintained will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the area.

6. That the standard of population density, site area dimension, site coverage, height of structure, distance between structures, off-site parking facilities, and landscaping areas will produce an environment of stable and desirable character consistent with the objectives of the Zoning Ordinance.

7. That the subject site shall comply with all design standards of the Zoning Ordinance which was in effect at the time of project approval, more specifically Section 2206 (E) and Section 2206 (F)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the City Council of the City of Porterville does hereby approve Conditional Use Permit 8-82, Modification No. 2 to allow occupancy of the constructed drive-through restaurant subject to the following conditions:

1. The hours of operation are to remain as originally approved pursuant to CUP 8-82, Modification No. 1 as follows:

   Sunday through Saturday
   5:30 am to 12:00 am (midnight)

2. For safety and security, adequate light will be required during the hours of operation that maintains visibility throughout the lot and designed to minimize glare and spillover onto adjacent parcels. Lighting is to be approved by the Police Chief or Community Development Director. Exterior lighting mounted on existing building shall install deflectors to prevent direct and annoying glare to the residential uses to the east and south of the project location.

3. Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy, all roof mounted, mechanical and electrical equipment shall be screened and maintained from public view.
4. Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy, an accurate complete set of as-built plans (3 copies) shall be submitted to show all revisions and modifications made to the existing building to the Public Work Department.

5. Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy, the developer shall design and improve the parking lot in conformance with Section 2206 (E) and Section 2206 (F)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance.

6. Comply with all local, state and federal laws, rules and regulations.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this _____ day of March, 2013

By: __________________________
Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: __________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
PUBLIC HEARING

SUBJECT: PACIFIC RIM COMMERCIAL MIXED USE PROJECT (PRC 2012-002), GENERALLY LOCATED WEST OF THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF HENDERSON AVENUE AND NEWCOMB STREET

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT - PLANNING DIVISION

COMMENT: The applicant is requesting approval of General Plan Amendment 2012-002, Zone Change 2012-002, and Tentative Parcel Map 2012-002 to facilitate development of a vacant 23.4± acre site with a commercial mixed use project. The applicant is also requesting consideration of Conditional Use Permit 2012-002 contingent upon approval of the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change. With the requested entitlements, the applicant proposes to develop a commercial mixed use project including 168 multi-family residential (apartment) units, 39,400± square feet of commercial uses, an 18,000± square foot two-story office building, and a 518± unit personal storage facility. The proposed project is generally located west of the southwest corner of Henderson Avenue and Newcomb Street.

The General Plan Amendment and Zone Change applications are required to accommodate a project of this scale and function at the subject site. The 23.4± acre site has multiple General Plan land use designations and zoning classifications including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Classification</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.38± acres</td>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>RM-3, High Density Residential</td>
<td>Commercial Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.77± acres</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>RM-2, Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>Commercial Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23± acres</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>CN, Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>Commercial Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A tentative parcel map is needed to configure four (4) parcels for site development as proposed. If the General Plan and Zone Change are approved, the applicant is requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit to approve the 518± unit mini-storage facility. Conditions of approval have been added to the project approvals to ensure that the entire project will be developed as one project regardless of what sequence the project phasing follows. The market is envisioned to drive the sequencing of the phases. Specifically, the Zone Change has been conditioned to facilitate this objective.

The applicant has requested a waiver of development fees; however, as the City has not approved such a waiver in the past, staff finds no precedent to support approval of a fee waiver for the proposed project. Staff informed the applicant of...
the 10-year development fee payment plan for all fees except school fees pursuant to Resolution 37-2012. Traditionally, the fee payment plan has only been used for commercial or low-income housing developments. As the proposed project includes a mix of commercial, office, and market-rate housing development, staff supports the use of the 10-year development fee payment plan as a logical extension of the program. It has been added as a condition of approval to the Parcel Map. If the Council chooses not to authorize this, it can be removed from the resolution.

When recent street improvements were completed along Henderson Avenue, there was a concrete reimbursement agreement approved for the property requiring payback upon development. The applicant has requested to waive this reimbursement requirement, which staff does not support. However, where those improvements are required to be removed, and new improvements are required to accommodate the development, that portion of the cost is deducted from the payback requirement; staff believes this provides an equitable balance.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: An environmental initial study was prepared for the project. On February 5, 2013, the Environmental Coordinator made the determination that a mitigated negative declaration would be applicable and appropriate for the project under CEQA guidelines. A mitigation monitoring plan has been developed and shall be incorporated into the zone change as development obligations of the project. To date, one letter of comment has been submitted. Dr. John Snively, Superintendent of Porterville Unified School District submitted a letter expressing concerns over the pedestrian and vehicular congestion at the intersection of Henderson Avenue and Newcomb Street. A copy of the letter is attached to the complete staff report for consideration.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Adopt the draft resolution approving the Mitigated Negative Declaration;
2. Adopt the draft resolution approving General Plan Amendment 2012-002;
3. Approve the draft ordinance adopting Zone Change 2012-002 contingent upon approval of General Plan Amendment;
4. Waive further reading of the draft ordinance, approving the Zone Change and order it to print;
5. Adopt the draft resolution containing findings and conditions in support of approval of the Tentative Parcel Map 2012-002; and
6. Adopt the draft resolution containing findings and conditions in support of approval of Conditional Use Permit 2012-002 for the personal storage facility.

ATTACHMENTS: Complete Staff Report
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA: MARCH 5, 2013

PUBLIC HEARING - STAFF REPORT

TITLE: PACIFIC RIM COMMERCIAL MIXED USE PROJECT (2012-002), GENERALLY LOCATED WEST OF THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF HENDERSON AVENUE AND NEWCOMB STREET

OWNER/APPLICANT: Henderson MU-V
Paul Owhadi
29610 Heathercliff Road, Suite 411
Malibu, CA 90265

AGENTS: The Vincent Company
Scott Vincent
1500 West Shaw, Suite 30
Fresno, CA 93711
Winton & Associates
Jim Winton
150 West Morton Avenue
Porterville, CA 93257

PROJECT LOCATION: Generally west of the southwest corner of Henderson Avenue and Newcomb Street

SPECIFIC REQUEST: The applicant is requesting approval of General Plan Amendment 2012-002, Zone Change 2012-002, and Tentative Parcel Map 2012-002 to facilitate development of a vacant 23.4± acre site with a commercial mixed use project. The applicant is also requesting consideration of Conditional Use Permit 2012-002 contingent upon approval of the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change. With the requested entitlements, the applicant proposes to develop a commercial mixed use project including 168 multi-family residential (apartment) units, 39,400± square feet of commercial uses, an 18,000± square foot two-story office building, and a 518± unit personal storage facility. The proposed project is generally located west of the southwest corner of Henderson Avenue and Newcomb Street.

The General Plan Amendment and Zone Change applications are required to accommodate a project of this scale and function at the subject site. The 23.4± acre site has multiple General Plan land use designations and zoning classifications including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Classification</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.38± acres</td>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>RM-3, High Density Residential</td>
<td>Commercial Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.77± acres</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>RM-2, Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>Commercial Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23± acres</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>CN, Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>Commercial Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The colors and finish of the proposed development will be consistent throughout the site. The development will have a Spanish mission theme as proposed by the developer. Building finishes
propose terra cotta and pale yellow colored stucco with soft clay, beige and red tones accenting rooftops. Matching signage and awnings compliment building architecture. Open spaces and recreation areas within the residential and commercial areas are provided for enjoyment by residents and patrons. Additionally, incorporated into the design of the project are modern architectural features at entrances, roundabout elements and drive-thru restaurants. Site features include a freestanding clock tower and two water fountain features within the commercial center. Increased landscaping will be provided along the project frontages on Henderson Avenue and throughout the parking lot and median areas. The consistency in design, colors, and architectural features of the project will complement the area and provide transition in development from residential to office and commercial development uses buffered by large landscape areas. The Zone Change has been conditioned to require site design and architectural consistency throughout the development.

HISTORY: The proposed project site has been vacant and undeveloped for over 30 years. Prior to the development of surrounding residential uses and clearing of the site, the area was primarily walnut orchards. Over the last several decades the surrounding residential neighborhoods have become established and continued to develop west of the project area towards the City’s western limits.

PROJECT DETAILS: As stated in the report, there are four components to the proposed mixed use project. The project includes a multi-family apartment complex, a commercial area (including retail shops, fast-food, and a financial pad), an office building, and a personal storage facility.

The multi-family apartment complex is currently permitted under the medium density residential General Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning Classification. The apartments, as proposed, are also permitted under the proposed Commercial Mixed Use General Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning Classification. Frontage and access for the apartments is proposed along Henderson Avenue with secondary access from Newcomb Street across an adjacent site. The 168 units are proposed at a density of approximately 14.3 units per acre, which is consistent with the current density provisions. The complex includes 23 apartment buildings and one office building. The residential component provides a number of recreational amenities for residents, including community buildings (3,300± sq. ft.), three (3) open space areas with a combined average over 17,000 square feet each. Two of the open spaces include a community pool with arbor. In addition, a covered barbeque area is centrally located near the largest open space area that provides residents the ability to cook and eat outdoors. Each unit provides a 50 square foot personal outdoor patio or balcony space. The proposed landscape plans show an abundance of live plants, shrubs, and trees that will be inviting to residents and visitors and encourage the utilization of outdoor space.

The commercial component of the development proposes 39,400± square feet of retail, fast-food and financial/bank services. The commercial area provides two (2) retail buildings (16,800± sq. ft. and 12,000± sq. ft.), two (2) fast-food pads (3,200± sq. ft. each), and one (1) financial pad (4,200± sq. ft.). The existing Neighborhood Commercial node permits all the types of commercial uses proposed, but would not accommodate the proposed size of commercial development on the site. Drive-thru functions in the fast food restaurants would also not be
permitted with the current zoning, but would be accommodated in the proposed Commercial Mixed Use (CMX) zone.

The third component of the project is a proposed two-story 18,000± square foot office building. The office is centrally located and accessed within the entire project. Proposed colors, design, roof and finish are consistent with the rest of the commercial center and residential uses. Parking and landscaping is provided around the entire building.

The final component of the project is the 518± unit personal storage facility. The facility is proposed on the western portion of the overall project tucked primarily behind the commercial center but having some frontage along Henderson Avenue for access. The area consists of fourteen (14) steel storage buildings (matching in color to the development) and one 1,290± square foot office building (consistent in colors, design, roof and features to the entire project). A matching six (6) foot tall concrete block wall with pilasters and stucco finish surrounding the mini-storage is proposed. A block wall is required for separation from residential zoning and uses to the south and west. The block wall around the entire facility will provide additional security and safety for both the surrounding commercial and residential uses.

The proposed CMX General Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning Classification over the entire site will permit all features of the development as proposed. All of the buildings throughout the project provide consistent design, colors, and features. The abundant landscaping and architectural features through the facility present a sense of place while providing a convenient location for multi-family residential uses to commercial, offices, public parks and personal storage facilities. The proposed commercial mixed use project would provide the convenient shopping and services for the surrounding established neighborhoods.

The entire site is pedestrian oriented for access and connectivity between all uses. Although there is a physical separation of uses - a landscaped and plastered six (6) foot tall block wall, the construction of the entire project site will be consistent which will provide a soft transition from use to use.

STAFF ANALYSIS: A General Plan Amendment and Zone Change is proposed for the entire site which will change the existing residential and commercial designations to the proposed Commercial Mixed Use designation over the entire site. Due to the nature of the requests the requested applications are generally contingent upon one another in the following order: the environmental is required to be approved prior to any applications, the General Plan Amendment is required to be approved prior to the Zone Change, which is required to be approved prior to the Tentative Parcel Map, which is required prior to the approval of the Conditional Use Permit. All are required to be approved prior to the Master Sign Program. The approvals would allow for uses of the development as proposed. Contingent upon the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change, the proposed personal storage facility requires a conditional use permit within a commercial mixed use zone. All other uses are permitted and allowed by right if the project is approved for development as proposed.

The applicant has requested a waiver of development fees; however, as the City has not approved such a waiver in the past, staff finds no precedent to support approval of a fee waiver for the
proposed project. Staff informed the applicant of the 10-year development fee payment plan for all fees except school fees pursuant to Resolution 37-2012. Traditionally, the fee payment plan has only been used for commercial or low-income housing developments. As the proposed project includes a mix of commercial, office, and market-rate housing development, staff supports the use of the 10-year development fee payment plan as a logical extension of the program. It has been added as a condition of approval to the Parcel Map. If the Council chooses not to authorize this, it can be removed from the resolution.

When recent street improvements were completed along Henderson Avenue, there was a concrete reimbursement agreement approved for the property requiring payback upon development. The applicant has requested to waive this reimbursement requirement, which staff does not support. However, where those improvements are required to be removed, and new improvements are required to accommodate the development, that portion of the cost is deducted from the payback requirement; staff believes this provides an equitable balance.

SURROUNDING LAND USES AND ZONING:

North: City- RS-2 (Low-Density Residential) – Single family residential Subdivision
South: City- RS-2 (Low-Density Residential) – Single family residential Subdivision
East: City- PK/PS (Parks and Recreation/Public and Semi-public) – Public Park and City Yard
West: City- RS-2 (Low-Density Residential) - Single family residential Subdivision

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION AND ZONING:
RM-2 (Medium-Density Residential)
RM-3 (High-Density Residential)
CN (Neighborhood Commercial)

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: An environmental initial study was prepared for the project. On February 5, 2013, the Environmental Coordinator made the determination that a mitigated negative declaration would be applicable and appropriate for the project under CEQA guidelines. The Initial Study has been transmitted to interested agencies, groups and individuals for review and comment. The review period ran for twenty (20) days from February 8, 2013, to February 28, 2013. A mitigation monitoring plan has been developed and shall be incorporated into the zone change as development obligations of the project. To date, one letter of comment has been submitted. Dr. John Snively, Superintendent of Porterville Unified School District submitted a letter expressing concerns over the pedestrian and vehicular congestion at the intersection of Henderson Avenue and Newcomb Street. A copy of the letter is attached for consideration.

DATE FILED FOR PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE PROCESSING: March 8, 2012

DATE ACCEPTED AS COMPLETE: January 28, 2013
LEGAL NOTICES:

Mitigated Negative Declaration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Environmental Document Distributed</th>
<th>Date Notice Published in Porterville Recorder</th>
<th>Date Notice Mailed to Property Owners within 300 feet of Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 7, 2013</td>
<td>February 8, 2013</td>
<td>February 7, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATIONS: That the City Council:

1. Adopt the draft resolution approving the Mitigated Negative Declaration and mitigation monitoring plan;
2. Adopt the draft resolution approving General Plan Amendment 2012-002;
3. Approve the draft ordinance adopting Zone Change 2012-002 contingent upon approval of General Plan Amendment;
4. Waive further reading of the draft ordinance, approving the Zone Change and order it to print;
5. Adopt the draft resolution containing findings and conditions in support of approval of Tentative Parcel Map for 2012-002 contingent upon approval of Zone Change 2012-002; and
6. Adopt the draft resolution containing findings and conditions in support of approval of Conditional Use Permit 2012-002 for the personal storage facility contingent upon approval of General Plan Amendment 2012-002 and Zone Change 2012-002.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Comment letter from Porterville Unified School District
2. Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration
3. Draft Resolution to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration
4. Draft Resolution to adopt General Plan Amendment
5. Draft Ordinance to approve Zone Change (Project Plans are attached to the Ordinance for the Zone Change)
6. Draft Resolution to adopt Tentative Parcel Map
7. Draft Resolution containing findings in support of approval for Conditional Use Permit for the proposed personal storage facility
February 26, 2013

City of Porterville Council Members
291 N. Main St.
Porterville, CA 93257

RE: Pacific Rim Commercial Mixed Use Project

Dear Council Members:

My schedule prevents me from attending the City Council meeting scheduled for March 5, 2013, regarding the Pacific Rim Commercial Mixed Use Project located at the southwest quadrant of Henderson Avenue and Newcomb Street. As such, please accept this letter as a request for the City Council to further review the project's impact beyond what staff is currently recommending.

The Porterville Unified School District administration has been engaged in previous conversations and review of the project referenced above with City of Porterville Planning Department staff. In these conversations, we have gone on record expressing concerns with the current amount of vehicular and pedestrian traffic at the intersection of Henderson and Newcomb. It is our expectation that this project will further impact an already congested intersection.

We applaud the staff of the City of Porterville for their effort to acknowledge and respond to our concerns. However, I continue to fear for the safety of the students who are likely to be affected by the increased flow of vehicular and pedestrian traffic from this project.

In particular, it is reasonable to expect that a number of elementary age students will be generated by 168 multiple family dwelling units. It is my understanding that these elementary age children will be attending Oak Grove Elementary located at 1873 West Mulberry Avenue. While the Porterville Unified School District is not responsible for elementary children attending Oak Grove, on behalf of all children, I feel compelled to bring to your attention potential hazards. Having worked in public education for over thirty-years, I believe I have some expertise regarding the walking patterns of students. As I view the project, it is my belief that children and parents are most likely to cross Henderson Avenue at Belmont Street and are not likely to back tract to the intersection of Newcomb and Henderson. While we appreciate staff's recommendation to improve the intersection at Henderson and Newcomb, I do not believe this adequately addresses the safety of elementary age students from this development.

On behalf of the Porterville Unified School District, we are not opposed to the project itself; our concerns are over the safety of students. I suspect this is one of the most impacted, if not, the most impacted intersection in our community. It would seem appropriate to encourage any vehicular and pedestrian traffic generated by this development in other directions. We, therefore, request City Council to consider other alternatives to mitigate the increased traffic caused by this project beyond that of improving the intersection of Henderson Avenue and Newcomb Street.

Sincerely,

John Snavely, Ed.D.
Superintendent

[Signature]

DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES
PETE LARA, JR.
President
LILLIAN DURBIN
Vice President
DAVID DePAOLI
Clerk
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ATTACHMENT
ITEM NO. 1
Pacific Rim
Commercial Mixed Use Project

Initial Study & Mitigated Negative Declaration

City of Porterville
Community Development Department
Planning Division

February 2013
CITY OF PORTERVILLE

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Project title: Pacific Rim Commercial Mixed Use Project

2. Lead agency: City of Porterville
291 N. Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257

3. Contact person: Julie Phillips, AICP
Community Development Manager
(559) 782-7460

4. Project location: Generally the southwest corner of Henderson Ave and Newcomb Street (Figures 1-4)

5. Latitude, Longitude: 
N 36° 4' 46.1575"
W 119° 3' 21.1562"

6. Project sponsor's name and address: Pacific Rim Companies
29160 Heathercliff Road, Suite 411
Malibu, CA 90265

7. General plan designation: High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Neighborhood Commercial (Figure 3)

8. Zoning: High Density Residential (RM-3), Medium Density Residential (RM-2) and Neighborhood Commercial (Figure 4)

9. Description of project: The project proposes to develop approximately 23.4 acres of vacant land as a commercial mixed use project consisting of four components (Figure 1). The four project components include a multi-family apartment complex, a commercial area (including retail shops, fast-food, and banking), a two story office building, and a personal storage facility (Figure 2). The proposed project would require a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change from high and medium density residential and neighborhood commercial uses to commercial mixed use. The project site is currently designated and zoned for residential and neighborhood commercial uses. Current General Plan land use designations and zoning are represented in Figures 3 and 4.

All of the buildings throughout the project provide consistent design, colors, and features resulting in a truly integrated mixed use project. The abundant landscaping and architectural features throughout the proposed development create a sense of place while
providing a convenient location for multi-family residential uses, commercial uses, offices, and personal storage facilities. The proposed commercial mixed use project would serve its own residential population as well as provide convenient shopping and services to the surrounding established neighborhoods.

The entire site is pedestrian oriented for access and connectivity between all uses. Although there is a physical separation of uses (a matching six (6) foot block wall at property lines), the construction of the entire project site would be consistent which would provide a soft transition from use to use. Pedestrian access gates would provide connectivity between uses (excluding the personal storage facility) without requiring foot traffic in drive aisles. Vehicular access for the entire project would be from Henderson Avenue along four driveways.

The multi-family apartment complex is a use permitted under the current medium density residential General Plan Land Use and Zoning Designations. The apartments as proposed are also permitted under the proposed Commercial Mixed Use General Plan land use and Zoning Designation as a part of the larger project. The proposed 176 units would result in a density of approximately 15.17 units per acre; current zoning would allow up to 15 units per acre, and the proposed zoning allows up to 30 units per acre. The residential complex includes 21 eight-unit apartment buildings, two community rooms, and one office building. In addition, the residential development includes three open space areas with a areas of roughly 17,000 square feet each. One of the open spaces includes a community pool with arbor. Additionally, a covered barbeque & picnic area is centrally located near the largest open space area that provides residents the ability to cook and eat outdoors. Each unit provides a 50 square foot personal outdoor patio or balcony space. The proposed landscape plan shows an abundance of live plants, shrubs, and trees that would be inviting residents and visitors and encourage the utilization of outdoor space. Proposed parking for the apartment complex exceeds the Development Ordinance parking standards.

The commercial component of the development proposes 39,400± square feet of retail, fast-food and financial/bank services. The commercial area provides two (2) retail buildings (16,800± sq.ft and 12,000± sq.ft.), two (2) fast-food pads (3,200± sq.ft. each), and one (1) financial pad (4,200± sq.ft.). The existing neighborhood commercial node permits all the types of commercial uses proposed with exception to the size and drive-thrus. The proposed Commercial Mixed Use General Plan land use designation and Zoning over the entire site would permit the development as proposed. All commercial buildings propose a consistent color palette, design, and architectural theme with the master plan. All commercial buildings would be single storey with Spanish themed architecture, featuring mission tiled roofs. Aesthetic improvements include large landscaped frontages along Henderson Avenue and within the parking areas which would provide live plants, shrubs and trees to buffer, shade and screen paved areas. Additionally, two water fountains and a clock tower would provide architectural enhancements to invite patrons and provide a convenient location for retail, banking and food services with drive-thru.
The third component of the project is a proposed two-story 18,000± square foot office building. The office is centrally located and accessible from the commercial component, with designated pedestrian access to the residential component. Proposed colors, design, roof and finish are consistent with the rest of the commercial center and residential uses. Parking and landscaping surround the building.

The fourth component of the project is a 518± unit personal storage facility. The facility is proposed on the western portion of the project, tucked primarily behind the commercial center but having some frontage along Henderson Avenue for access. The area consists of fourteen (14) steel storage buildings (matching in color to the development) and one 1,290± square foot office building (consistent in colors, design, roof and features to the entire project). A matching six (6) foot concrete block wall with plaster and stucco finish surround the mini-storage facility as proposed. A block wall is required for separation from residential zoning and existing uses to the south and west, and would provide additional security and safety for both the surrounding commercial and residential uses. The personal storage facility is provided access along Henderson Avenue; a designated entrance provides patron parking and secured access, as well as a landscaped buffer. The office building further screens the use, offering a continued transition in building design to the adjacent proposed commercial, office and residential uses.

In addition to on-site improvements as described above, the project proposes incorporating raised median islands in two locations on Henderson Avenue to help guide turning movements into and out of the development, as presented in Figure 2.

10. Surrounding land uses and setting: The proposed project is located in an urban setting on vacant land that has not been utilized since it was cleared of walnut orchards over 25 years ago. The surrounding uses are primarily residential to the north and south. Churches are located on the adjacent parcels to the east and west. A high school and city park are located just east across Newcomb Street with two fully developed commercial shopping centers beyond, approximately one-quarter mile to the east.

11. Other public agencies whose approval is required: None
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AffECTED:
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources  ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources  ☐ Cultural Resources  ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials  ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning  ☐ Mineral Resources  ☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing  ☐ Public Services  ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic  ☐ Utilities / Service Systems  ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

[Signature] [Date 2/3/13]

Bradley D. Dunlap, AICP, Community Development Director
Printed name
Figure 1
Project Location
Figure 2
Current General Plan Designation
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Current Zoning Designations
I. AESTHETICS
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses:

a, b) No Impact. The project site is not located within or adjacent to a scenic vista. There would be no Impact.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project site is undeveloped but surrounded by urban development including adjacent residential, school, park, and commercial uses within a quarter mile. There would be a less than significant impact.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would be subject to lighting standards found within the City of Porterville Development Ordinance. The Development Ordinance provides guidance for residential and commercial lighting to ensure that fixtures are shielded so as not to produce obtrusive glare onto the public right-of-way or adjoining properties (§300.07). There would be less than significant impact.
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses:

a) **No Impact.** The proposed project site is vacant and zoned for residential and neighborhood commercial uses. The land has been undeveloped and underutilized for more than 25 years. There would be no impact to farmland nor conversion of existing farmland to any other use. While most soil types in the region could at some point have been deemed farmland conducive, the project’s surrounding areas are primarily developed and at this time are considered urban built up land. Recent observations conclude that sites are discused primarily for the purposes of maintenance and weed abatement.

b,c,d) **No Impact.** The proposed project site is undeveloped and not currently zoned for agricultural uses. The site is not under any Williamson Act contract. The current zoning is high and medium density residential, and neighborhood commercial uses which do not accommodate agricultural uses.

e) **No Impact.** The proposed project is on the south side of Henderson Avenue. The nearest farmland use is approximately ¼ mile to the west on the north side of Henderson Avenue. That nearest agricultural use is surrounded on all sides by residential development.
III. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  
   □  □  ☒  □

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  
   □  ☒  □  □

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?  
   □  □  ☒  □

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  
   □  □  ☒  □

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?  
   □  □  ☒  □

Response:

a) Less Than Significant Impact. As none of the project components are considered a stationary source emitter, air quality impacts are limited to traffic volumes associated with the proposed development. A traffic analysis was prepared (Ruettgers and Schuler, 2012) to identify potential impacts related to increased traffic volumes and project ingress & egress. The analysis ran a traffic model to determine average daily traffic (ADT) and level of service (LOS) analysis for roadway segments in the proximity of the proposed commercial mixed use project. Based on the results of the ADT analysis, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts at the study roadway segments. The cumulative impacts associated with air quality of future traffic, with and without the project, results in all roadway intersections and segments operating at or above a LOS “D” thus resulting in a less than significant impact to transportation/circulation within Porterville as a result of the project.

The Project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the air quality management standards. Standards set by the SJVAPCD, CARB, and Federal agencies relating to the Project would continue to apply. There would be less than significant impact.

b) Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation. The San Joaquin Valley is designated as a Federal and State non-attainment area for O₃ and PM₁₅. The SJVAPCD is the regional agency that regulates air permitting and maintains an extensive air quality monitoring network to measure criteria pollution concentrations throughout the San Joaquin Valley air basin. Compliance with the SJVAPCD Regulation VIII
guidelines would ensure potential impacts remain less than significant. A CalEEMod Model was conducted to estimate source emission levels. With exception to NOx, at 11.55 tpy (SJVAPCD 10 tpy threshold), the proposed development does not exceed the tonnage per year allowed for ROG, PM10, and PM2.5. The proposed project is self mitigating by nature of the City’s General Plan and Development Ordinance. The City’s policies require that commercial mixed use projects be designed to provide pedestrian/transit orientation, commit to bicycle parking racks, transit infrastructure and pedestrian improvements, enhancements, and access. Although the project proposes an emissions mitigating design concept, these elements and construction management elements shall be listed as mitigation measures within the mitigation monitoring program attached to the initial study checklist. Additionally, traditional residential wood fireplaces will be restricted (install of natural gas fireplaces or inserts shall be acceptable) as an additional mitigation measure.

e) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Impact III-b, although the Project could result in the generation of criteria pollutants as a result of the proposed construction, compliance with the SJVAPCD Regulation VIII guidelines and the attached mitigation monitoring plan would ensure that potential impacts remain less than significant.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. Section 3 of the Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts defines a sensitive receptor as a location where human populations, especially children, seniors, and sick persons are present and where there is a reasonable expectation of human exposure to pollutants. Sensitive receptors normally refer to people with heightened sensitivity to localized, rather than regional pollutants. Compliance with the SJVAPCD Regulation VIII guidelines and mitigation monitoring plan would mitigate potential impacts to less than significant.

e) Less than Significant Impact. The Project would not be a source of odors because future construction of residential and commercial mixed uses would be consistent with existing and surrounding uses; therefore, there would be less than significant impact.
### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

#### Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f</td>
<td>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Response:

**a, b, c, d, e, f No Impact.** The site is currently vacant and undeveloped. The site is disked and cleaned annually for removal of debris and vegetation. Site visits and observations have not identified any trees, burrows, or channel waters for sensitive habitat or species within project area. Review of the City's General Plan Special Status Species & Sensitive Vegetation Figure 6-4 identifies the site as not an area of concern for sensitive habitat, species, or vegetation. The City does not have an adopted tree ordinance or habitat conservation plan.
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response:

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The project proposes to develop approximately 23.4 acres of currently undeveloped land within the City of Porterville; As a result of prior uses, (walnut tree grove: farming and disking) the surface of the site has been significantly disturbed to a depth of at least eight feet. No known historic, archaeological, paleontological or geological resources exist on site. In the event that any as-yet undetected (i.e., buried) cultural resources are encountered on this property at a future time, work shall cease within a 50-foot area of the find, and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate any such discoveries. There would be less than significant impact.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. Any impacts to archaeological resources have been discussed in Impact V-a. There would be less than significant impact.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. No known paleontological resources exist within the Project area, nor are there any known geologic features in the Project areas. However, any impacts to paleontological or geologic resources have been discussed in V-a.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. No formal cemeteries or other places of human interment are known to exist within the project areas. However, in the event that any as-yet undetected (i.e., buried) cultural resources are encountered on this property at a future time of development, work shall cease within a 50-foot area of the find, and a qualified archaeologist shall be contacted to evaluate any such discoveries. Impacts would be less than significant.
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the most recently adopted Uniform Building Code creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response:

a-i) No Impact. According to the Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Special Publication 42, no faults occupy the County of Tulare. The two nearest faults are: first a small fault section related to the “Kern Front” located in Kern County approximately 25 miles to the south and west. The second is the “Owens Valley” fault located north and east in Inyo County, approximately 50 miles away. The project is not in the vicinity of any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones as defined by the State Geologist, and would not expose people or structures to any seismic related impacts.
a-ii). No Impact. Impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking have been discussed in VI-a-i. There would be no impacts.

a-iii). No Impact. As discussed in VI-a-i., there are no fault zones within the project area and therefore there would be no seismic related ground failures or liquefaction.

a-iv). No Impact. The project area topography consists of flat land, comprised of stable soils and not subject to landslide. There would be no impact.

b). No Impact. The future development of the site with commercial and residential mixed uses could result in minor ground disturbance through leveling, grading etc., there would be no substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. There would be no impact.

c) No Impact. The project site consists of sandy loam soils that are flat and fairly stable. Development of the site as proposed would result in minor ground disturbance through leveling, grading, etc. and could contribute to minor soil erosion during construction. Normal project procedures, including the enforcement of a site development plan and other development related conditions of approval would ensure the project area is not subjected to landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

d) No Impact. The Soil Survey of Tulare County, Central Part (Soil Survey) indicates that soils in the project area are not expensive. There would be no risk to life or property.

e) No Impact. The project does not include the use of septic tanks or other alternative waste water disposal systems. There would be no impact.
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorporation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response:

a), b) Less Than Significant Impact. While climate change has been a concern since at least 1988, as evidenced by the establishment of the United Nations and World Meteorological Organization’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the efforts devoted to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction and climate change research and policy have increased dramatically in recent years. In 2002, with the passage of Assembly Bill 1493 (AB 1493), California launched an innovative and pro-active approach to dealing with GHG emissions and climate change at the state level. AB 1493 requires the Air Resources Board (ARB) to develop and implement regulations to reduce automobile and light truck GHG emissions; these regulations applied to automobiles and light trucks beginning with the 2009 model year.

On June 1, 2005, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05. The goal of this Executive Order is to reduce California’s GHG emissions to: 1) 2000 levels by 2010, 2) 1990 levels by the year 2020, and 3) 80% below the 1990 levels by the year 2050. In 2006, this goal was further reinforced with the passage of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 sets the same overall GHG emissions reduction goals while further mandating that ARB create a plan, which includes market mechanisms, and implement rules to achieve “real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions of greenhouse gases.” Executive Order S-20-06 further directs state agencies to begin implementing AB 32, including the recommendations made by the state’s Climate Action Team.

Climate change and GHG reduction is also a concern at the federal level; however, at this time, no legislation or regulations have been enacted specifically addressing GHG emissions reductions and climate change. Compliance with AB1493 and the San Joaquin Valley Air Resource Board development requirements would ensure future potential impacts to less than significant.
### HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response:

a) **No Impact.** The proposed project uses would not require transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. There would be no impact.

b) **No Impact.** The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as the Project would not discharge hazardous materials into the environment. There would be no impact.
c) **No Impact.** The proposed project will have no effect on hazardous emissions, involve hazardous materials, or create a hazard to adjacent schools in any way. There would be no impact.

d) **No Impact.** The Project does not involve land that is listed as an active hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and is not included on the list compiled by the Department of Toxic Substances Control. There would be no impact.

e) **No Impact.** The nearest airport, the Porterville Municipal Airport, is approximately 3.2 miles south of the project area. Due to the project description and the distance to the airport, there would be no impact.

f) **No Impact.** Any impacts regarding private airstrips have been discussed in Impact VII-e. There would be no impact.

g) **No Impact.** The Project does propose changes to any publicly accessed routes, and would not interfere with implementation of an emergency response plan or evacuation. There would be no impact.

h) **No Impact.** The proposed project area is currently undeveloped but the entire surrounding is developed with residential, school, park and commercial uses; the project site has been disked annually. The project would not result in risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.
### HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing and uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses:**
a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project area is not within or adjacent to any large water body although the Porter Slough does run along the northern property lines. Along Henderson Avenue, the Porter Slough has previously been encased within a 36in concrete pipe. The project is within the City’s Master Plan for Storm Drainage. Consequently, the storm water generated from future development has been anticipated. The Project would not violate any water quality standards and would not impact waste discharge requirements. The impact would be less than significant.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project site is located in the Tulare Lake Basin, an area considered to be in a state of overdraft according to the City’s Urban Water Management Plan 2007. General Plan Section 8.1 “Water Supply and Conservation,” provides current and planned water supplies and includes a schedule for meeting future demand including the increased potential units associated with the project. The General Plan also identifies programs and policies for water conservation and planned supply to service demand through 2030 including an established goal of reducing the per capita water demand by 10% per day by 2030. As the County continues to review and finalize the City’s Urban Development Boundaries, the City anticipates updating and completing the Water System Master Plan by 2014-2015. The update plans would include a water balance study and analysis of the distribution facilities needed to accommodate population growth.

Development in the project area has been anticipated and water demands would not challenge the City’s supply. City services outline and would serve the entire project area as development occurs. The impact would be less than significant.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Drainage patterns would not change substantially as a result of the proposed project. As development occurs, curb and gutter improvements would improve the management of stormwater flows to reduce existing erosion or siltation. No modifications to natural or created channels would occur, as there are none within the project area. As a part of the development, implementation of erosion control measures described by the Tulare County Development Standards and mandated in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program would minimize any potential impacts to less than significant.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Any impacts regarding the alteration of drainage patterns to increase runoff water that would potentially induce flooding have been discussed in the impact analysis for Impact VIV-c.

e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Any impacts regarding the creation or contribution to runoff water that would potentially exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems have been discussed in the impact analysis for Impact VIV-c.

f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Any impacts to water quality have been discussed in the impact analysis for Impact VIV-a.

g) **Less than Significant Impact.** According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) 06107C1633E dated June 16, 2009, the project areas are within Zone X, determined to be outside the 2% annual chance floodplain. There would be less than significant impact with regard to flood related events.

h) **No Impact.** Any impacts regarding the placement of structures in a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows have been discussed in the analysis of Impact VIV-g.
i) No Impact. The dam potentially affecting the Project, Success Dam, is approximately 10 miles to the east of the Project site. According to Tulare County’s Geographic Information Systems data, the Project area is not located within the 24-hour inundation area of the Success dam in the event of its failure.

j) No Impact. The nearest large body of water is Lake Success, which is located approximately 10 miles to the east of the Project site. Due to the lengthy distance between the lake and the Project site, there would be no potential for seiche or tsunami to occur. There would be no impact.
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING
Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Physically divide an established community?  

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the General Plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Response:

a) No Impact. The project site is undeveloped. Upon development, the residential and commercial mixed uses would be fully integrated into their surrounding urban area. The proposed project would create opportunity for a mixed use development to bring additional services and retail to the surrounding community.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed residential and mixed use project includes a General Plan amendment and Zone Change that would assure that the Commercial Mixed Use project conforms to the adopted City of Porterville General Plan and Development Ordinance.

c) No Impact. No habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan has been adopted for the project areas.
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Mitigation Incorporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Response:

a) No Impact. The Porterville General Plan (2008) includes Figure 6-3 Soil and Mineral Conservation, which indicates the locations of State-designated Mineral Resource Zones or areas possessing minerals which are of state-wide or regional significance. According to the map, none the project area is not located in a Mineral Resource Zone. Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of an available known mineral resource. There would be no impact.

b) No Impact. The Project site is not delineated on a local land use plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site; therefore, the existence of the Project would not result in the loss of availability of any mineral resources. There would be no impact.
XII. NOISE
Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response:

a), c), d) Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is undeveloped but if approved, standard noise requirements shall be implemented per the Development Ordinance and Chapter 18, Article XI of the Municipal Code. The project would not significantly change the noise level generation in the project areas. Conversely, as these sites develop into residential and commercial uses, they would be subject to the City's Noise Ordinance, providing greater enforcement mechanisms to monitor and reduce noise generation during hours of construction once developed. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Porterville has set forth vibration guidelines described in the Development Ordinance Section 307.06, which states that "no vibration shall be produced that is discernable without the aid of instruments by a reasonable person at the lot lines of the site. Vibration from temporary construction, demolition, and vehicles that enter and leave the subject parcel (e.g., construction, equipment, trains, trucks, etc.) are exempt from this standard." Impacts would be less than significant.
e) **No Impact.** The Porterville General Plan (2008), indicates in Figure 9-3, Projected Noise Contours 2030, that the Project site is located more than three two miles outside of the airport 55 dB CNE L noise contour. There would be no impact.

f) **No Impact.** There are no private airstrips in the project vicinity. There would be no impact.
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response:

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed 23.4± acre project area has been identified and planned on the City’s General Plan high and medium density residential uses, and for neighborhood commercial. The proposed General Plan Amendment and Zone Change would provide for the entire 23.4± acres to be developed as commercial mixed uses. The General Plan assures consistency with zoning and provides guiding and implementation policies to assure the City is capable of meeting population and housing demands. The subject site is included within the City of Porterville Sewer, Water, and Storm Drain Master Plans. Roads and other infrastructure are found along Henderson Avenue and Newcomb Street frontages, including city sewer, water, and storm drain systems to meet current and future demands. The impacts to population and housing would be less than significant.

b), c) No Impact. The proposed project site is undeveloped and has not been in use for over 25 years. No existing uses would be displaced by the project.
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- Fire protection?
- Police protection?
- Schools?
- Parks?
- Other Public facilities?

Response:

a) The site has been planned for high and medium density residential and neighborhood commercial uses. The proposed multi-family and commercial mixed use project is being evaluated for impacts to City services.

Less Than Significant Impact: Fire Protection – The proposed project is consistent with planned growth in the city, and would not result in increased in service times for safety response. The impact would be less than significant impact.

Less Than Significant Impact: Police Protection – The proposed project is consistent with planned growth in the city, and would not result in increased in service times for safety response. The impact would be less than significant impact.

Less Than Significant Impact: Schools – The project site is located within the Burton and Porterville Unified School District; Monache High School is located immediately to the east across Newcomb Street and on the north side of Henderson Avenue and within the project area. Additional students would slowly be introduced at the time of development within School Districts. The Project would result in an increase of population that would have a less than significant impact.

Less Than Significant Impact: Parks – As the Project introduces some population growth to the area, the project would not create a need for additional park or recreational services. The project proposes five recreation areas including a recreation building, two open spaces and two swimming pool areas. Residents within the Project areas are already able to take advantage of the City’s numerous recreational areas including Veteran’s Park across Newcomb Street and the high school north of the park. There would be less than significant impact.

No Impact: Other public facilities – As the Project would slowly introduce population growth, the project would not create additional need for other public facilities. There would be less than significant impact.
XV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Response:

a) No Impact. The project has been evaluated for impacts to neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or the need for these additional facilities.

Currently the City has 15 parks for a total of almost 295 acres of parkland, plus other community facilities. The City’s Park Standard for neighborhood and community parks is 5.0 acres per 1,000 residents. The goal for all parkland including specialized facilities, is 10.0 per 1000 residents. The General Plan provides approximately 870 acres of parkland within the Planning Area. Buildout of the proposed General Plan would result in an approximate park ratio of 6.3 acres of neighborhood and community parks and 10.3 acres of total parkland per 1,000 residents based on the General Plans 2030 planned 107,300 population.

b) No Impact. The project proposes five recreation areas including two (2) recreation buildings (1,344 sqft. & 3,300sqft.), two open spaces (14,000± sqft. and 18,000± sqft.) and two swimming pool areas (each 18,000± sqft.).
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

c) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Response:

A traffic analysis was prepared by Ruettgers and Schuler (2012) in order evaluate the potential traffic impacts as a result of the construction of the proposed mixed use development in the City of Porterville. Intersection and roadway capacity was analyzed for 11 intersections in the vicinity of the project for weekday AM and PM peak hours. Of the 11 intersections, all currently operate at or above a LOS C. In addition to intersection
analysis, the driveway operation and configuration along Henderson Avenue was reviewed with recommendations for number and location of driveways. The intersections evaluated were:

- Westfield Avenue at: Newcomb Street and Prospect Street
- Mulberry Avenue at: Newcomb Street and Prospect Street
- Henderson Avenue at: Westwood Street, Mathew Street, Newcomb Street, Prospect Street, State Route 65 southbound lane ramps, State Route 65 northbound lane ramps, and Porter Road.

a) Less Than Significant Impact.
The analysis of existing traffic conditions at 11 intersections within the study area resulted in operation at or above LOS C. In addition to intersection analysis, the driveway operation and configuration along Henderson Avenue was reviewed with recommendations for number and location of driveways.

b) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. Future cumulative analysis, with and without the project, results in all roadway intersections and segments operating at or above a Level of Service (LOS) D. However, the queue length for one intersection exceeded the existing capacity. Therefore, mitigation was found necessary for this intersection in the future year 2030.

The eastbound left turn storage lane at the intersection of Henderson Avenue and Newcomb Street would need to be lengthened to 250 feet to meet future queue length requirements. The proposed project’s share of the required improvements was calculated to be 52.71%. The installation of the improvements, with a reimbursement plan for the remaining amount, would be addressed as a condition of project approval and would mitigate the potential impact to less than significant.

c) No Impact. The Project is located approximately three miles northeast of the Porterville Municipal Airport. The Project would not cause an increase in air traffic levels or cause a change in air traffic location. There would be no impact.

d) No Impact. Roadway design features have been specifically coordinated with public safety agencies and the City’s Public Works Department to include design features that would reduce hazards and the proposed changes to land uses would not result in a use incompatible to existing surrounding uses. There would be no impact.

e) No Impact. Circulation would not be modified as a result of this Project; therefore, there would be no impact to any emergency access.

f) No Impact. There are no adopted alternative transportation policies, plans, or programs in the Project area. There would be no impact.
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS
Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? □ □ ☒ □

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? □ □ ☒ □

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? □ □ ☒ □

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? □ □ ☒ □

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? □ □ ☒ □

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? □ □ ☒ □

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? □ □ ☒ □

Response:

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The capacity of the City of Porterville Wastewater Treatment Plant is currently eight million gallons per day. Current usage averages 5.2 million gallons per day. The 2001 Sewer Master Plan addresses the City’s sewage collection system capacity and operational needs and recommends a long-term capital improvement program. If the proposed project is approved, development would be permitted
with discretionary approvals allowing for conditions to be placed accordingly. The impact would be less than significant.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project will not require expansion or construction of new facilities. The General Plan provides guiding and implementation policies to assure the City is capable of meeting increased demands. The subject site is included within the City of Porterville Sewer, Water, and Storm Drain Master Plans. As development and infill-development occurs throughout the city, the sewer, water, and storm drain systems would be extended as necessary to accommodate new construction. Funding mechanisms are identified in the Master Plans to ensure that the expansion of each system keeps pace with development. The impact would be less than significant.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Any impacts regarding the need for storm water drainage facilities have been discussed in Impact XVII-b. The impact would be less than significant.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Development of the project area would not challenge the City’s supply. General Plan Section 8.1 “Water Supply and Conservation,” provides current and planned water supplies and includes a schedule for meeting future demand including the increased potential units associated with the project. The General Plan also identifies programs and policies for water conservation and planned supply to service demand through 2030 including an established goal of reducing the per capita water demand by 10% per day by 2030. As the County continues to review and finalize the City’s Urban Development Boundaries, the City anticipates updating and completing the Water System Master Plan by 2014-2015. The updates plan would include a water balance study and analysis of the distribution facilities needed to accommodate population growth. City services outline and would serve the entire project site as development occurs. The impact would be less than significant.

e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Any impacts regarding wastewater treatment have been discussed in Impact XVI-a. The impact would be less than significant.

f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project area is undeveloped but is in an area that currently receives solid waste services from the City of Porterville. Both the private and public solid waste services make use of the Teapot Dome Landfill operated by the County of Tulare. Adequate capacity exists in that landfill for potential development consistent with the proposed High Density Residential Zoning. The impact would be less than significant.

g) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Any impacts regarding solid waste have been discussed in Impact XVII-f. The impact would be less than significant.
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Response:

a) No Impact. The analysis conducted in this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration results in a determination that the Project would have no negative effect on the local natural environment. Although the project area is undeveloped, the site is disked annually for weed control and abatement. The project area is substantially urban and would not result in loss of native habitat. The potential for impacts to biological and cultural resources from the project would be less than significant as discussed in the previous impact sections. Accordingly, the project would involve no potential for significant impacts through the degradation of the quality of the environment, the reduction in the habitat or population of fish or wildlife, including endangered plants or animals, the elimination of a plant or animal community or example of a major period of California history or prehistory. There would be no impact.

b) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. As discussed within the preceding impact analyses, the proposed project has potential for traffic and air related impacts. Those impacts have been addressed with mitigation measures, which when implemented will ensure not only the project related but the cumulative impact of the project. Compliance with applicable codes, ordinances, laws and other required regulations would further assure that potential impacts associated with development applications remain at a less than significant level.
c) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would not result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Adverse effects on human beings resulting from implementation of the project would be less than significant.
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### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Time Span</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Air Quality | Mitigation Measure #III a), b), c), d): Construction contracts shall require the primary construction contractor to implement the following practices during all construction activities:  
  - Construction equipment shall use aqueous diesel fuel and shall be equipped with particulate traps and catalytic converters.  
  - All disturbed areas, including soil piles, areas that have been graded, and unpaved roads shall be watered twice daily and, when feasible, covered or enclosed.  
  - When materials are transported offsite, loads shall be wetted and covered securely and at least two feet of freeboard shall be maintained.  
  - Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph and install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent.  
  - Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off all trucks and equipment leaving the site.  
  - Turn off equipment not in use for more than ten minutes.  
  - Curtail construction activities when the County’s Air Quality Index exceeds 150.  
  - Traditional residential wood fireplaces will be restricted (install of natural gas fireplaces or inserts shall be acceptable) | Condition of Building Permit, to be the responsibility of the applicant and applicant’s contractor. To comply with the District’s restriction of PM$_{10}$ generating activities, the project proponent will follow all Regulation VIII requirements (Tables 1 and 2). In addition, the proponent will further mitigate impacts by meeting the enhanced and additional control measures for construction emissions of PM$_{10}$ (Table 3). These actions will reduce any potential impact to less than significant | City of Porterville Building Department to verify at plan check and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District will be notified if necessary during construction.                                                                 | Beginning with construction permit and terminating with issuance of Notice of Completion |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Time Span</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure #XV a): Mitigation measures for the Henderson MU-V Commercial Mix Use Development; The developer/applicant shall dedicate right of way to the City for construction of the driveway transitional lanes, including sidewalks, as shown on the revised site plan and per the mitigation measures described in the Traffic Study prepared by Ruetgers &amp; Schuler Civil Engineers. Dedications shall include the ADA compliant curb returns at each driveway. Off-site median islands shall comply with the traffic study prepared by Ruetgers and Schuler Civil Engineers.</td>
<td>Condition of Building Permit, to be the responsibility of the applicant and applicant's contractor</td>
<td>City of Porterville Planning and Building Department to verify at plan check.</td>
<td>Completed at time of final building inspection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. __________

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
CONTAINING FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF APPROVAL OF
A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
FOR THE PACIFIC RIM COMMERCIAL MIXED USE PROJECT

WHEREAS: The City Council of the City of Porterville at its regularly scheduled
meeting of March 5, 2013, conducted a public hearing to consider entitlements needed to permit
the proposed Pacific Rim Commercial Mixed Use Project (2012-002) including a General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Tentative Parcel Map, and Conditional Use Permit; and

WHEREAS: General Plan Amendment 2012-002-G proposes to change the land use
designation on the General Plan Land Use Diagram for the subject site from Medium-Density Residential, High-Density Residential, and Neighborhood Commercial to Commercial Mixed Use; and

WHEREAS: Zone Change 2012-002-Z proposes to change the present zoning
classifications of the subject parcels from Medium-Density Residential, High-Density Residential, and Neighborhood Commercial to Commercial Mixed Use; and

WHEREAS: Tentative Parcel Map 2012-002-P proposes to divide a 23.4± acre site into
four parcels: Parcel 1- 5.70± acres; Parcel 2- 4.49± acres; Parcel 3- 1.57± acres; and Parcel 4-11.69± acres; and

WHEREAS: Conditional Use Permit 2012-002-C proposes to accommodate personal
storage uses in the CMX zone; and

WHEREAS: The City Council considered the following findings in its review of the
environmental circumstances for this project:

1. That a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared in accordance with the
California Environmental Quality Act.

2. That the subject project will not create adverse environmental impacts. The
project was evaluated in light of the prepared environmental initial study; one
comment was received from an interested party during the review period. In light
of the record and information received, it was determined that potential impacts
associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

3. That the City Council is the decision making body for the project.

4. On February 5, 2013, the environmental coordinator made a preliminary
determination that a Mitigated Negative Declaration would be appropriate for the
proposed project. The Initial Study has been transmitted to interested agencies and
groups for a twenty (20) day review period from February 8, 2013, to February
28, 2013. One comment was received from the Porterville Unified School
District related to vehicular and pedestrian traffic.
5. That review of the environmental circumstances regarding this project indicates that no adverse impacts would accrue to wildlife resources from implementation of this project. An on-site inspection was conducted, and a traffic study prepared to consider the impacts of the project on the environment. No natural resource concerns were identified with the proposed project. However, traffic impacts were identified. Mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant were defined and have been incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached hereto as Exhibit A.

6. That the environmental assessment and analysis prepared for this project supporting the Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the City of Porterville.

7. The developer/applicant shall comply with all mitigation measures adopted as a component of the approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project. The developer/applicant will be required to sign a document committing to comply with the adopted mitigation measures prior to any construction on the site.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the City Council of the City of Porterville does hereby approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the General Plan Amendment 2012-002-G, Zone Change 2012-002-Z and related development of the Pacific Rim Commercial Mixed Use Project, and that the mitigation measures defined in Exhibit A shall be implemented by the developer/applicant or his/her partners and successors with project implementation.

By: ____________________________
    Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: ____________________________
    Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
# MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Time Span</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure #III a), b), c), d): Construction contracts shall require the</td>
<td>Condition of Building Permit, to be the responsibility of the applicant and</td>
<td>City of Porterville Building Department to verify at plan check and the San Joaquin Valley Air</td>
<td>Beginning with construction permit and terminating with issuance of Notice of Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>primary construction contractor to implement the following practices during all</td>
<td>applicant's contractor. To comply with the District's restriction of PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>Pollution Control District will be notified if necessary during construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>construction activities:</td>
<td>generating activities, the project proponent will follow all Regulation VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction equipment shall use aqueous diesel fuel and shall be equipped with</td>
<td>requirements (Tables 1 and 2). In addition, the proponent will further</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>particulate traps and catalytic converters.</td>
<td>mitigate impacts by meeting the enhanced and additional control measures for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All disturbed areas, including soil piles, areas that have been graded, and</td>
<td>construction emissions of PM$_{10}$ (Table 3). These actions will reduce any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unpaved roads shall be watered twice daily and, when feasible, covered or enclosed.</td>
<td>potential impact to less than significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When materials are transported offsite, loads shall be wetted and covered securely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and at least two feet of freeboard shall be maintained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph and install sandbags or other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a slope greater than one percent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off all trucks and equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leaving the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Turn off equipment not in use for more than ten minutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Curtail construction activities when the County's Air Quality Index exceeds 150.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traditional residential wood fireplaces will be restricted (install of natural gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fireplaces or inserts shall be acceptable).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration*

*Henderson MU-V Commercial Mixed Use Development*
| Impacts            | Mitigation Measures                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Implementation                                                                                       | Monitoring                                                                                           | Time Span                                                                                           |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Transportation/Traffic | Mitigation Measure #XV a): Mitigation measures for the Henderson MU-V Commercial Mix Use Development; The developer/applicant shall dedicate right of way to the City for construction of the driveway transitional lanes, including sidewalks, as shown on the revised site plan and per the mitigation measures described in the Traffic Study prepared by Ruettgars & Schuler Civil Engineers. Dedications shall include the ADA compliant curb returns at each driveway. Off-site median islands shall comply with the traffic study prepared by Ruettgars and Schuler Civil Engineers. | Condition of Building Permit, to be the responsibility of the applicant and applicant’s contractor   | City of Porterville Planning and Building Department to verify at plan check.                        | Completed at time of final building inspection.                                                      |

*Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration*

*Henderson MU-V Commercial Mixed Use Development*  

*February 8, 2013*
RESOLUTION NO.______

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE CONTAINING FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF APPROVAL OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 2012-002-G FOR THE PROPOSED PACIFIC RIM COMMERCIAL MIXED USE PROJECT LOCATED GENERALLY AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF HENDERSON AVENUE AND NEWCOMB STREET

WHEREAS: The City Council of the City of Porterville at its regularly scheduled meeting of March 5, 2013, conducted a public hearing to consider approval of a General Plan amendment from High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and Neighborhood Commercial to Commercial Mixed Use for a 23.4± acre parcel located on the south side of Henderson Avenue, west of Newcomb Street (APN 245-410-032); and

WHEREAS: The project site is currently undeveloped; and

WHEREAS: On February 5, 2013, the Environmental Coordinator made a preliminary determination that a Mitigated Negative Declaration would be appropriate for the proposed project; and

WHEREAS: Approval of the General Plan Amendment and Zone Change would allow the project site to be developed with multiple uses in an integrated manner, and provide residential, office, commercial, and storage uses to the existing neighborhood; and

WHEREAS: Approval of the Commercial Mixed Use Project furthers the goals and objectives of the General Plan by developing higher density residential uses in close proximity to services, such as schools, parks and commercial businesses; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Porterville does hereby make the following findings:

1. The proposed General Plan Amendment has been requested by the applicant to accommodate opportunities for a commercial mixed use development that was unanticipated at the time of the adoption of the General Plan. The proposed Commercial Mixed Use Designation modifies the existing land use plan by integrating the various components of the development into a unified development. In essence, the existing land use designations would allow for multi-family residential and commercial development but in different proportions. The proposed mix of uses facilitated through the approval of the requested amendment are complementary and mutually supportive.

2. Based on review of application materials and submitted plans, the proposed project serves to fulfill the goals of the General Plan as adopted, and the amendment of the land use designation on the subject parcel (APN 245-410-032)
does not infringe on the goals of the General Plan to maintain transitions between types and intensities of land use.

3. That a Negative Declaration was prepared for the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and was transmitted to interested agencies and made available for public review and comment. The review period ran for twenty (20) days, from February 8, 2013, to February 28, 2013.

4. The City Council is the decision-making body for the project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the City Council does hereby approve the General Plan Amendment from High Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and Neighborhood Commercial to Commercial Mixed Use for development as represented and incorporated herein as Exhibit A.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of March 2013.

By: ____________________________
Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: ____________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
ORDINANCE NO. _________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
APPROVING ZONE CHANGE 2012-002-Z
FROM RM-2 (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL), RM-3 (HIGH DENSITY
RESIDENTIAL), AND CN (NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL) TO CMX (COMMERCIAL
MIXED USE) FOR THAT 23.4± ACRE SITE LOCATED GENERALLY AT THE
SOUTHWEST CORNER OF HENDERSON AVENUE AND NEWCOMB STREET

WHEREAS: The City Council of the City of Porterville at its regularly scheduled
meeting of March 5, 2013, conducted a public hearing to approve findings and consider Zone
Change 2012-002-Z, being a change of zone from RM-3 (High Density Residential), RM-2
(Medium Density Residential), and CN (Neighborhood Commercial) to CMX (Commercial
Mixed Use) for the site located on the south side of Henderson Avenue, west of Newcomb Street
(APN 245-410-032); and

WHEREAS: The City Council of the City of Porterville determined that the proposed
Zone Change (2012-002-Z) is consistent with the guiding and implementation policies of the
adopted 2030 General Plan; and

WHEREAS: That a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project in
accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and was transmitted to interested
agencies and made available for public review and comment. The review period ran for twenty
(20) days from February 8, 2013 to February 28, 2013; and

WHEREAS: The City Council made the following findings that the proposed project
will advance the goals and objectives of and is consistent with the policies of the General Plan
and any other applicable plan that the City has adopted.

a. The project supports and complies with the following General Plan guiding
   policies:
      LU-G-1: Promote a sustainable, balanced land use pattern that responds to
      existing needs and future needs of the City.
      LU-G-3: Promote sustainability in the design and development of public and
      private development projects.
      LU-G-10: Foster viable, pedestrian-oriented neighborhood centers with
      vertically- and horizontally- mixed-use development.

b. Development of the site as proposed, including personal storage, requires
   approval of a Conditional Use Permit and would be subject to the City’s
   development standards.

ATTACHMENT
ITEM NO. 5
c. An amendment to the General Plan designation is being processed concurrently with this Zone Change request. Approval of the Zone Change is contingent upon the approval of General Plan Amendment 2012-002 G, to ensure consistency between the General Plan and Zoning. The commercial mixed use (CMX) zoning will allow for similar types of land uses but in different proportions than currently exist on the property. In addition, the CMX Zone will allow the personal storage development pursuant to approval of a Conditional Use Permit as well as the drive through lanes as proposed.

d. The subject Zone Change will not create adverse environmental impacts on the adjacent neighborhood when mitigation measures are implemented and standards of the Development Ordinance and General Plan are applied to the subsequent development project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED: That the City Council of the City of Porterville does ordain as follows:

Section 1: That the following described property in the City of Porterville, County of Tulare, State of California, known as Zone Change 2012-002-Z, is hereby rezoned from RM-3 (High Density Residential), RM-2 (Medium Density Residential), and CN (Neighborhood Commercial) to CMX (Commercial Mixed Use), pursuant to Section 3 below, for the parcel described herein as Assessor’s Parcel Number 245-410-032 located on the south side of Henderson Avenue, west of Newcomb Street; and

Section 2: It is further ordained that all records of the City of Porterville, together with the official zoning map of the City of Porterville, shall be changed to show the above described real property is rezoned from RM-3 (High Density Residential), RM-2 (Medium Density Residential), and CN (Neighborhood Commercial) to CMX (Commercial Mixed Use) for the site described above, more particularly shown on the attached map as Exhibit “A”; and

Section 3: This ordinance shall be in full force and effect not sooner than thirty (30) days from and after the ordinance’s publication and passage, subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall comply with all local, State, and federal laws.

2. The project shall comply with all mitigation measures identified in the approved CEQA document.

3. Building Design Criteria: In order to receive building permit approval for the mixed use project, City staff shall find that all of the following criteria have been met:

   a. Integrated Theme – All buildings within the mixed use development will exhibit an integrated architectural theme that includes consistent materials, colors, and design details as represented on Exhibits “B, C and D”; including a complete master site plan, building elevations, and landscaping.
b. The architectural details of building entrances shall be integrated with the overall building design in terms of materials, scale, proportion, and design elements.

c. All buildings shall include a complementary level of design detail on all facades.

d. Signage shall be in compliance with the Master Sign Program for the entire development, as represented herein on Exhibit “E”.

4. The entire commercial mixed use project is considered one project as shown on the proposed Master Development Plan and Tentative Parcel Map (Exhibits “B” and “F”). Building permits secured separately for phased buildings and buildings with differing uses are considered part of one overall commercial mixed use project.

As either or both Parcels 2 and/or 3 develop, all parking, building pads, drive aisles, enhanced public open spaces, features and amenities shall be constructed with the initial building permit. The remaining building pad areas may develop by separate permits.

5. The main access point for the residential component (Parcel 4), along Henderson Avenue shall be fully developed and provide connectivity to the street with the first building permit for any portion of the apartments. The connecting drive aisle and parking within this area, as shown on Exhibit “B”, (approximately 80 foot width), shall be developed prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy. A recorded access easement for ingress/egress, parking, trash and connectivity to both streets shall serve as a guarantee for the functionality of the apartments on Parcel 4 and the adjacent development to the east. As shown on Exhibit “B”, the section of the easement running east to west shall be developed in favor of Parcel 4 and the section of the easement running north to south shall be in favor of the adjacent parcel.

6. All improvements shall be in accordance with City standards and should maintain a common theme throughout the entire project. All landscaping shall comply with all City of Porterville landscape and irrigation standards. Plants shall be selected for their ability to prosper in the climate and geography of this region; the Sunset Garden manual is one such approved resource that is frequently used to guide plant selection. Such landscaping shall include an automatic sprinkler system and adequate maintenance to maintain the landscaping as approved free of diseased, dead or damaged materials. Plants shall be maintained in a healthy and vigorous growing condition and planting areas shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner, free of weeds and debris. Other improvements to the Land Area are to include, at a minimum, a seating area with one or more benches and a trash receptacle which are designed for use in the public space. Owner shall submit details regarding the style, color, and materials for approval of the Community Development Director, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld.
7. Development of the project area shall substantially comply with all plan sheets (Exhibits "B, C, and D").

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this _____ day of March, 2013.

By: __________________________
    Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: __________________________
    Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
PRC 2012-002
Henderson Ave. Mixed Use Zoning Map
1" = 600 ft.
EXHIBIT
REFERENCES PLAN

MINI-STOREAGE SITE PLAN

NOTE: SHADING INDICATES STORAGE UNITS INCLUDED ON THIS PLAN

HENDERSON AVENUE

REFER TO SHEET PP-2.1
EXHIBIT "" ""

CENTER IDENTIFICATION SIGNS
(AREAS 1 AND 2)

MONUMENT SIGNS
(AREAS 3, 4, 5 AND 6)
City of Porterville
(development name) Master Sign Program
Henderson Avenue
MSP-

This Master Sign Program applies to the (development name). This master sign program has been established for the purpose of assuring an outstanding shopping center for the community and for the mutual benefit of all tenants. Conformance may be strictly enforced by the City, and any nonconforming or unapproved signs must be brought into conformance at the expense of the applicable tenant.

A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

1. Tenants shall be responsible for installation and maintenance of all tenant's individual signs at the tenant's expense.

2. Tenants shall be responsible for the fulfillment of all requirements and specifications of this Criteria.

3. Each tenant shall submit to the owner, before fabrication, at least two (2) copies of detailed drawings of proposed signs, indicating the location on the building and on the property, size of sign, layout, design and color of the proposed sign including all lettering and/or graphics, and a detailed method of attachment. However such detailed drawings may be submitted electronically.

4. All tenants at their own expense are responsible for obtaining a Porterville City Sign Permit. Both the tenant's and landlord's signature are required on all sign applications. Fabrication prior to City approval is not recommended. Said Sign Permit must be obtained by a State of California licensed contractor.

5. Tenants must have their signs, as specified in this Criteria installed within 90 days of opening for business. Signs must be removed within 15 days after their departure. Tenants shall be responsible for any necessary repairs to the building fascia, (i.e.) patching, painting etc. caused during installation or removal of the signs. All expenses for such shall be the responsibility of and paid for by the tenant.

B. GENERAL SPECIFICATION

1. All tenant signs shall be internally lighted individual channel letters as specified in Section "C" of this Criteria.

2. All tenant signs must be installed within the designated sign area on the building as shown in Exhibit A, and as specified in paragraphs 3 and 4 of this Section "B".
3. Major tenants may display their company name or agency, logo, products, departments or services that are consistent with their national branding of their store fronts or office buildings. A maximum of two (2) square feet of sign, per each linear foot of tenant’s leasehold frontage will be allowed, not to exceed 350 square feet, however no single sign shall exceed 300 square feet in area. Total linear feet of the signs shall not exceed 75% in horizontal length of the linear frontage of each tenant’s leasehold frontage.

4. All other tenants’ signs shall be displayed on one (1) line of text to include any logo or business name, with a minimum height of 12 inches and a maximum height of 24 inches. Two lines or “stacked” text or logos shall not be permitted. The overall size of all tenant signs shall not exceed two (2) square feet of sign per linear foot of tenant’s leasehold frontage. No sign shall exceed more than 75% in horizontal length of the linear frontage of the tenant leasehold space.

5. Tenants of areas 3, 4 and 5 as designated on Exhibit “C” may display their company name or agency, logo, products, departments or services that are consistent with their national branding of their stores or offices.

6. All signs are to be installed centered on the arched opening nearest to the main entrance door of the respective tenant’s leasehold (see Exhibit “A”).

7. At the property owner’s sole discretion, depending on the space available, tenants may be afforded a space on the Center Identification sign, located on Henderson Avenue (Exhibit “B”). No alterations to the spaces on these signs will be allowed without the landlord’s prior written approval as provided for in Section A, paragraph 3. However, no alterations or additional signs on the exterior of these signs will be allowed.

8. No additional freestanding signs are allowed for tenants of areas 1 and 2 other than the Center Identification signs on Henderson Avenue as shown on Exhibit “B”. Monument signs shall be allowed on Areas 3-6 as identified on Exhibit “C” as shown on Exhibit “B”.

9. Design, layout and materials for tenant signs shall conform in all respects with the sign design drawings included within these criteria. The maximum height for letters in the body of all signs shall be as indicated in this document.

10. All signage within this shopping center is subject to Chapter 305:12 “Master Sign Program” of the Porterville Development Ordinance. However, at the Zoning Administrator’s discretion, Chapter 305 “signs”) shall prevail if there are any discrepancies or omissions within this Master Sign Program.

C. CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS

1. Channel letter signs are to be manufactured using .040 aluminum returns, 1/8 inch plastic faces held on with 3/4 inch thick plastic trim capping. Illumination is to be provided using L.E.D. lighting.

2. Major tenants and tenants of areas 3, 4 and 5 (Exhibit “C”) will have the option of lighting their signs using either L.E.D. or 15mm Neon Tubing.

3. Tenants will have their choice of color; however, they must be approved by the landlord.

4. All electrical wiring shall be installed and enclosed behind the wall where letters are installed. No exposed crossover wiring or exposed raceways on the front of the building will be allowed.
5. Electrical wiring to the sign on the front fascia of the tenant's leasehold store front on the building to be existing. Tenants will be responsible at their sole expense for any timing device to operate the signs.

6. No audible, flashing or animated signs will be permitted.

7. All electrical wiring shall conform to and pass all state and local building codes.

8. All tenant signs shall be manufactured under Underwriters Laboratories specifications, and carry the U.L. label.

D. MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS

1. Advertising placards, banners, pendants, names, insignias, trademarks, or other descriptive materials, either temporary or permanently affixed or maintained upon the glass panes and supports of the show windows and doors, shall conform with the City of Porterville sign codes for such. Window signs shall not exceed 50% of the total glass window area. The above shall not be hand drawn.

2. Except as provided herein, no advertising placards, banners, pendants, names, insignia, trademarks or other descriptive materials shall be affixed or maintained upon the exterior walls or building without previous written approval of the landlord, and must receive a Temporary Sign Permit from the City of Porterville for such. The above shall not be hand drawn.

3. All sign plans must be submitted to the landlord for approval prior to the obtaining of a City of Porterville Sign Permit and installation as specified in Section "A", paragraph 3 of these Criteria.

4. The property owner reserves the right to designate the Sign Contractor to be contracted by the tenant, at the tenant's sole expense. Tenants must contact the property owner's agent as shown below to coordinate the hiring of the designated sign contractor. However, at the property owner's discretion, a tenant may be approved to use a Sign Contractor of their choice.

5. Any proposed Sign Contractor must be currently licensed as a C-45 State of California sign contractor. Said contractor must provide the following:

   a. Certificate of Liability Insurance in the amount of $2,000,000.00, naming ___ as additionally insured.

   b. Certificates of The State of California Workman's Compensation.

6. Owners agent: (name); Phone: (phone number) e-mail: (email address)
RESOLUTION NO._______

A RESOLUTION OF THE PARCEL MAP COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE CONTAINING FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF APPROVAL OF TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP 2012-002-PM TO DIVIDE A 23± ACRE SITE INTO FOUR (4) PARCELS GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTH WEST CORNER OF HENDERSON AVENUE AND NEWCOMB STREET

WHEREAS: The City Council of the City of Porterville at its scheduled meeting of March 5, 2013, conducted a public hearing to consider Tentative Parcel Map PRC-2012-002-PM; and

WHEREAS: The City Council received testimony from all interested parties relative to said Tentative Parcel Map; and

WHEREAS: The Parcel Map Committee of the City of Porterville at its regularly scheduled meeting of February 13, 2013, conducted a public hearing to consider approval of Tentative Parcel Map 2012-002-PM to divide a 23.4± acre vacant site into four (4) parcels as follows:

 Parcel 1 – 5.70± acres  
 Parcel 2 – 4.49± acres  
 Parcel 3 – 1.57± acres  
 Parcel 4 – 11.69± acres

; and

WHEREAS: The Parcel Map Committee discussed concerns and conditions relevant to the proposed project; and

WHEREAS: On February 5, 2013, the Environmental Coordinator made a preliminary determination that in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, a Mitigated Negative Declaration would be appropriate for the proposed project; and

WHEREAS: The Parcel Map Committee provided the opportunity to the public and all interested parties to comment on the proposed tentative subdivision map; and

WHEREAS: The Parcel Map Committee made the following findings:

1. That the proposed tentative parcel map is contingent upon approval of General Plan Amendment PRC 2012-002-G and Zone Change PRC 2012-002-Z.

2. That the proposed parcel map is consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

ATTACHMENT
ITEM NO. 6
3. The proposed use of the site shall be required to be operated and maintained to comply with State Law, the City of Porterville Development Ordinance, adopted Building Codes and all other applicable laws and ordinances.

4. The design and improvements of the parcel map and the proposed project are consistent with the proposed Commercial Mixed Use General Plan designation, as represented in Exhibits A & B.

5. That the site is physically suitable for the type and density of the proposed development.

   The subject site is flat. Conformance with the City Storm Drain Master Plan, and requirements relative to grading, the California Building Code, etc., will be required. Additionally, compliance with federal, State and local regulation requiring that storm water runoff monitored and maintained free of heavy concentration of pollutants will mitigate this potential impact to a level of insignificance (NPDES standards).

6. That the design of the parcel map or proposed improvements will not cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

7. That the design of the parcel map or type of improvements will not cause serious public health problems.

   The location of the project and the conditions under which it would be operated or maintained will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the area.

8. That the design of the parcel map or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of, property within the proposed parcel map.

9. That the Parcel Map Committee reviewed the proposed parcel map and recommended that the City review the project in its entirety.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the City Council does hereby approve Tentative Parcel Map 2012-002 subject to the following conditions:

1. An easement shall be recorded prior to the issuance of the first building permit that provides ingress/egress, parking, trash and connectivity throughout the development. Such an easement between Parcels 1 and 2 shall serve as a guarantee for the functionality and circulation of those parcels as proposed. Also shown on Exhibit A, a drive aisle between Parcels 1 and 2 shall be fully developed and provide connectivity from the secondary exit of the mini-storage to the mini-storage main entrance when Parcel 1 is developed.
2. An easement shall be recorded prior to the issuance of the Parcel 4 building permit that provides for emergency vehicular access to Newcomb Street over and across the adjacent easterly parcel.

3. As development of any parcel occurs, all right of way improvements along that parcel’s frontage shall be constructed in accordance with the mitigation measures and recommendations of the Ruettgers & Schuler traffic study (2012), as represented in Exhibit A and identified in the resolution approving the Mitigated Negative Declaration, prepared pursuant to CEQA. In the event Parcel 3 should develop prior to Parcel 2, the frontage improvements shall be completed for Parcel 2 at that time. At such time as Parcel 4 is developed, the off-site improvements extending the eastbound left turn lane on Henderson Avenue shall be constructed. At such time as Parcel 2 is developed, the off-site improvements extending the eastbound left turn lane on Henderson Avenue and the median improvements further west as represented on the site plan shall be constructed. In the event Parcel 1 is developed prior to Parcel 2, the raised median island improvements on Henderson Avenue shall be constructed.

4. Due to potential drainage issues, prior to securing a building permit, a grading sewer and water, and drainage master plan for Parcels 1, 2, 3, and 4, shall be submitted for review and approval by the City Engineer. As development of the site occurs, the phased master plan shall be implemented as approved by the City Engineer.

5. Prior to issuance of any building permit for the Project, access easements for ingress/egress, parking, and trash pick-up shall be recorded as deemed necessary by the City Engineer and Community Development Director. Copies of the easements shall be provided to the City.

6. Gates that have restricted access shall be identified on building permit plans.

7. The automated gate between Retail “B” and the mini-storage shall allow traffic to exit from the commercial complex to Henderson Avenue only. No access into shopping center is permitted.


9. The developer/applicant shall pay all applicable fees according to the Municipal Code and State law. The developer/applicant intends to utilize the 10-year development fee payment plan for all fees except school fees pursuant to Resolution 37-2012, adopted April 17, 2012.
10. The developer/applicant shall reimburse the City for constructed frontage improvements along Henderson Avenue in accordance with approved resolutions.

11. The developer/applicant shall construct and/or repair street, curb, gutter, sidewalk, etc. along the Henderson Avenue frontage, except where they exist and are in good condition in the opinion of the City Engineer at the time of inspection prior to building permit issuance (Ordinance. No. 1306).

12. The developer/applicant shall construct sidewalk necessary to obtain a width of 9.5 feet along the full frontage of the proposed project.

13. The developer/applicant shall construct drainage facilities as required to serve the property (Ordinance. No. 1306). The parking lot shall be designed to convey water to the City drainage system without crossing driveways.

14. The Porter Slough Ditch runs through this property, requiring piping and reservation of an easement in favor of the irrigation company. Construction of structures within the easement area shall be prohibited.

15. The developer/applicant shall coordinate with the Porterville Irrigation District and City of Porterville regarding potential conflicts with the existing pipeline/open ditch that crosses the property. The Porterville Irrigation District shall specify appropriate pipeline replacement size(s) and materials, should replacement or installation be mandated.

16. The developer/applicant shall, under City inspection, remove all existing abandoned and unnecessary items, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, before the issuance of a certificate of occupancy (e.g., foundations, septic tanks, irrigation pipes, etc.).

17. The developer/applicant shall abandon existing wells, if any, after first getting an abandonment permit from the Tulare County Environmental Health Department, and providing the City Engineer with proof of compliance with County regulations before performing any grading or issuance of the building permit, whichever comes first.

18. The developer/applicant shall construct the pipe connecting to on-site fire hydrants to City water main standards and shall provide easements for maintenance to the on-site water mains.

19. At the time of approval of the Final Map the developer/applicant shall dedicate right-of-way for a street width that matches the ultimate width in the adopted Land Use and Circulation Elements and/or that was established by the City Council, along with dedication of right-of-way adequate for all improvements associated with the project Traffic Study prepared by Ruetgers and Schuler, as well as dedication of property required for ADA ramp(s) (Section 21-23). Dedicate required utility easements.

20. The developer/applicant shall comply with Chapter 7, Article XIII of the City Code and Chapter 18 and Appendix J of the California Building Code and provide a Preliminary
Soils Report (C.C. Sec. 7-126 & Res. 4997) including results of "R-Value" tests and recommendations regarding construction of public improvements that address City Standard C-13, satisfactory to the City Engineer, prior to the approval of the improvement plans or start of grading, whichever comes first. Additional reporting requirements are as indicated below:

a. Final Grading, Drainage and Soils Report, prior to issuance of building permits (C.C. Sec. 7-133);

b. Soils Report(s) in accordance with Chapter 18 and Appendix J of the California Building Code.

21. Prior to approval of a permit or other grant of approval for development of the property, the developer/applicant shall comply with or provide plans that comply with City Retaining Wall Standards at Lot Lines (adopted by City Council January 3, 1989).

22. The dedication of easements or any other potential dedications shall be clearly identified on the Parcel Map. A Dedications Statement shall be placed on the map that reads:

   "Pursuant to the authority conferred by the City of Porterville, Ordinance No. 1590, adopted February 20, 2001, the undersigned, on behalf of the Public and City Council of the City of Porterville consents to the acceptance and recordation of the ______ dedication(s) as shown on this map.
   Dated this ______ day of ______, 20____
   By Michael K. Reed, City Engineer PLS 7514"

23. Prior to recording the Parcel Map, the developer/applicant shall provide improvements by the method indicated below:

   a. Simultaneous recording of a separate legal instrument or placement of a statement on the Parcel Map, if appropriate, that reads as follows:

      "In accordance with Section 66411.1 of the Government Code, the construction of on-site and off-site improvements, such as but not limited to, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, paseouts, pavement transitions, traffic signage and markings, median islands and the mitigation measures described in the project Traffic Study prepared by Ruettgers and Schuler Civil Engineers, utilities, grading, parking lot improvements, well abandonment (if any), removal of irrigation lines (if any), etc. has been deferred until such time as a permit or other grant of approval for development of the parcel is issued. Such construction may be phased when only a portion of the parcels shown herein receive such approval. The phased construction shall consist of all improvements related to the specific parcels plus that required to make the installed improvements function."

24. The developer/applicant shall move existing utility structures, if any, that are in conflict with the project driveways and associated transitional traffic lanes (for example, poles, splice boxes, vaults, etc.) to a position that provides a minimum of four feet (4') of clear
space in the sidewalk area and a minimum of two feet (2') of clear space from the curb face to the structure, unless they are below grade (Title 24 OSA).

25. Concurrent with issuance of building permits and construction of any improvements on a parcel, the developer/applicant shall have constructed, or pay fees for, street lights on Marbelite poles complying with Southern California Edison Company specifications, as approved by the City Engineer. Use of wood poles is prohibited without prior written approval of the City Engineer.

26. Prior to recording the final map, the developer/applicant shall provide easements, permits (from other agencies as required), calculations, etc., if, in the opinion of the City Engineer, they are needed for the proper functioning or phasing of the development (e.g., water, sewer, drainage, "turn arounds", etc.). If the City Engineer determines that construction of improvements is needed to protect public health and safety or for orderly development of the surrounding area, the developer/applicant shall construct or provide a surety for said improvements.

27. Prior to recording the final map, the developer/applicant shall replace or provide surety for replacement of irrigation pipes in the right-of-way (if present) if, in the opinion of the City Engineer, replacement is warranted. The developer/applicant shall cure any leaks in irrigation pipes crossing the subject parcel, if in the opinion of the City Engineer, such leaks may interfere with the development of the subject site. Easements shall be provided for irrigation pipes across parcels created, if such pipes will continue in use.

28. The developer/applicant shall dedicate a one foot (1') limitation of access strip between driveways shown on Exhibit A and those locations where, in the opinion of the City Engineer, it is undesirable to allow access. Dedication shall be illustrated on the Parcel Map or by recordation of a separate legal document.

29. The developer/applicant shall construct a City standard barricade or wall at the end of all dead end streets or drive aisles, with the exception of Fairhaven Avenue, where an emergency access gate shall be constructed and keyed with a Knox box padlock.

30. Depending on the location of the existing fire hydrant(s), additional fire hydrants may be required. All hydrants must be in place and accepted by the Fire Department prior to any combustibles being brought onto the site.

31. The City will test and maintain all fire hydrants in the City whether on private property or not. An "easement" is required from the owner.

32. Fire hydrant spacing shall be as follows:

a. In Commercial development, one hydrant shall be installed at 300-foot intervals.

b. In Residential development, one hydrant shall be installed at 500-foot intervals.
33. Access roads shall be provided for every facility, building or portion of a building, when any portion of the facility or portion of an exterior wall is located more than 150 feet from a fire apparatus access as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building.

34. Project must meet minimum fire flow requirements per the table in Appendix B & C of the California Fire Code. Fire flow for the project as proposed would be 1,500 GPM.

35. Areas identified as “Fire Lanes” must be identified as such by red painted curbs and identified per requirements set forth in the California Vehicle Code Section 22500.1.

36. The project shall comply with all local, State, and federal laws.

37. The project shall comply with all mitigation measures identified in the approved CEQA document.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ______ day of March, 2013.

By: Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

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

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
CONTAINING FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF APPROVAL OF A
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (2012-002-C)
FOR A PERSONAL STORAGE FACILITY ON A 5.66± ACRE PORTION OF
THE PROPOSED PACIFIC RIM COMMERCIAL MIXED USE PROJECT

WHEREAS: The City Council of the City of Porterville at its regularly scheduled
meeting of March 5, 2013, conducted a public meeting to consider approval of a Conditional Use
Permit to accommodate a 518 unit personal storage facility in the Commercial Mixed Use zone
on a 5.66± acre parcel; and

WHEREAS: The project site is currently undeveloped; and

WHEREAS: On February 5, 2013, the Environmental Coordinator made a preliminary
determination that a Mitigated Negative Declaration would be appropriate for the proposed
project; and

WHEREAS: The proposed Conditional Use Permit is supported by the General Plan
and Development Ordinance in that the proposed development is consistent with Section 301.13
of the Porterville Development Ordinance (Chapter 21 of the Porterville Municipal Code).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Porterville
does hereby make the following findings:

1. The General Plan designation for the subject area was approved by the City
Council on March 5, 2013, modifying the General Plan designation from RM-3
(High Density Residential), RM-2 (Medium Density Residential), and CN
(Convenience Neighborhood Commercial) to CMX (Commercial Mixed Use) for the subject
parcel.

2. The Zoning classification for the subject area was approved by the City Council
on March 5, 2013, modifying the zoning from RM-3 (High Density Residential),
RM-2 (Medium Density Residential), and CN (Convenience Neighborhood Commercial) to
CMX (Commercial Mixed Use) for the subject parcel.

3. That a Negative Declaration was prepared for the project in accordance with the
California Environmental Quality Act and was transmitted to interested agencies
and made available for public review and comment. The review period ran for
twenty (20) days, from February 8, 2013, to February 28, 2013.

4. The City Council is the decision-making body for the project.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the City Council does hereby approve the Conditional Use Permit for development of a 518 unit personal storage facility as represented and incorporated herein as Exhibit “A” subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed project shall comply with all local, State, and Federal laws, including but not limited to Section 301.13 of the Porterville Development Ordinance.
2. The project shall be developed in a manner consistent with the site plan and elevations, included herein as Exhibits “A” and “B”.
3. The personal storage units shall prohibit storage of hazardous materials on-site.
4. The Zoning Administrator shall consider any modifications to the development for consistency.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of March 2013.

By: __________________________
Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: __________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
SUBJECT: SECOND READING – ORDINANCE 1795, INTERFERENCE WITH ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS OF THE CITY

SOURCE: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES/CITY CLERK DIVISION

COMMENT: Ordinance No. 1795, An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Porterville Adding Sections 2-6.1 and 2-6.2 to Chapter 2, Article I of the Porterville Municipal Code regarding Council Manic Interference with Administrative Functions of the City, was given first reading on February 19, 2013, and has been printed.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Council give Second Reading to Ordinance No. 1795, waive further reading, and adopt said Ordinance.

ATTACHMENT: Ordinance No. 1795

Item No. 17
ORDINANCE NO. 1795

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
ADDING SECTIONS 2-6.1 AND 2-6.2 TO CHAPTER 2, ARTICLE I OF
THE PORTERVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE
REGARDING COUNCILMANIC INTERFERENCE WITH ADMINISTRATIVE
FUNCTIONS OF THE CITY

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE DOES ORDAIN AS
FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Code Amendment. Sections 2-6.1 and 2-6.2 are hereby
added to Chapter 2, Article I, of the Porterville Municipal Code, to read as
follows:

CHAPTER 2
ARTICLE I

Section 2-6.1. Interference with Performance of Duties of City Manager.

(a) As set forth in Section 67 of the Porterville Municipal Charter, no member
of the City Council shall in any manner attempt to influence or coerce the
city manager in the making of any appointment or the purchase of
supplies in accordance with applicable State and Federal law.

(b) The City Council shall deal with the administrative functions of the City
through the city manager. The City Council shall only have direct contact
with the directors of the city's departments for the purpose of asking
questions. No City Council member shall give an order or orders to any
subordinate of the City under the jurisdiction of the City Manager or other
such officers, either publicly or privately.

(c) Violations of this Section shall be subject to the penalty and enforcement
provisions set forth in this Municipal Code, including but not limited to
Section 1-9.

Section 2-6.2. Political Activities of Council Members, Administrative
Officers, and Employees.

(a) As set forth (and unless otherwise specified) in Section 67 of the
Porterville Municipal Charter, political activities of, and campaign
contributions by, the City's legislative officers, administrative officers,
and employees shall be governed in accordance with applicable State
and Federal law.
(b) All City legislative officers, administrative officers, and employees are prohibited from engaging in political activities during working hours.

(c) All City officers and employees are prohibited from engaging in political activities at their work place. Furthermore, all City officers and employees are prohibited from engaging in political activities on City property, provided this prohibition does not pertain to property that is otherwise open to the public for the purpose of engaging in political activities.

(d) Violations of the Section shall be subject to the penalty and enforcement provisions set forth in this Municipal Code, including but not limited to Section 1-9, in addition to any applicable State and Federal laws restricting said activities.

Section 3. Severability. Should any provision of this Ordinance, or its application to any person or circumstance, be determined by a court of competent jurisdiction to be unlawful, unenforceable or otherwise void, that determination shall have no effect on any other provision of this Ordinance or the application of this Ordinance to any other person or circumstance and, to that end, the provisions hereof are severable.

Section 4. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall take effect thirty days after adoption as provided by Porterville Charter Section 12.

Section 5. Certification. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this Ordinance and shall cause the same to be published according to law.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED, this ___ day of March, 2013.

____________________________
Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor

ATTEST:

John D. Lollis, City Clerk

By: Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
COUNCIL AGENDA: March 5, 2013

SUBJECT: CONSIDER ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR THE ENTERPRISE ZONE PROGRAM AND OPPOSITION TO REGULATORY REFORM THAT ADVERSELY EFFECTS THE PROGRAM

SOURCE: City Manager

COMMENT: The City of Porterville participates in the Enterprise Zone Program as part of the Sequoia Valley Enterprise Zone (Tulare County). The Tulare County Economic Development Corporation (TCEDC) and City staff are concerned about proposed regulatory changes to the Enterprise Zone Program that may adversely effect the Program and/or create excessive regulatory requirements on participating businesses.

The Governor's proposed budget for the coming 2013-14 fiscal year includes increased State revenues related to new regulations for the Enterprise Zone Program, including enhanced audit procedures, elimination of assistance to businesses in tax voucher processing, and additional verification of employee residency within a Targeted Employment Area (TEA). The Governor's proposed reforms are intended to make the Program more difficult to implement, and thus decrease the tax breaks afforded under the Program and increase State revenues.

Enterprise Zones focus on economic development and creating jobs in areas with high unemployment and lower levels of economic activity, providing tax benefit incentives for businesses to open or expand in these areas. Although recent unemployment figures reflect that Porterville’s unemployment fell from 14.9% in December 2011 to 14.4% in December 2012, the overall County unemployment rate is 15.7% (down from 16.2% in December 2011) in comparison to the overall State unemployment rate of 9.8% (down from 10.9% in December 2011).

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council consider the adoption of a Resolution of Support for the Enterprise Zone Program and opposition to regulatory reform that adversely effects the Program.

ATTACHMENT: Draft Resolution

C/M Item No. 18
RESOLUTION NO. __________

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE, COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, IN SUPPORT OF ENTERPRISE ZONES AND OPPOSITION TO REGULATORY REFORMS THAT ADVERSELY EFFECTS THE PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the City of Porterville participates in an Enterprise Zone that was established in 2010 as part of the Sequoia Valley Enterprise Zone, and has been an active participant in legislative and regulatory reforms for geographic targeted economic development areas for a number of years; and

WHEREAS, California’s Enterprise Zone program was established in 1984 by the Legislature to stimulate business investment in depressed areas of the state and create job opportunities for Californians; and

WHEREAS, according to the findings and declarations of the Enterprise Zone Act, it is in the economic interest of the state to have one strong, combined, and business-friendly incentive program to help attract business and industry to the state, to help retain and expand existing business and industry, and to create increased job opportunities for all Californians; and

WHEREAS, Enterprise Zones create and retain jobs, which according to the California Association of Enterprise Zones, more than 118,000 were created in 2010 while California experienced unprecedented unemployment; and

WHEREAS, Enterprise Zones attract businesses to California and retain them, given once a Zone is approved, businesses construct facilities, purchase equipment, hire workers, and make other investments in the area; and

WHEREAS, Enterprise Zones provide a geographically targeted economic development tool designed to improve poor and blighted communities.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Porterville hereby affirms its support for the positive benefits of the Enterprise Zone Program, and also expresses opposition to any regulatory reforms that adversely effect the Enterprise Zone Program or creates excessive regulatory burdens on participating businesses.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of March, 2013.

ATTEST:
John D. Lollis, City Clerk

Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor

By: Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
AGENDA: March 5, 2013

PORTERVILLE PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT CORPORATION

SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF REFINANCING 2005 CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION (COP)

SOURCE: Administration

COMMENT: In June 1998, the City issued $20 million in Certificates of Participation (COP) for the purposes of financing the widening of bridges and streets. In November 2005, the City refunded the 1998 COP issue for debt service savings, with the preclusion that the new COP issue could not be refunded "tax exempt" sooner than July 1, 2015. However, the 2005 COP may be refunded with a taxable bond issue.

As has been reported to the City Council, staff has been meeting with Mr. John Fitzgerald and Mr. Ben Levine over the past several months, who have assisted the City with past bond issuances and refinances, including last year's refinancing of the 1997 Sewer Bond issue to fund the annexation sewer extension projects. The purpose of these recent meetings have been to evaluate the potential to take advantage of the current favorable financing environment to achieve significant debt service savings on the 2005 COP issue.

At its meeting on September 18, 2012, the City Council approved proceeding with a recommended financing approach to issue a taxable revenue bond, utilizing a Variable Rate Demand Obligation (VRDO) bond structure. One of the requirements of the VRDO refinance was to secure a bank Letter of Credit (LOC). During the course of meeting with banking institutions to secure the LOC, several of the banks declined to provide a LOC either because they have been (or potentially will be) "burned" in recent municipal bankruptcies (Vallejo, San Bernardino, and Stockton) or the refinance amount was either too small or beyond their capacity. One bank, Rabobank, has indicated significant interest to work with the City, however, not in a VRDO financing structure but rather in a direct lending relationship.

One of the highest rated banks internationally, and given their business model emphasis on agriculture, Rabobank is interested in increasing its presence in the Central Valley, including the South Tulare County/Porterville area. Rabobank has completed its preliminary due diligence of the City's finances, and satisfied with its review, has offered a Term Sheet for the City's consideration.

Dir. Appropriated/Funded C/M Item No. PLC-01
Given the Term Sheet offered by Rabobank, the City would defease the 2005 COP issue with a total loan amount of up to $25 million, and in turn make interest-only payments for three years based upon a fixed 3.3% interest rate, followed by a 15 year loan with 25 years amortization (15/25) at United States Dollar (USD) 1-month Libor +2.125%. As of February 27, 2013, USD Libor is 0.20370%, and over the past two years has not exceeded 0.3%. If funding were to occur by July 1, 2013, the City is projected to save $1,228,942 in debt service payments through July 1, 2015, when the City could again evaluate a tax-exempt bond issuance, or save an additional $553,250 in evaluating the issuance by July 1, 2016.

With the Federal Reserve indicating that the federal funds rate will be held near zero through at least mid-year 2015 (currently 0.25%), the City should be in a prime position with the option to switch from the direct loan to either a variable or fixed rate tax exempt bond issue, thus affording the City with the most flexibility in the future.

Given the Porterville Public Improvement Corporation was the authority under which the 2005 COP was issued, a draft resolution has been provided to the Corporation to authorize the City Manager to sign the offered Term Sheet, and allow Rabobank to begin the proceedings toward the refunding of the 2005 COP issue in a direct lending structure.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the City Council, sitting as the Board of Directors for the Porterville Public Improvement Corporation, consider proceeding with the refunding of the 2005 COP through direct lending by Rabobank, and authorize the City Manager to sign the offered Term Sheet.

**ATTACHMENT:**

1. Rabobank Term Sheet
2. Draft Resolution
3. City Council Staff Report: September 18, 2012
By accepting this term sheet the City of Porterville (the “City”) agrees that (i) it shall use the information contained herein solely for the purpose of evaluating a possible transaction between the City and Rabobank, N.A. (the “Bank”) and for no other purpose and (ii) the City and its representatives will keep confidential and not disclose any of such information to any third parties other than its financial advisor and legal counsel, including the fact that the City is considering a possible transaction with the Bank. The terms and conditions contained in this proposal are not intended to be exhaustive or all-inclusive.

Borrower: City of Porterville

Bank: Rabobank, N.A.

Purpose: Proceeds will be used to prepay the Certificates of Participation executed and delivered on December 1, 2005 (the “2005 Certificates”).

Amount: Up to $25,000,000, including principal, interest and expenses.

Terms: 3.3% during interest-only period for 3 years followed by 17 year term at USD 1-month Libor +2.125%.

Nature of Obligation and Repayment: Principal security consists of a covenant to budget and appropriate lease payments (the “Obligation”) pursuant to lease-leaseback structure that is identical to the 2005 Certificates.

Principal to be paid annually and Interest to be paid semiannually.

Facility Fee: $85,000.

Prepayment Penalty: None.

Legal Fees/Expenses of Bank Counsel: $25,000.

Bank Counsel: Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.

Opinion of City’s Counsel: The Bank shall receive an opinion of bond counsel to the City acceptable to the Bank, including among other things an opinion that the Obligations have been duly and validly authorized by the City and when issued and delivered will each constitute a legal valid and binding obligation of the City, enforceable in accordance with its terms and that the 2005 Certificates are legally defeased.

Special Covenants: City will provide audited financial statements within 200 days following the end of each fiscal year.
City will provide unaudited (internally prepared) cash based financial statements within 60 days following the end of each calendar quarter.

City will provide budget annually as well as mid-year revisions, if any.

City shall maintain a debt service reserve fund under the lease designated by the city for repayment of the Obligations, equivalent to $1,000,000 that may be funded in part with proceeds.

The City shall maintain standard insurance coverages pursuant to the lease in connection with the Obligations, including rental interruption insurance.

Credit Approval and Offer Expiration:

Any offer by the Bank in connection with the proposed transaction will be subject to the Bank’s satisfactory completion of its due diligence review of the City and final credit approval by the Bank.

The Bank anticipates able to provide its final credit decision within 2 weeks of being given the mandate to provide the loan. The terms described herein expire March 15, 2013 unless extended by the Bank.

Absence of Fiduciary Relationship:

The City acknowledges that the transactions described in this document are arms’-length commercial transactions and that the Bank is acting as principal and in its best interests. The City is relying on its own experts, lawyers and advisors to determine whether the transactions described in this document are in its best interests. The City agrees that the Bank will act under this document as an independent contractor and that nothing in this document, the nature of the Bank’s services or in any prior relationship will be deemed to create an advisory, fiduciary or City relationship between the Bank, on the one hand, and the City, on the other hand. In addition, the Bank may employ the services of its affiliates in providing certain services in connection with the transactions described in this document and may exchange with such affiliates information concerning the City that may be the subject of the transactions described in this term sheet.

Please note that the Bank and its affiliates do not provide tax, accounting or legal advice. The Bank and its advisors are not serving as a municipal advisor to the City.

Anti-tying Disclosure:

The extension of commercial loans or other products or services to the City by the Bank or any of its subsidiaries will not be conditioned on the City’s taking other products or services offered by the Bank or any of its subsidiaries or affiliates. The Bank will not vary the price or other terms of any product or service offered by the Bank or its subsidiaries on the condition that the City purchase another product or service from the Bank or any affiliate. The Bank will not require the City to provide
property or services to the Bank or any affiliate as a condition to the extension of a commercial loan to the City by the Bank or any of its subsidiaries. The Bank will not require the City to refrain from doing business with a competitor of the Bank or any of its affiliates as a condition to receiving a commercial loan from the Bank or any of its subsidiaries.

Bank Contact:

Ian Carroll
Senior Vice President
Rabobank, N.A.
915 Highland Pointe Suite 350
Roseville, California 95678
916-878-4655 (office)
916-494-9770 (cell)
Ian.Carroll@Rabobank.com

Acknowledged and Consented:

By: __________________________

City Manager
JOHN LOLLIS

This document has been prepared by the Bank for information purposes only. This document is an indicative summary of the terms and conditions of the transaction described herein and may be amended, superseded or replaced by subsequent summaries. The final terms and conditions of the transaction will be set out in full in the applicable binding transaction document(s).

This document shall not constitute a commitment to participate in the transaction described herein, which shall be subject to the Bank’s internal approvals. No transaction or services related thereto is contemplated without the Bank’s subsequent formal agreement. The Bank is acting solely as principal and not as advisor or fiduciary. Accordingly you must independently determine, with your own advisors, the appropriateness for you of the transaction before investing or transacting. The Bank accepts no liability whatsoever for any direct, consequential or other losses arising from the use of this document or reliance on the information contained herein.

The Bank does not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of information which is contained in this document and which is stated to have been obtained from or is based upon trade and statistical services or other third party sources. Any data on past performance, modelling or back-testing contained herein is no indication as to future performance. No representation is made as to the reasonableness of the assumptions made within or the accuracy or completeness of any modeling or back-testing. All opinions and estimates are given as of the date hereof and are subject to change. The information in this document is not intended to predict actual results and no assurances are given with respect thereto.

The Bank, its affiliates and the individuals associated therewith may (in various capacities) participate in transactions identical or similar to those described herein.

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: The Bank and its affiliates do not provide tax advice. Please note that (i)
any discussion of US tax matters contained in this communication (including any attachments) cannot be used by you for the purpose of avoiding tax penalties; (ii) this communication was written to support the promotion or marketing of the matters addressed herein; and (iii) you should seek advice based on your particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

THIS DOCUMENT DOES NOT DISCLOSE ALL THE RISKS AND OTHER SIGNIFICANT ISSUES RELATED TO THE POTENTIAL TRANSACTION. PRIOR TO TRANSACTING, POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS SHOULD ENSURE THAT THEY FULLY UNDERSTAND THE TERMS OF THE TRANSACTION AND ANY APPLICABLE RISKS.
RESOLUTION NO. __________

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE, COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE COMMENCEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH THE REFUNDING OF THE CITY’S $20,850,000 CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION (2005 INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING PROJECT) PURSUANT TO A DIRECT PLACEMENT LEASE FINANCING WITH RABOBANK, N.A., AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A TERM SHEET WITH THE BANK AND APPOINTING A BOND COUNSEL, A PLACEMENT AGENT AND A FINANCIAL CONSULTANT IN CONNECTION THEREWITH

RESOLVED, by the City Council (the “Council”) of the City of Porterville (the “City”):

WHEREAS, the City has determined at this time, due to prevailing interest rates in the municipal bond market and for other reasons, to provide for the refunding of the $20,850,000 Certificates of Participation (2005 Infrastructure Financing Project) (the “2005 Certificates”);

WHEREAS, Rabobank, N.A. (“Rabobank”) has provided the City with a term sheet, attached hereto (the “Term Sheet”), setting forth its indicative terms and conditions to provide funds to refund the 2005 Certificates pursuant to a direct placement lease financing;

WHEREAS, it is desirable to authorize the commencement of proceedings in connection with the refunding of the 2005 Certificates and to appoint a bond counsel, a placement agent and a financial consultant in connection therewith;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby DECLARED and ORDERED, as follows:

The Council authorizes appropriate officers and officials of the City to proceed with the preparation of the necessary documents in connection with the refunding of the 2005 Certificates, subject to the final approval thereof by the Council at a subsequent meeting.

The City Manager or his designee is hereby authorized to execute the Term Sheet allowing Rabobank to submit the proposed financing to its credit committee to obtain final approval for the financing.

Quint & Thimmig LLP, San Francisco, California, is hereby designated as bond counsel to the City in connection with the financing, the compensation for such services to be negotiated by the City Manager or his designee.
Wulff, Hansen & Co., San Francisco, California is hereby designated as placement agent in connection with the financing, the compensation for such services to be negotiated by the City Manager or his designee.

Ravi Chitkara, Fremont, California, is hereby designated as financial consultant to the City in connection with the financing, the compensation for such services to be negotiated by the City Manager or his designee.

The Mayor, the Vice Mayor, the City Manager, Finance Director, the City Clerk and other appropriate officers and officials of the City are hereby authorized and directed to take such action and to execute such documents as may be necessary or desirable to effectuate the intent of this resolution.

This Resolution shall take effect from and after the date of its passage and adoption by this Council.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of March, 2013.

Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor

ATTEST:
John Lollis, City Clerk

By: ____________________________
Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
SUBJECT: CONSIDERATION OF REFINANCING 2005 CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION (COP)

SOURCE: Administration

COMMENT: In June 1998, the City issued $20 million in Certificates of Participation (COP) for the purposes of financing the widening of bridges and streets. In November 2005, the City refunded the 1998 COP issue for debt service savings, with the preclusion that the new COP issue could not be refunded "tax exempt" sooner than July 1, 2015. However, the 2005 COP may be refunded with a taxable bond issue.

Over the past several months, staff has been meeting with Mr. John Fitzgerald and Mr. Ben Levine, who have assisted the City with past bond issuances and refinances, including last year's refinancing of the 1997 Sewer Bond issue to fund the annexation sewer extension projects. The purpose of these recent meetings have been to evaluate the potential in continuing to take advantage of the current favorable bond rates and financing environment, specifically in reference to the 2005 COP issue. In coordination with Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Levine, options have been considered in the refinancing of this bond. Given current bond financing rates, the City could refund the 2005 COP issue with an annual debt service savings of $383,000 ($1,287,000 less $904,000) over the remaining 23 years of the original bond issuance for a total gross savings of approximately $8.8 million, with a net savings of approximately $2.5 million including the 7 years of additional debt service in a new issuance.

The recommended financing approach is to issue a taxable revenue bond, utilizing a Variable Rate Demand Obligation (VRDO) bond structure. The VRDO interest rate is a seven (7) day taxable interest rate tied to the 1 Month London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR), currently 0.23%, based upon the credit rating of a bank Letter of Credit (LOC). Current total annual costs would be 1.33%, including: 0.23% (current 1 Month LIBOR as of 09/12/12), 1.00% annual LOC fee (estimate), and 0.10% remarketing, rating, and trustee fees.

VRDO bonds require a remarketing agent who re-sets rates and remarkets the bonds, which may be paid down on a weekly basis (or off completely with 30-days notice) without a prepayment penalty. The bank LOC would effectively give access to investment grade rated financing (A+.
or better), resulting in a AAA rating. The VRDO market is significant, constituted primarily of money market mutual funds. Money market institutions invest under Investment Rule 2a-7, which requires high credit quality and liquidity with the right to put bonds back at any time on seven (7) days notice.

The bank LOC is estimated to be issued for an initial term of 2 to 10 years, with an annual rollover review. It is possible to renegotiate terms or bring in a substitute LOC provider on the rollover/review date. At the end of the initial 2-year term, a renewal would be negotiated every year thereafter.

With the Federal Reserve indicating that the federal funds rate will be held near zero through at least mid-year 2015 (currently 0.25%), and the 2005 COP issue becoming callable in July 2015, the City would be in a prime position given the option to switch from a taxable VRDO to either a variable or fixed rate tax exempt bond issue, thus affording the City with the most flexibility in the future. However, should the Federal Reserve significantly increase the federal funds rate prior to July 2015, and given the bonds reset interest rates every seven (7) days, the City can protect itself from rising rates through a variety of hedging strategies, either at the close of the transaction or at any time during the VRDO term. The best option to mitigate the risk of rising interest rates is to establish an interest rate cap, where the City will receive payments when an underlying interest rate index exceeds a specified cap rate. By setting the cap at the total amount of the potential bond issue ($22,000,000), the City would be protected if rates rise beyond the established cap and receive comparable compensation. The current LIBOR Cap Price for five (5) years at 5.00% is 43 basis points (0.43%), and for five (5) years at 4.00% is 55 basis points (0.55%).

For the Council's consideration, a draft resolution has been provided to begin the proceedings toward the refunding of the 2005 COP issue.

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the City Council consider proceeding with the refunding of the 2005 COP with the issue of a taxable revenue VRDO bond.

**ATTACHMENT:**
1. Presentation to Provide New Money Plan
2. Draft Resolution
City of Porterville

Presentation to Provide New Money Plan

July 20, 2012
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City Needs

Wulff, Hansen has the commitment and resources necessary to ensure a successful financing for the City of Porterville

Wulff, Hansen understands the need for the most flexible financing structure that utilizes and reflects the City of Porterville's credit quality

Needs

- General Fund budget deficit solution
- Indiana Street bridge for Walmart Supercenter access

Situation

- In June 1998, City issued $20 million COP for widening bridges and roads
- In November 2005, City refunded 1998 COP issue for savings to General Fund
- The 2005 City COP issue cannot be refunded tax exempt until July 1, 2015
- But, the 2005 City COP can be refunded now with a taxable bond issue
Financing Approach

Wulff, Hansen brings an experienced and committed team with a well thought out plan.

Our suggested variable rate demand obligation proposal provides the City with the most flexibility. This flexibility meets the City of Porterville’s unique criteria and takes advantage of market fluctuations, providing the City with the lowest possible overall rate and maximum flexibility, as market conditions change.

Solution (Rates & Costs are Estimated as of July 19, 2012)

- Issue a taxable revenue bond to refinance the 2005 COP issue
- Bond Structure: Variable Rate Demand Obligation (VRDO)
- Bond Life: 25+ years
- Interest Rate: 7 day taxable interest rate tied to 1 Month LIBOR, currently 0.24%, and based on the credit rating of the LOC provider
- All-in-annual costs of 1.34%: 0.24% current 1 Month LIBOR as of 5/1/12 + 1.00% annual LOC fee (preliminary estimate) + 0.10% remarketing, rating, and trustee fees
- VRDO can be paid down or off weekly without prepayment penalty
- Requires a remarketing agent when bonds are put back by bondholders
- VRDO market is huge, made up of money market funds

Benefits (Estimated as of July 19, 2012)

- Annual General Fund debt service savings: $383,000 per year
- If pay interest only first year, General Savings in year one: $1,234,000 and thereafter $383,000 per year
Future Options

Our proposal allows for the most flexibility in the future

When the 2005 COP issue becomes callable in July 2015, the City has the option to switch from a taxable variable rate demand obligation to either a variable or fixed rate tax exempt bond issue. This provides the City with the most flexibility in the future.

Solution

- Bond Structure: Tax Exempt Variable Or Fixed Rate Obligation
- VRDO Interest Rate: 7 day taxable interest rate tied to current SIFMA Index, currently 0.15% as of 7/19/12, and based on the credit rating of the LOC provider
- All-in-annual costs of 1.25%: 0.15% current SIFMA index + 1.00% annual LOC fee (preliminary estimate) + 0.10% remarketing, rating, and trustee fees
- VRDO can be paid down or off weekly without prepayment penalty

Benefits

- Over the past ten years, the average SIFMA benchmark is 1.62% and the 1 Month LIBOR benchmark is 2.40%
Plan of Finance: VRDO

Wulff, Hansen recommends a Variable Rate Demand Obligation solution that will provide maximum flexibility while meeting refinancing criteria.

The City of Porterville has an opportunity to leverage bond markets to obtain the lowest cost of funds possible while maintaining financial flexibility. Such an offering would likely be made under Rule 506 of SEC Regulation D and sold to qualified institutional investor(s), mainly Money Market Funds. Highlights of this financing structure include:

- $22.22 million in bond financing provides necessary funds for the City of Porterville to refinance existing debt, including all financing costs, resulting in annual debt service savings.

- Bank letter of credit which effectively gives the City access to investment grade rated financing (A+ or better), possibly with a Federal Home Loan Bank wrap, resulting in a AAA rating.

- In the current variable rate market (as of 7/19/12), a Porterville bond financing would likely carry an estimated initial interest rate of 0.24% depending on the credit rating of the LOC provider and an annual-all-in cost of 1.34% (including fee components). This results in an estimated initial annual net debt service of $904,000 (30 year self-amortizing) compared to the existing debt service of $1,287,000, providing an annual savings of $383,000.

- Variable rate structure takes advantage of available credit enhancement, low interest rates and market demand for short term paper.

**Annual All In Cost Calculation:**

| 0.24% Variable Rate Benchmark LIBOR as of 7/19/12 | + | 1.00% Estimated Annual Letter of Credit Fee | + | 0.10% Estimated Annual Remarketing Fee | = | 1.34% Estimated Annual All In Cost |

The money market institutional investors invest under Investment Rule 2a-7 which requires high credit quality and liquidity with the right to put the bonds back at any time on 7 days notice. The Letter of Credit fulfills these two functions.
# Financing Summary

City of Porterville  
Refunding $20,850,000 COP  
(2005 Infrastructure Financing Project)  
Taxable VRDO Bond Sizing & Savings

## 2012 Bond Sizing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escrow to Refund 2005 COP</td>
<td>$21,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: 2005 COP Reserve Fund (Surety Funded)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Reserve Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Issuance (1%)</td>
<td>224,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized 1 yr LOC &amp; Remarketing Fees (1.1%)</td>
<td>244,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwriters Discount</td>
<td>222,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Amount of 2012 Bonds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,220,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Debt Service 2005 COP to 2036</td>
<td>$1,287,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Cost Rate of 2012 Bonds: 1.34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Interest Rate, 0.24%, + LOC + Remarketing Fees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Cost of 2012 Bonds*</td>
<td>904,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Annual Savings</strong></td>
<td><strong>$383,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternative:**  
Pay Interest Only Yr 1 of 0.24% or  
**Year 1 Savings**                         
$53,000                                      
$1,234,000

* Note: Assumes 30 yr bond to 2043, seven years longer than the 2005 Bonds; the present value extra seven years cost less than year 1 savings  
** Note: All rates & costs are estimated as of July 19, 2012
# Variable Rate Demand Obligation

## Preliminary Financing Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considerations/Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Bond Proceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bond proceeds can be used to fund the City's infrastructure improvements, refund existing loans, and pay cost of issuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Credit Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Estimated to be issued for an initial term of 2 - 10 years, with a yearly rollover review (Evergreen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is possible to re-negotiate terms or bring in a substitute letter of credit provider on the rollover/review date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- At the end of the initial 2 year term, a renewal would be negotiated every year after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 25+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-amortization over the term of the bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Money Market Mutual Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 7-day interest rate reset based on 1-month LIBOR benchmark and can be pre-paid or refinanced without penalty upon 30 days notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Remarketing Agent would be in charge of re-setting rates and remarketing the bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepayment Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variable Rate Demand Obligation

Preliminary Financing Terms (Continued)

Considerations/Limitations

- A variety of hedging strategies can be implemented either at the close of transaction or at any time during the term of the bonds
- These hedging strategies are complex and carry certain risks which will be explained at the time these strategies are considered
- Wulff, Hansen will educate The City of Porterville to give them a better understanding of the benefits, costs, and risks

Hedge

Credit Enhancement

- Direct pay Letter of Credit (LOC) from a qualified bank
- If possible, a wrap will be explored as an additional guarantee from the Federal Home Loan Bank, creating a AAA rating

Estimated Closing Date

- September 2012
Risks & Mitigates

**Interest Rate Risk** – Because the bonds re-set interest rates every 7 days, rates could rise in the future and thus increase debt service requirements.

**Mitigate** – Use an interest rate swap, interest rate cap, or budget at higher rate and set up rate mitigation fund. Implementing a combination of the above may also be an ideal solution.

1. **Option 1: Interest-Rate Swap** – An interest-rate swap is a contract between two counterparties where they exchange future interest payments based on a specified principal amount. This option limits the City’s exposure to fluctuations in future interest rates. As of July 19, 2012, the LIBOR Swap rate for 30 years is 2.33%. The average 1 month LIBOR weekly taxable rate over the past 10 years, including the period ending 7/19/2012, is 2.40%.

2. **Option 2: Interest-Rate Cap** – An interest-rate cap is an option that protects the City from rises in short term interest rates where they will receive payments when an underlying interest rate index exceeds a specified cap rate. By setting up a cap for the total amount of the bond issue ($22,220,000), the City will be protected if rates rise and receive compensation. As of July 19, 2012, the LIBOR Cap Price for 5 years at 5.00% is 43 basis points and at 4.00% is 55.

3. **Option 3: Interest-Rate Cap & Rate Mitigation Fund** – Set up a cap for $10,000,000 out of the $22,220,000 and begin paying down the principal through the rate mitigation fund whenever there are excess revenues. By paying off the principal in advance, you protect yourself from rising interest rates in the future because there will be less principal to pay off at that future rate.
Risks & Mitigates (Continued)

**LOC Renewal Risk** – Risk that the LOC provider does not renew its Letter of Credit at the end of the agreed upon initial term, an approximate 2 - 10 year term.

**Mitigate** – The bond documents will set up provisions to mitigate the risks of the LOC Bank not renewing the Letter of Credit.

- Standard in the bond documents to have an advanced notice period of any such decision.
- Standard in the bond documents to have the option to bring in a substitute LOC provider, on then-current terms, at any time.
- Standard in the bond documents to have a 30 day notice call option on any reset date. This provides an opportunity for an alternative method of financing.
  - This option is similar to having a call provision without a pre-payment premium or time limitation. By fixing the rate, Wulff, Hansen would underwrite/place the bonds. This option allows the City maximum flexibility to take advantage of improved credit quality, while providing the opportunity to fix the rate if market conditions warrant.
  - If an interest-rate swap is in place, there may be costs involved that must be considered.
- Wulff, Hansen will attempt to negotiate an LOC with an Evergreen Provision where the 2 - 10 year term continually rolls over each year so that when one year is lost, another year is gained.
- The LOC Bank will generally work with the issuer to avoid drawing upon the Letter of Credit and will make every attempt to extend the LOC expiration date until a substitute LOC bank is found. Drawing upon the LOC is generally a last resort due to the bank's internal regulations. If this happens, the LOC bank will be responsible for the bonds and incorporate them in its own portfolio. The City will continue to make the agreed upon payments at a default rate negotiated at the time the LOC agreement is originally issued. The City will not be required to pay off the bonds at that time.
Risks & Mitigates (Continued)

**LOC Provider Downgrade Risk** – if the LOC Bank loses its investment-grade credit rating resulting in the bonds failing to be remarketed to Money Market Funds and a replacement LOC is not obtained.

The LOC bank will be responsible for the bonds and incorporate them in its own portfolio. The City of Porterville will continue to make the agreed upon payments at a default rate negotiated at the time the LOC agreement is originally issued. The City will not be required to pay off the bonds at that time.

**Mitigate** – Wulff Hansen seeks a replacement Letter of Credit provider.

**Mitigate** – The 2008 crisis separated the strong, highly rated banks from the weak. We would only recommend an LOC provider that had a qualified credit rating.

**Market Risk** – Risk that the market conditions freeze the variable rate market or disrupt the orderly reset rates.

**Mitigate** – The market experienced these risks in 2008 and the Federal Reserve intervened which diminished the problem. Wulff Hansen will recommend a strong, credit worthy bank for the Letter of Credit, thus diminishing the market risk.

**Remarking Failure** – Risk that Remarking fails.

**Mitigate** – The bank issuing the LOC is obligated to purchase the bonds and may convert the bonds into a commercial loan.

The City of Porterville will continue to make the agreed upon payments at a default rate negotiated at the time the LOC agreement is originally issued. The City will not be required to pay off the bonds at that time.

**Overall Mitigate** – Wulff Hansen will attempt to obtain a Federal Home Loan Bank wrap, which we believe the City will qualify for. The renewal risk is mitigated by the credit enhancement from the wrap.
RESOLUTION NO._________

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE, COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE COMMENCEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH THE REFUNDING OF THE $20,850,000 CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION (2005 INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING PROJECT) EVIDENCING DIRECT, UNDIVIDED FRACTIONAL INTERESTS OF THE OWNERS THEREOF IN LEASE PAYMENTS TO BE MADE BY THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE (TULARE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA), AS THE RENTAL FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY PURSUANT TO A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH THE PORTERVILLE PUBLIC FINANCING AUTHORITY, AND APPOINTING A BOND COUNSEL, A DISCLOSURE COUNSEL, A FINANCIAL CONSULTANT AND AN UNDERWRITER IN CONNECTION THEREWITH

WHEREAS, the City has determined at this time, due to prevailing interest rates in the municipal bond market and for other reasons, to provide for the refunding of the $20,850,000 Certificates of Participation (2005 Infrastructure Financing Project) evidencing direct, undivided fractional interests of the owners thereof in lease payments to be made by the City as the rental for certain property pursuant to a lease agreement with the Porterville Public Financing Authority (the “2005 Certificates”);

WHEREAS, it is desirable to authorize the commencement of proceedings in connection with the refunding of the 2005 Certificates and to appoint a bond counsel, a disclosure counsel, a financial consultant and an underwriter in connection therewith;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby DECLARED and ORDERED, as follows:

The Council authorizes appropriate officers and officials of the City to proceed with the preparation of the necessary documents in connection with the refunding of the 2005 Certificates, subject to the final approval thereof by the Council at a subsequent meeting.

Quint & Thimmig LLP, San Francisco, California, is hereby designated as bond counsel and disclosure counsel to the City in connection with the financing, the compensation for such services to be negotiated by the City Manager or his designee.

Ravi Chitkara, Fremont, California, is hereby designated as financial consultant to the City in connection with the financing, the compensation for such services to be negotiated by the City Manager or his designee.

Wulff, Hansen & Co., San Francisco, California is hereby designated as underwriter in connection with the financing, the compensation for such services to be negotiated by the City Manager or his designee.
The Mayor, the Vice Mayor, the City Manager, Finance Director, the City Clerk and other appropriate officers and officials of the City are hereby authorized and directed to take such action and to execute such documents as may be necessary or desirable to effectuate the intent of this resolution.

This Resolution shall take effect from and after the date of its passage and adoption by this Council.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 18th day of September, 2012.

Virginia R. Gurrola, Mayor

ATTEST:
John Lollis, City Clerk

By: Patrice Hildreth, Chief Deputy City Clerk
SUBJECT: AMENDMENT TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET AND THE RECOGNIZED OBLIGATED PAYMENT SCHEDULE

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: At the January 10, 2013, Oversight Board meeting, staff advised the Board of the civil complaint filed by the County of Tulare challenging the validity of the 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project Area No. 1. The Board directed Members Ennis and Hess to request that the County dismiss the Oversight Board from the lawsuit as the Oversight Board was not in existence at the time that the Porterville Redevelopment Agency and the Porterville City Council adopted the Amendment. On behalf of the Board, Members Ennis and Hess drafted a letter to the Tulare county Counsel requesting dismissal, Tulare County Counsel responded to the request that the County could not dismiss the Oversight Board as they felt the Oversight Board is an indispensable party to the lawsuit. Both letters are attached for reference.

At the February 19, 2013, Successor Agency meeting, the Successor Agency adopted Resolution 2013-01 and Resolution 2013-02 to submit the Administrative Budget and the Recognized Obligated Payment Schedule (ROPS 13-14 A) to the Oversight Board for approval (as required by Health & Safety Code section 34177(j), as modified by AB 1484).

At the Oversight Board’s regularly scheduled meeting on February 25, 2013, it was anticipated that the amount listed for Professional Services should be higher due to the litigation with the County of Tulare as the Oversight Board cannot respond to the litigation and cannot be represented by the Successor Agency’s counsel. As such, the Oversight Board increased the Professional Services budget by $15,000 for an allocation of $65,000 to accommodate legal services for defending the Oversight Board in the lawsuit. The change to the Administrative Budget shall also be reflected in the ROPS 13-14 A.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Successor Agency receive the report.

2. Tulare County Counsel response
3. Amended Administrative Budget
4. Amended ROPS 13-14 A
RE: Tulare County Superior Court Case No. 249877, December 14, 2012

Request to Dismiss the Oversight Board to the Successor Agency of the City of Porterville Redevelopment Agency as a Defendant in this Case

The Oversight Board to the Successor Agency of the Porterville Redevelopment Agency held its first meeting on April 11, 2012. Since that time, the Oversight Board members and Successor Agency staff have worked to oversee the dissolution process of the former Porterville Redevelopment Agency as required by California statute. On January 10, 2013, Successor Agency staff provided the Oversight Board with a copy of Tulare County Superior Court Case No. 249877 filed on December 14, 2012 with the Clerk of the Tulare County Superior Court by the County of Tulare.

In summary, this lawsuit appears to be a challenge to the Porterville Redevelopment Agency's and the Porterville City Council's action to add 1,525 acres of territory to the existing Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1. This new territory was added through an Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project No. 1 by Ordinance No. 1765 adopted at a joint public hearing of the Porterville Redevelopment Agency and the Porterville City Council on June 15, 2010.

The Oversight Board to the Porterville Successor Agency is listed as a Defendant to Tulare County Superior Court Case No. 249877. The Oversight Board did not exist on June 15, 2010. The Oversight Board has not acted in any way regarding the amended territory and has no authority or involvement in the eight Causes of Action listed in this Case. Furthermore, the Oversight Board has no ability to amend Redevelopment Plans to add or remove territory from Redevelopment Projects or approve California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents. Primarily, Oversight Board members have fiduciary responsibilities to the holders of recognized obligations and any those taxing entities effected by the dissolution process.

For these reasons, on January 10, 2013, the Oversight Board of the Porterville Redevelopment Successor Agency agreed to submit this letter to your office formally requesting that the County of Tulare dismiss the Oversight Board as a listed Defendant in Tulare County Superior Court Case No. 249877.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Supervisor Mike Ennis, District 5
Oversight Board Member

[Signature]
John L. Hess, Administrative Analyst
Oversight Board Member

Cc: Nina Dong, Tulare County Deputy County Counsel
Jean Rousseau, Tulare County Administrative Officer
John Lollis, Porterville City Manager
Brad Dunlap, Porterville Community Development Director
February 25, 2013

Oversight Board to the Successor Agency
of the City of Porterville Redevelopment Agency
291 N. Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257

Re: Tulare County Superior Court Case No. 249877, December 14, 2012
Request to Dismiss the Oversight Board to the Successor Agency of the City of
Porterville Redevelopment Agency (Oversight Board) as a Defendant in this case

Dear Oversight Board:

Thank you for your letter dated January 16, 2013 by Oversight Board members Ennis and Hess. Your letter requests that the County dismiss the Oversight Board as a defendant in this lawsuit. The County cannot dismiss the Oversight Board because it appears to the County that the Oversight Board is an indispensable party to the lawsuit in that the Oversight Board approves financial redevelopment related actions made by the Successor Agency and may appeal or set-aside a settlement or judgment. A party is indispensable if his or her rights must necessarily be affected by the judgment, or if complete relief cannot be accorded in his or her absence. At this time the County of Tulare denies the Oversight Board’s request to be dismissed from the lawsuit. We do not anticipate that the Oversight Board has any obligation to respond to this litigation prior to April 5, 2013 (if the administrative record is filed by March 6, 2013).

Very truly yours,

KATHLEEN BALES-LANGE
County Counsel

By

Nina F. Dong
Deputy County Counsel
§ 389. Joinder as party, conditions; indispensable person,..., CA CIV PRO § 389

West's Annotated California Codes
Code of Civil Procedure (Refs & Annos)
Part 2. Of Civil Actions (Refs & Annos)
Title 3. Of the Parties to Civil Actions
Chapter 8. Compulsory Joinder (Refs & Annos)

§ 389. Joinder as party, conditions; indispensable person, factors; statement of reasons for nonjoinder; class actions

Currentness

(a) A person who is subject to service of process and whose joinder will not deprive the court of jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action shall be joined as a party in the action if (1) in his absence complete relief cannot be accorded among those already parties or (2) he claims an interest relating to the subject of the action and is so situated that the disposition of the action in his absence may (i) as a practical matter impair or impede his ability to protect that interest or (ii) leave any of the persons already parties subject to a substantial risk of incurring double, multiple, or otherwise inconsistent obligations by reason of his claimed interest. If he has not been so joined, the court shall order that he be made a party.

(b) If a person as described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subdivision (a) cannot be made a party, the court shall determine whether in equity and good conscience the action should proceed among the parties before it, or should be dismissed without prejudice, the absent person being thus regarded as indispensable. The factors to be considered by the court include: (1) to what extent a judgment rendered in the person's absence might be prejudicial to him or those already parties; (2) the extent to which, by protective provisions in the judgment, by the shaping of relief, or other measures, the prejudice can be lessened or avoided; (3) whether a judgment rendered in the person's absence will be adequate; (4) whether the plaintiff or cross-complainant will have an adequate remedy if the action is dismissed for nonjoinder.

(c) A complaint or cross-complaint shall state the names, if known to the pleader, of any persons as described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subdivision (a) who are not joined, and the reasons why they are not joined.

(d) Nothing in this section affects the law applicable to class actions.

Credits
(Enacted in 1872. Amended by 1897, c. 12, p. 9, § 1; Stats.1907, c. 371, p. 704, § 3; Stats.1957, c. 1498, p. 2824, § 2; Stats.1971, c. 244, p. 376, § 15, operative July 1, 1972.)

Editors' Notes

CODE COMMISSION NOTES

2004 Main Volume
### SUCCESSOR AGENCY AND HOUSING AUTHORITY SUCCESSOR AGENCY BUDGET
#### JULY 1, 2013 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT #</th>
<th>ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>2013-14 BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PERSONAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-01</td>
<td>SALARIES, REGULAR</td>
<td>$10,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-02</td>
<td>SALARIES, PART TIME</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-03</td>
<td>SALARIES, OVERTIME</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-09</td>
<td>BENEFITS</td>
<td>$3,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,737</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MATERIALS, SUPPLIES &amp; SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-12</td>
<td>BUILDINGS/GROUND MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-21</td>
<td>ADVERTISING</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-22</td>
<td>PRINTING</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-23</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-24</td>
<td>COLLECTION COSTS</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-28</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>OFFICE AND COMPUTER SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-34</td>
<td>MAINTENANCE &amp; REPAIR MATERIALS</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-41</td>
<td>MEETING EXPENSE</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42</td>
<td>UTILITIES</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-43</td>
<td>UNIFORM ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-44</td>
<td>TRAINING EXPENSE</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-45</td>
<td>PUBLICATION AND DUES</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-46</td>
<td>POSTAGE</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-52</td>
<td>INSURANCE, LIABILITY</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-62</td>
<td>DEBT REDEMPTION</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-64</td>
<td>AMORTIZATION</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-65</td>
<td>DEPRECIATION EXPENSE</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-66</td>
<td>OTHER EXPENSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$76,525</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$91,262</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Successor Agency Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successor Agency</th>
<th>379</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County:</td>
<td>Tulare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successor Agency:</td>
<td>Porterville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Primary Contact
- **Honorific (Ms, Mr, Mrs):**
- **First Name:** Maria
- **Last Name:** Bemis
- **Title:** Finance Director
- **Address:** 291 N. Main Str, Porterville, CA 93257
- **Phone Number:** 559-782-7435
- **Email Address:** mbemis@ci.porterville.ca.us

#### Secondary Contact
- **Honorific (Ms, Mr, Mrs):**
- **First Name:** Jenni
- **Last Name:** Byers
- **Title:** Project Manager
- **Phone Number:** 559-782-7460
- **Email Address:** jbyers@ci.porterville.ca.us
### SUMMARY OF RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Filed for the July 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013 Period

**Name of Successor Agency:** PORTERVILLE (TULARE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Debt or Obligation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Outstanding Debt or Obligation</td>
<td>$8,746,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Period Outstanding Debt or Obligation</th>
<th>Six-Month Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Available Revenues Other Than Anticipated RPTTF Funding</td>
<td>$103,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Enforceable Obligations Funded with RPTTF</td>
<td>$164,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Administrative Allowance Funded with RPTTF</td>
<td>$91,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Total RPTTF Funded (B + C = D)</td>
<td>$256,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Total Current Period Outstanding Debt or Obligation (A + B + C = E) Should be same amount as ROPS form six-month total</td>
<td>$360,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Enter Total Six-Month Anticipated RPTTF Funding</td>
<td>$448,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Variance (F - D - G) Maximum RPTTF Allowable should not exceed Total Anticipated RPTTF Funding</td>
<td>$192,791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prior Period (July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012) Estimated vs. Actual Payments (as required in HSC section 34186 (a))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Period (July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012) Estimated vs. Actual Payments</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H Enter Estimated Obligations Funded by RPTTF (lesser of Finance's approved RPTTF amount including admin allowance or the actual amount distributed)</td>
<td>$320,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Enter Actual Obligations Paid with RPTTF</td>
<td>$271,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Enter Actual Administrative Expenses Paid with RPTTF</td>
<td>$29,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Adjustment to Redevelopment Obligation Retirement Fund (H - I + J = K)</td>
<td>$19,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Adjustment to RPTTF (O - K = L)</td>
<td>$236,271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Certification of Oversight Board Chairman:**

Pursuant to Section 34177(m) of the Health and Safety code,
I hereby certify that the above is a true and accurate Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for the above named agency.

/s/

Signature

Name: [Dr. John Snavely]

Title: Oversight Board Chair

Date: [ ]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name / Series Number</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Description/Project Scope</th>
<th>Estimated Amount</th>
<th>Actual Amount</th>
<th>Estimated Amount</th>
<th>Actual Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1 2003 Tax Allocation Bond Series A</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>Issuance of the Agency's 1st Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2 2003 Tax Allocation Bond Series B</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>Issuance of the Agency's 2nd Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3 2004 Tax Allocation Bond Series C</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Issuance of the Agency's 3rd Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4 2005 Tax Allocation Bond Series D</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Issuance of the Agency's 4th Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-5 2006 Tax Allocation Bond Series E</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Issuance of the Agency's 5th Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-6 2007 Tax Allocation Bond Series F</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Issuance of the Agency's 6th Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-7 2008 Tax Allocation Bond Series G</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Issuance of the Agency's 7th Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-8 2009 Tax Allocation Bond Series H</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>Issuance of the Agency's 8th Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-9 2010 Tax Allocation Bond Series I</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>Issuance of the Agency's 9th Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10 2011 Tax Allocation Bond Series J</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Issuance of the Agency's 10th Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-11 2012 Tax Allocation Bond Series K</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Issuance of the Agency's 11th Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-12 2013 Tax Allocation Bond Series L</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Issuance of the Agency's 12th Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Estimated amounts are based on projections and may adjust as actuals are finalized.
- Actual amounts reflect the completed payments as of December 31, 2013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Project Name / Debt Obligation</th>
<th>Notes/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bonds Series A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bonds Series B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bonds Series C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bonds Series D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bond Reserves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bond Admin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bond Arbitrage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rural Eco. Dev. Infrastructure Prog.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rural Eco. Dev. Infrastructure Prog. Reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Loan for Formation of Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Loan for Repayment to County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Loan for Parking Lot Improvements - Storm Drain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Loan for Reconstruction of Parking Lot - Hockett Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Loan for Amendment of the Boundaries of Project Area No. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Successor Agency Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Bond Obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bonds Series A</td>
<td>07/12/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bonds Series C</td>
<td>07/14/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bonds Series D</td>
<td>07/14/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>07/14/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bond Admin</td>
<td>07/14/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2008 Tax Allocation Bond Refunding</td>
<td>07/14/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bond Com. Dev. Infrastructure Proj.</td>
<td>07/13/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bond Com. Dev. Infrastructure Proj. Reserve</td>
<td>07/13/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Loans to Farmers Co.</td>
<td>07/14/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Loans to Reconciliation Ltd</td>
<td>07/13/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Loans to Farmers Co.</td>
<td>07/13/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Loans to Farmers Co.</td>
<td>07/13/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Loans to Farmers Co.</td>
<td>07/13/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Loans to Farmers Co.</td>
<td>07/13/2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table includes various projects and obligations with details such as dates, banks involved, and funding sources. The total due during fiscal year 2013-14 and other long-term total amounts are listed.
JOINT CITY COUNCIL/SUCCESSOR AGENCY

SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENTAL PROFESSIONAL LEGAL SERVICES FEE AGREEMENT

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: On December 14, 2012, the County of Tulare filed a civil complaint challenging the validity of the 2010 Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Porterville Redevelopment Project Area No. 1 against the City of Porterville, the City Council of the City of Porterville, the Successor Agency for the City of Porterville Redevelopment Agency and the Oversight Board to the Successor Agency of the City of Porterville Redevelopment Agency.

In response to the complaint, the City Council authorized Stradling, Yocca, Carlson, & Rauth, the City’s longstanding legal services provider for the Porterville Redevelopment Agency, to represent the City, City Council and the Successor Agency in responding to the lawsuit. This item approves the Professional Legal Services agreement to support that authorization.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:
1. Approve the Fee Agreement for Professional Legal Services; and
2. Authorize the Mayor to sign the Terms of Retention.

That the Successor Agency:
1. Approve the Fee Agreement for Professional Legal Services; and
2. Authorize the Mayor to sign the Terms of Retention.

ATTACHMENTS: Letter for extension of services dated January 25, 2013
January 25, 2013

By Email and U.S. Mail

John D. Lollis
City Manager
City of Porterville
291 North Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257

Re: Professional Legal Services: Fee Agreement

Dear Mr. Lollis:

Thank you for the opportunity to represent the City of Porterville ("City"), the City Council of the City of Porterville ("Council"), and the City of Porterville Acting As Successor to the Porterville Redevelopment Agency ("Successor Agency") in connection with the action filed in Tulare County Superior Court, County of Tulare vs. City of Porterville, et al, Case No. 249877 (the "Matter"). We believe that Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth ("SYCR") is uniquely qualified to provide special legal services related to the Matter.

It is necessary at this time to memorialize our arrangement in a legal services agreement among the City, City Council, Successor Agency (collectively, "Porterville") and SYCR, effective as of December 18, 2012. This is in addition to the longstanding legal services agreement between SYCR and the former Porterville Redevelopment Agency (now the Successor Agency) dated November 6, 1990.

Our fee for providing the legal services discussed above as counsel to the City will be based upon the rates described in the December 18, 2012 email from Vanessa S. Locklin of this office to Julia M. Lew, City Attorney, specifically: $300 per hour for Thomas P. Clark and Allison E. Burns, $235 per hour for Vanessa S. Locklin, David C. Palmer and other associates of the firm, $205 for Colin Hendricks, and $140 per hour for paralegal services. Rates are adjusted, if at all, based on CPI for the prior year. All fees for legal services will be billed to the tenth of an hour and are billed monthly. The monthly statement will set forth the nature of the services provided during the preceding month for the total number of hours attributable to providing such services. In addition to the above fees, we would be reimbursed for our out-of-pocket expenses, including long distance and cellular telephone charges, facsimile transmissions, document delivery and messenger fees, photocopying, electronic research and travel at your direction (IRS rate, currently 56.5¢ per mile). Our representation is subject to the firm’s Terms of Retention, which are attached hereto.

Additionally, and from time to time, the Matter may require the retention of certain expert witnesses or other consultants on behalf of the City. While the firm will assist the City in the
coordination of such services and will, at your request, directly contract with such service providers on behalf of the City, any and all costs for such services shall be the sole and exclusive responsibility of the City.

Thank you for your consideration and for giving us this opportunity to present this information to you. If you decide to retain our firm for these services, please acknowledge by signing the Terms of Retention and returning a signed copy to me.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
Allison E. Burns
Shareholder
STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH, P.C.

Enclosure

c: Julia M. Lew
Bradley D. Dunlap
Thomas P. Clark, Jr.
Vanessa S. Locklin
TERMS OF RETENTION OF
STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH

1. **Fees and Costs.** Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth is compensated for its services based primarily on the value of the services and the time spent performing them. This includes the time spent on conferences, court appearances, depositions, travel, research, drafting documents, and other activities. Our current hourly rates range from $275 to $520. We also bill for services performed by our paralegals, librarian, senior legal assistants, and other professional personnel at rates presently ranging between $130 and $160 per hour. These rates are modified from time to time.

   The amount of fees charged on a statement is determined by starting with the hours expended by the different attorneys and other professional personnel involved. These amounts are then adjusted for factors such as the extent of any duplication of attorney effort, unusual efficiency (or lack of efficiency), the novelty or difficulty of the issues involved, the time demands of the representation, and unusually good (or unusually disappointing) results.

   The firm also charges for various costs such as copying, telephone charges, computerized legal research, word processing and/or other computer time, overtime costs, messenger services, travel, filing fees and other costs. Bills for some costs are passed on directly, such as bills for certified shorthand reporters, technical consultants, appraisers and other professionals’ fees.

   Payment is due within ten days of the date of each fee and costs statement. Overdue statements will be charged interest of 10% per annum, compounded annually. If you wish to question any charge, you have agreed to do so within ten days of the statement date. Please contact the partner in charge of your matters if you have any questions about any of your bills.

2. **Estimates Not Binding.** Although we may furnish estimates of fees or costs that we anticipate will be incurred, these estimates are not intended to be binding, are subject to unforeseen circumstances, and are by their nature inexact.

3. **Termination by You.** You have the right at any time, in your sole discretion, to terminate our services and representation. Upon our termination, you will remain obligated to pay for all services rendered and costs or expenses paid or incurred on your behalf prior to the date of such termination or which are reasonably necessary thereafter.

4. **Termination by Us.** We reserve the absolute right to withdraw from representing you if, among other things, you fail to honor the terms of our agreement, you fail to cooperate fully or follow our advice on a material matter, or any fact or circumstance occurs that would, in our view, render our continuing representation unlawful or unethical. If we elect to withdraw, you will take all steps necessary to free us of any obligation to perform further services, including the execution of any documents necessary to complete our withdrawal, and we will be entitled to be paid at the time of withdrawal for all services rendered and costs and expenses paid or incurred on your behalf. If necessary in connection with litigation, we would request leave of court to withdraw.
5. **Date of Termination.** Our representation of you will be considered terminated at the earlier of (i) your termination of our representation, (ii) our withdrawal from our representation of you, or (iii) the substantial completion of our substantive work for you.

6. **Related Activities.** If any claim or action is brought against us or any personnel or agents of the firm based on your negligence or misconduct, or if we are asked to testify as a result of our representation of you or must defend the confidentiality of your communications in any proceeding, you agree to pay us for any resulting fees, costs, or damages, including our time, even if our representation of you has ended.

7. **No Guarantee of Outcome.** We do not and cannot guarantee any outcome in a matter.

8. **Insurance.** In accordance with the requirements of California Business and Professions Code § 6148, we advise you that this firm maintains professional errors and omissions insurance coverage applicable to the services to be rendered to you.

9. **Client.** This firm's client for the purpose of our representation is only the person or entity identified in the letter accompanying these Terms of Retention. Unless expressly agreed, we are not undertaking the representation of any related or affiliated person or entity, nor any parent, brother-sister, subsidiary, or affiliated corporation or entity, nor any of your or their officers, directors, agents, or employees.

10. **Payment Notwithstanding Dispute.** In the event of any dispute that relates to our entitlement to any payment from you, all undisputed amounts shall be paid by you. Any amounts in any client trust account held on your behalf, sufficient to pay the disputed amounts, shall continue to be held in such trust account until the final disposition of the dispute.

11. **Arbitration.** IN THE EVENT OF A DISPUTE REGARDING FEES, COSTS, OR ANY OTHER MATTER ARISING OUT OF OR RELATED IN ANY WAY WHATSOEVER TO OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH YOU, OR YOUR OR OUR PERFORMANCE OF THIS AGREEMENT, INCLUDING THE QUALITY OF THE SERVICES WHICH WE RENDER, THE DISPUTE SHALL BE DETERMINED, SETTLED AND RESOLVED BY CONFIDENTIAL ARBITRATION IN ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA. ANY AWARD SHALL BE FINAL, BINDING AND CONCLUSIVE UPON THE PARTIES, AND A JUDGMENT RENDERED THEREON MAY BE ENTERED IN ANY COURT HAVING JURISDICTION THEREOF. SHOULD YOU ELECT TO HAVE ANY FEE DISPUTE ARBITRATED PURSUANT TO NONBINDING ARBITRATION UNDER STATUTORY OR CASE LAW, THEN SUCH NONBINDING ARBITRATION SHALL DETERMINE ONLY THE ISSUE OF THE AMOUNT OF FEES PROPERLY CHARGEABLE TO YOU. ANY OTHER CLAIMS OR DISPUTES BETWEEN US, INCLUDING CLAIMS FOR PROFESSIONAL NEGLIGENCE, SHALL REMAIN SUBJECT TO BINDING ARBITRATION PURSUANT TO THIS AGREEMENT.
Arbitration may be demanded by the sending of written notice to the other party. If arbitration is demanded, within 20 days of the demand you shall present a list of five qualified individuals who would be willing to serve that you would find acceptable to act as arbitrator. To serve as arbitrator, the individual must be a retired judge having served on any federal court or the California Superior Court or higher court in the State of California. Within 20 days of receiving your list, we may at our sole discretion (i) select any individual from that list and that individual shall serve as the arbitrator, or (ii) propose our own list of five individuals for arbitrator. If we choose to present a separate list, you may within 20 days select any individual from that list and that person shall serve as arbitrator. If no arbitrator can be agreed upon at the end of this process, each of us shall select one individual from our own respective list and those two persons shall jointly select the arbitrator. The arbitration shall be conducted pursuant to the procedures set forth in the California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 1280 et seq., and in that connection you and we agree that § 1283.05 thereof is applicable to any such arbitration. Nothing herein shall limit the right of the parties to stipulate and agree to conduct the arbitration pursuant to the then-current rules of the American Arbitration Association, the Judicial Arbitration & Mediation Services, or any other agreed-upon arbitration services.

12. At your direction, SYCR will contract with certain expert witnesses or other consultants necessary to your representation; any and all costs for such services shall be your sole and exclusive responsibility.

Date: _______________ 2013

AGREED: