CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
PORTERVILLE, CALIFORNIA
FEBRUARY 17, 2004 7:00 P.M.

Pledge of Allegiance Led by Mayor Pro Tem Pete Martinez
Invocation
Roll Call

PRESENTATIONS
• City Manager Featured Projects
  1. Granite Hills Streets Project, Phase Two
  2. General Plan Amendment - Jaye/190
  3. Neighborhood Community Center - Permits Issued and Property Purchase.
  4. Date Avenue General Plan Amendment and Environmental

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.

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. Approval of City Council Minutes of June 21, July 12, and November 1, 2003 and February 3, 2004

2. Claim - Kimberly Martin
   Re: Claim for Damages allegedly a result of a City refuse driver running over a dog on private property at 812 W. Tomah on January 3, 2004. The amount being claimed is $1,500.00.

3. Authorization to Advertise for Bids - Development of Water Well Test Holes
   Re: Approving plans and project manual for the drilling of exploratory test holes at various locations throughout the City.

4. Award of Contract - Design and Inspection Services for Well No. 28 and Four Future Wells
   Re: Awarding the contract to Dee Jaspar & Associates in the amount of $38,792.

5. Award of Contract - Hockett and Division Parking Lot - Downtown Parking Project
   Re: Awarding the contract to Central Valley Asphalt in the amount of $179,126.50.

6. Acceptance of Appraised Value of Right of Way for Property Located at APN No. 245-060-026 - First Church of God - Henderson Avenue Street Construction Project
   Re: Approving the payment to the First Church of God in the amount of $300.00, and accept the grant deed and record it with the County Recorder.
Re: Approving the payment to Sequoia Apparel, Inc. in the amount of $6,000.00, open escrow and record all documents with the County Recorder.

8. Authorization for City Manager to Endorse Insurance Check for First Time Low Income Homebuyer Participant  
Re: Authorization to endorse an insurance check as second trust deed holder and approval to sign future such checks that include the City as the payee for a claim payment for property damage to houses in the City’s First Time Low Income Homebuyer Program.

9. Approval to Enter into an Agreement for the Removal of Encroaching Structures at the Neighborhood Community Center Site  
Re: Continuing with site preparation by working toward removal of structures erected by adjacent property owners on the Neighborhood Community Center Site.

10. Rescind Resolution Establishing the Long Range Planning Committee  
Re: Rescinding Resolution 80-2001 to eliminate the Long Range Planning Committee.

11. Adoption of the Revised Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACMs) for the Extreme Area Ozone Attainment Plan for the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin  
Re: Revising previously adopted measures to meet the 2010 attainment date requested by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Board through the Environmental Protection Agency.

12. Approval for Community Civic Event Porterville Chamber of Commerce Iris Festival, April 24, 2004  
Re: Approval to close certain downtown streets and sidewalks from 4:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. on April 24, subject to the application restrictions.

13. C.O.L.T. Fixed Route Bus Stop Locations  
Re: Information regarding all established fixed bus stop locations.

14. Amendments to Employee Pay and Benefit Plan and Employee Health Plan Document  
Re: Accepting a signed Memorandum of Understanding from the Porterville City Firefighters’ Association and approving the resolution implementing the points of agreement.

15. Addendum to M.O.U. between City/P.C.F.A., and Amendment to City Council Resolution No. 116-2002  
Re: Accepting Addendum No.2 to the 2002 Memorandum of Understanding with the Porterville City Firefighters’ Association to increase the contribution rates in the employee medical premiums effective 11-01-03.


**3- Government Code § 54956.8** - Conference with Real Property Negotiators/Property: Two Adjacent Triangular Sites Located West of Olivecrest Avenue, between Crestview & Oak and Ruth Street & Olive Avenue-. Agency Negotiator: John Longley. Negotiating Parties: City of Porterville, Porterville Public Cemetery District. Under Negotiation: Terms and Price;

**4- Government Code § 54956.9(a)** - Conference with Legal Counsel - Existing Litigation: City of Porterville v. Tulare Valley Rail Road;

**5** -Government Code § 54956.9(c) - Conference with Legal Counsel - Anticipated Litigation: One Case;


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

**PUBLIC HEARING**

17. An Ordinance Amending the General Plan Amendment Process (Zoning Ordinance Amendment 1-2004)

   Re: Approving the proposed ordinance modifying the General Plan Amendment Process reflecting the elimination of the Long Range Planning Committee.

**SECOND READING**

18. Ordinance 1647, Zone Change 6-2003 (Sierra View District Hospital)

   Re: Approving the change of zone from City R-1 to City P-O for the site located on the west side of Kessing Street, between Putnam Avenue and Oak Avenue.

19. Ordinance 1648, Request for Special Fireworks Permit


**SCHEDULED MATTERS**

20. Policy for Naming of Dedication of City Facilities

   Re: Consideration of a uniform policy to assist the City Council and guide the Parks and Leisure Services Commission and/or staff in naming of City facilities.

21. A Plan for Nelson Building Demolition, First Phase Development of Centennial Plaza, as Well as Trailhead Park Tree Installation

   Re: Consideration of the demolition of the Nelson Building, the design of the Centennial Plaza Park, and tree planting at Trailhead Park at Highway 190 and 65.
22. **North Main Street Traffic Study and Analysis**
   Re: Consideration designating two Council Members as an ad hoc subcommittee to participate in meetings with tavern principals and interested public members regarding parking and pedestrian issues in the vicinity of Charlie’s Engine House No. 5.

23. **Grant Management**
   Re: Consideration of including a Grant matrix to be included as part of the Quarterly Financial and Portfolio Updates.

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

**OTHER MATTERS**

**ADJOURNMENT** - to the meeting of March 2, 2004

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the California Ralph M. Brown Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, or to be able to access this agenda and documents in the agenda packet, please contact the Deputy City Clerk at (559) 782-7442. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting and/or provision of an appropriate alternative format of the agenda and documents in the agenda packet.
CITY MANAGER’S FEATURED PROJECTS FOR FEBRUARY 17, 2004

1. Granite Hills Streets Project, Phase Two
2. General Plan Amendment - Jaye/190
3. Neighborhood Community Center - Permits Issued and Property Purchase.
4. Date Avenue General Plan Amendment and Environmental
PORTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL MEETING
ADJOURNED MEETING JUNE 21, 2003
STRATEGIC PLANNING SESSION, 9:00 A.M.
LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM

Call To Order: 9:00 a.m.
Roll Call: West, Martinez, Hamilton, Irish, Stadtherr

SCHEDULED MATTER

Mayor Stadtherr welcomed everyone to the special meeting of the Porterville City Council Strategic Planning Session. The Mayor then turned the meeting over to City Manager John Longley.

City Manager recapped last year’s sessions, providing a copy of the staff report that went to Council of the five defined issues from last year’s group. He stated that the five issues the Council settled on were from a different time/different set of policy makers and today’s group may settle on a different set of issues altogether. City Manager further explained the goal of the three sessions and why they are important, i.e., to engage in dialog to define the core, essential issues facing the community. This way, he said, we can utilize the resources most effectively. He added the process isn’t a miracle cure as such, but it is highly useful. It gets everyone down the road much faster, builds consensus into the process, and gives a sense of direction they otherwise don’t have.

The City Manager introduced Professor Dr. Cary Simon, of the Naval Post Graduate School. Dr. Simon works through the Defense Department and spreads his methodology around the world to assist others toward utilizing American-style democracy. He has worked with the governments of Peru and Colombia, among others. He has also been working fairly extensively with local governments and Porterville was privileged that he is willing to work with us.

Everyone in attendance introduced themselves and Dr. Simon thanked everyone for attending the meeting. He stated this is where government really begins to manifest itself, saying this is how government really works. The people and citizens come into contact with those they have elected to govern and make decisions and choices about the future, and about the City. Dr. Simon further explained the process that he recommends that the group follow. He explained that it’s a 50/50 process. He will do his share, 50%, to get something that’s productive for Porterville. The group will have their duties/responsibilities for the remaining share. Everyone attending the meeting was encouraged to participate.

At this point Dr. Simon presented a scenario to the group where the group was asked to make a choice in the scenario that was given. He explained that the planners/decision makers do not have enough resources to fix all the problems and solve everything. Choices have to be made among a group of people about where to put resources, i.e., energy, time, money, and expertise. He also explained, that going hand-in-hand with choices, the group will also be making a value distinction. He added that this is all about decision making as it relates to strategy/decisions/direction for the City.
A discussion followed among the group regarding relationships between operations/administration vs. the logic to public/private sector. Dr. Simon said the majority of the time is typically spent on the operations/administration stage. He mentioned Gresham’s Law which he explained: entities are so busy they don’t have time to try to make the maneuvers to position themselves to the future. Which means, he said, these businesses are reacting, i.e., answer the phones, the mail, whatever occurs each day. He added this approach may not be the best way to give businesses the most value or leverage. Dr. Simon stated that about 5% of the time the group will be discussing Porterville’s future, which he termed “Strategic Issues.” The problem with Planning, he said, some organizations have a plan, with no action. The plan in and of itself does nothing. Strategic management a.k.a. change/implementation takes action on issues.

Dr. Simon said the first thing was the “assessment” of the situation, and the group must diagnose the current state of affairs, then proceed to make the changes upon consensus. The second piece was “setting direction.” One way to set direction was to have goals/objectives, i.e., rules/regulations. You can set a direction using vision, a mission. Aspects of the City’s mission were discussed. An “issue” is neutral, something that’s important/relevant to Porterville. Some issues may become emotional and may turn into a disagreement. Dr. Simon explained there is no right or wrong way to discuss any issue. He recommended talking about the important issues facing Porterville. The heart of the matter was to get to the issues as fast they could and also realizing the choices that are involved. He explained the terms: “content” (Porterville’s issues) vs. “process” (action plan). In dealing with strategy, the group will go back and forth between content and process. Process was how we would identify the issues, how were they going to develop an action plan. The length of the process was discussed, i.e., when should it happen - days, months, and/or years. Dr. Simon recommended looking at issues no longer than three years out, changing as the political process changed. In his experience, anything longer than three years would be too long- transformation of New York City was mentioned which took decades and vision. Discussion by the group followed. The term consensus was defined by Dr. Simon, “the people in this room should be able to come together around the important/relevant things in Porterville.”

Dr. Simon stated that last year’s group created a list of the City’s perceived strengths and weaknesses. From this list, issues were starting to emerge. Dr. Simon explained the City’s internal Stakeholders putting themselves in the position of the elected officials, who have hired the staff to govern Porterville. Other stakeholders are its citizens, i.e., business owners, educational representatives. The meaning of a stakeholder was defined as anybody that has a stake in what Porterville is trying to accomplish or can have an impact for Porterville. A list was made of the area’s stakeholders. Dr. Simon stated that meeting the needs and expectations of the important Stakeholders was what it is all about.

Following a short break the meeting continued.

Dr. Simon gave a handout to everyone titled Strategic Issues. The purpose of the handout had a theoretical foundation, i.e., an art and a science of strategic planning. It was one way to go about planning – Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats a.k.a. the SWAT analysis. The
handout was used as a tool, to help set a direction. Internal/external stakeholders as they relate to success was discussed. It’s the perceptions from the Stakeholders that determines success, what they perceive. There was a flow and rhythm and a theoretical foundation for what they are doing.

Next in the meeting was the framing of issues that the City is now facing. Dr. Simon explained the three-step criteria:

1) Frame it into a question the City can do something positive about. (If the City cannot do anything about it, it’s not an issue for the City.)

2) What’s the alternative, and

3) The consequences if the question is not resolved.

Discussion followed on previous five-year plans and why they were created. As the environment changes, so does the issues/plans Dr. Simon said. “Issue management” meant a shorter time frame, i.e., issues they could take action on in the next one, two, to three years. Typically governments look 20 years into the future as well as real time issues. Plan vs. reacting was further defined. We are in an operational world, i.e., this is where we live. We can: 1) do what I can to try and prepare a little for the future, or 2) get back to work into the reaction mode. Discussion followed on airline safety after September 11, 2001.

At this point questions were developed on the issues facing Porterville. Topics of possible discussion were on: air quality; attracting more businesses; attracting more tourism (separate to business); recreational needs, i.e., increasing green spots; combating graffiti. Last year’s Strategic Plan handouts were referenced at this point: “The City should establish an environment that encourages development of a value added dynamic base.” Dr. Simon clarified the meaning of “Value added”—value of education, monetary expenditures, tax base. Dynamic economic base meant diverse economic base.

Lengthy discussion followed on the topic of graffiti prevention and removal. Graffiti was everywhere - on signs, public utility boxes, trash cans and was very visible. The current Council knew the importance of the ongoing graffiti issue. City Manager indicated that this topic would be addressed at the next City Council meeting.

At this point, discussion followed on incorporating county areas into the City. The pros and cons were mentioned. Possible ways to phrase the questions were discussed. For example, Dr. Simon said, “How can we increase community building efforts to enhance the community as it relates to county islands.” The City Manager said that it costs approximately $6,000 to incorporate a residence into the City, and the City does not recoup its cost.

After a short break, Dr. Simon recapped last year’s handout asking the group if any of them needed to be addressed at today’s meeting. Water/sewer was discussed, and streets were also added. Eliminating the time period of five years to “must be met” was discussed. How could they ensure the
water/sewer needs were met? Funding sources and staffing levels were discussed. The Leadership Program’s successes were mentioned in working with tomorrow’s leaders to develop their leadership skills today.

How could they use the staff resources they have in a most effective manner? The City Manager explained to the group where they stand with Council’s recent budget adoption. Currently, he said, we have a hiring freeze on City positions, resource driven, but all public safety positions, Police and Fire, are exempt from this. Any other position that was critical to the health and safety of the community, or met contractual requirements was also exempt from the freeze. Resources are challenging, Mr. Longley said, but the “sky is not falling.” Dr. Simon said he doesn’t see an issue with what he was hearing because the City Manager can hire and fire public safety positions. Staffing levels for Police and Fire Departments was further discussed. City Manager stated he believed it was a crucial current issue that they maintain adequate levels of staffing/support for basic public services, especially public safety.

In closing, Dr. Simon gave direction to the group to rank the issues that were developed. Following are the questions and how they were ranked by the group---the consensus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Ranked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to ensure water, sewer, and street requirements are met?</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we attract more businesses?</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we improve Porterville’s “Air Quality?”</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to maintain efforts to recruit, train, and retain employees (staff) to meet essential service responsibilities?</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to engage the community to further prevent and reduce graffiti?</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine its need for additional recreational facilities and “open-space,” and size, location, access, financing and type of same, e.g., River Parkway.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we attract more visitors?</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to entice “county islands” into the City?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADJOURNMENT
The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

Colette Parnell, PFD Secretary

Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor
Call To Order: 9:00 a.m.
Roll Call: West, Martinez, Hamilton, Irish, Stadtherr

SCHEDULED MATTER

Mayor Stadtherr started the meeting by welcoming everyone to the second phase of the Porterville City Council’s Strategic Planning Session. He stated that he was thrilled about the turnout for the meeting with only two empty chairs in the room. Mayor said we have a good showing of people attending the meeting and flattered that everyone took time out of their day to help Council plan the Strategic priorities.

An announcement was made concerning the West Nile Virus and its potential negative impact to the citizens of the City and Valley. The City Manager stated that if anyone was interested to contact Baldo Rodriguez, Public Works Director, at the break. Citizens were encouraged to contact the City Manager’s office with any concerns.

City staff and everyone present introduced themselves. Dr. Cary Simon stated that he is a Professor at the Navel Post Graduate School in Monterey. He was there as a facilitator to help the City of Porterville identify and resolve important issues. He explained briefly what happened at the June 21 session. He stated that this was the type of planning that countries all over the world come to our country to try to understand what we do. Countries like Colombia and Peru were trying to have some sort of democratic process whereby a group of people, like those present today, all have different ideas on how government should work. Dr. Simon further stated that disagreeing was part of the process, and if they disagree today, it’s alright. He explained that our Founding Fathers liked disagreeing, liking conflict. The people set up the three different branches of government to challenge one another—to have discussion and to disagree. He encouraged the group to participate, keeping in mind to keep it brief, coming to the point, and anything could be brought up for discussion. They would focus on what the group considers were the most important issues, i.e., the problems and challenges that Porterville was facing.

Referencing the issues that were developed from the first session, Dr. Simon explained how planning tends to break down. He said planning can break in the implementation or execution stage in the process. The Strategic Plan for Porterville, although just words on a paper, does nothing at all. It’s still just a plan. How do they connect a plan with execution/implementation to link the two together. They have to bring the people who are implementing it to become part of the process. Dr. Simon said that today they have a sample of Porterville sitting in the room, and they could see people would come up with problems/challenges, e.g., West Nile Virus & ponds to be drained. Two main areas were defined: identifying (where are the main issues) and beginning to resolve them. Porterville
he explained has been doing planning for years/decades, fixing streets, installing lights. There was already a plan, so what’s the problem? What’s different? Discussion by the group followed. Dr. Simon said they found themselves in an environment that was changing rapidly. For example, the Internet alone was changing how they communicate. The demographics in the workplace was changing and continuing to change. The world was more interconnected now, more global. Dr. Simon explained the terms of “wicked” or “messy” problems. He said society had a number of wicked or messy problems, those were the different wars that we are in: poverty, terrorism, drugs, graffiti. It doesn’t mean they can’t do anything about them, it means they are harder to tackle. The way they try to formulate it into a simple process was to talk about the problem using three criteria: 1) describe or frame the problem (issue) into a question (one that the City can do something about), 2) next are the alternatives (options), and 3) if the question is not dealt with, what are the consequences. Dr. Simon said this was the process that they are using. He explained the questions that were raised at the first session, explaining how far into the future we go with the plan. He said it’s okay to have a 10-year vision or 20-year vision for Porterville. They could talk about it. In today’s time, they typically look 1, 2 or 3 years out, as the political climate changes. To act on the plan it must be politically rational.

Referencing the list that was created from the first session, Dr. Simon said City staff would come up with solutions to those problems to use resources, e.g., time, energy, and money to help begin to resolve them. The idea, Dr. Simon stated, was that without consensus, people basically would comply. For example, a staff member would do it, getting to it later, not understanding the issue, or wait until the climate changed. This was called human nature. What we tend to believe, if we have consensus--this was an important issue that we can do something about. When you begin to have consensus you have power, and they were interested in what the group thinks were the important problems and what were the alternatives/options to begin to solve/resolve those issues. They all have opinions on what needs to be fixed, e.g., junk cars should be removed and water problems should be fixed. He said opinions were okay, but they were going for informed judgment which was further than the discussion of opinions. It was called deliberation, it was what participants in democracy do, they deliver it. So the decision makers could think of all sides to the problem. That was the difference between discussion and listening to what the other person is saying. This would help them make informed decisions.

Dr. Simon reviewed each item from the list that was created from the first session. Discussion followed on each topic. The following was from the list that was created as each topic was discussed.

1. How to ensure water, sewer, and street requirements are met?

- Infrastructure...focus
- A Plan for growth...
  (drawings/degraded homes (sub-standard), lack of curbs)
- Acquire water rights where possible/feasible
- Eliminating a barrier
  (Complete a mitigation bank for endangered species)
  (Mitigation plan and site ongoing)
  (Complete/expand implementation)
2. How can we attract (and secure/retain) more businesses?

- Reinstate vocational programs (plus other diverse efforts)
- Assist businesses with collaboration efforts
- Establish a plan as to what type of businesses we want to recruit and train to requirements.
- Marketing (Economic Development Jobs Plan)
- Numbers and environment and infrastructure (Wal-Mart Distribution Center for example)
- Ease Regulations (Zoning)
- Value added
- Attract more nonproductive income (retirees)

3. How can we improve Porterville’s “Air Quality”?

- Mass Transit
- Loss of federal transportation dollars
- Our voice heard to those drafting the changes
- Reduce burning
- Work with other valley towns (partnerships)
- Reduce unregistered / smog polluting cars
- Research Tulare City CNG
- Car pooling options
- On-site day care facilities
- Preserve our trees

4. How to maintain efforts to recruit, train, and retain employees (staff) to meet essential service responsibilities?

- Maintain “parity”
- How to reduce “turnover” (Law Enforcement)
- Salary/Benefits “matter”
- Home-grown emphasis (high school)

5. How to engage the community to further prevent and reduce graffiti?

- Immediately paint over
- Murals (a tag wall)
- Continue to enhance City and Chamber efforts to ensure follow-up
- Task Force (Chamber, Schools, City, Volunteers, Block Captains)

During the period in which Dr. Simon was creating alternatives (to the original five questions), the following ideas were given:
It’s important that we attract and retain businesses. Collaborative effort between local agencies and college mentioned, e.g., Visalia’s EDC and Local Employment Connection facilities mentioned.

If the City’s infrastructure and facilities are in place, then the marketplace will take care of itself. For example, infrastructure was already in place when Wal-Mart Distribution Center decided to locate in Porterville.

On Porterville’s Air Quality: We plant trees, then let them die. Foliage does a lot to improve quality which is great. But preserving trees is better, and not often done.

Discussion followed on the teen pregnancy rate in the area. Method of facilitating training mentioned. Different possibilities suggested, e.g., ways to expand thinking, which in turn helps to solve the problem. After a lengthy discussion Dr. Simon clarified the statement: Does the City have a role in addressing teen pregnancies? A “yes,” “no,” or “not sure” count was taken. Eleven respond that the City has a role in addressing the issue, while 23 respond it does not, and a couple were not sure. After the count, Dr. Simon stated this is not an issue for the City. It appears it’s not an official issue to dedicated City resources toward. This may change over time, Dr. Simon stated.

At this point the group continued to define the alternates to the five issues that were previously discussed to give City staff something to work on, an outline a.k.a. an action plan. Dr. Simon said whatever it takes to help resolve the issues, who is going to deal with it, how it’s dealt with, e.g., projects, programs, and research. The group was asked if any of the big issues were missed from the five issues that were mentioned.

The topic of how to attract and keep business was again mentioned. It was suggested that it’s a three part process: 1) Wal-mart and Home Depot look at areas to locate, we do not attract businesses, per se. 2) Cities have to have the numbers, and 3) the infrastructure must be in place. The City’s Enterprise Zone was mentioned that in fact it does draw businesses to the area. Wal-mart Super Center locating to Porterville was mentioned. Brad Dunlap, City Planner, defined the City’s Economic Development Plan. He said that our system is very streamlined which means businesses such as Home Depot can open in such a short turn around time. Question was raised on our total volume in sales tax dollars. City Manager stated it’s about $4 million, with approximate gross sales about $500 million.

Suggestion was made to relocate, move the golf course to the sports complex, making it into an 18-hole course. Also, redesign the current golf course into a park with a skateboarding park -- not at the proposed Veterans Park site.

Porterville’s potential of the sheriff’s substation closing was mentioned. Dr. Simon asked, How can the City Prevent the closing of Porterville’s sheriff substation? Discussion followed.

It was asked how the public can become aware of what the City is doing? Dr. Simon suggested to make the plan simple, not bulky, i.e., a few pages vs. a 1,000 page document.
Discussion followed. Dr. Simon clarified what the group was asking: an easy, readable, summary, a.k.a. an Executive Summary. That way the public could build on that: plans, projects, etc. These are alternatives to help address the question of awareness. It also helps to point out the good work that is ongoing or things that are emerging like skateboard parks and the potential closing of the substation, Dr. Simon said. This means the City must commit resources because somebody will have to summarize some of these complicated issues. Someone will write this down that involves time/expertise.

- Attracting nonproductive income mentioned (retired citizens) to Porterville. Issues of Graffiti and beautifying the City with murals mentioned. Dr. Simon mentioned that at the last meeting we talked about graffiti in detail. Programs are in place with no followup a citizen stated. City Manager stated his impression is exactly the opposite that things are addressed very quickly now, within 24 hours for example. City Manager stated to let him know if things are not eradicated and quickly. Police Chief is holding an upcoming meeting on the topic of graffiti. Volunteering as block captains mentioned. Discussion followed. Dr. Simon said, when enough groups care and citizens say this is unsatisfactory, this is the strongest medicine of all.

- Dr. Simon references the list asking for further alternatives. Community Center and Indiana Street Improvement projects delayed due to the Elderberry Beetle discussed. City Planner stated we are working on a plan for eradication.

Dr. Simon asked what the group would like to see happen from this point forward. It was suggested to break down into different committees, having the smaller committees work on a single area, five in all. Part of that, Dr. Simon stated, was to track and assist with resolving the issues. Break down into smaller groups, then come back together and report back as a unit, was an appropriate action. There were trade offs involved in all of these, i.e., not enough resources, so someone will have to make decisions what can they afford/not afford to do. That was the City Staff and Council's job in trying to come up with a way to trade off whatever resources they can-- along with all the other operational things that they do every day. Ideally, when they meet again they would have the outline, framework of an action plan which would provide what they think could be done.

The City Manager suggested they could compile a tier, for example, and have staff members in each of those areas prepare a one to two page summary where they are right now: what has been done. This could be part of the consideration. Dr. Simon stated this goes along with trying to improve the process, generating awareness for what is being done, i.e., awareness and discussion. Dr. Simon said this was a good way to proceed. Those in the group were encouraged to go into the community talking to others and bring them to future meetings. Dr. Simon stated that the group could leave the meeting and do nothing, or actually stimulate interest/involvement in the City and further communicate, and bring in additional people into the group. Keep in mind, Dr. Simon said, that although it's an important, relevant issue, it's not necessarily something the Council can act upon to make a substantial change. Marginal changes may be made. Dr. Simon said that this group really works well together. No one points fingers at one another.

The Police Chief was asked about the Department's staffing levels and maintaining them. He explained they were dealing with larger departments like Visalia, Fresno, and Bakersfield Police
Departments because they pay more in salary and benefits. It’s a constant challenge. Cities of Porterville’s size, such as Madera, Hanford, and Delano, were comparable to our salary/benefits. It appears, one suggested, that we were reverting to the staffing levels of 25 years ago in the Public Safety arena. Retention was important in the long haul. Employees would go where the money was the best. Recruiting “home-grown” was mentioned. The City hires them for a short time, then they gain their education/experience and leave for their hometown.

City Manager expected to set another meeting with Dr. Simon in September. In the meantime he would meet with the City Directors to put issue papers together. He said reminder letters would be sent out early so everyone would be able to plan their schedule accordingly.

The Mayor thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Mayor adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

---

Colette Parnell, PFD Secretary

Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor
Call to Order: 9:00 a.m.
Roll Call: West, Hamilton, Irish, Martinez, Stadtherr

SCHEDULED MATTER

Mayor Stadtherr started the meeting by welcoming everyone to the third phase of the Porterville City Council’s Strategic Planning Session. He then turned the floor over to the program moderator.

Dr. Cary Simon began by explaining to those in attendance the purpose for the meeting and where they are at in the process. The problem solving process, he begins, always begins with the identification of a problem. It is the identification of a problem that usually takes the most time, because they can be complex problems that need to be broke down. Dr. Simon stated that this is in relation to our society being more complex, demographics are different, globalization takes effect, and that the changes taking place can be very rapid. Referencing the current situation with the Southern California fires, Dr. Simon explained how problems affecting a group could change as a result of unexpected events.

Dr. Simon explained that the way in which the strategic planning was approached was along a straightforward process. Problems or issues were identified, which took a fair amount of time. The group came up with options to work on and resolve issues. The next phase being that of choice; where it must be decided where to put precious resources. No state, city, group, or organization has enough resources to accomplish all of the alternatives, so choices must be made. This phase is choice/implementation; where people are doing things. The last phase involves some sort of evaluation that says, “What are we doing? Is it working? How do we know?” He then stated that the purpose of this meeting is to discuss and share information on these two aspects of problem solving. What is being implemented, and what evaluation information do we have, if any, to let us know if these actions are working or not working.

Referring to diagrams that he had posted of the issues that would be discussed at this meeting, Dr. Simon stated that all strategy he is familiar with involves a fair amount assessment. An external assessment of the environment, an internal assessment of Porterville’s own capabilities, i.e., staff issues and things of that nature, which have both already been done. Some sort of direction has to be set where a governing body of a city has to say, “Okay, given this assessment of our situation, we are going to do this way.” Problems can be placed in the form of a question, explained Dr. Simon, and if the question mark is taken away, the question then becomes a goal. The implementation process may take a year or two years, and may change as a result of new issues that supercede those our city had previously.

Dr. Simon opened the meeting up to questions and comments from those attending the meeting.
At the end of this session, Dr. Simon stated, there should be a greater understanding of what is being implemented. One of the issues or concerns that were brought up before was that there needed to be a communication tool that would allow the City to explain the conditions and strategies of important issues. The White Papers were developed as this communication tool. Dr. Simon stated that the White Papers were very informative.

Staff is the group of individuals who take the ideas and words on these White Papers and works on the implementation of these strategies. Staff has participated in the problem solving process from the beginning. The operations of the City of Porterville are connected to its strategy. Goals can be vague and ambiguous, and are not as helpful as smart goals. Smart goals are more specific, measurable, and attainable.

City Manager Longley stated that he is a big advocate of this approach, but where all the approaches break down in his opinion is during the translation from identifying goals and direction to the actual implementation. As different forms of implementation are identified, staff can be required to change direction. Mr. Longley stated that it is not as easy as just changing direction and leaving behind all that was invested previously, as that there is some baggage that remains. He also stated that it is not just about ordering staff to implement certain strategies, but getting them to understand your way of thinking.

Dr. Simon identified two subjects, one a field called Change Management. This is cities, firms, societies, institutions, trying to adapt to a fast moving environment. The other subject that has been brought up is motivation. It is important to find out what motivates you and others involved. Communication is essential in identifying the motivations of your employees since the need’s of each individual varies.

Dr. Simon told the parable about the frog in boiling water. If you were to place a frog in a pot of boiling water it will jump out. If you place a frog in a pot of water at room temperature, then gradually heated the water the frog would not react, eventually fall asleep, and the water would come to a boil, killing the frog. People, in many ways react similarly to situations or conditions of their environment. They react to sudden changes, but tend to not see the slow gradual changes. How long as pollution been developing in the Valley? The point is that we have to get better at identifying the slow gradual changes.

In reference to Issue #5, graffiti, someone asked if graffiti was the problem or if crime would be a better word. Dr. Simon’s response was to ask the group if crime would be a better word. Graffiti is an aspect of crime, crime being a broader category. Dr. Simon stated that in this case perhaps it was the presence of graffiti, the fact that it is easily observed that is disturbing.

Someone brought up that every two years there is a change in government, that new people may come in and not have the same concern and priorities being discussed today. Dr. Simon agreed
with this comment and asked what a possible solution is to this problem. Another commented that the officials in government are elected by the people and therefore are influenced by the people.

After a short break Mayor Stadtherr announced that since there was no longer a quorum the meeting of the City Council was adjourned, but that the meeting would continue as a Committee of the Council.

Dr. Simon addressed the white paper pertaining to water, sewer and street first. The first part of the white paper is descriptive, and the second part makes reference to the Water Master Plan. At this point Public Works Director Baldo Rodriguez elaborated on the Master Plans and their revisions and goals. Dr. Simon pointed out something that he felt was an important and pressing matter in the White Papers regarding water, and that was the need to find, develop, and bring on line quality wells. He asked if someone could discuss this matter further. Baldo Rodriguez stated that the process is already established, but it is in the details that time is invested. Baldo Rodriguez then briefly explained the process of finding, developing, and bringing quality wells on line. Dr. Simon commented that this process took quite a while to complete, approximately 18 months, and if he was comfortable with the process and its implementation. Baldo Rodriguez stated that the process does take longer than desired, and that measures are being taken to improve the amount of wells brought on line, such as bringing wells on line that yield less water than the previously set standard of 1,000 gallons per minutes.

It was asked of Baldo Rodriguez, in terms of the overall system, where the water system stood or ranked? To which he answered, 91%. He stated that if you were to match demand with what the City could produce the water system would be in the ninety percent or better range. Baldo Rodriguez explained the background, immediate and future water system needs, as well as long term needs. He addressed questions regarding the current water capacity, nitrate levels, and the possibility of water treatment as a long-term solution.

The Public Works Director then addressed the sewer issue, specifically the effluent problem being resolved with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. He also addressed the Waste Water Treatment Facility.

The white paper pertaining to streets was also addressed by Baldo Rodriguez.

Another topic of discussion addressed in the White Papers was How Can We Attract (and Secure/Retain) More Businesses? Some of the concerns brought up in this discussion were the lack of opportunities available for education and vocational training. The City is working with the Porterville Unified School District (through TCOVE), Porterville Adult School, and Porterville College to offer vocational classes and training opportunities to suite local demand. They are also exploring the possibility of more convenient access to a 4-year degree.

The Porterville Economic Development Plan identified they type of businesses that the City hopes aims to recruit. These types of business include: Food & Kindred Products, Paper & Allied Products, Plastic Products, Industrial machinery, Telecommunications Centers, and 3rd Party Influences. It was suggested that the City should broaden this list to include types of business that would require a higher skill level. This perhaps would encourage those younger individuals who
leave the city to obtain a degree to return to Porterville. The types of businesses being recruited by the City are those best suited for the existing workforce. 2000 Census data reported that approximately 30% of Porterville’s population, over the age of 25, has less than a 9th grade education. The City recognizes this and so there efforts are to target those types of businesses that are suited for the current workforce, and to bridge the gap to educational opportunities. Issues such as higher education levels, private schools, specialized training and bandwidth were discussed.

The audience spoke about marketing the Porterville area and selling the positive aspects and amenities to the rest of the State.

The next topic for discussion was the problem of air pollution. In 2001, the EPA categorized the air district’s smog as “severe”. Someone stated that they felt that the amount of dairies and their close proximity to the city affected the air quality, and suggested not permitting new dairies to come in. It was also brought up that in the case of dairies there was a sort of trade off, in that they provide employment opportunities and contribute economically. In the case of pollution can you mitigate environmental factors in a dairy with technology? The answer is yes, because the technology is there. Dr. Simon stated that this problem is a messy problem, and that it is too complex for this discussion.

Another problem brought up was the amount of dust and debris kicked up by diesel trucks traveling along highway 190. Dr. Simon stated that the City’s plan to improve the air is clearly communicated in the White Papers, and that there are many strategies identified in the White Papers to reduce air pollution and promote clean air. The Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACMs) and Best Available Control Measures (BACMs) developed by the City, if successfully implemented, would only decrease the ground-level ozone pollution approximately 6%. It is believed that only the reduction of emissions allowed for pickups, sports utility vehicles and vans would significantly decrease ground-level air pollution, and allow the air district to meet the EPA’s standards. The fact that it would also mean more restrictions on businesses was also discussed. The question of ability to measure success was discussed.

The last topic addressed was graffiti. City Manager Longley briefly explained the involvement of the Porterville Sheltered Workshop in City’s plan to reduce graffiti. Dr. Simon asked what metrics were being used to measure the success of the graffiti abatement. In this case the amount of time it takes to eradicate the graffiti from public and private property within the city was a way to measure the project’s efficiency.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m. until November 4, 2003.

Georgia Hawley, Deputy City Clerk
By: Luisa Herrera

Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor
PORTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING - FEBRUARY 3, 2004
COUNCIL CHAMBERS - 7:00 P.M.

Pledge of Allegiance Led by Council Member Kelly West
Invocation: Pastor Steve Belke, Strathmore First Baptist Church
Roll Call: West, Martinez, Hamilton, Irish, Stadtherr

PRESENTATIONS

• Employee of the Month - Jeannie Greenwood
• Youth Members of the Parks and Leisure Services Commission
  Carlos Rudas, Angelica Vasquez, and Megan Acosta came forward and addressed the Council.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

• Dave Hutchinson, 1375 N. Lotas Way, introduced himself as a Parks and Leisure Services
  Commissioner and representative on recommendations and planning for the proposed Skate
  Park which was a high priority for the Commission. He stated the Commission supports
  Veterans Park location.
• Ellen Nichols (Noble) spoke as member of Blue Skies Coalition and asked Council to support
  bicyclists and energy conservation.
• Michael Ebaugh, 998 Highland Drive, spoke regarding support of Skate Park at Veteran’s
  Park.
• Gina Blasingame spoke regarding Item PRA-1.
• Brent Blasingame spoke regarding Item PRA-1 and possibly amending the Facade Easement
  Agreement to include more colors.
• Dick Eckhoff, Chairman Downtown Porterville Assoc., 180 N. Main, in the City Council
  Minutes of November 10, 2003, Michelle Hooper is Administrative Assistant to the
  Downtown Porterville Association.
• Pete McCracken, 657 Village Green, spoke regarding Item 21 and the lack of community
  support as shown in the lack of funding. He suggested putting up a box at Parks and Leisure
  Services and charging $1 a vote for one of the six sites.
• Neil Smith, Chairman of Parks and Leisure Services Commission, suggested giving charge to
  the Commission to give leadership to the efforts of generating funds for the matching grant.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Mayor Stadtherr, SECONDED by Council Member West to
move address Item 21 prior to the Consent Calendar. The motion carried unanimously.

M.O. 01-020304

Disposition: Approved
Recommendation: The City Council review the proposed site evaluation Scoring Matrix, revise the matrix as appropriate, and determine which of the above options, as direction to staff, is most appropriate.

Council Member Hamilton suggested the possible use of modular units as opposed to concrete construction. This would allow the City to move the units and re-arrange them as needed.

Council Member Irish presented a slideshow of pictures of Skateboard Parks in surrounding areas. The pictures captured some problems with the Parks such as graffiti, litter, property damage, issues of safety, etc.

Council Member West stated that Veteran’s Park is not funded or maintained by Veterans, and is in support of the Veteran’s Park location. He also expressed an interest in Council Member Hamilton’s suggestion of portable modular units.

Mayor Pro Tem Martinez thanked Council Member Irish for putting together the slideshow and requested that a hard copy be distributed. He stated that the slideshow identified problems that may occur and would allow the City to take a pro-active approach to solving and preventing them from occurring in Porterville. He also asked if alternative site would jeopardize the grant.

Parks and Leisure Services Director Jim Perrine explained that there would be an appeal process necessary, and City Manager Longley stated that a request to change sites has never been granted due to it never before being requested.

Mayor Pro Tem addressed the question of gender division within the sport by stating that he felt that as the sport grows females participation will increase.

Council Member Irish stated that he would not have a problem with the Skateboard Park if modular units were used.

City Manager Longley stated that when it was asked of Parks and Recreation if modular facilities would be acceptable under the grant, they advised that they would not.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Mayor Pro Tem Martinez, SECONDED by Council Member West to approve Option 1.

M.O. 02-020304

AYES: West, Martinez  
NOES: Hamilton, Irish, Stadtherr

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

Disposition: Defeated

Mayor Stadtherr stated that he too was in favor of a modular facility.
Council Member West brought up the question of costs to move the modular units.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Council Member Irish to approve to continue with grant at Veteran’s Park, but aggressively work through the Parks and Recreation for a modular facility. The motion carried unanimously.

M.O. 03-020304

Disposition: Approved

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS FOR THE 2003/2004 FISCAL YEAR

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

Disposition: Approved
Documentation: Minute Order No. 04-020304

3. BUDGET CALENDAR

Recommendation: No Action Required by Council.

5. ACCEPTANCE OF AGREEMENT FOR PURCHASE OF EASEMENT ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 260 S. MAIN STREET – FELBURG – ORANGE AVENUE STREET RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT

Recommendation: That City Council:
1. Authorize staff to make payment to Mr. Robert A. and William F. Felburg, owners of the property, in the amount of $550.00; and
2. Accept the Easement Deed and authorize staff to record with the County Recorder.

Disposition: Approved
Documentation: Resolution No. 8-2004

6. AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE PROPERTY FROM PORTERVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR THE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITY CENTER

Recommendation: That City Council:
1. Approve the purchase of approximately 16.5 acres from Porterville Unified School District for the purpose of constructing a Library/Neighborhood Community Center; and
2. Authorize staff to begin escrow, with the City paying escrow fees; and
3. Authorize the Mayor to sign all necessary documents; and
4. Authorize staff to record all documents with the County Recorder.
8. CDBG CITIZENS’ ADVISORY AND HOUSING OPPORTUNITY COMMITTEE AND CITIZEN PLAN

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Adopt the 2004 Citizen Participation Plan; and
2. Appoint Grace Munoz-Rios, Pat Contreras, John Dennis, Linda Olmedo, Rudy Roman, and Hector Villicana to the Citizen’s Advisory and Housing Opportunity Committee for a one-year term.

Disposition: Approved
Documentation: Minute Order No. 05-020304

9. REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATIVE BODY


Disposition: Approved
Documentation: Minute Order No. 06-020304

10. ADA COMPLIANCE EFFORTS

Recommendation: That the City Council designate the Deputy City Manager as the ADA Compliance Coordinator.

Disposition: Approved
Documentation: Minute Order No. 07-020304

11. APPROVAL FOR COMMUNITY CIVIC EVENT – CITY OF PORTERVILLE’S PARKS & LEISURE SERVICES ANNUAL SWEETHEART’S RUN – FEBRUARY 14, 2004

Recommendation: That the Council approve the City of Porterville’s Parks & Leisure Services annual Sweetheart’s Day Run subject to the restrictions and requirements contained in the application, agreement and Exhibit “A” of the Community Civic Event application.

Disposition: Approved
Documentation: Minute Order No. 08-020304
12. STATUS OF “P” HILL PROJECT

Recommendation: In response to the letter from Global Drug Testing Service, write to Mr. McIntire indicating the Council’s support for their effort to coordinate and fund the restoration of the “P” on Bennett (“P”) Hill.

Disposition: Approved
Documentation: Minute Order No. 09-020304


COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member West, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton to approve Consent Calendar Items 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8 through 12. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved

**************************************************************************************************

1. CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 10, 2003 AND JANUARY 13 AND 20, 2004

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Mayor Pro Tem Martinez, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton to approve the November 10, 2003 and January 13, 2004 minutes as presented, and to approve the January 20, 2004 with the following corrections: Page 4 of 19, Dec. 3, 2003 not 2004, Page 9 of 19, change Stadherr/West to Martinez/Stadherr. The motion carried unanimously.

M.O. 10-020304

Disposition: Approved

4. AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR EFFLUENT MANHOLE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Recommendation: That City Council:
1. Award the Effluent Manhole Replacement Project to Halopoff & Sons Inc., in the amount of $22,550.81;
2. Authorize progress payments up to 90% of the contract amount; and
3. Authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen construction costs;
4. Authorize appropriation of $14,000 from the Waste Water Treatment Plant Reserve to cover the project cost, contingencies and staff time.

Council Member Hamilton asked City Manager Longley to explain how they came up with the total amount of $29,000 instead of the $15,000 budgeted.

City Manager Longley stated that there was $14,000 of additional expenses that consisted of design, inspection, testing, and an increase in the amount of the contract.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Council Member West to accept staff's recommendation. The motion carried unanimously.

M.O. 11-020304

Disposition: Approved

7. FARMING OPERATIONS REPORT

This item was carried over.

Council took a short recess from 8:15 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

13. ZONE CHANGE 6-2003 (SIERRA VIEW DISTRICT HOSPITAL)

Recommendation: That the City Council:
1. Adopt the draft resolution approving a Negative Declaration for Zone Change 6-2003.
2. Adopt the draft ordinance approving Zone Change 6-2003.

Kelly Morgan, 465 W. Putnam, President and Chief Executive Officer of Sierra View District Hospital gave the supplementary presentation. The slideshow presentation entailed information about parking capacity and needs, growth rates, highlights from the master plan, recent improvements, and future projects.

The Public Hearing was opened at 8:50 p.m., and closed at 8:51 p.m.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Council Member West to adopt the draft resolution approving a Negative Declaration for Zone Change 6-2003, and adopt the draft ordinance approving Zone Change 6-2003, being AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE APPROVING ZONE CHANGE 6-2003, BEING A CHANGE OF ZONE FROM R-1 (ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) TO PO (PROFESSIONAL OFFICE) FOR THAT 1.4±
ACRE SITE LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF KESSING STREET, BETWEEN PUTNAM AVENUE AND OAK AVENUE.

AYES: West, Hamilton, Irish, Martinez
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Stadtherr
ABSENT: None

Disposition: Approved


Recommendation: It is recommended that the City Council adopt the draft resolution approving Conditional Use Permit 2-2003.

The public hearing was opened at 8:54 p.m.

Dick Eckhoff, Downtown Porterville Association, 180 N. Main came up to share the result of an informal telephone poll conducted by the DPA. There were no opposing comments.

Council Hamilton asked for the concentration of conditional use permits in this particular area.

The hearing was closed to the public at 8:57 p.m.

Council Member Hamilton stated that he did support the approval of this permit, however he is concerned with the concentration in this area.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member West, SECONDED by Council Member Irish to accept staff’s recommendation to adopt the draft resolution approving Conditional Use Permit 2-2003.

Disposition: Approved

SECOND READING

15. ORDINANCE 1645, ZONE CHANGE 5-2003 (ZENZ & O’SULLIVAN)

Recommendation: That Council give Second Reading to Ordinance No. 1645, waive further reading, and adopt said ordinance.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Mayor Pro Tem Martinez that Council give Second Reading to Ordinance No. 1645, waive further reading, and adopt said ordinance, being AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE APPROVING ZONE CHANGE 5-2003 BEING A CHANGE OF ZONING FROM R-1
Ordinance 1645

AYES: West, Hamilton, Martinez, Stadtherr
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Irish
ABSENT: None

Disposition: Approved

16. ORDINANCE 1646, CHANGES TO TIME OF REGULAR COUNCIL MEETINGS

Recommendation: That Council give Second Reading to Ordinance No. 1646 and waiving further reading, adopt said ordinance.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Mayor Pro Tem Martinez to waive further reading and adopt said ordinance being AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE AMENDING CHAPTER 2, SECTION 2-1, TIME AND PLACE OF REGULAR MEETINGS, OF THE PORTERVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE. The motion carried unanimously.

Ordinance 1646

Disposition: Approved

SCHEDULED MATTERS

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Mayor Pro Tem Martinez to take Item No. 18 before No. 17. The motion carried unanimously.

M.O. 12-020304

18. REQUEST FOR SPECIAL FIREWORKS PERMIT

Recommendation: That the City Council approve the request for a special fireworks permit to the Exchange Club of Porterville for Calendar Year 2004, give First Reading to the draft ordinance, and order it to print.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Mayor Pro Tem Martinez, SECONDED by Council Member Hamilton to approve the request for a special fireworks permit to the Exchange Club of Porterville for Calendar Year 2004, give First Reading to the draft ordinance, and order it to print, being AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE AMENDING
CHAPTER 12, ARTICLE II, FIREWORKS, OF THE PORTERVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE.

Ordinance 1648

AYES: West, Hamilton, Martinez, Stadtherr
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Irish
ABSENT: None

Disposition: Approved

17. SEWER USER SURCHARGE FEES FOR INDUSTRIAL DISCHARGERS

Recommendation: That the City Council authorize the Mayor to sign the resolution setting new sewer user surcharge rates for industrial dischargers.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Council Member West to approve the resolution setting new sewer user surcharge rates for industrial dischargers. The motion carried unanimously.

Resolution 12-2004

Disposition: Approved

19. STAFF REVIEW OF THE BLUE SKIES COALITION BIKE PLAN PETITION

Recommendation: That the City Council accept the petition and Staff Analysis but defer action until an update of the Circulation Element is completed with the new General Plan.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Mayor Pro Tem Martinez, SECONDED by Council Member West to accept staff's recommendation plus Option #4. The motion carried unanimously.

M.O. 13-020304

Disposition: Approved

20. STAFF REVIEW OF THE BLUE SKIES COALITION ENERGY POLICY PETITION

Recommendation: That the City Council:
  1. Request the assistance of the Blue Skies Coalition in preparing a fact sheet regarding energy efficiency resources for display;
  2. Track the progress of the Governor's proposal to create a statewide energy bank; and
  3. Defer action to consider planning policy changes as a component of the next General Plan update.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Council Member West to accept staff's recommendation, with #2 being assigned to the Blue Skies Coalition.
22. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION GRANT

Recommendation: That City Council set the priority for projects to be considered for U.S. Department of Economic Development Administration (EDA) for funding, direct staff to identify all of the projects on the 2004-05 County Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy report, direct staff to explore the EDA technical assistance for the prioritized projects, and direct staff to continue to seek additional funding resources for the non-EDA portion of the project.

Council Irish asked staff to elaborate on project #2. City Manager Longley provided some information regarding the lease arrangements for incubator businesses.

COUNCIL ACTION: MOVED by Council Member Hamilton, SECONDED by Council Member Irish to carry this item forward to the February 17, 2004 meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Disposition: Approved

Adjourn to a Meeting of the Porterville Redevelopment Agency.

PORTERVILLE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AGENDA
February 3, 2003

Roll Call: Redevelopment Agency: West, Martinez, Hamilton, Irish, Stadtherr

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
• Letter written by Gina Blasingame, owner of Room With A View.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS
• Gina and Brent Blasingame came forward regarding Item PRA-1.
• Denise Marchant came forward to explain the process of developing the color palette.
• Dick Eckhoff, Downtown Porterville Association, spoke in approval of a variance at this time, and stated that he would also like to see the color palette updated.
SCHEDULED MATTER

PRA-1. BUILDING FACADE RENOVATION GRANT PROGRAM VARIANCE REQUEST FOR 118 N. MAIN ST.

Recommendation: That the Redevelopment Agency deny the Blasingame’s request for a Variance to the Downtown Porterville Architectural Design Guidelines and direct staff to enforce the Facade Easement Agreement executed on May 2, 1995.

Agency Member Hamilton asked if they were aware of the Facade Easement Agreement prior to painting the building, because he had a problem with the fact that they did not ask for variance prior to painting.

The Blasingame’s stated that they did receive a paper during the close of escrow, but that they were not aware that the easement included paint color. They were not aware they were in violation of the contract until they had painted the building.

Agency Member Irish stated that he would not have a problem updating the color palette, but under different circumstances. He also stated that he felt that there could be a better means of distributing this type of information to prevent this type of situation from happening again.

AGENCY ACTION: MOVED by Agency Member Irish, SECONDED by Agency Vice Chair Martinez to bring back this item in 180 days.

M.O. 01-020304 MOVED by Agency Vice Chair Martinez, SECONDED by Agency Chair Stadtherr to amend the initial motion to 90 days. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENCY ACTION: MOVED by Agency Vice Chair Martinez, SECONDED by Agency Chair Stadtherr to bring this item back in 90 days at the first meeting in April. The motion carried unanimously

Disposition: Approved

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

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

• Cathy Capone, 806 W. Westfield, thanked staff for Blue Skies Coalition consideration.
• Dick Eckhoff, 30 E. Oak, spoke re: Item 21, Skate Park.

CLOSED SESSION

12a. CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO: 1-GOVERNMENT CODE § 54957.6 – CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR, AGENCY NEGOTIATOR: DARREL PYLE. EMPLOYEE GROUP: PORTERVILLE CITY FIREFIGHTERS ASSOCIATION; 2-GOVERNMENT CODE § 54956.8 – CONFERENCE WITH
3-GOVERNMENT CODE § 54956.9(c) – CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION: TWO CASES.
4-GOVERNMENT CODE § 54957 – PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION – TITLE: CITY MANAGER

OTHER MATTERS

• Council Member Hamilton called for a study session on the RDA Report.
• Council Member Hamilton clarified that the Nuchols’ contract and how they got there would be brought back to the Council.

Council adjourned to Closed Session at 10:40 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT - at 11:30 p.m. to the meeting of February 17, 2004

________________________

Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor

________________________

Georgia Hawley, Deputy City Clerk
By: Luisa Herrera
SUBJECT: CLAIM - KIMBERLY MARTIN

SOURCE: Administrative Services Department/City Clerk Division

COMMENT: Kimberly Martin has filed a claim against the City for damages. Ms. Martin is claiming that a City refuse driver fatally ran over her dog on January 3, 2004, while on her property at 812 W. Tomah Avenue.

The amount being claimed as of the date of the claim is $1,500.00, based on cost of burial in a pet cemetery, and pain and suffering of the family.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Council reject said claim, and refer the matter to the City's insurance adjustor, and direct the City Clerk to give the claimant proper notification.

ATTACHMENT: Claim
CLAIM AGAINST
City of Porterville - Refuse Dept.

Kimberly Martin
S.S. # 571-60-3317

Claimant's Date of Birth: 3-17-79
Telephone # ( ) NO PHONE

Claimant's Address: 812 W. Toman Ave.

Address where Notices about Claim are to be sent, if different from above:
SAME AS ABOVE

Date of Incident/Accident/Arrest: January 8, 2003, 12:30 pm (approx.)

Date Injuries, Damages or Losses were discovered: January 8, 2003

Location of Incident/Accident/Arrest: 812 W. Toman Ave, Porterville

What did Entity or Employee do to cause this Loss, Damage or Injury?
Trash man ran over our dog on our property. Our dog suffered from her injuries for approx. 20 min. She then died.

What are the Names of the Entity's Employees who caused this Injury, Damage or Loss (if known)?
Unsure of trash man's name. His supervisor is Jose Lopez. Damages resulting were fatal.

What specific Injuries, Damages or Losses did Claimant receive?
Loss of family pet we had for 5 years.

We are asking the City for $1,500.00

How was this amount calculated (please itemize)?
$1,000 cost of burial in Pet Cemetery. $500.00 for having to bury her on our property.

Date Signed: 1/11/03
Signature: Kimberly Martin

If signed by Representative:
Representative's Name
Address
Telephone #
Relationship to Claimant
and dig her back up for proper burial. Also for the suffering our children have gone through and are still going through for the loss of the dog they have had nearly all their lives. We strongly believe the driver of the trash truck was very negligent in his driving having hit her on our property, then not even stopping to let us know he had hit her. We had to chase the driver several blocks from from where he had originally hit our dog.
SUBJECT: AUTHORIZATION TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS - DEVELOPMENT OF WATER WELL TEST HOLES

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Field Services Division

COMMENT: The Project Manual has been prepared for drilling exploratory test holes at various locations throughout the city. The purpose of drilling exploratory test holes is to verify water quality and quantity for future well development. It is anticipated that three to four test holes will be initially drilled with the option of extending the contract into the next fiscal year, budget permitting.

The Project Manual is available for review in Public Works Department - Engineering Division.

Funds for this project were approved in the City’s 03/04 Annual Capital Improvements Budget from Developer Fees.

Recommendation: That City Council:

1. Approve the Project Manual; and

2. Authorize staff to advertise for bids on the project.

Attachment: Locator Map

Y:\Engineering\Council Items\Authorization to Advertise for Bids - Development of Water Well Test Holes

Item No. 3
SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT - DESIGN AND INSPECTION SERVICES FOR WELL NO 28 AND FOUR FUTURE WELLS

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: The construction of a new municipal water well located on the west side of “F” Street, north of Gibbons Avenue and adjacent to the southerly boundary of the WalMart Distribution Center was approved by City Council during the adoption of the 2003/2004 Annual Budget. Request for Proposals were issued to a number of consultants, including all the local consultants, for the design of the subject municipal water well and for inspection services during the construction phase. The proposal also included the same services for four (4) future municipal water well projects.

On November 21, 2003 staff received four (4) proposals for design and inspection services for the Water Well No. 28 Project and four (4) future municipal water projects. The new municipal water well and future wells are in accordance with the 2001 Water System Master Plan. With the construction of this well, the City will still be in need of approximately six (6) to ten (10) new water wells in order to satisfy the City’s peak demands, standby production, and for the anticipated growth within Porterville.

Staff received proposals from Roberts Engineering, Quad Knopf, Provost & Pritchard, Inc. and Dee Jaspar & Associates. These consulting firms were interviewed by staff in accordance with the revised “Policy for Selecting Consultants to Provide Architectural, Engineering and Similar Services”. The anticipated fee for this project was between $30,000 and $50,000, and therefore the City’s Semiformal Selection Process was utilized. The policy also directs that City Council must authorize the execution of a Professional Service Contract for a fee within this range. Dee Jaspar & Associates ranked the highest by staff mainly because of their vast experience in municipal water well and agricultural water system design. The firm also illustrated a high level of documented inspection services during critical stages of well drilling and construction. Sub consultants include Dr. Kenneth Schmidt (Groundwater Hydro-geology) and Electrical Power Systems (electrical control components). Eighty percent of the firm’s work is in the field of water engineering, and of that eighty percent, seventy-five percent is in municipal water engineering including water treatment.

Dir _____ Appropriated/Funded _____ CM _____

RECOMMENDATION: That City Council:
1. Authorize the Mayor to execute the “Service Agreement” for the Well No. 28 Project, to the firm of Dee Jaspar & Associates at an agreed fee of $38,792.00; and

2. Authorize progress payments up to 100% of the fee amount and authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen costs.

ATTACHMENT: Service Agreement
Locator Map
SERVICE AGREEMENT

DATE: February 17, 2004

PARTIES: City of Porterville, a California municipal corporation, hereinafter referred to as "CITY"; and Dee Jaspar & Associates, Inc., hereinafter referred to as "CONSULTANT".

RECITALS:
CITY has undertaken a project on which it is seeking assistance from CONSULTANT. Said project which will hereinafter be referred to as "project" is described as follows:

Project Name: Water Well No. 28 and four future Wells

Description of Project: Preparation of construction plans, project manual and partial inspection services for the construction of water pumping plant known as Well No. 87. Well No. 28 is located on the west side of "F" Street, north of Gibbons Avenue and adjacent to the southerly boundary of the WalMart Distribution Center. This service agreement also includes the provision for consultant to provide same services for four future municipal water wells projects.

AGREEMENTS:
IN CONSIDERATION OF MUTUAL COVENANTS AND AGREEMENTS HEREAFTER set forth the parties hereto do contract and agree as follows:

SECTION 1. CONTRACT SERVICES: CONSULTANT hereby agrees to provide the following services and materials, in a timely manner as described in Exhibit "A", Scope of Services, in connection with the above described project.
SECTION 2. PAYMENT: In consideration for said services and materials, CITY shall pay CONSULTANT on a time and materials basis, not to exceed Thirty Eight Thousand, Seven Hundred and Ninety Two Dollars, ($38,792.00) (refer to attached fee schedule, if used.)

TIME OF PAYMENT: Progress payment requests shall be submitted by the 25th of each month. CONSULTANT should receive payment within 30 days of the date the bill is received.

SECTION 3. COMPLETION DATE: The services to be performed by CONSULTANT will be commenced upon execution of this agreement and all "work directives" shall be completed by ____________.

The parties agree that time is of the essence under this contract. Inasmuch as it would be difficult to ascertain the actual amount of damages sustained by delay in performance of said contract, the amount of $100.00 per calendar day shall be deducted from the contract price for liquidated damages for each calendar day beyond the completion date listed above. Said deduction will not be made if CONSULTANT submits proof in writing that delay in completion was due to a cause beyond its control.

SECTION 4. FAMILIARITY WITH PROJECT: CONSULTANT certifies and agrees that it is fully familiar with all of the details of the project required to perform its services. CONSULTANT agrees it will not rely upon any opinions and representations of CITY unless CITY is the only available source of said information.
SECTION 5. INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR: It is expressly understood that CONSULTANT is entering into this contract and will provide all services and materials required hereunder as an independent contractor and not as an employee of CITY. CONSULTANT specifically warrants that it will have in full force and effect, valid insurance covering:

(i) Full liability under worker’s compensation laws of the State of California; and

(ii) Bodily injury and property damage insurance in the amount not less than Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($500,000) per occurrence; and

(iii) Errors and Omissions insurance of Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($500,000) minimum per occurrence, if deductible for Errors and Omissions insurance is Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000) or more, the City may require a Surety Bond for the deductible; and

(iv) Automotive liability in the amount not less than Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($500,000) per occurrence; fully protecting CITY, its elected and appointed officers, employees, agents and assigns, against all claims arising from the negligence of CONSULTANT and any injuries to third parties, including employees of CITY and CONSULTANT. CONSULTANT agrees to indemnify, defend (at CITY’S election), and hold harmless the CITY against any claims, actions or
demands against CITY, and against any damages, liabilities for personal injury or death or for loss or damage to property, or any of them arising out of negligence of CONSULTANT or any of its employees or agents.

SECTION 6. WORKMANSHIP AND MATERIALS: Every part of the work herein described shall be executed in a professional manner with competent, experienced personnel. Finished or unfinished material prepared under the agreement, prepared by CONSULTANT, shall become property of CITY. CONSULTANT hereby warrants that any materials prepared under this agreement shall be fit for the intended use contemplated by the parties.

SECTION 7. ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACT: It is acknowledged by the parties that CITY has entered into this contract with the express understanding that all work will be performed by CONSULTANT. CONSULTANT shall not, without the written consent of CITY, assign, transfer or sublet any portion or part of this work, nor assign any payments to others.

SECTION 8. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: CONSULTANT will not discriminate against any employee, or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, gender, marital status, or national origin.

SECTION 9. CONFLICT TO INTEREST CODE: CONSULTANT agrees to comply with the regulations of CITY’S “Conflict of Interest Code”. Said code is in accordance with the requirements of the Political Reform Act of 1974. CONSULTANT covenants that it presently has no interest, and shall
not have any interest, direct or indirect, which would conflict in any manner with the performance of service required hereunder. The term "conflict" shall include, as a minimum, the definition of a "conflict of interest" under the California Fair Political Practices Act and the City of Porterville Conflict of Interest Code, as that term is applied to consultants.

SECTION 10. TERMINATION: This contract may be terminated by either party for just cause by giving seven (7) days written notice to the other party. Upon termination by CITY, CITY shall be relieved of any obligation to pay for work not completed including profit and overhead. CONSULTANT may be entitled to just and equitable compensation for satisfactory work completed, except CITY can withhold damages incurred as a result of the termination.

SECTION 11. ENTIRE CONTRACT: It is understood and agreed that this Service Agreement represents the entire Agreement between the parties. Should it be necessary to institute legal proceedings to enforce any and all of the covenants and conditions of this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to recover attorneys' fees and costs.

SECTION 12. DISPUTES; VENUE: If either party initiates an action to enforce the terms hereof or declare rights hereunder, the parties agree that the venue thereof shall be the County of Tulare, State of California. CONSULTANT hereby waives any rights it might have to remove any such action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 394.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Service Agreement on the date and year first above written.

CITY OF PORTERVILLE

By __________________________
Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor

Date _______________________

CONSULTANT

By __________________________
Dee Jaspar, Dee Jaspar & Associates, Inc.

Date _______________________

HLH:vs
SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT – HOCKETT AND DIVISION PARKING LOT – DOWNTOWN PARKING PROJECT

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

COMMENT: On February 10, 2004, staff received nine (9) bids for the Hockett and Division Parking Lot – Downtown Parking Project. The bids received are as follows:

Central Valley Asphalt
Lindsay, CA
$179,126.50

Mitch Brown Construction Inc.
Porterville, CA
$179,335.57

Halopoff & Sons, Inc.
Porterville, CA
$184,175.70

Mike Mauldin Construction
Selma, CA
$201,887.90

Hoffman Engineering/Const., Inc.
Tulare, CA
$219,870.23

R. J. Berry Jr., Inc.
Selma, CA
$228,217.60

American Paving Co.
Fresno, CA
$234,755.10

Lee’s Paving Inc.
Visalia, CA
$271,142.51

Garcia Paving Co. Inc.
Fresno, CA
$275,238.99

The engineer’s estimate for this project was $183,000.00. The low bid from Central Valley Asphalt came in at approximately .0212% below the engineer’s estimate.
Staff has found the low bid acceptable. This project will be funded through the Central Valley Infrastructure Grant Program (AB31).

RECOMMENDATION: That the council:

1. Award the Hockett and Division Parking Lot – Downtown Parking Project to Central Valley Asphalt in the amount of $179,126.50;
2. Authorize progress payments up to 90% of the contract amount; and
3. Authorize a 10% contingency to cover unforeseen construction costs.

ATTACHMENT: Locator Map
SUBJECT: ACCEPTANCE OF APPRAISED VALUE OF RIGHT OF WAY FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT APN NO. 245-060-026 - FIRST CHURCH OF GOD - HENDERSON AVENUE STREET CONSTRUCTION PROJECT

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: The First Church of God in Porterville Inc., owner of a property located at APN No. 245-060-026, have accepted the appraised value of $300.00 for the 84.07 square feet of right-of-way located at 1970 W. Henderson Avenue.

The City recently had the property appraised by Timothy J. Simon, MAI, a Certified General Real Estate Appraiser. The appraisal came in at $300.00 for the 84.07 square feet needed for the project. This appraisal is available in the Community Development Department for your review.

This acquisition is a requirement for the Henderson Avenue street construction project.

RECOMMENDATION: That City Council:
1. Authorize staff to make payment to First Church of God, owner of the property, in the amount of $300.00; and
2. Accept the Grant Deed and authorize staff to record with the County Recorder.

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Right-Of-Way Take Map
2. Grant Deed
3. Resolution

DD__ APPROPRIATED/FUNDED__ CM__

ITEM NO. 6
First Church of God in Porterville, Inc. a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California, does hereby GRANT to the CITY OF PORTERVILLE, a Municipal Corporation all that real property in the City of Porterville, County of Tulare, State of California, described as:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atlas Sheet</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Street/Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21S</td>
<td>27E</td>
<td>Henderson Ave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The grantor further understands that the present intention of the grantee is to construct and maintain a public street and underground utilities on the lands hereby conveyed in fee and the grantor, for the grantor and the grantor's successors and assigns, hereby waives any claims for any and all damages to grantor's remaining property contiguous to the property hereby conveyed by reason of the location, construction, landscaping or maintenance of said street.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, said corporation has caused its corporate name to be hereunto subscribed and its corporate seal to be affixed hereto, this 28th day of January, 2004.

[Signature]
President
First Church of God in Porterville, Inc.

[Signature]
Vice President
First Church of God in Porterville, Inc.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

County of

On this the 28th day of January 2004, before me, Vickie Schulz, Notary Public, personally appeared Thomas Boone and Stephan McCracken, Name(s) of Signer(s)

☐ personally known to me
☒ proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Vickie Schulz
(Notary Public's signature in and for said County and State)

PERSONAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Vickie Schulz, Notary Public, acknowledges that the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

VICKIE SCHULZ
Commission # 1431940
Notary Public - California
Tulare County

(for notary seal or stamp)
RESOLUTION NO. ________

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE ACCEPTING A GRANT DEED IN FEE FOR PUBLIC STREET AND UNDERGROUND UTILITIES PURPOSES FROM FIRST CHURCH OF GOD IN PORTERVILLE, Inc.(Corporation)

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Porterville, that the City of Porterville hereby accepts a Grant Deed in fee from First Church of God in Porterville, Inc., for public street and underground utility purposes, in the City of Porterville, County of Tulare, State of California, to-wit:

See Exhibit “A” and Exhibit “B” attached hereto and made a part thereof.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the purchase price of $300.00 is hereby approved with the City to open escrow account, pay the normal and customary escrow fees, authorize Mayor to sign all necessary documents, and said deed to be recorded in the office of the Tulare County Recorder. The foregoing has been accepted by the City Council for the City of Porterville.

___________________________
Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor

ATTEST:

John Longley, City Clerk

By: Georgia Hawley, Deputy
EXHIBIT “A”

That portion of Parcel No. 1 of Parcel Map No. 122, in the County of Tulare, State of California, as per map recorded in Book 2 of Parcel Maps, at Page 22, Tulare County Records, lying Southwesterly of a 20.00 foot radius curve concave Northeasterly, said curve being tangent to the West line of said Parcel No. 1 and tangent to the North line of the 17.00 foot dedication lying along the South line of said Parcel No. 1.

APN: 245-060-026
FIRST CHURCH OF GOD
A.P.N. 245-060-026

ADDITIONAL RIGHT OF WAY
TO BE ACQUIRED —
84.07 SQ. FT.
SUBJECT: ACCEPTANCE OF APPRAISED VALUE OF RIGHT OF WAY FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT APN NO. 260-320-026 - SEQUOIA APPAREL, INC. - JAYE STREET PROJECT

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: Sequoia Apparel Inc., owner of a property located at APN No. 260-320-026, have accepted the appraised value of $6,000.00 for the 2,160 square feet of right-of-way located at 580 S. Jaye Street.

The City recently had the property appraised by Timothy J. Simon, MAI, a Certified General Real Estate Appraiser. The appraisal came in at $6,000.00 for the 2,160 square feet needed for the project. This appraisal is available in the Community Development Department for your review.

This acquisition is a requirement for the Jaye Street project.

RECOMMENDATION: That City Council:

1. Authorize staff to begin escrow, with the City paying escrow fees;
2. Authorize staff to make payment to Sequoia Apparel Inc. in the amount of $6,000.00 after completion of escrow;
3. Authorize the Mayor to sign all necessary documents; and
4. Authorize staff to record all documents with the County Recorder.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Right-Of-Way Take Map
2. Grant Deed
3. Resolution

DD_____ APPROPRIATED/FUNDED_____ CM_____ ITEM NO. _7_
RIGHT OF WAY AQUISITION
AT THE N.E. COR. OF
JAYE ST. & SPRINGVILLE AVE.

COURSE DIST.
1 N 01°13'01" E 34.34'
2 S 44°18'01" E 31.31'
3 S 89°49'12" E 102.68'
4 N 89°49'12" W 193.47'

CURVE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RADIUS</th>
<th>DELTA</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>TANGENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>19°56'54&quot;</td>
<td>34.82'</td>
<td>17.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>19°56'54&quot;</td>
<td>34.82'</td>
<td>17.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APN
250-320-26

PROP R/W
RIGHT OF WAY AQUISITION 2,160 S.F.

SPRINGVILLE AVE
N 89°49'12" W
RECORDING REQUESTED BY
AND WHEN RECORDED MAIL THIS
DEED AND TAX STATEMENTS TO:

City of Porterville
291 N. Main St.
Porterville, CA 93258

GRANT DEED
(CORPORATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atlas Sheet</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Street/Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jaye Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEQUOIA APPAREL, INC., a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of CALIFORNIA, does hereby GRANT to the CITY OF PORTERVILLE, a Municipal Corporation all that real property in the City of Porterville, County of Tulare, State of California, described as:

That portion of Lot 60 of Pleasant Grove Tract situated in the Southeast quarter of Section 35, Township 21 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, in the City of Porterville, County of Tulare, State of California, as shown on map filed in Book 9 of Maps, at page 1 in the Office of the County Recorder of said County, more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING AT the South quarter corner of said Section 35;

THENCE, North 00° 24' 26" East, along the west line of said Southeast quarter, a distance of 1350.45 feet;

THENCE, South 89° 35' 34" East, a distance of 74.04 feet, to a point of intersection with the easterly line of the land conveyed to the County of Tulare by Deed dated January 21, 1965 and recorded February 3, 1965 in Book 2657, page 55, File No. 4928, Official Records and the southerly line of said Lot 60 (northerly right of way line of Springville Avenue), said point of intersection being the POINT OF BEGINNING;
THENCE, North 01° 13' 01" East, along the said easterly line, a distance of 34.34 feet;

THENCE, South 44° 18' 01" East, a distance of 31.31 feet, to a point being 12.00 feet Northerly, measured at right angles, of the southerly line of said Lot 60;

THENCE, South 89° 49' 12" East, along a line parallel with the said southerly line, a distance of 102.68 feet, to the beginning of a curve, concave Southwesterly, having a radius of 100.00 feet;

THENCE, Easterly and Southeasterly along said curve, through a central angle of 19° 56' 54", an arc length of 34.82 feet, to a point of reverse curvature, concaveNortheasterly, having a radius of 100.00 feet;

THENCE, Southeasterly and Easterly along said curve, through a central angle of 19° 56' 54", an arc length of 34.82 feet, to a point in the southerly line of said Lot 60;

THENCE, North 89° 49' 12" West, along said southerly line, a distance of 193.47, to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING 2160 square feet, more or less

BASIS OF BEARINGS for the parcel described herein is the west line of the Southeast quarter of Section 35, Township 21 South, Range 27 East as shown on Record of Survey filed in Book, 21 of Licensed Surveys, at page 68 in the office of the County Recorder of the County of Tulare.

END OF DESCRIPTION

This real property description has been prepared by me, or under my direction, in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act.

Signature: 

Date: 1/9/04

[Stamp]
The grantor further understands that the present intention of the grantee is to construct and maintain a public street and underground utilities on the lands hereby conveyed in fee and the grantor, for the grantor and the grantor's successors and assigns, hereby waives any claims for any and all damages to grantor's remaining property contiguous to the property hereby conveyed by reason of the location, construction, landscaping or maintenance of said street.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, said corporation has caused its corporate name to be hereunto subscribed and its corporate seal to be affixed hereto, this 26th day of January, 2004.

By
Brian Acquafresca, President

By
Joe Acquafresca, Secretary

[CORPORATE SEAL]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

On this the 26th day of January, 2004, before me, Vickie Schulz Notary Public, personally appeared Brian Acquafresca, who is/are known to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Vickie Schulz
(Notary Public's signature in and for said County and State)

PERSOAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Name, Title of Officer E.G., "Jane Doe, Notary Public"

Name(s) of Signer(s)

VICKIE SCHULZ
Commission # 1631962
Notary Public - California
Tulare County

(for notary seal or stamp)
CALIFORNIA ALL-PURPOSE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

State of California
County of Alameda

On 1-28-04 before me, Vicki Schulz, Notary Public,

personally appeared Joseph Acquafresca

☐ personally known to me
☑ proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence

☐ to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed
the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or
the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

VICKIE SCHULZ
Commission # 1431940
Notary Public - California
Tulare County

Place Notary Seal Above

OPTIONAL

Though the information below is not required by law, it may prove valuable to persons relying on the document
and could prevent fraudulent removal and reattachment of this form to another document.

Description of Attached Document: Corporation Grant Deed

Document Date: 1-28-04 Number of Pages: 3

Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: Brian Acquafresca

Capacity(ies) Claimed by Signer

☐ Individual
☐ Corporate Officer — Title(s): ____________________________
☐ Partner — ☐ Limited ☐ General
☐ Attorney in Fact
☐ Trustee
☐ Guardian or Conservator
☐ Other: ____________________________

Signer is Representing: ____________________________

RIGHT THUMBPRINT
OF SIGNER
Top of thumb here
RESOLUTION NO. _________

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE ACCEPTING A GRANT DEED IN FEE FOR PUBLIC STREET AND UNDERGROUND UTILITIES PURPOSES FROM SEQUOIA APPAREL, INCORPORATED

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Porterville, that the City of Porterville hereby accepts a Grant Deed in fee from Sequoia Apparel, Incorporated, for public street and underground utility purposes, in the City of Porterville, County of Tulare, State of California, to-wit:

See Exhibit “A” attached hereto and made a part thereof.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the purchase price of $6000 is hereby approved with the City to open escrow account, pay the normal and customary escrow fees, authorize Mayor to sign all necessary documents, and said deed to be recorded in the office of the Tulare County Recorder. The foregoing has been accepted by the City Council for the City of Porterville.

______________________________
Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor

ATTEST:

John Longley, City Clerk

By: Georgia Hawley, Deputy
RIGHT OF WAY AQUISITION
AT THE N.E. COR. OF
JAYE ST. & SPRINGVILLE AVE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>DIST.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N 01°13'01&quot; E</td>
<td>34.34'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 44°18'01&quot; E</td>
<td>31.31'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 89°49'12&quot; E</td>
<td>102.68'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 89°49'12&quot; W</td>
<td>193.47'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CURVE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RADIUS</th>
<th>DELTA</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>TANGENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>19°56'54&quot;</td>
<td>34.82'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>19°56'54&quot;</td>
<td>34.82'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APN
260-320-26

PROP R/W
RIGHT OF WAY AQUISITION 2,160 S.F.

SPRINGVILLE AVE
N 89°49'12" W

RW

RW

RW

RW

RW

RW

RW

RW

RW

RW

RW

RW

RW

RW

RW

RW
SUBJECT:  AUTHORIZATION FOR CITY MANAGER TO ENDORSE INSURANCE CHECK FOR FIRST TIME LOW INCOME HOMEBUYER PARTICIPANT

SOURCE:  COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

COMMENT: One of the City participants in the First Time Low Income Homebuyer Program, Juan Cordero, has requested that the City endorse the insurance check for $4,122.76 for water damage that occurred in his home in January when a pipe broke under the cement. The check is for the floor and rug replacement. Since the estimates for the repair work was over $5,000, the Centre Insurance Company is required to issue the check payable to the homeowner and the holders of the deeds of trust, and therefore, all are required to endorse the check. Mr. Cordero sent the check to Florida to the first trust deed holder who endorsed the check and returned it to Mr. Cordero. The City, as the second trust deed holder, is now requested to endorse the check so that Mr. Cordero can pay for the repairs to his home. He and his family have been living at a motel since this incident happened.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Authorize the City Manager, as the representative for the City as second trust deed holder, to endorse the insurance check for $4,122.76 for water damage that occurred in the home of Mr. Juan Cordero, a participant in the First Time Low Income Homebuyer Program; and

2. Authorize the City Manager, as the representative for the City, to endorse any future insurance checks that include the City as the payee for a claim payment for property damage to houses that are part of the City’s First Time Low Income Homebuyer Program.

ATTACHMENTS:  1. Copy of the insurance check
                2. Copy of ZC Sterling Insurance Agency Correspondence

DD Approp./Funded CM ITEM NO. 8
Pay FOUR THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED TWENTY-TWO AND 76/100 DOLLARS

$4,122.76

To The Order Of
Cordero, Juan A. & Wachovia Bank
& City of Porterville Comm. Dev.
1040 N. Greenfield Drive
Porterville, CA 93257

SunTrust Bank
919 E. Main St, Richmond, VA 23219

Claim Number: 04-50038
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Attachment No. 1
February 4, 2004

Juan A. Cordero
1040 N. Greenfield Dr
Porterville, CA 93257

RE: Our Claim #: 04-50038
    Date of Loss: 1/1/2004
    Type of Loss: Water
    Policy #: ZHO 538438-2
    Property Location: same as above

Dear Mr. Cordero:

This is to advise of the status of your claim. Currently, we are awaiting the final estimates from Dan Potter of Claim Adjustment Specialists. Once this has been received you will be contacted and the settlement discussed. We expect to receive this soon and appreciate your patience in the matter.

Should you have any questions or wish for us to reopen this claim please feel free to call me at 1-800-822-2997 ext. 2747 during regular business hours.

Sincerely,
ZC Sterling Insurance Agency, Inc.,
Program Manager for Centre Insurance Company

Miles Moody
Claims Representative
SUBJECT: APPROVAL TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT FOR THE REMOVAL OF ENCROACHING STRUCTURES AT THE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITY CENTER SITE

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

COMMENT: At the February 3, 2004 City Council meeting, Council approved the purchase of approximately 16.5 acres from the Porterville Unified School District (PUSD) for the construction of a Neighborhood Community Center. Upon execution of the purchase agreement, staff opened escrow on the property and anticipates escrow to close in mid-March 2004.

Over the course of project planning, it has become evident that a number of the adjacent property owners have erected structures that are encroaching into the project area. Staff has been in contact with the property owners of those parcels regarding encroachments. The majority of neighboring property owners have removed the encroaching structures, however a few structures are remaining. PUSD has agreed to enter into an agreement to allow the City to begin enforcing removal of the encroaching structures while the property is in escrow. The term of the agreement shall continue until such time as the purchase of the property has closed escrow.

Significant terms and conditions of the agreement are:

- The City will undertake, at no risk or expense to PUSD, removal of any and all structures encroaching onto the property.
- The term of the Agreement will continue until such time as the purchase of the property has closed escrow.
- City agrees to pay all expenses arising out of the removal of encroachments.

The agreement is an interim measure that will allow the City to move forward with site preparation prior to commencement of construction. Staff estimates removal of encroaching structures could cost up to $20,000. Funding would be through the Section 108 Loan Guarantee and would be recovered by placing liens upon the property. However, with the authority granted in this agreement, it is Staff’s intention to encourage property owners to undertake the removal efforts. If the desired results are not achieved, staff will request bids for demolition and present to City Council for authorization.
RECOMMENDATION: That City Council approve the agreement regarding removal of encroaching structures at the Santa Fe School/Neighborhood Community Center Joint Project site and authorize the Mayor to sign all necessary documents

Attachments: 1) Agreement
AGREEMENT REGARDING REMOVAL OF ENCROACHING STRUCTURES AT SANTA FE SCHOOL/NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITY CENTER JOINT PROJECT SITE

THIS AGREEMENT is entered into this _____ day of ________________, 2004, between the PORTERVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, referred to as PUSD, and the CITY OF PORTERVILLE, referred to as CITY, with reference to the following:

A. WHEREAS, property located along Orange Avenue between “A” Street and Plano Street, is currently owned, and maintained by PUSD; and

B. WHEREAS, CITY has initiated the process of purchasing from PUSD, an approximately 16 acre site on the west side of the property, which is currently owned by PUSD. Said purchase is anticipated to be completed by March of 2004; and

C. WHEREAS, CITY is interested in the removal of those structures which currently encroach onto the property prior to the completion of the purchase to facilitate said construction of a Neighborhood Community Center.

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS AGREED:

1. PUSD authorizes CITY to undertake, at no risk or expense to PUSD, removal of any and all structures encroaching onto the property currently owned by PUSD. The specific area is more particularly identified in Exhibit “A” which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

2. CITY agrees to remove said encroachments in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and CITY’s laws, regulations and directives. CITY shall apply all applicable notifications and other controls required by state and local laws, regulations and ordinances.

3. CITY agrees that no authorization, oversight, input or requirement other than the authority conferred by this Agreement shall be necessary from the PUSD.

4. The term of this Agreement is indefinite and shall continue until such time as the referenced segment of the property is purchased by CITY. The indemnity provisions contained in paragraph 6 of this Agreement shall continue in full force and effect
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beyond expiration by purchase of the property or termination of this Agreement by any other means.

5. CITY hereby agrees to pay all expenses arising out of the removal of encroachments and hereby waives any claim against the PUSD for any cost of removal of said encroachments.

6. From and after the execution of this Agreement, CITY shall have all responsibility and liability for all activities and omissions related to the removal of encroachments from the property, and CITY shall hold harmless, defend and indemnify PUSD, its agents, officers and employees from and against any liability, claims, actions, costs, damages or losses of any kind, including, but not limited to court cost and attorney fees, death or injury to any person and/or damage to any property (including PUSD property), arising out of or related to said removal of encroachments by CITY, its agents, officers, independent contractors, developers and employees. CITY specifically agrees to hold harmless, defend and indemnify PUSD for any and all claims arising out of PUSD'S waiver of PUSD'S actions or omissions by CITY in connection with any permit or other discretionary permit issued by CITY to facilitate this Agreement. This indemnification obligation shall continue beyond the term of this Agreement or any extension of this Agreement. CITY shall maintain adequate insurance coverage, either through policies issued by insurance companies or through self insurance reserves, to provide said indemnity to the PUSD.

7. CITY shall maintain complete and accurate records with respect to all works of improvement authorized by this Agreement.

8. This Agreement represents the entire agreement between CITY and PUSD as to its subject matter and no prior oral or written understanding shall be of any force or effect. No part of this Agreement may be modified without the written consent of both parties.
9. Except as may be otherwise required by law, any notice to be given shall be written and shall be either personally delivered, sent by facsimile transmission or sent by first class mail, postage prepaid and addressed as follows:

PUSD: Superintendent
Porterville Unified School District
600 W. Grand Avenue
Porterville, CA 93257

(Fax No.: (559) 793-2455 / Phone No. (559) 781-8386)

CITY: City Manager
291 N. Main Street
Porterville, CA 93257

(Fax No.: (559) 781-6437 / Phone No. (559) 782-7460)

Notice delivered personally or sent by facsimile transmission is deemed to be received upon receipt. Notice sent by first class mail shall be deemed received on the fourth day after the date of mailing. Either party may change the above address by giving written notice pursuant to this paragraph.

10. This Agreement reflects the contributions of both parties and accordingly the provisions of Civil Code Section 1654 shall not apply to address and interpret any uncertainty.

11. Unless specifically set forth, the parties to this Agreement do not intend to provide any other party with any benefit or enforceable legal or equitable right or remedy.

12. The failure of either party to insist on strict compliance with any provision of this Agreement shall not be considered a waiver of any right to do so, whether for that breach or any subsequent breach. The acceptance by either party of either performance or payment shall not be considered to be a waiver of any preceding breach of the Agreement by the other party.

13. The Recitals and the Exhibits to this Agreement are fully incorporated into and are integral parts of this Agreement.

14. This Agreement is subject to all applicable laws and regulations. If any provision of this Agreement is found by any court of other legal authority, or is agreed by the
parties, to be in conflict with any code or regulation governing its subject, the
conflicting provision shall be considered null and void. If the effect of nullifying any
conflicting provision is such that a material benefit of the Agreement to either party is
lost, the Agreement may be terminated at the option of the affected party. In all other
cases the remainder of the Agreement shall continue in full force and effect.

15. Each party agrees to execute any additional documents and to perform any further
acts which may be reasonably required to effect the purposes of this Agreement.

16. CITY expressly agrees that it will not discriminate in employment or in the provision
of services on the basis of any characteristic or condition upon which discrimination is
prohibited by state or federal law or regulation.

THE PARTIES, having read and considered the above provisions, indicate their
agreement by their authorized signatures below.

PORTERVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

BY

John Snively, Superintendent

CITY OF PORTERVILLE

BY

Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor

Approved as to Form
City Attorney

BY __________________________

ATTEST: John Longley
City Clerk
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Parcel 1 - City Portion (except School Parking Lot)

That portion of the Northwest quarter of Section 36, Township 21 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, in the City of Porterville, County of Tulare, State of California described as follows:

Commencing at the point of intersection of the Northeasterly line of Orange Avenue with the East line of Wallace Street said Northeasterly line of Orange Avenue being a 450.28 foot radius curve concave to the Southwest, the radial line through said point of intersection bears North 13°50'20" East;

Thence, North 00°58'50" East, 12.91 feet along said East line of Wallace Street to a point in a 579.00 foot radius non-tangent curve, concave to the South, a radial to said point bears North 12°37'07" East, said point being the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING of the parcel to be described;

Thence, Easterly, along said curve, through a central angle of 13°00'05", an arc distance of 131.38 feet, to the beginning of a 90.67 foot radius compound curve, concave to the Southwest, a radial to said beginning bears North 25°37'12" East;

Thence, South Easterly, along said curve, through a central angle of 24°29'08" an arc distance of 38.75 feet, to the beginning of a 90.67 foot radius reverse curve, concave to the Northeast, a radial to said beginning bears South 50°06'20" West;

Thence, South Easterly, along said curve, through a central angle of 17°55'24" an arc distance of 28.36 feet, to the beginning of a 567.00 foot radius reverse curve, concave to the Southwest, a radial to said beginning bears North 32°10'56" East;

Thence, South Easterly, along said curve, through a central angle of 10°10'52" an arc distance of 100.75 feet;

Thence, tangent to said curve, South 47°38'12" East, 10.78 feet;

Thence, North 40°33'11" East, 86.80 feet;

Thence, North 49°26'49" West, 141.91 feet;

Thence, North 40°33'11" East, 156.95 feet;

Thence, North 04°26'49" West, 45.21 feet;

Thence, North 40°33'11" East, 36.20 feet;

Thence, South 85°33'11" West, 91.51 feet;

Thence, North 49°26'49" West, 44.73 feet;

Thence, North 29°02'14" East, 206.52 feet;
Thence, North 38°31'29" East, 187.65 feet to a point in the West line of Parcel 1 of Parcel Map No. 3371 per map recorded in Book 34, page 73 of Parcel Maps in the Office of the County recorder of said County, said point being North 00°06'48" West, 32.00 feet of the Southwest corner of said Parcel 1;

Thence, North 00°06'48" West, 497.67 feet along the West line of said Parcel 1 and the most Northerly East line of Parcel 2 of said Parcel Map No. 3371 to the most Northerly Northeast corner of said Parcel 2;

Thence, South 89°53'14" West, 515.73 feet along the North line of said Parcel 2 and along the South line of Parcel 1 of Parcel Map No. 2207 per map recorded in Book 23, page 8 of Parcel Maps in the Office of the County Recorder of said County, to the Southwest corner of Parcel 1 of said Parcel Map No. 2207 said Southwest corner being the beginning of a 1810.08 foot radius non-tangent curve, concave to the East, a radial to said beginning bears South 85°48'03" West;

Thence, Northerly, along the West line of Parcel 1 of said Parcel Map No. 2207 and along said curve, through a central angle of 04°07'06" an arc distance of 130.11 feet;

Thence, tangent to said curve, North 02°04'51" West, 190.34 feet to the Northwest corner of Parcel 1 of said parcel Map No. 2207;

Thence, South 89°51'03" West, 176.76 feet along the South line of Olive Avenue to a point in the West line of the Northwest quarter of the Northwest quarter of said Section 36;

Thence, South 01°12'49" West, 1025.73 feet to the Southwest corner of the Northeast quarter of the Northwest quarter of said Section 36, said point also being the Northwest corner of Parcel 1 of Parcel Map No. 2391 per map recorded in Book 24, page 92 of Parcel Maps in the Office of the County Recorder of said County;

Thence, South 01°04'26" West, 60.30 feet to an angle point in the West and Southwesterly line of Parcel 1 of said Parcel Map No. 2391;

Thence, South 46°57'44" East, 311.66 feet along the Southwesterly line of Parcel 1 of said Parcel Map No. 2391 to a point in the West line of Wallace Street;

Thence, North 00°59'46" East, 15.73 feet along the West line of Wallace Street;

Thence, South 49°12'16" East, 103.87 feet to a point in the East line of Wallace Street;

Thence, South 00°58'50" West, 11.59 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

The Basis of Bearings for the purpose of this description is South 89°25'17" East, for the South line of the Northwest quarter of said Section 36 as shown on the Record of Survey recorded in Book 21, page 68 of Licensed Surveys, Tulare County Records.
Parcel 2 - School Parking Lot

That portion of the Northwest quarter of Section 36, Township 21 South, Range 27 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, in the City of Porterville, County of Tulare, State of California described as follows:

Commencing at a point in the South line of Lot 11 in Block 3 of Cornell Addition per map recorded in Book 8, page 40 of Maps in the office of the County Recorder of said county, said point being S 89°00'02" E, 74.58 feet of the Southwest corner of said Lot 11;

Thence, N 47°38'12" W, 56.31 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING of the Parcel to be described;

Thence, continuing N 47°38'12" W, 448.10 feet;

Thence, N 40°33'11" E, 86.80 feet;

Thence, S 49°26'49" E, 56.49 feet to a point in a non-tangent 24.5 foot radius curve, concave to the South, a radial line through said point bears N 41°38'18" W;

Thence, Easterly along said 24.5 foot radius curve through a central angle of 82°11'29", an arc distance of 35.15 feet;

Thence, S 49°26'49" E, 75.00 feet;

Thence, N 40°33'11" E, 20.00 feet;

Thence, S 49°26'49" E, 129.09 feet to the beginning of a tangent 50.5 foot radius curve concave to the Southwest;

Thence, Southeasterly along said 50.5 foot radius curve, through a central angle of 45°00'16", an arc distance of 39.67 feet;

Thence, S 04°26'32" E, 180.06 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

The Basis of Bearings for the purpose of this description is South 89°25'17" East, for the South line of the Northwest quarter of said Section 36 as shown on the Record of Survey recorded in Book 21, page 68 of Licensed Surveys, Tulare County Records.
SUBJECT: RESCIND RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING THE LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT – PLANNING

COMMENT: During the course of reviewing and considering changes to the various committees the Community Development Department is involved with, the City Council acted to make certain modifications necessitating further action. On December 16, 2003, the City Council voted to eliminate the Long Range Planning Committee. Attached is a resolution rescinding Resolution No. 80-2001, which established the Long Range Planning Committee.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council adopt a resolution rescinding Resolution No. 80-2001, which established the Long Range Planning Committee.
RESOLUTION NO. ________

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 80-2001 WHICH ESTABLISHED
THE LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, On January 20, 2004, the City Council, after studying the matter,
voted to abolish the Long Range Planning Committee and directed staff to undertake the
necessary process to amend the City’s policies to reflect such abolishment;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council does hereby
rescind Resolution No. 80-2001 which established the Long Range Planning Committee.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this ____ day of _____.

__________________________
Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor

ATTEST:

John Longley, City Clerk

Georgia Hawley, Deputy City Clerk
SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF THE REVISED REASONABLY AVAILABLE CONTROL MEASURES (RACMs) FOR THE EXTREME AREA OZONE ATTAINMENT PLAN FOR THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AIR BASIN

SOURCE: Public Works Department - Engineering Division

COMMENT: The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has submitted a request to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin to be reclassified from “Severe” to “Extreme” non-attainment for the one (1) hour ozone standard. This designation will result in a November 15, 2010 attainment date for compliance.

The SJVAPCD must submit a revised “Extreme Area Attainment Plan” to the EPA later this year. The plan must demonstrate that attainment can be reached by the 2010 date above. This plan includes local measures known as RACMs that were adopted by each city in the basin during the “severe” classification process. The City of Porterville adopted its control measures on September 18, 2001 (Resolution #119-2001) and February 5, 2002 (Resolution #21-2002).

Tulare County Association of Governments has requested that all cities in Tulare County revise their previously approved RACM’s to meet the 2010 attainment date. The majority of revisions to the control measures by staff include changing stop dates from inclusive to non-inclusive such as “this measure will continue through 2010,” and stating that funding for measures is subject to availability.

RECOMMENDATION: That City Council adopt the attached resolution implementing the revised control measures identified in Exhibit “A”.

ATTACHMENT: Resolution Exhibit “A”
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Dir ___ Appropriated/Funded ___ CM ___ Item No. 11
RESOLUTION NO. __________

RESOLUTION FOR ADOPTION OF PORTERVILLE'S REVISED REASONABLY AVAILABLE CONTROL MEASURES FOR THE EXTREME AREA OZONE ATTAINMENT PLAN

WHEREAS, the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has requested the Environmental Protection Agency to re-designate the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin from “Severe” to “Extreme” non-attainment for the one (1) hour ozone standard; and

WHEREAS, the re-designation will give the SJVAPCD until November 15, 2010 to comply with the standard; and

WHEREAS, the Tulare County Association of Governments has requested all Tulare County Cities to revise their Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACMs) for Ozone Attainment to meet the 2010 attainment date;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Porterville to adopt the Revised Reasonably Available Control Measures for the Extreme Area Ozone Attainment Plan listed in the attachment document “Exhibit A”.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Porterville at a regularly scheduled meeting thereof on the 17th date of February, 2004.

________________________
Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor

ATTEST:

John Longley, City Clerk

By: Georgia Hawley, Deputy
EXHIBIT “A”
REASONABLY AVAILABLE CONTROL MEASURES
TO BE IMPLEMENTED BY THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE
FOR THE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 1.2

Measure Title: Transit Access to Porterville Municipal Airport

Measure Description: Provision of public transportation, i.e., demand response, to and from the Porterville Municipal Airport.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: The Public Transit Division for the City of Porterville through the contract transit provider, Sierra Management, is implementing this measure.

Implementation Schedule: This service is currently being provided by dial-a-ride and will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of this service will require no additional staff time. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure will be subject to availability from Caltrans Transit Funds.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: The Public Transit Division monitors the transit system contract with Sierra Management.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 1.6

Measure Title: Transit Improvements in Combination with Park-and-Ride Lot

Measure Description: Porterville will create a bus stop adjacent to the proposed new park-and-ride lot on the west side of Jaye Street adjacent to and south of the Tule River.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: The Public Transit Division of the City of Porterville will be responsible for implementing the new bus stop.

Implementation Schedule: An additional bus stop will be added by 2010 subject to available funding.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.005 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $250 plus the appropriate signs and curb painting at an estimated cost of $500 for a total cost of $750. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this project. The funding for this project will come from Caltrans Transit funds and is subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: The Public Transit Division will monitor this project.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 1.7

Measure Title: Free Transit During Special Events

Measure Description: Provision of a shuttle bus to and from the Sutton Iris Farm during the Iris Festival.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Porterville Chamber of Commerce.

Implementation Schedule: This is an annual event that is planned to continue at least through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.001 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $50. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budgets. The total estimated annual cost for providing this service is $500. The Porterville Chamber of Commerce provides this service at their expense and is subject to available funding.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: This program will be monitored by the Finance Department in connection with their issuance of the Civic Event Permit annually.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 1.9

Measure Title: Increase Parking at Transit Center

Measure Description: A new multi-modal transit center will be constructed next to an existing underutilized City parking lot.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: City of Porterville.

Implementation Schedule: The transit center has been constructed and will be continuous use through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to one and one half full-time employees, at an approximate cost of $75,000. This will be accomplished partly by current department personnel and by one part-time inspector paid out of the funding for the project. The estimated construction cost is $1,359,000 consisting of $1,235,000 in State Transportation Improvement Program funds and $124,000 in City funds.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: N/A
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 3.1

Measure Title: Commute Solutions

Measure Description: The City of Porterville will send letters to local employers, to whom
the Federal Commuter Choice Program applies, to inform them that they can help reduce ground
level ozone pollution by offering benefits to employees who choose to commute to work by
methods other than driving alone.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Employers in Porterville under the
authority defined in the Federal Commuter Choice Program.

Implementation Schedule: This measure is currently in process and will continue through
2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development
for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.004 full-time employee, at an approximate
cost of $200. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual
budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure will be subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: Once a year, the City Public Works Department will ask the local
employers, to whom the Federal Commuter Choice Program applies, what incentives they are
providing.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 3.2

Measure Title: Parking Cash-Out

Measure Description: The Public Works Department will send letters to local employers, to whom the State law applies, informing them that certain employers, who provide subsidized parking for their employees, are required by law to offer a cash allowance in lieu of a parking space.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Local employers to whom the State law applies.

Implementation Schedule: This measure is on-going through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.005 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $250. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure will be subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: Community Development Department will ask the local employers, to whom the State law applies, if they are offering the required cash allowances.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 3.3

Measure Title: Employer Rideshare Program Incentives.

Measure Description: The City will send letters to local employers urging them to offer incentives to their employees to encourage ridesharing.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Community Development Department.

Implementation Schedule: This measure is in process and will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.005 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $250. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure will be subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: The Community Development Department will monitor the program by asking the employers if they are offering ride share incentives once a year beginning in 2003.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 3.5 & TU 8.3

Measure Title: Preferential Parking for Carpools.

Measure Description: The City plans to provide preferential parking for carpools at its Field Services Division office.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Public Works Department - Field Services Division.

Implementation Schedule: A sign was posted in 2002 and will remain at this location through at least 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.005 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $200. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budgets will accomplish this. Funding for this measure will be subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: The Field Services Manager or his/her designee will enforce the use of the parking space.

Monitoring Program: Use of the parking space will be checked not less than weekly.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 3.9

Measure Title: Encourage Merchants and Employers to Subsidize the Cost of Transit for Employees.

Measure Description: The City will send letters to merchants and employers encouraging them to subsidize the cost of transit for their employees.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: The Community Development Department.

Implementation Schedule: The letters are being sent annually (beginning in 2002) and will continue through at least 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.005 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $250. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure will be subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: The Community Development Department will annually ask merchants and employers if they are subsidizing transit for their employees beginning in 2003.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 5.1 & 5.2

Measure Title: Develop Intelligent Transportation Systems & Traffic Signal Coordination.

Measure Description: Traffic Signal Coordination with Computer Controlled Settings that change during the day plus Traffic Signal Preemption for Emergency Vehicles.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Public Works Department.

Implementation Schedule: The schedule for completing this work is as follows:

TRAFFIC SIGNAL COORDINATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>EST. DATE OF COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morton Ave. from Newcomb St. to Second St.</td>
<td>March, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Ave. from Newcomb St. to Second St.</td>
<td>June, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Ave. from Newcomb St. to Indiana St.</td>
<td>June, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood St. from Olive Ave. to Henderson Ave.</td>
<td>February, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcomb St. from Olive Ave. to Henderson Ave.</td>
<td>February, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam Ave. from Porter Road to Plano St.</td>
<td>February, 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRAFFIC SIGNAL PREEMPTION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>EST. DATE OF COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Ave./Villa St. New Signal</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Ave./Main St. Conversion to Eight Phase</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Ave./Westwood St. New Signal</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam Ave./Villa St. New Signal</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Ave./Second St. New Signal</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam Ave./Jaye St. Conversion to Eight Phase</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Ave./Main St. New Signal</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Ave./Wallace St. Conversion to Eight Phase</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Ave./Jaye St.</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>EST. DATE OF COMPLETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Ave./Jaye St. New Signal</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springville Ave./Jaye St. New Signal</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Ave./Indiana St. New Signal</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam Ave./Indiana St. New Signal</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Ave./Newcomb St. Existing</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Ave./Prospect St. Existing</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Ave./Indiana St.</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This measure will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.7 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $35,000. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. The estimated construction cost is $240,000, consisting of and is subject to available funding from Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, Gas Tax funds and certificate of participation funds.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: The Public Works Department - Field Services Division will monitor and adjust coordination and preemption quarterly.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 5.3

Measure Title: Reduce Traffic Congestion at Major Intersections.

Measure Description: Porterville has plans to reduce traffic congestion at thirteen intersection locations. Funding for some of the projects has been allocated. The following is a listing of such projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT LOCATION &amp; WORK TO BE DONE</th>
<th>EXISTING CONDITION</th>
<th>ADT(^1) MAJOR/ MINOR ST.</th>
<th>COST ($)</th>
<th>EST. DATE OF COMPLETION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Ave./Villa St. New Signal</td>
<td>Two-way Stop</td>
<td>15,000/6,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Ave./Main St. Conversion to Eight Phase</td>
<td>Six Phase Signal</td>
<td>11,000/10,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Ave./Westwood St. Four-way Stop New Signal</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,500/5,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam Ave./Villa St. New Signal</td>
<td>Four-way Stop</td>
<td>13,500/5,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Ave./Second St. New Signal</td>
<td>Two-way Stop</td>
<td>19,500/2,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam Ave./Jaye St. New Signal (&quot;T&quot; Intersection)</td>
<td>One-way Stop</td>
<td>10,500/5,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Ave./Main St. Conversion to Eight Phase</td>
<td>Four Phase Signal</td>
<td>8,500/8,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Ave./Wallace St. New Signal</td>
<td>Two-way Stop</td>
<td>8,500/2,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Ave./Jaye St. Conversion to Eight Phase</td>
<td>Six Phase Signal</td>
<td>18,000/5,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Ave./Jaye St. New Signal</td>
<td>Four-way Stop</td>
<td>8,000/5,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springville Ave./Jaye St. New Signal</td>
<td>Two-way Stop</td>
<td>8,500/2,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive Ave./Indiana St. New Signal</td>
<td>Two-way Stop</td>
<td>23,000/1,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam Ave./Indiana St. New Signal</td>
<td>Two-way Stop</td>
<td>5,500/3,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition Porterville plans to construct Indiana Street from Thurman Avenue to Olive Avenue, using $1.2 Million in certificate of participation funds, to relieve traffic congestion at the intersections of Porter Road/Morton Avenue and Porter Road/Olive Avenue.

\(^1\)Average Daily Traffic
Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Public Works Department - Engineering Division.

Implementation Schedule: See table above.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project and maintenance will require staff time equivalent to 1.5 full-time employees, at an approximate cost of $100,100. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. The estimated construction costs are shown in the table above. The funds will come from a combination of certificate of participation, CMAQ and Hazard Elimination Safety funds. Construction of the listed improvements will be subject to funding approval and availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: The Public Works Department - Field Services Division will monitor and maintain the operation of these traffic signals.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 5.4

Measure Title: Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures.

Measure Description: Porterville will construct left turn lanes at the following location:
• Henderson Avenue/Westwood Street
• Henderson Avenue/Mathew Street
• Henderson Avenue/Villa Street
• Henderson Avenue/Main Street

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Porterville Public Works Department - Engineering Division.

Implementation Schedule: The estimated schedule for completing this work is as follows:
• Henderson Avenue/Westwood Street 2003
• Henderson Avenue/Mathew Street 2003
• Henderson Avenue/Villa Street 2002
• Henderson Avenue/Main Street 2002

This measure will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.01 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $5,000. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure will be subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: N/A
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 5.5

Measure Title: Removal of On-Street Parking.

Measure Description: Porterville has a policy of removing on-street parking where increases in traffic accidents require additional sight distance at intersections. This parking is not replaced when it is removed. Three parking stalls were removed on the west side of Hockett Street on either side of Cleveland Avenue in 2001.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Porterville Public Works Department - Engineering Division.

Implementation Schedule: This work has been completed and more work will be scheduled as the City Engineer determines the need. This practice will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.001 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $500. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budgets will accomplish this. The estimated construction cost is $100, consisting of street maintenance funds and subject to available funding.

Enforcement Program: Police Department Patrol.

Monitoring Program: N/A
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Measure Title: Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading.

Measure Description: Porterville constructed one bus pullout on Olive Avenue near Westwood Street. Additional pullouts will be constructed as the need arises.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Public Works Department - Engineering Division.

Implementation Schedule: This measure will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.004 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $2,000. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budgets will accomplish this. The estimated construction cost is $5,000 in Gas Tax funds and is subject to available funding.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: N/A
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 5.13

Measure Title: Fewer Stop Signs.

Measure Description: When Porterville constructs a new traffic signal at Henderson Avenue and Villa Street, the only impediment to traffic between Henderson Avenue and Olive Avenue will be the four-way stop at Grand Avenue and Villa Street. Traffic on Grand Avenue is substantially less than it has been in the past because a former shopping center on the northwest corner of Grand Avenue and Villa Street is now the office of the Porterville Unified School District. Therefore, Porterville will remove the stop signs that stop Villa Street traffic at Grand Avenue when the traffic signal is put into operations.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Public Works Department - Engineering Division.

Implementation Schedule: The stop sign on Villa Avenue at Grand Avenue were removed in 2002. However, this practice will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.01 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $500. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this. Funding for this measure will be subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: N/A
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 5.16

Measure Title: Adaptive Traffic Signals and Signal Timing.

Measure Description: Porterville already has traffic signal coordination with adaptive signals in three corridors as follows:
- Henderson Avenue from Newcomb Street to Indiana Street
- Morton Avenue from Westwood Street to Plano Street
- Olive Avenue from Westwood Street to Plano Street

Porterville plans to coordinate traffic signals with computer controlled timers, that adapt to traffic at different times each day, along the following corridors:
- Putnam Avenue from Porter Road to Second Street
- Newcomb Street from Henderson Avenue to Olive Avenue
- Westwood Street from Henderson Avenue to Olive Avenue

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Public Works Department - Engineering Division.

Implementation Schedule: The estimated time of completion for this project is 2005; however, the measure will continue through at least 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.01 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $5,000. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this. Funding for this measure is subject to availability from CMAQ.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: The traffic signals will be monitored and adjusted, if needed, quarterly by the CD&S - Field Services Division.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 6.1

Measure Title: Park and Ride Lots.

Measure Description: Porterville plans to construct a Park and Ride lot near the interchange of State Route 65 and State Route 190. The lot will be on the south side of the Tule River and the west side of Jaye Street.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Public Works Department - Engineering Division.

Implementation Schedule: This measure has been completed; however, another park and ride lot is scheduled to be constructed prior to 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.01 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $5,000. Department personnel under the Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this. Funding for this measure is $70,000 from CMAQ funds, subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: The Police Department and the Parks & Leisure Services Department will monitor the lot to assure that it reserved for its intended use.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 7.3

Measure Title: Involve School Districts to Encourage Walking to School.

Measure Description: Porterville is currently constructing the Granite Hills Streets Project, at a cost of approximately $4 million, to encourage the students at Granite Hills High School to walk to school. Prior to the construction of improvements in this project, there were no safe walking routes to this school, so most of nearby students’ parents drove the students. Porterville involved the Burton School District in applying for a $490,000 Safe Routes to School grant to create safe walking routes to the schools in that district. Porterville has written a letter to the Porterville Unified School District asking them to nominate projects for the next round of Safe Routes to School grant funding. The Police Department and community has participated yearly in the International Walk to School event.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Public Works Department - Engineering Division, Porterville Unified School District, Burton School District and the Porterville Police Department.

Implementation Schedule: Porterville will complete the Granite Hills Streets Project in 2003. Porterville will submit Safe Routes to School grant applications in the next round of funding. The Police Department will continue community participation in the International Walk to School event. The City of Porterville will continue an active outreach program to all schools to encourage walking or biking to school through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 2.5 full-time employees, at an approximate cost of $100,000. This will be accomplished by department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget. The estimated construction cost is $4 Million, consisting of $3 Million from approved certificate of participation funds and $1 Million from Safe Route to School grant funds, subject to availability and award.

Enforcement Program: N/A
Monitoring Program: N/A
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 7.13

Measure Title: Land Use/Air Quality Guidelines.

Measure Description: Porterville uses the Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts, published by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, to evaluate each new development in the city. Appropriate mitigation measures are required to comply with the guidelines.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Community Development & Services Department - Planning Division.

Implementation Schedule: This measure will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.10 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $5,000. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure is subject to availability in the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget.

Enforcement Program: Community Development Department - Planning Division.

Monitoring Program: The Community Development Department - Planning Division.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 7.14

Measure Title: Incentives for Cities with Good Development Practices.

Measure Description: Porterville is making good use of its HUD Community Development Block Grants as well as HOME, CalHOME and HELP funds to promote in-fill development and preserve housing stock that will make transit more efficient and support private investment in the housing stock near downtown.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Community Development Department.

Implementation Schedule: This measure will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.20 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $10,000. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this. The estimated construction cost is $350,000 from HUD funds and is subject to available funding.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: N/A
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 7.17

Measure Title: Transit Oriented Development.

Measure Description: Porterville is planning to construct an inter-modal transit center in 2002. The City will promote transit-oriented development in and around the transit center.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: City Public Transit Division.

Implementation Schedule: Promotion of transit-oriented development will begin when the center in completed in 2003 and will continue through at least 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.02 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $1,000. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this. Funding for this measure is subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: The City Public Transit Division will monitor progress on obtaining transit-oriented development.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 9.2 & 15.1

Measure Title: Encouragement of Pedestrian Travel.

Measure Description: When Phase Two of the Tule River Parkway and the Rails to Trails Project are completed, Porterville will conduct dedication ceremonies and issue news releases encouraging people to use the facilities for pedestrian travel. In addition, many of the sidewalks are missing in the core area of Porterville, thereby discouraging pedestrian travel. Porterville just obtained a $1.9 Million CMAQ grant to complete missing curb, gutter and sidewalks in the core area bounded by Henderson Avenue, Plano Street, State Route 190 and State Route 65.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Parks & Leisure Services Department for the Tule River Parkway and Rails to Trails projects; Public Works Department - Engineering Division for the Core Area Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk project.

Implementation Schedule: Dedication ceremonies will be held at the completion of construction for the Tule River Parkway and Rails to Trails projects. Core Area project - Environmental work and design in 2003. Construction is estimated to begin in 2004. This measure will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Tule River Parkway & Rails to Trails: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.002 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $100. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this. The estimated construction cost is $1.7 Million, funding is subject to availability and consists of $1.5 Million from CMAQ funds and $200,000 in developer land donations and City funds.

Core Area Project: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 2.0 full-time employees, at an approximate cost of $100,000. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this. The estimated construction cost is $2.2 Million, consisting of $1.9 Million from CMAQ grant and $300,000 in City funds.

Enforcement Program: Tule River Parkway & Rails to Trails: The Porterville Police Department will patrol to assure that motorized vehicles do not use the paths. Core Area Project: N/A.

Monitoring Program: Tule River Parkway & Rails to Trails: The paths will be monitored by the Porterville Parks & Leisure Services Department. Core Area Project: Public Works Department - Engineering Division.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 9.3

Measure Title: Bicycle/Pedestrian Program.

Measure Description: Porterville has an established bicycle/pedestrian program. Examples of products of that program are the Tule River Parkway and the Rails to Trails Project. The first phase of the Tule River Parkway, from State Route 65 to Indiana Street and along the east side of State Route 65 from the Tule River to Highway 190, was constructed in 2000. The next phase of the Tule River Parkway, from Indiana Street to Jaye Street, is scheduled to be constructed in 2004. The Rails to Trails Project is scheduled to be constructed in 2005.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Parks and Leisure Services Department.

Implementation Schedule: See Measure Description above. The portion of the Tule River Parkway between Jaye Street and Main Street is scheduled to be constructed in 2004. This measure will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.4 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $20,000. Department personnel and a part-time inspector under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this. The estimated construction cost of the portion from Indiana Street to Jaye Street is $591,000. The estimated cost of the portion from Jaye Street to Main Street is $250,000. Funding is subject to availability from CMAQ (90%) and City (10%).

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: The Porterville Police Department will patrol these projects to assure that they are used exclusively for pedestrians and bicyclists.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 9.4 and 9.8

Measure Title: Close Streets for Special Events for Use by Bikes and Pedestrians.

Measure Description: Several times during every year, Porterville establishes auto free zones and turns portions of Main Street into a pedestrian mall. Some examples of these events are the Iris Festival, the Sierra Music Festival, a Bicycle Race, the Arts and Crafts Show, the Farmers Market, and at times, more than one car show.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Finance Department issues Community Civic Event permits for these events.

Implementation Schedule: This measure will continue to be implemented through at least 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.01 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $500. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding is subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: The Police Department enforces the closure of Main Street.

Monitoring Program: The Finance Department monitors compliance with the Civic Event Permit.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 9.5

Measure Title: Encouragement of Bicycle Travel.

Measure Description: Porterville has adopted bicycle routes as part of its General Plan Circulation Element. Porterville has also worked hard to obtain the grants to construct the Tule River Parkway and the Rails to Trails Project. Porterville has cooperated with Tulare County in its creation of countywide Bikeway Maps that qualify Porterville for California Bicycle Account Funds to extend the Tule River Parkway. When future phases of the Tule River Parkway are constructed, Porterville will hold dedication ceremonies that generate publicity and issue news releases that encourage the public to use the new bicycle trails.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Parks & Leisure Services Department.

Implementation Schedule: Grant funds will be applied for implementation of this measure through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.1 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $5,000. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish. The estimated construction cost on future Tule River Parkway phases is $1 Million and is subject to available grant funding.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: N/A
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 10.2

Measure Title: Bike Racks on Buses.

Measure Description: Porterville will equip new buses it acquires with bike racks.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: City Public Transit Division.

Implementation Schedule: This measure is on-going and will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.01 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $500. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this. The estimated cost of the bike racks is $1,375 from FTA and CMAQ funds and is subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: City Public Transit Division.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 14.2

Measure Title: Special Event Controls.

Measure Description: Porterville will send a letter to new and existing owners/operators of special event centers to encourage them to reduce mobile source emissions generated by their events. A list of optional strategies will be sent with the letter.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Community Development Department.

Implementation Schedule: This measure began in 2003 and will continue through at least 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.01 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $500. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure will be subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: Community Development Department.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 14.3

Measure Title: Land Use/Development Alternatives.

Measure Description: The City of Porterville General Plan and planning policy supports placing commercial development throughout the city so the travel distance for shoppers is minimized. The City also supports a land use pattern that supports public transit.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Community Development Department - Planning Division.

Implementation Schedule: This measure will be on-going through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 1.0 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $50,000. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure is subject to availability in the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: Community Development Department - Planning Division.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 14.5

Measure Title: Evaluation of Air Quality Impacts of New Development and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts.

Measure Description: Porterville evaluates each new development using the Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts published by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District and requires mitigation for projects where appropriate.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Community Development Department - Planning Division.

Implementation Schedule: This measure will be on-going through 2010

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.01 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $500. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure is subject to availability in the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget.

Enforcement Program: City Council action to enforce.

Monitoring Program: Community Development Department - Planning Division.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 14.7

Measure Title: Incentives to Increase Density Around Transit Centers.

Measure Description: Porterville plans to construct an inter-modal transit center on the south of Oak Avenue between Hockett Street and “D” Street. Commercial space will be constructed into the transit center, thereby increasing density. The very presence of this center will encourage commercial developers to construct new buildings around the center, also increasing density.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: City Public Transit Division.

Implementation Schedule: The transit center was constructed in 2003. This measure for providing transit services to the city will continue through at least 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 1.0 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $50,000. Department personnel and a part-time inspector under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this. The estimated construction cost is $1,359,000, consisting of $1,235,600 in State funds and $124,000 in City funds and is subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: N/A
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 14.8

Measure Title: Incentives for Cities with Good Development Practices.

Measure Description: Porterville receives incentives for its good development regularly from such sources as HUD Community Development Block Grants plus HOME, CalHome and HELP funds.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Community Development Department.

Implementation Schedule: This measure is on-going and will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.10 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $5,000. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure is subject to availability in the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: Community Development Department.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 17.12

Measure Title: Use Community Groups, Churches and Public Figures to Carry Messages of Air Pollution Problems.

Measure Description: Porterville is making plans to have the Porterville Blue Skies Coalition to carry the message of “Spare the Air” days during the summer to encourage people to reduce ground-level ozone pollution during those critical days.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Public Works Department - Engineering Division.

Implementation Schedule: This measure was implemented during the spring of 2003 and will continue through at least 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.01 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $500. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure is subject to availability in the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: Public Works Department - Engineering Division.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TU 17.14

Measure Title: Cool Cities Approach to Reduce Heat Build-up.

Measure Description: Porterville has a policy of requiring one tree for every five parking stalls in parking lots. Porterville also requires one tree for every new lot in subdivisions.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Community Development Department - Planning Division.

Implementation Schedule: This measure will be on-going through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.01 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $500. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure is subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: The Planning Division reviews each new development.

Monitoring Program: The City of Porterville Planning Division monitors to see that the required number of trees are shown on the plans. The Public Works Department - Engineering & Building Division inspectors monitor to assure that the development is constructed according to the plans.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TCM 1

Measure Title: Traffic Flow Improvements.

Measure Description: Porterville is proceeding with numerous traffic flow projects listed elsewhere in this document. In addition, Porterville participated in the Cross-Valley Passenger Rail Feasibility Study and is actively working to preserve the San Joaquin Valley Railroad Company’s corridor for future passenger rail service connecting to the planned high speed passenger railroad through the San Joaquin Valley.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Community Development Department is responsible for implementing this policy.

Implementation Schedule: Work is currently on-going to keep the San Joaquin Valley Railroad Company’s operation economically viable to preserve the corridor for future passenger rail use. This work will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.01 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $500. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure is subject to availability in the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: Community Development Department will monitor and provide assistance as the department’s resources allow.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TCM 2

Measure Title: Public Transit.

Measure Description: Porterville is acquiring four large buses (30-Passenger) to accommodate the increasing number of passengers using its transit system.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: City Public Transit Division.

Implementation Schedule: The transit buses will be put into service in FY 2003/2004. Implementation of this measure will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.10 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $5,000. Department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. The estimated cost is $600,000, consisting of $240,000 from Federal Transit Administration 5311 funds, $264,000 from Federal Highway Administration Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds and $96,000 from City funds and is subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: The operations of the buses will be monitored by the City Public Transit Division.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Measure Title: Rideshare Programs.

Measure Description: The City of Visalia is working on a ride share program that will serve the entire county. It will use newspapers and radio broadcasts to promote the program by giving people, who are interested, a phone number they can call to get a partner with whom they can rideshare. The callers will be computer matched. Porterville is cooperating with the City of Visalia in implementing this program.

Porterville has also created a map showing where each of its approximately 220 employees live. This map is used to encourage City employees to rideshare. In a future issue of the City employees newsletter, “The Pen”, an article will be included that makes all employees more aware that they can use this map to locate candidates with whom they can rideshare.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: City of Visalia Transit Division staff, the Porterville City Manager’s Office and the Porterville Community Development & Services - Engineering Division.

Implementation Schedule: Implementation of the Ride Share Program and publication of the article in “The Pen” began in 2002 and will continue through 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for these projects will require staff time equivalent to 0.5 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $25,000. This will be accomplished by current Visalia personnel using the $25,000 in the FY 2002/2003 TCAG budget earmarked for this purpose. City department personnel under the current and subsequent Council adopted annual budget will accomplish this task. Funding for this measure will be subject to availability.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: The City of Visalia Transit Division and the City of Porterville Public Works Department - Engineering Division.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
EXTREME AREA OZONE PLAN

Number: TCM 5

Measure Title: Alternative Fuels Program.

Measure Description: Provide a fueling station that dispenses a cleaner burning fuel than gasoline or diesel, such as compressed natural gas (CNG). Recently, Porterville sent a letter to the Southern California Gas Company asking them to construct a CNG fueling facility at their maintenance yard in the Porterville Airport Industrial Park. Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) staff have included $10,000 in their proposed FY 2002/2003 budget to do a project study report and financing plan for a CNG fueling station in the Porterville-Lindsay area.

Responsible Agency and Authority for Implementation: Southern California Gas Company and TCAG.

Implementation Schedule: The study was completed in FY 2002/2003. Follow-up will include construction of a fueling facility in eastern Tulare County. Construction of the facility is scheduled to be completed by 2010.

Level of Personnel and Funding for Implementation: Administration of plan development for this project will require staff time equivalent to 0.10 full-time employee, at an approximate cost of $5,000. TCAG personnel under the budget will accomplish this for FY 2002/2003. The estimated construction cost is $150,000, consisting of money from the sources identified in the report.

Enforcement Program: N/A

Monitoring Program: TCAG Staff.
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
CONTROL MEASURES
WHICH ARE NOT FEASIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAMS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC TRANSIT

• Regional Express Bus Program: It is financially and technically infeasible for Porterville to provide a regional express bus program because Porterville has no dedicated funding source and Porterville does not have regional political jurisdiction. Regional bus service is being provided by Tulare County.

• Study Benefit of a Particulate Trap Retrofit Program: Not applicable because Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) staff has said that this measure is not recommended for the suggested list of RACMs.

• Mass Transit Alternatives: It is not financially feasible for Porterville to make a major change in its transit system.

• Require that Government Employees Use Transit for Home to Work Trips, Expand Transit, and Encourage Large Businesses to Promote Transit Use: Porterville does ask large businesses to encourage transit use but it is not financially feasible for Porterville to expand transit use more than it already is. Porterville does not have the jurisdiction to force all government employees to use transit for home to work trips.

• Eliminate Parking Zoning Near Transit: This is technically infeasible because there is no parking zoning adjacent to the proposed transit center.

REASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN ROADS OR LANES, OR CONSTRUCTION OF SUCH ROADS OF LANES, FOR USE BY PASSENGER BUSES OR HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLES

• These measures will not provide significant ozone reductions in a city the size of Porterville and they are financially infeasible.

EMPLOYER-BASED TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLANS INCLUDING INCENTIVES

• Employer Rideshare Program Incentives: It is not financially feasible for Porterville to offer incentives to its employees or to force local employers to offer incentives to their employees.

• Implementing Parking Charge Incentive Program: It is not feasible for Porterville to begin charging its employees to park or to force local employers to charge their employees to park in order to give them an incentive to use transit. It would cause too many personnel problems in Porterville.

• Employee Parking Fees: This measure is not feasible for the same reasons cited above.

• Merchant Transportation Incentives: This measure is not feasible for the same reasons
cited above.

- **Purchase of Vans and Vanpools:** This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.
- **Off-days for Ozone Alerts Just Like Sick Days:** This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.
- **Pay for In-house Meals on Ozone Action Days:** This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.
- **Voluntary Business Closures on Ozone Action Days:** This measure is financially infeasible because it would incur strenuous objections from the affected businesses and would probably result in costly litigation.
- **Close Government Offices on Ozone Action Days to Serve As an Example:** This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.
- **Mandatory Compressed Work Week:** This measure is financially infeasible because it will increase salary and training costs and the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.
- **Extend Parking Cash-Out Rule to More Employers:** Porterville cannot extend to more employers because it has never made a parking cash-out program mandatory by ordinance.
- **Telecommuting:** This measure is not feasible because it lowers employee efficiency which in turn makes it financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.

**TRIP REDUCTION ORDINANCE**

- California law prohibits employer based mandatory trip reduction ordinance programs (SB437).

**TRAFFIC FLOW IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS THAT ACHIEVE EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS**

- **Reversible Lanes:** This measure is technically infeasible because Porterville’s small amount of traffic congestion and its street system do not lend themselves to making any significant gains in creating reversible lanes.
- **One-way Streets:** This measure is technically infeasible because Porterville’s small amount of traffic congestion and its street system do not lend themselves to making any significant gains in creating one-way streets.
- **On-site Parking Restrictions:** This measure is technically infeasible because Porterville does not have a shortage of parking in its downtown area. Therefore, restricting on-street parking would not have the effect of reducing ozone pollution. It is not economically feasible for Porterville to implement this measure because it would be an economic hardship for the downtown merchants without producing a significant benefit.
• Additional Freeway Service Patrol: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure and it is technically infeasible because Porterville has so little freeway that the benefits of this measure would be de minimis.

• Consider Coordinating Scheduling of Arterial and Highway Maintenance to Exclude Ozone Action Days if the Maintenance Activities Require Lane Reductions on Heavily Utilized Arterials and Highways: This measure is financially infeasible because it would increase maintenance costs and the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.

• Re-routing of Trucks on Ozone Days: This measure is technically infeasible because traffic congestion is so small in Porterville that rerouting trucks may actually increase production of ozone.

• Ban Left Turns: This measure is technically infeasible because traffic congestion is so small in Porterville that the ozone reduction resulting from banning left turns would be de minimis.

• Changeable Lane Assignments: This measure is technically infeasible because traffic congestion is so small in Porterville that the ozone reduction resulting from creating changeable lanes would be de minimis.

• Freeway Bottleneck Improvements: This measure is technically infeasible because there are no freeway bottlenecks in Porterville.

• Minimize Impact of Construction on the Traveling Public. Have Contractors Pay When Lanes Are Closed as an Incentive to Keep Lanes Open: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure and its ozone reduction would be de minimis.

• Internet Provided Road and Route Information: This measure is technically infeasible for Porterville because there isn’t enough congestion in Porterville to motivate motorists to search the internet for road and route information.

• Regional Route Marking System to Encourage Underutilized Capacity: This measure is preempted by Tulare County because they are the government agency with regional jurisdiction.

• Congestion Management Field Team to Clear Incidents: This measure is technically infeasible because traffic congestion is so small in Porterville that the ozone reduction resulting from having a congestion management field team clear incidents would be de minimis.

• Use Dynamic Message Signs to Direct/Smooth Speeds During Incidents: This measure is technically infeasible because traffic congestion is so small in Porterville that the ozone reduction resulting from using dynamic messaging signs would be de minimis.

• 55 mph Speed Limit During Ozone Season: This measure is technically infeasible for Porterville because the roads to which this would apply are in the jurisdiction of the County of Tulare of the State of California.

• Require 40 mph Speed Limit on All Facilities: This was tried in the one location where it would apply and it was found to be politically infeasible.
• Require Lower Speeds During Peak Periods: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.

FRINGE AND TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR PARKING FACILITIES SERVING MULTIPLE OCCUPANCY VEHICLE PROGRAMS OR TRANSIT SERVICE

• Park and Ride Lots Serving Perimeter Counties - This measure is preempted by Tulare County because they are the logical government agency to provide such a measure.

PROGRAMS TO LIMIT OR RESTRICT VEHICLE USE IN DOWNTOWN AREAS OR OTHER AREAS OF EMISSIONS CONCENTRATIONS PARTICULARLY DURING PERIODS OF PEAK USE

• Off-Peak Goods Movement: This measure is technically infeasible because Porterville has such a small amount of traffic congestion that the reduction in ozone emissions from implementing this measure would be de minimis.
• Truck Restrictions During Peak Periods: This measure is technically infeasible because Porterville has such a small amount of traffic congestion that the reduction in ozone emissions from implementing this measure would be de minimis.
• Adjust School Hours So They Don’t Coincide with Peak Traffic Periods and Ozone Seasons: This measure is preempted by the Porterville Unified School District because they are the logical government agency to provide such a measure.
• Area-wide Tax for Parking: This measure is technically infeasible because it would not be politically acceptable.
• Increase Parking Fees: This measure is technically infeasible because there are no parking fees to be increased.
• Graduated Pricing Starting with Highest in CBD: This measure is technically infeasible because it would not be politically acceptable.
• Buy Parking Lots and Convert to Other Land Use: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.
• Limit the Number of Parking Spaces at Commercial Airlines to Support Mass Transit: This measure is technically infeasible because Porterville does not have a commercial airport.
• No CBD Vehicles Unless LEV or Alternate Fuel or Electric: This measure is technically infeasible for Porterville because Porterville’s citizens own so few LEV, alternate fuel or electric vehicles. One reason for this is that Porterville has no fueling station dispensing alternate fuel. This measure is also financially infeasible because it would result in costly litigation for which the City of Porterville has no adequate funding source.
• Auto Restricted Zones: This measure is technically infeasible because there are no high congestion zones in Porterville where congestion is great enough to warrant restriction.
PROGRAMS FOR PROVISION OF ALL FORMS OF HIGH-OCCUPANCY, SHARED RIDE SERVICES

- Financial Incentives Including Zero Bus Fares: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.
- Internet Ride Matching Service: This measure is technically infeasible for Porterville because there are too few people, who would seek ride matching, that are on the internet. However, Porterville is participating with Visalia in the telephone ride matching service for the south valley.
- Credits and Incentives for Carpoolers: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.
- Employers Provide Vehicles to Carpooler for Running Errands and Emergencies: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.
- Establish Auto Free Zones and Pedestrian Malls: This measure is technically infeasible because there is so little congestion in Porterville that the amount of ozone reduction resulting from this measure would be de minimis.
- Close Certain Roads for Use By Non-Motorized Traffic: This measure is technically infeasible because there is so little congestion in Porterville that the amount of ozone reduction resulting from this measure would be de minimis. However, Porterville does close certain roads for special events.
- Free Bikes: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.
- Cash Rebates for Bikes: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.
- Use Condemned Dirt Roads for Bike Trails: This measure is technically infeasible because Porterville has no condemned dirt roads.
- Provide Funding So Volunteers Do Not Have to Pay the Cost of Trail Creation and Maintenance: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund this measure.

PROGRAMS TO SECURE BICYCLE STORAGE FACILITIES, AND OTHER FACILITIES, INCLUDING BICYCLE LANES FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF, AND PROTECTION OF, BICYCLISTS IN BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AREAS

- Region-Wide Mandatory Bike Racks at Work Sites: This measure is preempted by Tulare County because they are the governmental agency with region-wide jurisdiction.
- Regional Bike Parking Ordinance for All New Construction: This measure is preempted by Tulare County because they are the governmental agency with region-wide jurisdiction.
PROGRAMS TO CONTROL EXTENDED IDLING OF VEHICLES

- **Limit Excessive Car Dealership Starts**: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund enforcement of this measure.
- **Encourage Limitations on Vehicle Idling**: This measure in technically infeasible because the amount of voluntary compliance resulting from this measure would be de minimis.
- **Turn Off Engines While Stalled in Traffic**: This measure is technically infeasible because Porterville has so little congestion that the ozone reduction resulting from this measure would be de minimis.
- **Outlaw Idling in Parking Lots**: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund enforcement of this measure.
- **Reduce Idling at Drive-throughs, Shut Windows Down**: This measure is financially infeasible because the City has no dedicated funding source to fund enforcement of this measure.

PROGRAMS AND ORDINANCES TO FACILITATE NON-AUTOMOBILE TRAVEL, PROVISION AND UTILIZATION OF MASS TRANSIT, AND TO GENERALLY REDUCE THE NEED FOR SINGLE-OCCUPANT VEHICLE TRAVEL, AS PART OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

- **Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Housing Incentive Program**: This program is currently financially infeasible because staff has a full workload administering similar programs that have a similar effect such as HUD Community Development Block Grants plus HOME, CalHome and HELP funds.
SUBJECT: APPROVAL FOR COMMUNITY CIVIC EVENT
PORTERVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
IRIS FESTIVAL, APRIL 24, 2004

SOURCE: Administrative Services - Finance Division, Business Tax Section

COMMENT: The Porterville Chamber of Commerce is requesting approval to hold its 6th Annual Iris Festival on Saturday, April 24, 2004, from 4:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. (9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. is actual event time). The following street/sidewalk/parking lot closures/uses are requested:

STREETS:
Main Street from Cleveland Avenue to Olive Avenue;
Garden Avenue from Main Street to the alley east of Main Street;
Oak Avenue from Division Street to the alley east of Main Street;
Mill Avenue from Division Street to the alley east of Main Street; and
Putnam Avenue from Division Street to the alley east of Main Street.

SIDEWALKS:
Main Street from Olive Avenue to Cleveland Avenue;
Oak Avenue from Main Street to Second Street;
Mill Avenue from Hockett Street to Main Street; and
Putnam Avenue from Hockett Street to Main Street.

PARKING LOT:
Former J.C. Penney parking lot.

This request is being made under Community Civic Event Ordinance No. 1326, as amended. The application has been routed according to the ordinance regulations and reviewed by all departments involved. All requirements are listed on the attached application, agreement and exhibit “A.” The application, agreement, exhibit “A,” request for street closures, and a map showing the desired street closures are attached.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Council approve the Community Civic Event Application and Agreement from Porterville Chamber of Commerce, subject to the Restrictions and Requirements contained in application, agreement and exhibit “A” of the Community Civic Event forms.

ATTACHMENT: Community Civic Event forms
Application Date: 1-8-04

CITY OF PORTERVILLE
APPLICATION & AGREEMENT
EXEMPT FIRE BUSINESS LICENSE PERMIT

Event Date: April 24, 2004
Sponsoring Organization: [Porterville Chamber of Commerce]
93 W. Main St. 784-7240

Authorized Representative: [Name]
Address: [Address]
Tel. No.: [Tel. No.]

Event Chairman: [Name]
Address: [Address]
Tel. No.: [Tel. No.]

Location of Event (Location Map Must be Attached): Downtown Porterville-
Main Street, Ohio to Cleveland

Type of Event/Method of Operation: 4th Annual Porterville

Nonprofit Status Determination: [Yes/No]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Services to be Provided</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barricades: No. @ $550.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection: No. @ $1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Control: No. @ $550.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Pickup: @ $550.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cleaning Deposit: $100.00

Encroachment Permit Approval: Yes, No
Parks Facility Application Required: Yes, No
Parade/Public Gathering Permit Application: Yes, No

STAFF COMMENTS: [List special requirements or conditions for event as to area of responsibility.]

APPRV/DENY:
--- Bus. Lic. Supvr: ____________________________
--- City Engineer: ____________________________
--- City Planner: ____________________________
--- P/S Manager: ____________________________
--- Dir CDAS: ____________________________
--- Fire Chief: ____________________________
--- Parks Dir: ____________________________
--- Police Chief: ____________________________
--- Risk Mgr: ____________________________

Liability Insurance: Applicant agrees to provide Public Liability Insurance naming the City as additional insured against all claims arising out of or in connection with the issuance of permit or the operation of permittee, his agents or representatives pursuant to the permit. Said policy of insurance shall provide coverage which shall be determined by the City's Risk Manager. Claims-made policies shall not be acceptable.

Liability Insurance $1,000,000 Risk Manager Initials: ____________________________

Liquor Liability Insurance: If alcoholic beverages are to be served or sold, the insurance policy shall be endorsed to include Full Liquor Liability, in an amount which shall be determined by the Risk Manager. The City of Porterville shall be named as additional insured against all claims arising out of or in connection with the issuance of permit. Claims-made policies shall not be acceptable.

Liquor Liability Insurance $1,000,000 Risk Manager Initials: ____________________________

The sponsoring organization, in filling the application and in executing this permit agrees to comply with all provisions of Ordinance No. ______, and the terms and conditions set forth by the City Council.

Authorized Representative: ____________________________ Date: 1-8-04
1. Written request to City Council for approval to hold such sale or activity and request for waiver of encroachment permit, at least 30 days in advance of date for such activity.

2. Compliance with City Code requirements:
   a. At least 48" clearance on sidewalk for pedestrian traffic
   b. No blocking of any exits of building
   c. Electrical - Cords must be approved and installation checked by Fire Department for safety.

3. Public Liability Insurance:

   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 shall be named as additional insured. The amounts of such insurance shall be as follows:

   Public liability and combined limits in an amount not less than One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) per occurrence and $1,000,000 aggregate. Claims-made policies shall not be acceptable.

4. Liquor Liability Insurance:

   If alcoholic beverages are to be served or sold the insurance policy shall be endorsed to include Full Liquor Liability in an amount not less than One Million Dollars per occurrence ($1,000,000). The City of Porterville shall be named as additional insured against all claims arising out of or in connection with the issuance of permit or the operation of permittee, his agents or representatives pursuant to the permit. Claims-made policies shall not be acceptable.

   Organization/applicant agrees, during the term of this permit, to secure and hold CITY free and harmless from all loss, liability and claim for damages, costs and charges of any kind of character arising out of, relating to, or in any way connected with his 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 CITY for any injury to persons or property which may result solely or primarily from the action or nonaction of CITY or its directors, officers or employees.

   Organization
   Signature
   Date

Original: File
Copy: Applicant
REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNITY CIVIC EVENT
PORTERVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
IRIS FESTIVAL
APRIL 24, 2004

Business License Supervisor:
   K. Maxwell
Submit vendor list 1 week prior to event for business license verification.

Public Works Director:
   B. Rodriguez
No comments.

Community Development Director:
   B. Dunlap
Obtain Council approval for public right-of-way closure.

Field Services Manager:
   B. Styles
Call 782-7514 to arrange for pick-up of barricades.

Fire Chief:
   F. Guyton
Keep center lane clear and do not block hydrants.

Parks and Leisure Services Director:
   J. Perrine
Stay out of the downtown planters, and leave the area clean.

Police Chief:
   S. Rodriguez
Ensure appropriate use of barricades to warn motorists of street closures. Explorers will work X-patrol by traffic.

Risk Manager:
   D. Pyle
See page 2.
Sponsor: Porterville Chamber of Commerce
Event: Iris Festival
Event Chairman: Kristi Nanamura
Location: Main Street
Date of Event: April 24, 2004
Time of Event: 4:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.

RISK MANAGEMENT: Conditions of Approval

That the Porterville Chamber of Commerce provide a Certificate of Commercial General Liability Insurance 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 than A:VII, and the insurance company must be an “admitted” insurer in the State of California.
No permit shall be issued without filing of information listed below and should be submitted with the application, but in no case shall be submitted less than one week prior to event.

Sponsoring Organization: Porterville Chamber of Commerce
Location: Main Street Date of Event: April 24, 2004
Type of Event: 6th Annual Porterville Tie Festival

List all firms, individuals, organizations, etc. engaging in selling or participating in event:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Type Of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vendor list to be provided at a later date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors known at this time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Mountain Casino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Business Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville Recorder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westcoast Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galax Theater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMPR Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia Beverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Long People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite Fitness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van in the Mane &amp; Mane Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Use additional sheet if necessary)

Distr: White: Purchasing Dept.
Canary: Fire Dept.
Pink: Police Dept.
Goldenrod: Applicant
COMMUNITY CIVIC EVENT - STREET CLOSURES/USAGE
(Attach Map – Mark Areas To Be Used or Closed)

NAME OF EVENT: 5th Annual Porcupine Tri Festival
ORGANIZATION: Porcupine Chamber of Commerce
DATE: April 24, 2014
HOURS: Street Closure 4a-9:30p
Event 9a-5p

LIST AREAS TO BE USED OR CLOSED, WHICH RESTRICT EITHER VEHICULAR OR PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Closed From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Cline</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Ave west of Main &amp; commerce</td>
<td>Vendor/food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ave Stage</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ave Stage</td>
<td>Art Exhibition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sidewalks to be used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Closed From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Cline</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Sidewalk Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>Hackett</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>Hackett</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former De Perey lot</td>
<td>Vendor/entertainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Applicant Signature: [Signature]
Date: [Date]
SUBJECT: SHORT-RANGE TRANSIT PLAN

SOURCE: Administration

COMMENT: The 2004 Short Range Transit Plan for the City of Porterville represents the fifth five-year plan prepared for the Porterville Transit System since its inception in March of 1981. It provides the Council and City staff with an opportunity to understand current conditions, define the demand for service over the next five years, and establish an operational and capital plan to meet those demands. It can also be used for planning, policy, programming and budgeting purposes. City staff will use this document as a management document which will guide the work efforts for the next five years. The Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) will utilize the Plan for programming local, State and Federal funding, as well as for preparing the annual Regional Transportation Improvement Program and Regional Transportation Plan. The Short Range Transit Plan is required under Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307, and the FTA will use the Plan as an information source for programming and approving Federal funding grants and programs. The Plan was funded by a Section 5303 Grant from the FTA and Transportation Development Act funds contributed by the City of Porterville.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Approve the 2004 Short Range Transit Plan for the City of Porterville; and

2. Authorize Staff to file the 2004 Short Range Transit Plan with the Federal Transit Administration in accordance with Section 5307 requirements, and with the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG).
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City of Porterville

2004 SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

The 2004 Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) for Porterville represents the fifth five-year plan prepared for the Porterville Transit System since its inception in March of 1981. The first Porterville Transit Development Plan was prepared in 1984 and covered Fiscal Years (FY) 1985/86 through 1989/90. The current TDP was completed in 2003 prior to the designation of Porterville as an Urbanized Area. That Plan is being updated to reflect new requirements and plans as a result of the change in federal requirements and funding. TPG Consulting has prepared this document under contract with the City of Porterville. The Porterville SRTP was funded by a Section 5303 Grant from the Federal Transit Administration and Transportation Development Act funds contributed by the City of Porterville.

In general, the Porterville SRTP provides the community, policy makers, and city staff an opportunity to understand current conditions, define the demand for service over the next five years and to establish an operational and capital plan to meet those demands. The Porterville Short Range Transit Plan is to be used by the Porterville City Council for planning, policy, programming and budgeting purposes. The SRTP is to be used by the City Council and the community for direction and guidance of future transit activities. City Staff will use the SRTP as a management document to guide their work efforts over the next five years. The Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) will use the document for programming local, state and federal funding, as well as for preparing the annual Regional Transportation Improvement Program and Regional Transportation Plan. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will use the Plan as an information source for programming and approving federal funding grants and programs.
CONTENTS OF THE SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN

The Porterville SRTP is presented in five chapters, which include the Introduction, Existing Services, Analysis Section, Policy Section, and the Implementation Plan. The Existing Services chapter describes the current Transit and COLT services, the ridership profile, the number and type of buses used by the system, the fare structure and the management structure. The Analysis Section includes an operational analysis of the existing service, and reviews future operating alternatives. This section also includes an opportunities and constraints matrix with future demand estimates, and sets-forth a capital program for future vehicle purchases. The Policy Section includes the system’s goal, objectives, and policies. The Implementation Plan outlines the direction the system will take over the next five years and includes discussions of a Marketing Program, a Management Plan, and a Comprehensive Financial Plan. This section also covers the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Federal Drug Testing Program.

COMMUNITY PROFILE

The City of Porterville is located in Tulare County, which is part of the Central San Joaquin Valley. Porterville is located at the base of the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range. It is approximately 60 miles north of Bakersfield and 30 miles southeast of Visalia. The City’s sphere of influence includes rural areas surrounding the incorporated city and an urban area known as East Porterville (Figure 2 – City Base Map). The following data was extracted from the 2000 U.S. Census and reflects estimated populations for the urbanized area. The complete demographic information for the urbanized areas is not yet available, so in some instances the City of Porterville demographic information is utilized within this SRTP report.

![City of Porterville Population by Sex (2000 Census)](image)

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, as of January 2000, the population of the urbanized area was approximately 59,961, of which the City of Porterville’s population totaled 39,615. The population distribution is shown in Figure 3. The 2000 Census data reveals that 47.8% of the population in the City of Porterville is male (18,936), and 52.2% is female (20,679).
The 2000 Census data indicates that there are 8,409 single adults within the City of Porterville. Of these adults, 6,310 are male and 2,099 are female. Of the remaining 31,206 persons, 9,170 are married without children. The other 22,036 persons residing in the City of Porterville belong to a family group. The average family size within the City of Porterville is 3.3 persons per household.

In 2000 the City of Porterville had a total of 12,691 housing units available. Of these, 11,884, or 94%, were occupied. The 807 units remaining were vacant. The vacancy rate was 2%, while the rental vacancy rate was 7.2%. Seasonal use of housing units totals less than 1%, with 48 total housing units available.

Housing tenure refers to whether occupants own or rent the housing unit in which they reside. The 2000 Census indicates that of the 11,884 total housing units occupied 6,698, or approximately 56%, are owner-occupied. Conversely, renter occupied units make up approximately 44% of the total housing tenure. This equates to 5,186 renter-occupied housing units within the City of Porterville. Further, the average household size of an owner-occupied unit is 3.19 and the average household size of a renter is 3.2.
Based on the ethnic composition data for the City of Porterville, persons of Hispanic origin make up the majority of the population (49%). Minority groups include Caucasians (non-Hispanic: 42% of the population), persons of Asian and Pacific Island descent (5%), and African-Americans (1%). American Indian and Other ethnicities make up the remaining 3% of the population. Figures 4 through 8 show the distributions of the groups within the City.

In 2000, 13% of persons eighteen years of age or older in the City of Porterville had a high school diploma and 9% had a Bachelor’s degree. Forty eight (48%) percent of the population does not have a high school diploma and 12% have attended college but do not have a degree. The Census data indicates that approximately 13,166 residents were enrolled in school during 2000.

The 2000 Census data reveals that the median household income for the City of Porterville is $32,046, while the average income is $41,836. The per capita income is $12,745. The Below $20,000 income range is represented by 31% of the total number of households (Figure 9). Sixteen (16%) percent of households earn $20,000 to $29,999, 22% fall into the $30,000 to $49,999 income category, and 31% fall into the $50,000+ category.
ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER POPULATION DISTRIBUTION
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Fifteen (15%) percent of the population within the City of Porterville hold a position in an executive, administrative or managerial occupation according to the 2000 Census. Five (5%) percent of the population has a position in sales or care occupations. Three (3%) percent of the population hold positions in household, protective or other service occupations. Occupations involving farming, forestry or fishing comprise 3% of the total population. Eight (8%) percent of the population are employed in an occupation involving precision production, craft, and repair.

According to the 2000 Census, 10,183 persons in the City of Porterville commute to work. Seventy-two (72%) percent of the working population drive alone to work, 19% carpool, less than 1% use public transit, 6% walk to work, and 3% use other means of transportation or telecommute. The average commute time to work in 2000 was 18 minutes.

REFERENCES

The following documents were used in the preparation of the Short Range Transit Plan:

* 1984 City of Porterville Transit Development Plan
* 1990 City of Porterville Transit Development Plan
* 1992 Transit System Performance Audit
* 1993 Update Tulare County Congestion Management Program
* 1993 Tulare County Association of Governments Census Data Book
* 1993 Porterville Circulation Element
* 1994 Tulare County Regional Transportation Plan
* 1994 Coordination Plan for the Tulare County Transit Systems
* 1994 Air Quality Guidelines for General Plans
* 1994 San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District Rule 9001-Commute-Based Trip Reduction
* 1994 City of Porterville Land-Use Element
* 1994 Tulare County Social Services Transportation Study
* 2000 U. S. Census
* 2003 City of Porterville Transit Development Plan
CHAPTER 2 – EXISTING SERVICES

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT FIXED ROUTE SERVICE

The City of Porterville operates Porterville Transit as its fixed route service. The fixed route service currently serves an estimated service area population of over 59,000 residing within the City of Porterville and surrounding unincorporated areas. Presently, Porterville Transit provides service with eight active vehicles to the urban area of Porterville and its unincorporated county areas. Figure 10 delineates Porterville Transit routes.

- **Route 1** serves central and west Porterville, including Sierra View District Hospital on Putnam, Porterville Union High School, and locations along Olive, Westwood, and Morton.
- **Route 2** serves northwest Porterville, including Monache High School, commercial areas along Henderson, Westfield, North Grand, Prospect, and north Main Street.
- **Route 3** serves eastern portions of the City, including several residential areas. The route travels along Date Avenue and Springville Drive to the eastern service boundary at Doyle, then along Crabtree, Holcomb, east Olive, and Putnam.
- **Route 4** serves southeastern portions of the City, including the Porterville Development Center, Porterville College, Pioneer Junior High School and other areas south of Highway 190, and locations along Main Street, Orange Avenue, and Plano.
- **Route 5** serves central and west Porterville, including commercial areas along Henderson and locations on Morton, Westwood, and Plano.
- **Route 6** serves Downtown Porterville, Sierra View District Hospital, Porterville High School, Jaye Street, and the Family HealthCare Network.

Porterville Transit provides fixed route service Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and on Saturday from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Porterville Transit does not operate on Sundays, New Year’s Day, Independence Day, Thanksgiving Day, or Christmas Day.

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT DEMAND-RESPONSE SERVICE

The City of Porterville operates COLT as its demand-response service. The demand-response service currently serves an estimated service area population of over 59,000 residing within the City of Porterville and surrounding unincorporated areas. Presently, COLT service provides demand-response service with five active vehicles to the urban area of Porterville and its unincorporated county areas.

COLT provides dial-a-ride service Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and on Saturday from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. COLT does not operate on Sundays, New Year’s Day, Independence Day, Thanksgiving Day, or Christmas Day. The COLT dial-a-ride service handles
all requested trips on a first come, first serve basis. COLT accepts reservations up to three hours before the desired trip time. When scheduling a pick-up, customers are advised of their approximate pick-up time and every effort is made to pick-up that customer as soon as reasonably possible. COLT drivers assist handicapped persons boarding the vehicle, and passengers with shopping bags, parcels or small children.
FIXED ROUTE RIDERSHIP PROFILE

In 2002/03 ridership on Porterville Transit totaled 447,282 passengers. This is a 2% decrease from the previous 2001/02 fiscal year, which totaled 454,564 passengers. In October 2002 ridership on Porterville Transit peaked with 43,609 passengers. Three months prior, in July 2002, ridership was at its lowest level during the fiscal year with 33,487 passengers. The average monthly ridership in FY 2002/03 on Porterville Transit was 37,274 passengers.

Below is an outline of monthly ridership on Porterville Transit over the last fiscal year.

![Porterville Transit Monthly Ridership Graph](image)

DEMAND-RESPONSE RIDERSHIP PROFILE

In FY 2002/03 ridership on COLT totaled 73,789 passengers. This represented an 11% decrease over the previous year, which totaled 86,716 passengers. In October 2002 ridership on COLT peaked at 7,483 passengers. In June 2003 ridership was at its lowest level during the fiscal year with 5,148 passengers. The average monthly ridership in 2002/03 on COLT was 6,149 passengers.

Following is an outline of monthly ridership on the COLT system over the last fiscal year.
Fixed Route Service Comparisons

Table 1 below compares 2002/03 performance of the Porterville Transit service with other fixed route transit services in the Central San Joaquin Valley.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Porterville Transit</th>
<th>Tulare Transit Express</th>
<th>Visalia City Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Ridership</td>
<td>447,282</td>
<td>336,000</td>
<td>1,048,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Box Ratio</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>9.16%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$3.38</td>
<td>$2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost Per Hour</td>
<td>$38.50</td>
<td>$61.21</td>
<td>$43.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - Fixed Route Service Comparison

Demand-Response Service Comparisons

Table 2 compares 2002/03 performance of the COLT service with other demand-response transit services in the Central San Joaquin Valley.
**DEMAND-RESPONSE SERVICE COMPARISON**  
(FT 2002/03)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>COLT Service</th>
<th>Tulare DART</th>
<th>Visalia Dial-a-Ride</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Ridership</td>
<td>73,789</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Box Ratio</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>10.37%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$7.70</td>
<td>$13.24</td>
<td>$4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost Per Hour</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
<td>$60.38</td>
<td>$12.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 - Demand-Response Service Comparison

**FIXED ROUTE VEHICLE PROFILE**

The fixed route fleet consists of twelve (12) vehicles; ten (10) vehicles in the active fleet and two (2) in the inactive fleet. All Porterville Transit buses are equipped with a wheelchair lift and securement system to better serve passengers who are physically challenged. The following table shows the fixed route (Porterville Transit) fleet inventory for 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Make and Model</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8142</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Collins Diplomat</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8143</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Collins Diplomat</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8150</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Ford E450 Aerotech</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8151</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Ford E450 Aerotech</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8152</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Ford E450 Aerotech</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8156</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8157</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8158</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8159</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>MST Freightliner</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8160</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>MST Freightliner</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8161</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>MST Freightliner</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8162</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>MST Freightliner</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 - Fixed Route Fleet Inventory
The five-year program for replacement of Porterville Transit and COLT vehicles is designed to provide adequate equipment to meet the service demands projected. The capital plan has been developed to be consistent with the City’s acquisition schedule. The Transit Capital Plan was developed for the City of Porterville in the 2003 Transit Development Plan (TDP). The Transit Capital for the FY 2003/04 to FY 2006/07 includes: the purchase of four medium duty fixed route transit coaches, the installation of new bus stop signs, and an annual bus stop sign replacement and bus shelter installation program.

**Capital Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>10 Bus Stop Signs/Poles</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>2 New Shelters</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>10 Bus Stop Signs/Poles</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>2 New Shelters</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>2 Thirty (30) Passenger Buses</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>10 Bus Stop Signs/Poles</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>2 New Shelters</td>
<td>$11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>2 Thirty (30) Passenger Buses</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>10 Bus Stop Signs/Poles</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>2 New Shelters</td>
<td>$11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL $805,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 - Capital Program Equipment Purchase

**DEMAND-RESPONSE VEHICLE PROFILE**

The demand-response fleet consists of eleven (11) vehicles; six (6) vehicles in the active fleet and five (5) in the inactive fleet. All COLT buses are lift equipped Activans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Make and Model</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D8145</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Activan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8146</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Activan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8147</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Activan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8148</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Activan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8149</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Activan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8153</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Activan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8154</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Activan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8155</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Activan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8163</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Activan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8164</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Activan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8165</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Activan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 - Demand-Response Fleet Inventory

The five-year program for replacement of COLT vehicles is designed to provide adequate equipment to meet the service demands projected. A Transit Capital Plan has been developed to be consistent with the City's acquisition schedule. The replacement of mini-vans at five years will ensure higher service reliability and reduce maintenance cost increases. The table below is a copy of the proposed capital program.

### Capital Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>2 Mini-vans</td>
<td>6 each</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>2 Mini-vans</td>
<td>6 each</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>1 Mini-van</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $304,000

Table 6 - Capital Program Vehicle Replacement
FIXED Route Fare Structure

Porterville Transit has a one-way fare of 75¢ and timed transfers are free. Children under the age of 4 ride for free (two children per adult).

DEMAND-RESPONSE FARE STRUCTURE

The current COLT fare structure is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (62 and older)</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (after 6:00 p.m. with student ID)</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child (5 and older)</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 4 (two children per adult)</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) riders must show his/her eligibility card in order to receive the reduced fare. Present eligibility requirements include: self-certification, licensed professional certification and the use of medical verification on an "as needed" basis. Eligibility screening will be given to anyone who requests it, or to anyone who requests screening on behalf of a potential rider. All requests for eligibility will be reviewed and a determination of eligibility made within 21 days of receipt of a completed application or telephone/TDD interview. Applicants will be advised of their eligibility determination in writing within 21 days of receipt of a completed application. The eligibility determination letter explains any eligibility limitations and/or conditions. If the applicant is determined to be ineligible, the determination letter states the reasons for the finding.

FIXED Route Financial

Porterville Transit cost a total of $917,026 in FY 2002/03. Tulare County Local Transit Funding (LTF) and fare box revenue are the main sources of revenue for Porterville Transit. The passenger fare revenue totaled $163,138 in FY 2002/03, which is approximately 18% of total operating revenue. Due to its recent designation as an urban area Porterville now qualifies for Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 funding which will comprise a significant portion of the total operating revenues. The County LTF contract service fees have not yet been finalized at this time and will be substantially different from previous years since Porterville now qualifies under Section 5307.

DEMAND-RESPONSE Financial

COLT cost a total of $585,342 in FY 2002/03. Tulare County Local Transit Funding (LTF) and fare box revenue are the main sources of revenue for COLT. The passenger fare revenue totaled
$107,611 in FY 2002/03, which is approximately 18% of total operating revenue. Due to its recent designation as an urban area Porterville now qualifies for Federal Transit Administration Section 5307 funding which will comprise a significant portion of the total operating revenues. The County LTF contract service fees have not yet been finalized at this time and will be substantially different from previous years since Porterville now qualifies under Section 5307.

MANAGEMENT

The City Council is the policy-making body for the Porterville Transit and COLT services. It adopts the Short Range Transit Plan, and through the annual budgetary process, establishes operational and funding levels for the system. The City Council also sets operational policies and parameters for both services.

The City of Porterville City Council has appointed a Transit Advisory Committee in accordance with the Transportation Development Act (state law) to review the service for productivity and to make recommendations for improvements. The committee will meet throughout the Short Range Transit Plan development process.

Management of Porterville Transit and COLT are an integrated function of the City of Porterville. The City Manager’s office is responsible for the overall management of the service.

Program management of the services is provided by the City’s Administration Division through the Deputy City Manager and the Administrative Analyst. These City Staff members are responsible for marketing, data analysis, contract administration, report preparation, system design and implementation, vehicle procurement, vehicle fueling, vehicle storage, vehicle maintenance, state and federal funding program management, and they act as liaisons to the Tulare County Association of Governments, CALTRANS and the Federal Transit Administration.

The City has used a private contractor to operate the service since it began operation in 1981. In July 1994, the City contracted with Sierra Management, a private contractor, to perform the daily operations of the transit service. Sierra Management is responsible for dispatching, drivers, fare collection, reporting, and ridership data collection.

The County of Tulare has contracted with the City of Porterville to provide transit service to the unincorporated areas surrounding Porterville through the use of Local Transportation Funding (LTF). The County of Tulare reimburses the City for service provided to those County residents using both Porterville Transit and COLT services.
PORTERVILLE TRANSIT
MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

PORTERVILLE CITY COUNCIL

ADMINISTRATION
John Longley, City Manager

ADMINISTRATION DIVISION
(Public Transportation)
Darrel Pyle, Deputy City Manager
Linda A. Clark, Administrative Analyst

TRANSIT CONTRACTOR
(Sierra Management)
Steve Tree, Owner
Richard Tree, General Manager

COUNTY OF TULARE
(Resource Management Agency)
Doug Wilson, Director
Dan Fox, Transit Manager
DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER

The Downtown Transit Center in the City of Porterville was built to establish a centralized location for the routing of transit buses, coordination of transit systems, access to the Union Pacific Railroad, and to attract revenue-generating enterprises related with the center. Prior to its opening in May 2003, the City of Porterville did not have an integrated transit center. Buses were routed through an on-street transfer site located on Second Street in the downtown area, where only four buses could be accommodated at any one time.

The Downtown Transit Center (see Figure 11 – Photograph log) is located on Oak Avenue between “D” Street and Hockett Street. The building was constructed on a previously abandoned car wash site. The new 2,790 square foot building houses a dispatch center for the transit system and a ticket office that is surrounded by nine bus bays and landscaping. Besides City managed services, Orange Belt Stages and an AMTRAK bus service are housed within the facility. In addition, the Transit Center Building also includes a well-lit 24-hour car parking lot for employees and persons traveling overnight.
EXISTING INTERFACE BETWEEN TRANSIT SYSTEMS

A number of transit systems interface within the Porterville area. Porterville Transit and COLT currently provide transit service to the Porterville Developmental Center and the Porterville Sheltered Workshop. The Porterville Sheltered Workshop also provides transit service to its clients from their homes to program work sites. The service operates Monday through Friday from 5:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., and limited hours on Saturday and Sunday. The Porterville Sheltered Workshop service area encompasses approximately 700 square miles in southeast Tulare County. The Developmental Center provides door-to-door transit service to its clients attending Porterville Sheltered Workshop activities, as well as other activities throughout the Porterville area. This service operates between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on a daily basis. The Porterville Sheltered Workshop contracts with the Tulare County Housing Authority to provide service to senior citizens residing at the Sequoia Dawn facility in Springville. This service operates on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. for the first two weeks of the month and on Thursdays (only) during the last two weeks of the month.

The County of Tulare currently operates three inter-city transit routes that serve Porterville. The Southeast route travels between Visalia, Farmersville, Exeter, Lindsay, Strathmore, and Porterville. The Lindsay-Strathmore-Porterville line serves each of the towns in the bus route’s name. The Springville-Porterville route travels between Springville and Porterville. In Porterville, the Tulare County Transit service can be utilized Monday through Friday at the Downtown Transit Center.

The Orange Belt Stages, which is partially funded by Tulare County Transit, provides bus service between Porterville and Bakersfield, as well as between Porterville, Visalia, and Hanford. The service is designed to provide basic inter-city service, carry express packages and connect to both AMTRAK and Greyhound depots. Orange Belt Stages provides one round trip per day between Porterville and Bakersfield, and one round trip per day between Porterville and Visalia/Hanford.

The Family HealthCare Network is now providing vanpool transportation services along a designated route in the outlying Porterville areas. Transportation services can be accessed at locations in Poplar, Terra Bella, and Woodville. These services are free to Family HealthCare Network patients and their families.

PARATRANSPORT PLAN FOR AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

The 2003 Paratransit Plan for the City of Porterville is a result of the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). The Americans with Disabilities Act requires that public entities which operate fixed route transit services provide comparable paratransit service to disabled persons who are unable to use the fixed route service. This plan updates the information and findings contained in the 2003 Paratransit Plan.
The Americans with Disabilities Act requires that “complementary paratransit programs” must provide a level of service that is comparable to that provided on the fixed route system. Six service criteria are used to determine comparability. These six criteria state that paratransit service must:

- Operate in the same service area as the fixed route system;
- Have a response time that is comparable;
- Have comparable fares;
- Have comparable days and hours of service;
- Meet requests for any trip purpose; and,
- Not limit service availability because of capacity constraints.

The City of Porterville currently meets all of the six service criteria as stated in the Americans with Disabilities Act. The City of Porterville operates the City Operated Local Transit (COLT) as a paratransit service. COLT overlaps and surpasses the service area of the City’s fixed route service (Porterville Transit). Generally, COLT has a response time of service within one hour or less. In addition, advanced reservations can be made up to fourteen days before service is needed. COLT operates the same days as the fixed route service and has service hours that operate beyond those of the fixed route service. All requests for service are met regardless of trip purpose within the response time set forth in the policy section of the City of Porterville’s 2003 Transit Development Plan. Currently, COLT capacity surpasses the demand for service, and the fare structure is set to charge handicapped passengers a fare of not more than twice the fare charged on the fixed route service.

The 2003 Paratransit Plan represents the second paratransit service plan prepared for the Porterville Transit and COLT services. With the adoption of this document, the City of Porterville will continue its historic commitment to providing transit service to the disabled members of the community.
CHAPTER 3 – ANALYSIS SECTION

The Analysis Section will discuss various components of the Porterville Transit and COLT services. By analyzing specific components, a better understanding of the overall operation of the service can be achieved. The results will provide clarity and direction for the operational, capital and planning activities in the coming years.

The Analysis Section will begin by looking at the overall performance of the existing fixed route and demand-response transit services. This section will illustrate annual ridership, cost per passenger, and fare box ratios for the last three years. This section will also provide a summary of the annual ridership for FY 2002/03, as well as ridership assessments by month. Average response times, wait time, ride time and service time data will be outlined in this section. This section will also contain an operational analysis of the existing Porterville Transit and COLT services, as well as future ridership projections of Porterville Transit and COLT ridership demands. Complete assessments of the current vehicle structures are also included.

In addition, the Analysis Section will analyze three operating alternatives including the continuation of the existing services, the expansion of fixed route with restricted COLT use, and fixed route based on projected demand. This section also includes equipment purchase programs. Finally, the Analysis Section will present the results of the rider surveys conducted to determine the community’s and passenger’s attitudes regarding the transit services. These surveys are used to assess the needs and desires of the community, as well as those of the current passengers in response to Porterville Transit and COLT services.

PORTERVILLE TRANSIT SERVICE PERFORMANCE

In addition to the performance data, a series of assessments were completed to provide a better understanding of the operations and productivity of the fixed route service. The following graphs show a comparison of annual ridership, costs, fare revenues, fare box ratios, and costs per passenger over the last three years.
Annual ridership on Porterville Transit has remained steady over the past three years. This is unusual since the population of Porterville has increased over the same time period.

While annual ridership has remained stable, the annual cost of providing Porterville Transit service has increased by approximately 50%.
The annual fare revenues reflect the ridership data for the past three years. Porterville Transit fare revenues have increased 15% in the past year.

Porterville Tranist’s fare box ratios have declined over the past three years.
The annual cost per passenger on Porterville Transit has increased approximately 44% over the past three years. This increase reflects the increases in annual costs given the flat annual ridership data.

The following graph illustrates the ridership by month for FY 2002/03.

The ridership by month data suggests that Porterville Transit’s busiest busiest month is October, and that its slowest month is July.
The Porterville Transit service performance for 2002/03 reflects that the fixed route service is achieving or exceeding some of the established service standards. The following table compares the overall performance of the Porterville Transit service for FY 2002/03 with the established service standards described in the Policy section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORTERVILLE TRANSIT SERVICE STANDARDS</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fare Box Ratio</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost Per Revenue Hour</td>
<td>$38.50</td>
<td>$35.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Revenue Hour</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>25.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On Time Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 minutes</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>99%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passenger Complaints/ Passengers Carried</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 complaint / 1,000 boardings</td>
<td>.01%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preventable Accidents/ Revenue Mile Operated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 accident / 200,000 revenue miles</td>
<td>.0005%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadcalls/ Revenue Mile Operated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 roadcall / 10,000 revenue miles</td>
<td>.01%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus Trips Cancelled</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero tolerance</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Achieved service standard

Table 7 - Porterville Transit Service Standards

The Porterville Transit service has achieved or exceeded standards in 2 of the 5 performance categories for which data is available.

**COLT Service Performance**

In addition to the performance data, a series of assessments were completed to provide a better understanding of the operations and productivity of the existing COLT service. The following graphs show a comparison of annual ridership, costs, fare revenues, fare box ratios, and costs per passenger over the last three years.
Annual ridership on COLT has decreased approximately 15% over the past year. This reflects the continuing shift of passengers to the fixed route service.

While annual ridership has declined, the annual cost of providing the COLT service increased approximately 23% last year.
COLT's annual fare revenues have remained stable over the last three fiscal years.

COLT's fare box ratios for the past three years have declined, which reflects the increased cost of the service.
The annual cost per passenger on COLT has increased approximately 84% over the past year. This increase reflects the increases in annual costs and the decline in annual ridership.

The following graph illustrates the ridership by month for FY 2002/03.

The ridership by month data suggests that COLT’s busiest month is October and its slowest month is June.
The COLT service performance for 2002/03 reflects that the COLT service is achieving or exceeding some of the established service standards. The following table compares the overall performance of the COLT service for FY 2002/03 with the established service standards described in the Policy section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLT SERVICE STANDARDS</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>2002/03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fare Box Ratio</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$7.70</td>
<td>$7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost Per Revenue Hour</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
<td>$33.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Revenue Hour</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Time Performance</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Complaints/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Carried</td>
<td>.01%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventable Accidents/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Mile Operated</td>
<td>.0005%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadcalls / Revenue Mile Operated</td>
<td>.01%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Trips Cancelled</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial-a-COLT Denials</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Achieved service standard

Table 8 - COLT Service Standards

The COLT service has achieved or exceeded standard in 2 of the 5 performance categories for which data is available.

FUTURE TRANSIT DEMAND

Estimation of future demand for transit can be based on a number of factors including population, automobile ownership, income, service availability and historic ridership. The
estimation of the five-year demand for transit service in Porterville has been completed using two methods. The first method assumes the continuation of the existing type and scope of transit service. The second method attempts to estimate the total demand for transit service within the service area.

The future transit demand projections for continuation of services were calculated for both the fixed route and demand-response services using the current annual per capita trip rate. Per capita trip rates reflect the transit trip making characteristics of a community. The number of transit trips made per capita is reflective of the type and frequency of service, the fare structure and the socio-economic profile of the population.

- The estimation of future trips for continuation of the existing fixed route service was based on the current per capita trip rate of 6.35 trips per year. This factor was multiplied by the estimated service area population to determine the projected annual ridership.

- The estimation of future trips for continuation of the existing COLT service was based on the current per capita trip rate of 1.04 trips per year. This factor was multiplied by the estimated service area population to determine the projected annual ridership.

In contrast to the projection of trips for continuation of the existing services, an estimate was developed for the total number of transit trips that could be expected from the service area. An estimation of total transit trip demand was prepared to establish a maximum level of ridership that could reasonably be expected over the next five years.

- The estimation of total latent demand for fixed route ridership was calculated using a per capita trip rate of 10.6 trips per year. This per capita number was derived from a review of comparable cities which provide fixed route services. The per capita rate is intended to provide an approximation of the demand for transit service within a community the size of Porterville. This trip demand factor was multiplied by the estimated service area population to determine the projected annual transit demand for Porterville Transit operations.

- The estimation of total latent demand for demand-response ridership was calculated using a per capita trip rate of 0.36 trips per year. This per capita number was derived from a review of comparable cities which provide Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and senior only demand-response services. The per capita rate is intended to provide an approximation of the demand for transit service within a community the size of Porterville. This trip demand factor was multiplied by the estimated service area population to determine the projected annual transit demand for COLT operations.
The following chart outlines the future transit demand for Porterville Transit in fiscal years 2004/05 through 2008/09.

Using the existing trip rate, by FY 2008/09 the fixed route service can be expected to have an annual demand of approximately 549,000 passengers. This would represent an increase of 23% over current annual ridership and would mirror the expected increase in service area population.

Using the estimated demand rate for transit, the annual demand for transit service for FY 2008/09 is expected to be approximately 917,000 passengers. This ridership would represent an increase of 105% over current annual ridership.

The following chart outlines the future transit demand for COLT in fiscal years 2004/05 through 2008/09.
Using the existing trip rate, by FY 2008/09 the demand-response service can be expected to have an annual demand of approximately 90,000 passengers. This would represent an increase of 22% over current annual ridership and would mirror the expected increase in service area population.

Using the estimated demand rate for transit which is based on the conversion of the service to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and senior only service, the annual demand for transit service for FY 2008/09 is expected to be approximately 31,000 passengers. This would represent a 57% reduction in demand.

SERVICE ALTERNATIVES

Three service alternatives have been explored in an effort to respond to projected transit demand. In response to future ridership demands, the City may choose to retain its current fixed route and dial-a-ride services which would continue to operate in the same manner. The City may choose to expand the fixed route service but with a restricted demand-response service. Or, the City may choose to significantly expand the fixed route service and implement the restricted demand-response service. The evaluation of each of the alternatives will focus on the anticipated ridership, fare revenue, fare box ratio projections and operating costs.

OPTION 1 - EXISTING TRANSIT AND COLT SERVICE

The continuation of the existing transit service was analyzed in response to the projected transit demand increases over the next five years. Based on this data, ridership demand given the service levels provided for by the current fixed route service is projected to be approximately 549,000 by
FY 2008/09. Similarly, ridership demand for the current level of demand-response service is projected to be approximately 90,000 by FY 2008/09.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Fare Revenues</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Net Costs</th>
<th>Fare Box Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>479,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$692,000</td>
<td>$517,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td>$181,000</td>
<td>$727,000</td>
<td>$546,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>513,000</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
<td>$763,000</td>
<td>$576,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>531,000</td>
<td>$194,000</td>
<td>$801,000</td>
<td>$607,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>549,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$841,000</td>
<td>$641,000</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 - Option 1: Porterville Transit Existing Service

Under this alternative Porterville Transit ridership is projected to increase approximately 23% over the current level. The annual operating costs are projected to increase 34% over current costs. Based on the above illustration, the fare box ratio will fall below the 30% performance standard for fixed route service.

The following table delineates the projected performance of the COLT service over the next five years. This scenario assumes the current level of service is maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Fare Revenues</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Net Costs</th>
<th>Fare Box Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>$114,000</td>
<td>$645,000</td>
<td>$531,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>$118,000</td>
<td>$677,000</td>
<td>$559,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>$123,000</td>
<td>$711,000</td>
<td>$589,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>$127,000</td>
<td>$747,000</td>
<td>$920,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>$131,000</td>
<td>$784,000</td>
<td>$653,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 - Option 1: COLT Existing Service

COLT ridership is projected to increase approximately 21% over the current level of ridership. The operating costs are projected to increase by 34%. Based on the above illustration, the fare box ratio will remain at or slightly above the 17% performance standard for demand-response service.
OPTION 2 – EXPANDED FIXED ROUTE WITH RESTRICTED COLT SERVICE

In order to meet a greater demand for transit service, the service could be focused on the fixed route service but continue a demand-response service restricted to persons who are elderly or handicapped. Under this option, the fixed route service would be expanded from its current 6-bus operation to a 9-bus service. This would significantly increase the passenger per hour capacity and alleviate current capacity constraints on selected routes. The existing COLT service would remain in effect to accommodate those transit passengers who are unable to ride the fixed route system, generally, individuals who qualify under the Americans with Disabilities Act and senior citizens. The following chart delineates the projected performance of the expanded fixed route service with restricted use on COLT over the next five years. Ridership projections for FY 2004/05 through 2008/09 represent annual combined totals for fixed route and demand-response services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Fare Revenues</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Net Costs</th>
<th>Fare Box Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>639,000</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>$1,038,000</td>
<td>$805,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>661,000</td>
<td>$241,000</td>
<td>$1,090,000</td>
<td>$849,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>684,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$1,144,000</td>
<td>$895,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>708,000</td>
<td>$258,000</td>
<td>$1,202,000</td>
<td>$943,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>733,000</td>
<td>$268,000</td>
<td>$1,262,000</td>
<td>$994,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 - Option 2: Expanded Porterville Transit Service

Under this alternative Porterville Transit ridership is projected to increase approximately 15% over the five years shown above. The analysis illustrates that as ridership increases, fare revenues and operating costs will increase as well. The operating costs are projected to increase 21%. The net cost represents the cost to the City of Porterville after deducting the fare revenues from the operating costs. Based on the above illustration, the fare box ratio will fall below the 30% performance standard for fixed route service.

The following table delineates the projected performance of the COLT service over the next five years. This scenario assumes that COLT service is restricted to ADA and senior service only.
RESTRICTED COLT SERVICE (OPTION 2)
(FY 2004/05 THROUGH 2008/09)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Fare Revenues</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Net Costs</th>
<th>Fare Box Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$223,000</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
<td>$193,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$246,000</td>
<td>$204,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$258,000</td>
<td>$214,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$271,000</td>
<td>$226,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 - Option 2: Restricted COLT Service

COLT ridership would decrease significantly under this option. As all general riders are shifted off of COLT, the remaining demand would be approximately 58% lower than the current level of ridership. Under this scenario, the annual operating costs are projected to decrease 54% over the current level. Based on the above illustration with the restricted COLT service, the fare box ratio will remain at or slightly above the 17% performance standard for demand-response service.

OPTION 3 – DEMAND DRIVEN FIXED ROUTE WITH RESTRICTED COLT SERVICE

In order to serve a greater demand for transit service, the significant expansion of fixed route service was assessed. Under this option, the fixed route service would be expanded from its current 6-bus service to a 12-bus system. The existing demand-response service would be converted to a restricted ADA and senior service.

The following table delineates the projected performance of the demand-driven fixed route service over the next five years. Ridership projections for FY 2004/05 through 2008/09 represent annual totals for the fixed route service.

DEMAND DRIVEN PORTERVILLE TRANSIT SERVICE (OPTION 3)
(FY 2004/05 THROUGH 2008/09)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Fare Revenues</th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Net Costs</th>
<th>Fare Box Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>799,000</td>
<td>$292,000</td>
<td>$1,384,000</td>
<td>$1,092,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>827,000</td>
<td>$302,000</td>
<td>$1,453,000</td>
<td>$1,151,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>856,000</td>
<td>$312,000</td>
<td>$1,526,000</td>
<td>$1,214,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>886,000</td>
<td>$323,000</td>
<td>$1,602,000</td>
<td>$1,279,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>917,000</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>$1,682,000</td>
<td>$1,348,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 - Option 3: Demand Driven Porterville Transit Service
The analysis suggests that annual ridership is projected to increase by 105% over current levels. The operating costs are also projected to increase to provide this expanded level of service. It is important to note that the fare box ratio is estimated to remain below the 30% performance standard for fixed route service.

**FIVE-YEAR EQUIPMENT PURCHASE PROGRAM**

The five-year program for replacement of Porterville Transit and COLT vehicles is designed to provide adequate equipment to meet the service demands projected. The Capital Plan has been developed to be consistent with the City’s acquisition schedule. The Capital Plan was initially developed for the Federal Transit Administration’s Section 5307 Program. The Capital Plan for the period FY 2004/05 to FY 2008/09 includes: the purchase of ten medium-duty fixed route transit coaches, the installation of new bus turn-outs, and an annual bus stop sign replacement and bus shelter installation program. The replacement of mini-vans over the next five years will ensure higher service reliability and reduce maintenance costs. Table 14 is a copy of the proposed capital program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>50 Bus Stop Signs/Poles</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>5 Shelters/Benches</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>Bus Turn-outs</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>2 Thirty (30)-Passenger Buses</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>2 Five (5)-Passenger Mini-vans</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>Bus Washer/Storage Area</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>50 Bus Stop Signs/Poles</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>5 Shelters/Benches</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>Bus Turn-outs</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>2 Thirty (30)-Passenger Buses</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>2 Five (5)-Passenger Mini-vans</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>50 Bus Stop Signs/Poles</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>5 Shelters/Benches</td>
<td>$11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>Bus Turn-outs</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>2 Thirty (30)-Passenger Buses</td>
<td>$423,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>1 Five (5)-Passenger Mini-vans</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>50 Bus Stop Signs/Poles</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>5 Shelters/Benches</td>
<td>$11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>Bus Turn-outs</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>2 Thirty (30)-Passenger Buses</td>
<td>$465,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>1 Five (5)-Passenger Mini-vans</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>2 Thirty (30)-Passenger Buses</td>
<td>$512,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>1 Five (5)-Passenger Mini-vans</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
$2,966,785

Table 14 - Transit Capital Program

**MARKETING**

On-board surveys are one of the most accurate and cost effective means of obtaining information about current riders. A well-designed and administered survey can provide statistically valid data about who rides the system (demographics), where they travel (origin-destination) and how they
feel about the service they receive. Surveys are often the only direct source of information about trip purpose and mode choice. Surveys can also be used to identify service needs, and to answer specific policy questions.

On-board surveys were administered for Porterville Transit and COLT in October 2001. Surveys were provided in both English and Spanish.

PORTERVILLE TRANSIT PASSENGER SURVEY RESULTS

Surveyors collected 405 surveys from Porterville Transit passengers. Of these, 318 were collected on weekdays, and 87 on Saturday. This represents a response rate of 13.9%, based on the ridership for the days the surveys were administered.

Results of the surveys are summarized below. All responses are for combined weekday and Saturday ridership. Any significant differences between weekday and Saturday responses are noted.

Age

Approximately half of respondents (47%) were working age adults between the ages of 19 and 44 years. The system also serves a significant number of school-aged passengers. Youth between the ages of 16 and 18 made up 22% of respondents. Youth 15 years of age and under represented 13% of respondents. The number of passengers in this age group is likely much higher, as the survey excluded children approximately 13 years of age and younger. A tally of passengers who did not complete surveys indicates that approximately 36% of riders are 13 years of age and younger (28% on weekdays and 44% on Saturday).

Adults between the ages of 45 and 59 comprised 14% of respondents. Approximately 4% of passengers are 60 years of age and over. This is relatively small compared to the 12% of local residents that are above age 60.

On Saturdays, the percentage of riders aged 24 and younger is lower, while the percentage of riders aged 25 and older is higher. This is likely due to the fact that school-aged passengers use the bus to go to and from school during the week.
Gender

Just under two-thirds (64%) of respondents were female. The proportion of females was slightly higher (68%) on Saturday. Routes 5 and 3 had especially high percentages of female respondents, with approximately 70% each. Routes 4 and 1 had the highest percentages of male respondents, with 48% and 45% respectively.

Income

The majority (56%) of respondents reported household incomes under $30,000, with 41% in the very low-income category. Since over one-third of respondents (39%) were unwilling to state their income, the actual percentage in these categories could be much higher. Although household size is not known, it is likely that many of these households are at, or near the poverty level.

Not surprisingly, the percentage of riders with incomes above $50,000 is quite low (1%). Typically, a direct correlation exists between income and ridership. As household income increases, transit use generally decreases simply because higher income families have more options available to them.
The Porterville Transit service area has a large population of Spanish-speaking residents. To ensure that this group would have an equal opportunity to complete the survey, the survey was made available in both English and Spanish. Overall, 16% of the respondents elected to complete the form in Spanish. On Saturday, a much higher proportion of Spanish surveys were collected (30%), compared with the weekday (13%).

Route 3 had the highest overall percentage of surveys returned in Spanish (29%), followed by Route 4 (21%) and Route 2 (17%). On Saturday, Routes 3 and 4 had a particularly high percentage of surveys returned in Spanish, with 36% and 46%, respectively.

**Automobile Availability**

Respondents were asked whether they had access to an automobile for their particular trip. Approximately two-thirds (68%) of respondents indicated that they did not have a car available for their trip, underscoring the importance of transit service to Porterville Transit’s core riders. This percentage was slightly higher among Saturday respondents.

To further explore transit dependency, riders were asked whether they had a valid drivers’ license. Sixty-one percent (61%) of respondents reported that they did not have a valid drivers’ license. This ratio was higher (73%) for Saturday riders, compared with weekday riders (57%).
Alternative Modes

Another question asked riders how they would have traveled to and from their destination if transit service had not been available. A significant percentage (44%) of respondents reported that they would have walked, possibly indicating that many passengers are using transit for relatively short trips. Another 12% reported they would have obtained a ride, and 18% indicated other modes of transportation (including 3% who provided multiple responses).

Overall, 74% of respondents would have used alternate means to make the trip, while 10% of respondents reported that they would not have made the trip if the bus was not available. The remaining 16% did not provide a response.
Trip Purpose

Passengers were asked to indicate where they were coming “from” (origin) and where they were going “to” (destination). They were also asked to indicate the trip purpose for each end of their trip. Just under half (46%) of the responses indicated “home” as either the origin or destination. The other 54% of responses indicated an “activity”. Trip purpose for weekday and weekend passengers is depicted in the following charts, with the “home” responses omitted in order to illustrate activity patterns.

Respondents reported a variety of trip purposes, indicating that Porterville Transit serves a variety of different needs. However, dominant patterns emerged for both weekday and Saturday riders. Almost half (46%) of weekday passengers used the service to get to or from school/college. Other frequently mentioned weekday activities were work (13%), personal business or errands (13%), and shopping (10%).

The majority (56%) of Saturday riders indicated shopping as their primary trip purpose. The proportion of rides for recreation/social visits was also higher than on weekdays (17% on Saturday compared with 6% on weekdays), while the proportion for school/college, work, and doctor/dentist were lower.
Overall, travel to and from work comprised a relatively minor portion of total trips. In addition, the proportion of work trips did not vary significantly between weekdays and Saturday, indicating that many of those who use Porterville Transit for work trips have weekend shifts. Given that transit often serves an important role in transporting people to and from entry-level and low-wage jobs, the proportion using transit for work trips in Porterville seems low, especially when compared with other small urban systems. This number may be low due to transit hours of service; some workers might have shifts that begin before 7 a.m. or end after 6 p.m. It is also possible that low-income wage earners in Porterville have work locations that are not served by the local transit system, such as agricultural jobs that require travel outside of the city limits.

**Weekday Trip Purpose**

- School/college: 46%
- Work: 13%
- Doctor/Dentist: 5%
- Personal business or errands: 13%
- Recreation/social visit: 6%
- Other: 4%
- Multiple responses: 3%
Origins and Destinations

Respondents were asked to report the specific location of their trip origin and destination. The Porterville Transit service area was split into six geographical zones (Figure 12) and each origin and destination was coded to the zone where it is located.

Origin and destination zone activity was determined by combining the number of origin and destination trip ends within each zone. These totals were then ranked to determine the highest trip-generating zones.
Table 15 - Origin and Destination Zones

None of the zones clearly dominated trip activity. Central Porterville was the largest trip-generator, with 17.8% of total origins and destinations, followed by northeast Porterville (16.5%) and northwest Porterville (14.6%). North central Porterville and south Porterville were similar, with 8.8% and 8.6% respectively. West central Porterville generated the smallest number of trips, with 5.9%.

Twenty-eight percent (27.8%) of trip origins and destinations were unknown, either because information was not reported by respondents, or the information provided was insufficient to determine zone location.
Figure 12 - Porterville Origin and Destination Zones
Trip Pairs

Origin and destination zones were paired by trip to determine the frequency of travel patterns between zones. Trip pairs were distributed throughout the system, and no pairs had a particularly high percentage of trips. The highest frequencies occurred between Zones 4 and 5 (8.6% of trips), Zones 1 and 4 (6.4% of trips), Zones 1 and 5 (5.4% of trips), and Zones 1 and 6 (4.7% of trips). All others were 4% or less of total trips.

School Trip Generators

Respondents coming from or going to school were asked to list the name of the school. Porterville College and Granite Hills High School were the most frequently mentioned, with 35 trips and 34 trips respectively. Other schools frequently mentioned include Monache High School (18 trips), Porterville High School (11 trips), and Porterville Adult School/College (11 trips).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porterville College</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Hills High School</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monache High School</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville High School</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville Adult School</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Junior High School</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roche</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Middle School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Junior High School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus High School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 - School Origins and Destinations

Access/Egress Mode

The table below shows the modes used when traveling to and from a Porterville Transit bus stop. Responses from weekday and weekend passengers were very similar and have been combined in the table. Nearly three-quarters of the respondents (73%) indicated they walked to get to the bus. Nineteen percent (19%) indicated they transferred from another Porterville Transit route. The remaining 8% were split among other modes.

Walking was also the dominant mode for respondents to get from the bus to their destination, although the proportion was not as high as for getting to the bus. Over half (58%) of respondents
indicated they would walk. Thirty-three percent (33%) indicated they would transfer to another Porterville Transit route. The remaining 9% were split among other modes. Data suggests a low transfer rate between Porterville Transit and Tulare County Transit.

For those walking, the median walking time was five minutes for both getting to and from the bus stop.

### Access and Egress Modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>To the Bus</th>
<th>From the Bus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer on Porterville Transit</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get dropped off/picked up</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer on COLT</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer on Tulare County Transit</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 - Access and Egress Modes

Transfer Analysis

Respondents were asked how often, on average, they have to transfer between Porterville Transit buses to complete their trips. A little over a quarter of respondents (28%) require transfers “frequently”, or more than 60% of the time. Another 17% said they require transfers “often”, or about 41 to 60% of the time. Eighteen percent (18%) said “occasionally”, or about 26 to 40% of the time. Twenty-seven percent (27%) of respondents require transfers “rarely”, or about 1% to 25% of the time. Ten percent (10%) “never” require transfers for their trips.
HOW OFTEN TRANSFERS ARE REQUIRED TO COMPLETE TRIPS

Survey responses were also analyzed to determine transfer activity between specific routes. The following table shows the total number of transfers between each route pair, as indicated in the survey responses. Transfer activity was distributed throughout the system. The most frequently indicated transfers were between Routes 2 and 3 (25 trips) and Routes 1 and 3 (21 trips). Route pairs with the fewest transfers were Routes 1 and 5 (5 trips) and Routes 2 and 5 (four trips).

TRANSFER ACTIVITY BETWEEN ROUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Pairs</th>
<th>Total Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 and 3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 and 5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 and 4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 and 5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 - Transfer Activity Between Routes

Table 19 below shows the total number of transfers for each individual route. Routes 3 was involved in the largest number of total transfers (66 trips), followed by Route 2 (49 trips) and Route 1 (44 trips). Route 5 had the fewest transfers, with 31 trips.
TRANSFER ACTIVITY FOR INDIVIDUAL ROUTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Total Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 - Transfer Activity for Individual Routes

Frequency of Use

Over half (52%) of weekday riders use Porterville Transit five to six days a week. Another 30% use it three to four days a week, 11% use it one to two days a week, and 5% less than once a week. Saturday riders tend to use Porterville Transit less frequently. Thirty-eight percent (38%) indicated they use it five to six days a week, 28% use it three to four days a week, 17% use it one to two days a week, and 13% less than once a week. Two percent (2%) of weekday riders and 4% of Saturday riders indicated it was their first time using Porterville Transit.
Length of Use

The majority of respondents have used the system for more than one year, with 18% indicating they have used it more than three years, and 41% indicating they have used it one to three years. Given that Porterville’s fixed route system had only been in operation for approximately four years at the time the survey was administered, these figures demonstrate a relatively loyal ridership. Thirty-seven percent (37%) indicated they have used the system for less than one year and 4% indicated it was their first trip. Responses were similar for weekday and Saturday riders.
Use of COLT by Porterville Transit Passengers

Respondents were asked how often they use COLT. Forty-eight (48) respondents use COLT five to six days a week, 40 respondents use it three to four days a week, 31 use it one to two days a week, and 46 use it one to three times a month. This is a total of 165 respondents, or 41% of total respondents indicating they use COLT on at least a monthly basis.

Riders’ Attitudes and Opinions

Survey respondents were asked to provide comments about Porterville Transit service. Responses were coded if more than one person made the same comment. Table 20 lists positive and negative comments and the frequency mentioned.

Overall, respondents indicated that hours of service were their biggest concern, including the need for later hours/extended hours (57 respondents), Sunday service (42 respondents), and earlier hours (9 respondents). Relatively few (4 respondents) complained about the buses being late; however, a large number (53 respondents) noted the crowdedness of the buses and the need for more buses, bigger buses, and/or better or newer buses.

Another set of comments addressed issues related to the routes, including the desire for stops closer to their residence, closer routes, and/or more routes (10 respondents), the need for regular bus stops (4 respondents), and complaints about being passed up by drivers and/or inconsistent stops (2 respondents).

Fourteen (14) respondents made complaints about drivers. Five (5) respondents mentioned the desire for transit center amenities such as restrooms, restaurant, vending machine, and phones. Four (4) respondents complained about students on the bus either being too loud or making the buses late. Related to this, another 2 respondents complained about noise on the buses.

On the positive side, 59 respondents commented that the service is good, they enjoy it, it works well, it was long overdue, is very helpful, etc. Another 10 respondents noted that the drivers are nice, helpful, do a good job, etc.


COMMENTS ABOUT PORTERVILLE TRANSIT SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Later hours/extended hours</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses too crowded, need larger buses, more buses, new/better buses</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday service</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints about bus drivers - rude, not safe, need to smile more, mean, references to specific drivers</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop closer to my house, closer routes, more routes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlier hours</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit center amenities - restroom, restaurant, vending machines, phones</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus reliability, late</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students - loud, need separate bus, make buses late, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need regular bus stops</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow drinks on buses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy - radios, walkman, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bypass - don’t stop for me, drop-offs are inconsistent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower the price, need day passes, should be free</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General - good service, thanks, enjoy it, works well, long overdue, very helpful</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers - nice, helpful, do good job</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 - Rider Comments for Porterville Transit

PORTERVILLE COLT PASSENGER SURVEY RESULTS

COLT passenger surveys were distributed on COLT vehicles, with postage-paid return envelopes attached. Out of 200 surveys distributed, a total of 68 were returned, for a response rate of 34%. Daily COLT ridership ranged from 160 riders on Saturdays to 310 riders on weekdays. No data is available to determine how many individuals form the active ridership base. The COLT passenger survey provides only a “snapshot” of ridership. No statistical validity can be ascribed to these findings. The results of the survey are summarized below.

Age

As expected, the age of paratransit riders tends to be older than that of fixed route riders. Approximately half (51%) of riders are 60 years of age or older, with a significant percentage (16%) being 80 years of age or older. Another 41% are working-age adults between the ages of
19 and 59 years. The remaining 8% are 18 years of age and under, indicating that Porterville COLT serves a small percentage of school-age individuals.

AGE PROFILE OF COLT RIDERS

Gender

A large majority of survey respondents were female (79%). While females are more likely to fill out surveys, given the exceptionally large proportion of female respondents, it is likely that COLT ridership includes more females than males.

Language

The survey was provided in both English and Spanish. Seven (7) respondents elected to complete the form in Spanish. This represents 10% of respondents, a lower percentage than the 16% of fixed route respondents completing forms in Spanish.

Use of Mobility Aids

Approximately one quarter (26%) of COLT riders use a mobility aid, and three-quarters (74%) do not. Four (4) respondents use multiple mobility aids. Eight (8) respondents reported using a walker, seven (7) use a cane, seven (7) use a wheelchair, and two (2) use other mobility aids.

Automobile Availability

Surprisingly, over 90% of respondents indicated they had a car available for the trip (53% “yes”, and 38% “yes, but with inconvenience to others”). Only 9% said they did not have a car available for the trip, compared with 68% of fixed route riders who did not have a car available.

One explanation may be that the wording of the question did not distinguish those who had a car available and were able to drive it. Of the 90% of COLT riders reporting that a car was available for the trip, almost one-third indicated they use a mobility aid. Other disabilities may also
prevent use of an automobile, such as sight impairments. So even though a respondent had a car available, perhaps he or she was not able to drive it.

Alternative Modes

Respondents were asked how they would have traveled to and from their destination if COLT service had not been available. Thirty-four percent (34%) would not have made the trip, indicating a high dependence on demand-responsive service among COLT passengers. Another 22% would have walked, 10% would have taken a taxi, 6% would have obtained an automobile ride from someone, and 4% would have taken a local bus route. A very small percentage (3%) would have driven alone. Eighteen percent (18%) indicated more than one choice.

Common Origins and Destinations

Respondents were asked to name the key places they use COLT to get to. The top response was doctor, hospital or other medical trip, with 30 responses. The next most common responses were Wal-Mart (26 responses), Save Mart (16 responses), other grocery shopping (13 responses), other locations (13 responses), and Target/Mervyn’s (11 responses).
COMMON DESTINATIONS FOR COLT RIDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctor, Hospital, or Other Medical Trip</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal-Mart</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savemart</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grocery Shopping</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target/Mervyn’s</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville College</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Shopping</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 - Common Destinations for COLT Riders

Frequency of Use

The majority of COLT riders use the service on a very frequent basis. Twenty-three percent (23%) of respondents report using the service daily. Another 29% report using it three to four days a week. Twenty percent (20%) use the service one to two days a week, 25% use it one to three days a month, and 3% use it less than ten days a year.

FREQUENCY OF USE – COLT RIDERS

- Less than 10 days a year: 3%
- 1-3 days a month: 25%
- 1-2 days/week: 20%
- 3-4 days/week: 29%
- Daily: 23%
Length of Use

Over three-quarters (78%) of COLT riders have been using the service for more than one year. Sixteen percent (16%) report using it for one year or less. Six percent (6%) indicated it was their first time using the service.

Use of Porterville Transit by COLT Passengers

In response to a question about whether they ever use the other Porterville bus services, 57% said “yes” and 43% said “no”. When asked why they do not use the other bus services, respondents cited the following reasons: convenience; distance to stops; difficulties related to their disabilities; not wanting to transfer; the routes not going where they need them; the fixed route being too complex; flexibility for multiple destinations; not knowing where the bus stops are because stops are not marked; the bus not stopping for them; and not being aware of other bus services.

COLT Riders’ Attitudes and Opinions

Respondents were asked what they like and do not like about COLT. As far as what they like about the service, almost two-thirds of respondents (42) noted that the drivers and/or other staff are friendly, nice, helpful, courteous, etc. About half of respondents (31) made a comment about the service being convenient, helpful for getting around, etc. One-quarter of respondents (17) noted that the service is on-time/fast/efficient. Eight (8) respondents noted that the cost is reasonable/affordable.

As far as what they do not like about the service, almost half of respondents (31) commented that the wait for pick-ups is too long, pick-ups are late, or the trip takes too long. This was the only
significant complaint. Seven (7) respondents complained about the hours of service; service does not run late enough and should run on Sundays and Holidays. Other minor complaints include that the drivers are rude or drive recklessly, etc. (4 comments), dispatchers are rude or have a bad attitude (3 comments), passengers have to call early for an appointment and/or cannot make next day reservations (2 comments), and the cost is too high (1 comment).

**COMMENTS ABOUT PORTERVILLE COLT SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drivers/Staff are friendly, nice, helpful, courteous</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The service exists; helps me get around; independence; convenience; door-to-door service; handicap accommodations; can make reservations; runs many hours</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On time; fast service; good service; efficient</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost is reasonable, affordable</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiting to be picked up; late pick-ups; trip takes too long</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours - quit too early; no Sunday or Holiday service</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to call early for an appointment; no next day reservation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers - rude, bad drivers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatchers - rude; attitude</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 - Rider Comments for COLT

According to the Rider survey results, on the whole passengers are satisfied with the current level of transit service that Porterville Transit/COLT is providing them. The biggest concern indicated by respondents is the need for later/extended hours of service. Furthermore, the survey results indicate that the majority of the transit passengers are transit dependent and require this service to get them to work/school, to the shopping centers, and to doctor/dentist appointments, as well as, other areas around the community.
CHAPTER 4 – POLICY SECTION

The Policy Section of the SRTP will outline the various policies that control the operation of the Porterville Transit and COLT systems.

There is a strong role for public transit service in the City of Porterville. The critical role for transit is serving the mobility requirements and travel needs of the transit-dependent who have no or very limited access to a private vehicle. Low-income families, seniors, and persons with disabilities comprise the primary transit markets in Porterville. Students, as represented by school ridership peaks around class start times and afternoon dismissal times, also make up a sizable market for Porterville Transit.

Transit-dependent individuals have few travel choices and rely heavily on publicly provided community transportation to access jobs and those goods, services and activities within the community that influence social well-being and quality of life. The development of a goal for transit in Porterville recognizes the importance of transit’s primary markets and the importance of an affordable transit service to the mobility of this dependent market.

The marketing of transit to a “choice” travel market in Porterville would be difficult and impractical. While some transit agencies try to capture and cater to a “choice” transit market in order to influence a decrease in single occupant vehicle (SOV) use, there are no disincentives such as chronic traffic congestion or parking shortages in Porterville to “push” people out of their cars. A transit alternative is a hard sell to individuals in a community like Porterville who have a choice between the unrestricted use of an automobile and public transit. Besides, many jobs and destinations are dispersed around the city and difficult to effectively serve with a fixed route service or efficiently serve with a demand-response service.

The development of a system goal focuses on effectively serving the primary and loyal transit markets of Porterville.

RECOMMENDED SYSTEM GOAL

“Provide affordable, reliable and efficient transit service that effectively meets the needs of Porterville residents who have limited mobility options, or those who choose transit for some or all of their local travel needs.”
Recommended Objectives and Policy Directions

Objective A: Maximize service reliability and convenience.

Policies:

- Ensure availability of sufficient safe and reliable in-service vehicles to meet the daily pullout requirements of Porterville Transit and COLT. Adopt and adhere to a zero tolerance standard for the cancellation of scheduled Porterville Transit bus trips or the cancellation of COLT trips already confirmed with the passenger, unless service must be canceled due to circumstances beyond the reasonable control of the City and/or service contractor.

- Ensure sufficient in-service buses to eliminate canceled Porterville Transit bus trips because of on-time performance problems.

- Ensure sufficient round-trip running times for all Porterville Transit routes to facilitate on-time performance within the adopted on-time performance standard. Adopt and adhere to a 90% on-time performance standard for all scheduled Porterville Transit service.

- Maintain timed transfers between Porterville Transit fixed routes at the Downtown Transit Center.

- Porterville Transit buses will not depart an identified time point before the published departure time in the schedule.

- COLT service will operate on schedule within the adopted on-time service performance standard. Adopt and adhere to a 90% on-time performance standard for all scheduled COLT service.

- Ensure adequate Porterville Transit capacity to maintain passenger loads within the adopted maximum load standards established for transit service. Establish and adhere to a 1.25 maximum load standard for Porterville Transit service.

- Ensure adequate COLT wheelchair and ambulatory service capacity to meet all confirmed trips within the adopted COLT wait time, maximum travel time and on-time performance standards.

- Provide Porterville Transit service to designated bus stops along each route and provide a courtesy stop request service on the last bus trip each evening.

- Provide subscription, advance booking and same day service on COLT.
Objective B: Maximize operating efficiency without negatively impacting service quality.

Policies:

• Seek competitive bids for Porterville Transit and COLT services every three to five years from qualified service contractors.

• Formalize and adhere to a medium to heavy-duty bus specification to increase the effective life span of Porterville Transit service vehicles.

• Establish and adhere to a Porterville Transit and COLT fleet retirement program that recognizes the effective life cycle of specific Porterville Transit and COLT service vehicles.

• Bus specifications will be developed with input from the service contractor and the City’s Maintenance Section.

• Maintain a small bus fleet with a maximum spare bus to in-service bus ratio of one spare to every three buses required to meet the daily in-service pullout requirement. This will have to be delayed until all buses and vans within the Porterville Transit and COLT fleets are at or under the optimal life cycle age.

• Minimize general public service overlap between Porterville Transit and COLT.

• Develop COLT scheduling and trip assignment parameters and procedures that maximize ride sharing, linked trips and maintain productive vehicle utilization.

• Establish a COLT hourly productivity incentive to encourage higher vehicle utilization.

Objective C: Operate a productive service that remains affordable to the recognized primary transit markets.

Policies:

• Maintain adopted fare box ratio standards by operating productive and efficient services to minimize fare increases.

• Maintain affordable fares for low income persons, seniors, and persons with disabilities, on Porterville Transit and COLT services.
- Maintain a Porterville Transit fare lower than the COLT discounted fares to encourage a continual ridership shift from COLT to Porterville Transit fixed route service.

- Offer free transfers between Porterville Transit fixed routes.

- Support a countywide fare-medium and fare-reciprocity agreement.

**Objective D: Promote the coordination of service with other regional transit services.**

**Policies:**

- Improve Porterville Transit connections with Tulare County Transit and Orange Belt Stages/Greyhound through the integrated use of the new Downtown Transit Center.

- Encourage the flexibility in Tulare County Transit scheduling to improve connections between Porterville Transit and Tulare County Transit services.

- Continue to provide COLT service to County urban areas beyond the Porterville city limits on a full cost recovery basis.

- Support a countywide fare-medium and fare-reciprocity agreement.

**Objective E: Promote public/private partnerships to market or operate transit services in support of City of Porterville Economic and Land Use Development Goals.**

**Policies:**

- Actively participate in the City of Porterville’s development review process to ensure that transit operations are considered as part of new developments.

- Work with businesses to develop automobile trip reduction programs at major employment or service centers that can be effectively served by Porterville Transit fixed route service.

- Explore joint promotions with retailers and services for the production of Porterville Transit and COLT public brochures.

- Work with local organizations to provide transit support to major events on a full 100% cost recovery basis.
• Continue a 100% cost recovery Porterville Transit/COLT service policy for services to locations that cannot be effectively served at existing service levels, or fall outside the existing service area.

**Objective F: Ensure ongoing service monitoring, evaluation and planning.**

**Policies:**

- The Porterville Transit and COLT service contractor is required to maintain an on-going road supervision program to deal effectively with driver concerns, suggestions, and issues as well as commendations, operating problems, breakdowns, complaint investigation, driver training and accident investigations.

- The Porterville Transit and COLT service contractor is required to maintain a fleet coordination program to ensure that driver maintenance requests are addressed.

- The City of Porterville will actively monitor service performance through the review of operating and performance reports and field spot checks.

- The City will coordinate a management, dispatch and driver forum with the service contractor for: the ongoing review and resolution of operations and service quality issues; the development of vehicle specifications; and to obtain input on on-going service planning.

**SERVICE STANDARDS AND BENCHMARKS**

Monitoring system performance remains an important task for transit operators. Standards can be set by federal, state and local regulatory requirements, as well as goal objectives and service priorities adopted by transit agencies. While specific standards vary, industry practice generally uses the following three categories for service performance and design:

- Efficiency standards,

- Service quality/reliability standards, and

- Service design standards.

**RECOMMENDED EFFICIENCY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

Efficiency standards use operational performance data to measure the performance of a transit system. Monitoring operational efficiency and productivity requires data such as operating costs,
fare box revenue recovery, vehicle revenue miles, vehicle revenue hours and boardings (passenger trips).

Many communities the size of Porterville do not have the staff resources to collect and analyze a broad range of performance data. We have therefore limited our recommended efficiency performance standards to several key indicators that provide transit managers with a good picture of how well their service is doing. Recommended efficiency performance for Porterville Transit and COLT include:

- **Operating Cost per Passenger**: Calculated by dividing all operating and administrative costs by total passengers (with passengers defined as unlinked trips). The subsidy cost per passenger is a further refinement of this measure and is calculated by subtracting fare box revenue from gross operating and administrative costs and dividing by total passengers.

- **Operating Cost per Revenue Hour**: Calculated by dividing all operating and administrative costs by the total number of vehicle revenue hours (with revenue hours defined as time when the vehicle is actually in passenger service). Operating cost per revenue hour measures system efficiency.

- **Passengers per Revenue Hour**: Calculated by dividing the total number of passengers (unlinked trips) by the total number of vehicle revenue hours. The number of passengers per hour is a good measure of service productivity and critical to the establishment of design standards and benchmarks for the expansion of transit service.

- **Fare Box Recovery Ratio**: Calculated by dividing all fare box revenue by total operating and administrative costs. The California Transit Development Act (TDA) mandates a fare box recovery of 20% for fixed route service and 10% for dial-a-ride service. Fare box recovery evaluates both system efficiency (though operating cost) and productivity (through boardings). Fare box recovery ratio benchmarks are critical to the establishment of passengers per revenue hour benchmarks and benchmarks for design standards.

The chosen indicators comply with the basic performance indicators required by the TDA and are consistent with operating and cost data already collected for Porterville Transit and COLT. Cost and productivity standards based on revenue miles were not included in the set of recommended performance standards because most transit costs, as well as budget projections, are based on operating or revenue hours. Revenue mile-based performance standards would be more relevant than hour-based standards for paratransit contracts, such as taxis contracts, where contractor compensation is based on travel distance.

Porterville Transit operating cost/revenue hour will be influenced by increasing labor, fuel, service and inventory costs. The operating cost/revenue hour will be dependent on contractor bid prices beyond June 20, 2004, City administrative overheads and fleet maintenance costs.
Contractor costs are becoming increasingly difficult to project because of recently sharp and unexpected insurance cost increases. This trend could continue for the foreseeable future.

For both Porterville Transit and COLT, the operating cost/passenger and the achievement of the recommended fare box recovery ratio will be greatly influenced by the achievement of the passenger/revenue hour productivity benchmarks. The City and the service contractor have more direct control over service productivity through the fixed route planning process and the demand-response scheduling and dispatch process.

SERVICE QUALITY/RELIABILITY STANDARDS

Porterville Transit and COLT service quality and reliability standards should reflect system goals and support the measurement of success in achieving specific objectives and policies. Both the key service quality and reliability standards and the performance standards for the fixed route and demand-response services are summarized in the following sections.

FIXED ROUTE SERVICE STANDARDS

The 2003 Porterville Transit Development Plan established a series of service standards for use in determining the efficiency and effectiveness of the fixed route service. These standards have become the adopted minimum threshold levels for transit operation within the service area. The following table summarizes the fixed route performance and service standards for Porterville Transit.

Please note that a zero tolerance applies to cancelled trips caused by equipment or manpower shortages and on time performance. It does not apply to service cancellations resulting from conditions or circumstances beyond the control of the City or Service Contractor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard or Quality/Reliability Standard</th>
<th>Porterville Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost/Passenger</td>
<td>Year 1 - $1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2 - $1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3 - $1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 4 - $1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 5 - $1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost/Revenue Hour</td>
<td>Year 1 - $38.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2 - $40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3 - $42.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 4 - $43.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 5 - $45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers/Revenue Hour</td>
<td>Year 1 - 28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2 - 29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3 - 30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 4 - 31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 5 - 32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare box Recovery Ratio</td>
<td>Year 1 - 30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2 - 30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3 - 30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 4 - 30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 5 - 30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Time Performance</td>
<td>90% of all revenue bus trips must depart the route start point and arrive at the route end point within 5 minutes of the time published in the schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No bus shall depart a formal time point before the time published in the schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Complaints/Passenger Carried</td>
<td>The number of complaints shall not exceed 0.10% of the total boardings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard = 1 complaint/1,000 boardings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventable Accidents/Revenue Mile Operated</td>
<td>While there should be no preventable accidents, a benchmark has been established to permit some flexibility in the evaluation of training efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The number of preventable accidents shall not exceed 0.0005% of total revenue miles operated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard = 1 preventable accident/200,000 revenue miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadcalls/Revenue Mile Operated</td>
<td>The number of roadcalls should not exceed 0.01% of total revenue miles operated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard = 1 roadcall/10,000 revenue miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Trips Cancelled</td>
<td>No Scheduled bus trips shall be cancelled because of equipment or manpower shortages, or on time performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard = zero tolerance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 - Porterville Transit Performance and Service Standards
DEMAND-RESPONSE SERVICE STANDARDS

The 2003 Porterville Transit Development Plan established a series of service standards for use in determining the efficiency and effectiveness of the COLT service. These standards have become the adopted minimum threshold levels for transit operation within the service area. The following table summarizes the demand-response performance and service standards for COLT.

Please note that a zero tolerance applies to cancelled trips caused by equipment or manpower shortages and on time performance. It does not apply to service cancellations resulting from conditions or circumstances beyond the control of the City or Service Contractor.
### COLT Performance and Service Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Standard or Quality/Reliability Standard</th>
<th>COLT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Operating Cost/Passenger                            | Year 1 - $7.50  
Year 2 - $7.80  
Year 3 - $7.90  
Year 4 - $7.95  
Year 5 - $8.02 |
| Operating Cost/Revenue Hour                         | Year 1 - $27.00  
Year 2 - $28.50  
Year 3 - $30.00  
Year 4 - $31.00  
Year 5 - $33.00 |
| Passengers/Revenue Hour                             | Year 1 - 4.75  
Year 2 - 4.85  
Year 3 - 5.00  
Year 4 - 5.25  
Year 5 - 5.50 |
| Fare box Recovery Ratio                             | Year 1 - 20.0%  
Year 2 - 20.0%  
Year 3 - 20.0%  
Year 4 - 20.0%  
Year 5 - 20.0% |
| On Time Performance                                 | 90% of all pick ups must be within the policy pick up window, and 90% of all drop offs will not be earlier than 20 minutes before, or 5 minutes after the requested drop off time, unless otherwise requested by the passenger. |
| Passenger Complaints/Passenger Carried              | The number of complaints shall not exceed 0.30% of the total boardings.  
Standard = 3 complaints/1,000 boardings |
| Preventable Accidents/Revenue Mile Operated         | While there should be no preventable accidents, a benchmark has been established to permit some flexibility in the evaluation of training efforts.  
The number of preventable accidents shall not exceed 0.0005% of total revenue miles operated.  
Standard = 1 preventable accident/200,000 revenue miles |
| Roadcalls/Revenue Mile Operated                     | The number of roadcalls should not exceed 0.01% of total revenue miles operated.  
Standard = 1 roadcall/10,000 revenue miles |
| Bus Trips Cancelled                                 | No scheduled (confirmed) passenger trips shall be cancelled because of insufficient vehicles to meet the scheduled in-service pullout requirement.  
Standard = zero tolerance |
| Dial-a-COLT Trip Denials                            | No advance bookings by ADA certified registrants shall be denied. |

Table 24 - COLT Performance and Service Standards
RECOMMENDED SERVICE DESIGN STANDARDS

Service design standards are critical planning tools to justify and prioritize the expansion of service to new areas and potential markets, and to guide how the service will be delivered. Transit service design incorporates a mix of interrelated social, political and economic factors. Generally these can include:

- The community’s vision, goals, and objectives for transit;
- The marketability of the service(s) to be provided;
- Environmental and energy issues;
- Available technology;
- Budget limitations; and,
- Land use constraints and right-of-way design characteristics and limitations.

Design service standards for Porterville Transit and COLT are summarized in the following tables.
## PORTERVILLE TRANSIT SERVICE DESIGN STANDARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Benchmark/Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of New Service</td>
<td>This can include the introduction of a new route, the expansion of an existing route, and an increase in service frequency. New service should be introduced if anticipated hourly productivity will meet a minimum farebox recovery ratio standard of 20%. New service should be operated on a trial basis for up to 12 months to allow ridership to develop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Walking Distance</td>
<td>70% of all city residences or activity centers will be within ¼ mile walking distance of a bus stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Spacing</td>
<td>Bus stops will be spaced at a minimum of 1,200 feet along each route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Location</td>
<td>Bus stops should be placed at the far side corner of intersections to allow clearer traffic view lines for pedestrians. Mid-block bus stops should be limited to major activity centers or high-density residential complexes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Bus Stop Design</td>
<td>All bus stops should be clearly marked with proper signage including the designated route number. Benches should be considered for individual stops where the average daily boardings exceed 25 passengers or at specific bus stops serving senior residences or activity centers serving seniors and persons with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Loads</td>
<td>Maximum passenger loads should not exceed 1.25 passengers/seat (one standee for every four occupied bus seats).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Headways</td>
<td>Service headways should be such that passenger load standards are not exceeded on a continual basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timed Transfers</td>
<td>Schedules should be designed to ensure timed transfers between all routes at the Downtown Transit Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Bus Specifications</td>
<td>While all buses should meet all federal, state and city safety, emissions, accessibility and mechanical fitness requirements, all buses should have sufficient capacity to meet passenger load standards, conform to City fuel policy, meet full service day fuel capacity requirements, and comply with technical specifications developed by the City's Maintenance Section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Unfunded Services</td>
<td>COLT will continue to provide service to activities or areas outside its mandated service scope or area, on a 100% cost recovery basis, assuming that such service does not interfere with the operation of mandated services, and does not unfairly compete with local private, for-hire carriers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 - Porterville Transit Service Design Standards
## COLT Service Design Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Benchmark/Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Eligibility</td>
<td>Service will be provided to the general public residing in the City of Porterville and in designated urban areas within the County, under a service agreement with the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Capacity</td>
<td>Service capacity as determined by the number of in-service vehicles will be maintained at levels that support the minimum hourly productivity standard needed to achieve the farbox recovery ratio standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick Up Windows</td>
<td>The pick-up windows confirmed with COLT passengers will not exceed 30 minutes, and will not begin, beyond 60 minutes of the confirmed drop-off time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-off Window</td>
<td>Unless otherwise advised by the passenger, no passenger will be dropped off 20 minutes before the confirmed drop off time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum On-Board Travel Time</td>
<td>On-board travel times for COLT passengers will not exceed 45 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Booking Options</td>
<td>Registered seniors and persons with disabilities shall be able to make subscription, advance and same day bookings. General public riders shall be limited to same day bookings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Vehicle</td>
<td>While meeting all federal, state and city safety, emissions and mechanical fitness requirements, all COLT vehicles will have a minimum capacity for three ambulatory passengers, or capacity for one wheelchair and one ambulatory passenger and comply with all technical specifications developed by the City’s Maintenance Section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 - COLT Service Design Standards

Please note that a reduction in the pick up window from the current 60 minute standard may have to be delayed because of the current COLT service hour reductions required to offset the costs of the trial shuttle to the Family HealthCare Network clinic. Also, the establishment of a 45-minute maximum onboard travel time may also have to be delayed because of reduced COLT service hours.
CHAPTER 5 – IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The five-year plan developed for both Porterville Transit and COLT responds to the potential ridership for both the fixed route and demand-response transit systems in the Porterville area. The implementation plan includes an outline for a five-year financial plan that will delineate annual operating and equipment expenses for the entire system, as well as annual revenues. The implementation plan will conclude by discussing a management plan and fare structure for the system. This section also includes a discussion of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, Transportation Demand Management impacts, and the federal mandatory Drug Testing Program.

FIXED ROUTE SERVICE SYSTEM

The fixed route service will continue to operate from 7:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and from 9:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays during the FY 2004/05. The current level of service will be maintained at 6 routes and 6 buses (one bus per route), and the existing fare structure will remain unchanged.

In FY 2005/06 the fixed route service will continue to operate on the FY 2004/05 schedule, but with the addition of 3 new buses. These buses will be deployed through additional routes, or incorporated into the existing route structure in order to reduce service headways. In addition, a fare increase will be applied to adjust for fare box ratio requirements, changes in service and increases in operating costs.

From FY 2006/07 through FY 2008/09 the fixed route service will maintain this 9 bus service level, with the exception of a fare increase in FY 2007/08.

DEMAND-RESPONSE SERVICE SYSTEM

In conjunction with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the emphasis of the demand-response service will focus on providing trips to seniors, handicapped persons, and those persons whose origin or destination lies outside the area served by the routes.

The existing COLT dial-a-ride service will continue to operate from 7:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and from 9:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays during the FY 2004/05. COLT service is to be continued for those persons unable to use fixed routes or who wish to continue with demand-response service.

In FY 2005/06, in conjunction with the expansion of fixed route service, the demand-response service will convert to a more limited service. Existing schedules will be maintained, but service will be restricted to seniors or handicapped persons during fixed route service hours. Handicapped individuals are those persons who qualify under the Americans with Disabilities Act. During the hours when fixed route services are not available, COLT services will continue
to provide public access. These open hours will run from 6:00 p.m. until 10:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and from 5:00 p.m. until 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. In addition, a fare increase will be applied to adjust for fare box ratio requirements, changes in service and increases in operating costs.

From FY 2006/07 through FY 2008/09 the demand-response service will maintain existing service levels, with the exception of a fare increase in FY 2007/08.

**COMPREHENSIVE FINANCIAL PLAN**

The fixed route and demand services described above, plus the equipment purchase program outlined in the Analysis Section, will result in the following five-year financial plan. This financial plan includes estimates of operating and equipment expenditures and projections of revenues by source for the proposed services. The estimates are for the purposes of this study only, and represent approximations of the costs of operations and equipment. Actual values for annual operation and equipment will vary and will be determined through the City’s annual budget process. The purpose of this data is to provide comparative information for the review of this plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Service 2004/05</th>
<th>Expended Transit Service with Restricted COLT Service</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>2007/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
<td>$423,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vans</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters/Benches/Signs</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn-outs</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washer/Storage Area</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotals</strong></td>
<td>$759,000</td>
<td>$332,000</td>
<td>$515,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$2,096,000</td>
<td>$1,856,000</td>
<td>$1,905,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 - Expenditure Plan

The expenditure plan shown above anticipates an outlay in FY 2004/05 of $2,096,000 for operating and capital. Annual expenditures afterwards range from $1,856,000 up to $2,127,400. A one-time expenditure of $275,000 for a Bus Maintenance Facility in FY 2004/05 accounts for the drop in annual expenditures between FY 2004/05 and FY 2005/06.
Based on the five-year expenditure plan, projected annual fare box ratios are expected to meet or exceed the 20% service requirement established by the TDA. Fare box ratios for the first four years of the plan will range above the TDA requirement, with a projection of 22% for FY 2004/05 and a projection of 21% for the following three years. The projected fare box ratio for FY 2008/09 is expected to be at the 20% requirement level. Future increases to the fare structure will adjust for inflation and fare box ratio requirements.

The five-year expenditures outlined above will require a mix of funding revenues. The intent of this plan is to maximize the use of federal (FTA) funding, as well as fare revenues from users of the service. This course will minimize the use of local Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year:</th>
<th>Current Service 2004/05</th>
<th>Expanded Transit Service with Restricted COLT Service</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>2006/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA (Sec. 5307)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$607,200</td>
<td>$425,600</td>
<td>$412,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>$907,200</td>
<td>$725,600</td>
<td>$712,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fares</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
<td>$282,000</td>
<td>$292,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$748,000</td>
<td>$742,000</td>
<td>$798,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$151,800</td>
<td>$106,400</td>
<td>$103,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>$899,800</td>
<td>$848,400</td>
<td>$901,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$2,096,000</td>
<td>$1,856,000</td>
<td>$1,905,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 - Funding Revenues

The Federal funds are projected to cover 38% of the total costs over the next five years. These funds will be used primarily for equipment purchases. Other funding sources, such as the Congestion Management/Air Quality program (CMAQ) or the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District’s REMOVÉ program, could potentially provide additional funding for the needed equipment, and should be pursued whenever they become available.

Over the next five years, passenger fares are projected to contribute 15% of the operating and equipment costs of the proposed fixed route and demand-response services. The City of Porterville, through its local Transportation Development Act funds, is projected to pay 47% of all costs.
The use of Transportation Development Act funds for public transit is of critical importance to the City of Porterville. Historically, a significant share of these funds has been used for street purposes. State law requires that each year TDA funds first be made available for transit purposes. If no transit needs exist that can reasonably be met, the funds can then be used for street purposes. The following chart compares the Transportation Development Act funds that are projected to be available annually over the next five years. The projected level of funding needed for the fixed route and demand-response services is also shown, with the projected balance available for street purposes. Projections for available Transportation Development Act funds are based on an anticipated population increase in Porterville. Further, it includes an estimate of the contribution from the County of Tulare for its share of the operation of the fixed route and demand-response services in unincorporated County lands in and near the City of Porterville. The chart suggests that each year some funds will be available for street purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA Available</td>
<td>$1,348,000</td>
<td>$1,388,000</td>
<td>$1,430,000</td>
<td>$1,473,000</td>
<td>$1,517,000</td>
<td>$1,563,000</td>
<td>$8,719,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA for Transit</td>
<td>$1,025,000</td>
<td>$927,000</td>
<td>$874,000</td>
<td>$928,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,173,000</td>
<td>$5,927,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>$323,000</td>
<td>$461,000</td>
<td>$556,000</td>
<td>$545,000</td>
<td>$517,000</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>$2,792,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 – Transportation Development Act Funds

**Proposed Fare Structure**

It is recommended that no change to the existing fare structures for either Porterville Transit or COLT be implemented for transit services within the Porterville service area. The fixed route service currently has a one-way fare of 75 cents and timed transfers are free. Table 30 lists the existing fare structure for the two services.
PORTERVILLE TRANSIT AND COLT FARE STRUCTURE
(FY 2003/04)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Fare Category</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>75¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (62 and older)/ADA (non-peak)</td>
<td>35¢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLT Fare Category</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (62 and older)</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (after 6:00 p.m. with student ID)</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child (5 and older)</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 4 (two children per adult)</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30 - Transit Fare Structure

Beginning in FY 2005/06 and every two years thereafter, the fare structure should be reviewed. Adjustments to the structure should be made to reflect fare box ratio requirements, changes in service and increases in operating costs.

MANAGEMENT PLAN

The City of Porterville will continue to own and operate the Porterville Transit and COLT services in the Porterville area. The management of the combined fixed route and demand-response system will be vested with the Porterville City Council. The City will continue to own and maintain the equipment and intends to continue to use a contractor for the day-to-day operation of both services. The contractor will be responsible for the employment of drivers and dispatchers, plus the tracking of all necessary ridership and operations data.

The City of Porterville intends on continuing the contractual arrangement with the County of Tulare for service to county areas surrounding Porterville. Pursuant to County policy, that arrangement is expected to provide operating and capital assistance for both the fixed route and demand-response services.

In addition, the City of Porterville will work closely with the Porterville Sheltered Workshop, Family HealthCare Network, and the Porterville Developmental Center to develop operating agreements with these organizations. The focus of these agreements will be to define common transit needs and operating cost assistance.

The City of Porterville is also committed to working actively with major employers within the community to provide commute alternatives for employees. The emphasis will be on dissemination of transit information to employees and fare payment methods, as well as development of service hours and operating parameters.
Finally, the City will annually review and adjust the system's performance standards. The review will include an assessment of the service's achievement of performance standards. Changes will be made to reflect inflation, changes in operations, passenger demand and modifications to contractor agreements.

The Porterville City Council declares the plan is contingent upon the following stipulations and conditions:

1) That the County of Tulare remain an equitable cost-sharing partner in funding the annual operating costs of the Porterville Transit System.

2) That grant funding is obtained, and gas tax revenues remain available, to provide sufficient revenue to establish and operate a fixed route public transit system.

3) That at no time will the operation of a demand-response system, or a fixed route system, or any combination thereof, rely on, or receive General Fund Revenues.

4) That City Council approval is required:
   a. Of all capital and operating grant funding applications intended to implement the 2003 Porterville Transit Development Plan.
   b. To maintain effective efficient alignments and frequency of fixed route and demand-response services.
   c. To maintain an equitable fare structure for users of both fixed route and demand-response systems.

MARKETING PLAN

Given the information provided by passengers and the community through the Rider surveys, the current Porterville Transit and COLT service could benefit from the implementation of a marketing program. By reaching target markets with published materials and literature, the community will gain a higher level of understanding of the current service, and passengers will receive valuable information to assist in their use of the service. Marketing both the fixed route and demand-response services will also assist in boosting off-peak use by encouraging riders to run errands or attend appointments during non-commute hours. These changes will improve service time and the overall quality of the services. Another area greatly affected by marketing is image. Marketing public transit will inform the target riders of service goals and will let them know that their patronage is appreciated.

A marketing plan should reflect the role that transit plays in the community by targeting current and potential users. Transit in Porterville currently has a very definitive market including commuters (comprised of workers and students) and senior citizens. Therefore, the marketing plan should focus primarily on community outreach. The community outreach effort proposed for Porterville Transit includes four subcomponents.
• Updating maps and schedules;
• Easy access to transit information;
• Marketing promotions; and,
• Free advertising.

Transit route maps and schedules are the primary information required by existing and potential transit patrons. All transit maps and schedules should be as clear and simple to read as possible, and should be updated annually to reflect major service changes. Continuation of color-coding the various routes is recommended. As individual routes grow (incorporate more stops) it is advised that maps and schedules be designed for each individual route in addition to the current system-wide map/schedule.

Information on the transit system should be easily available and prominently displayed for all target markets. The availability of service information at the transit center, on buses and at route stops (posted signage) is important to educate and keep existing transit users informed. Printed materials containing up-to-date information on routes, schedules and other transit services should be available at places frequented by target patrons (e.g., government centers, schools, senior centers). In order to attract new riders, these printed materials should also be available in other public places (e.g., grocery stores, shopping centers, medical facilities).

Additional information sources should include a Porterville Transit web page with current route maps and schedules, and service goals. This web page could be linked to the City of Porterville home page and contain a contact link for rider suggestions.

Marketing promotions involve efforts beyond printed information. Developing community-wide events to promote Porterville Transit and COLT should keep transit in the minds of residents as a viable transportation option. Marketing promotions are also particularly important when major changes occur to the existing system. Promotions could be self-sponsored or held in conjunction with other local events. These promotions could include participation in National Transit Week (second week in September), Earth Day, or local civic events. Promotions should include the distribution of route flyers and free bus passes (good for one round-trip) to attract first time riders. Transit personnel should be available to answer service questions.

Marketing promotions can be further enhanced by the addition of a trolley bus. Trolley buses are generally used for promotional events, such as parades and fund raisers, and rides are generally free.

Free advertising, in the form of press releases and media coverage, should be utilized whenever possible to promote transit services. Media coverage should be coordinated to celebrate the one-year anniversary of the Downtown Transit Center. Press releases should announce major service changes and improvements to the system.

Since a large portion of Porterville Transit’s target market is Hispanic, all advertising should be available in Spanish, as well as English.
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) is the culmination of almost 20 years of debate on the issue of disability rights. In general, the law prohibits public entities from denying individuals with disabilities the opportunity to use public transportation services, if the individuals are capable of using the system. It also prohibits public entities from providing services which discriminate against persons with disabilities. Specific actions which must be taken by public transit agencies, commuter rail authorities, and AMTRAK to avoid discrimination are delineated. For example, the law requires that:

- all newly purchased or leased vehicles used in fixed route service must be accessible;
- public entities which provide fixed route public transportation service also must offer comparable paratransit service to individuals with disabilities who are unable to use the fixed route system;
- new or used vehicles purchased or leased for use in general public demand-responsive service must be accessible unless it can be shown that equivalent service is provided to persons with disabilities;
- vehicles which are remanufactured (defined to include structural changes) to extend their useful life beyond a given number of years (5 years for buses, 10 years for commuter and intercity rail cars) must include accessibility features;
- new facilities must be accessible;
- alterations to transit facilities must include features to make them accessible. Alterations covered by the law include changes that affect or could affect the usability of the facility. Not covered are normal maintenance, painting, or changes to the electrical, mechanical, or plumbing systems;
- key stations in rail systems be made accessible as of July 26, 1993; and
- one car per train in rapid rail and light rail systems must be accessible by July 26, 1995.

Many sections of the ADA, including the transportation provisions, are open to interpretation. This is not unusual for major legislation. The purpose of the law is to set goals, define general types of discrimination, and create a framework for addressing this discrimination. As with other civil rights legislation, specific definitions, interpretations, and requirements are spelled out in regulations issued by the implementing agencies. Several regulations have already been issued to implement the ADA.

The underlying tenets of the ADA are equal opportunity, full participation, and independence. The law intends for persons with disabilities to have equal access to facilities and to be able to fully and equally participate in programs and services. Access to mainline and fixed route service is therefore to be provided. While access to fixed route systems is the primary focus, the law acknowledges that some persons with disabilities are not able to use fixed route services even if these services are accessible. The law also acknowledges that until fixed route systems are made completely accessible, alternative means of transportation need to be provided to
persons who are otherwise able to use accessible fixed route services. Complementary paratransit service (i.e. dial-a-ride) is required in the ADA to serve those persons whose needs cannot be met by fixed route systems.

The ADA regulations identify three categories of individuals who are eligible for complementary paratransit service. These persons are considered "ADA paratransit eligible". Each public entity providing complementary paratransit service must establish a process for determining ADA paratransit eligibility.

1) "Any individual with a disability who is unable, as the result of a physical or mental impairment (including a vision impairment), and without the assistance of another individual (except the operator of a wheelchair lift or other boarding assistance device), to board, ride, or disembark from any vehicle on the system which is readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities."

2) "Any individual with a disability who needs the assistance of a wheelchair lift or other boarding assistance device and is able, with such assistance, to board, ride, and disembark from any vehicle which is readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities if the individual wants to travel on a route of the system during the hours of operation of the system at a time, or within a reasonable period of such time, when such a vehicle is not being used to provide designated public transportation on the route."

3) "Any individual with a disability who has a specific impairment-related condition which prevents such individual from traveling to a boarding location or from a disembarking location on such system."

Complementary paratransit service also must be provided to a personal care attendant traveling with an eligible rider. In addition to a personal care attendant, the regulations require that service be provided to one companion accompanying an eligible rider. Other persons accompanying the rider are to be accommodated on a "space available" basis. Persons are considered to be accompanying the eligible rider if they are picked up and dropped off at the same locations as the eligible rider.

The Americans with Disabilities Act requires that "complementary paratransit programs" must provide a level of service that is comparable to that provided on the fixed route system. Six service criteria are used to determine comparability. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 sets forth the following six service criteria for complementary paratransit service.

1) **Service Area:** Paratransit service must be provided to all origins and destinations within the basic service area. The basic service area is a corridor centered on the fixed route and extending 3/4 of a mile to either side of the route. Corridors can, however, be extended up to 1 1/2 mile on either side of the fixed route. Exact widths of corridors should be determined through the public participation process.
2) **Response Time:** The regulations require that next day service be provided. This means that you must accommodate requests for services for a particular day made anytime during the preceding day (including Sunday for Monday service).

3) **Fares:** Fares charged for complementary paratransit service can be no more than twice the fare for a comparable trip made by a person without a disability on the fixed route system.

4) **Trip Purpose:** Requests for all types of trip purposes must be accepted and handled on an equal basis.

5) **Hours and Days of Service:** Complementary paratransit service must be offered during the same days and hours that the fixed route system is in operation.

6) **Capacity Constraints:** The regulations prohibit public entities from limiting the amount of complementary paratransit service provided to ADA paratransit eligible persons. Patterns and practices that limit availability of service, rather than individual, one-time incidents, indicate capacity constraint problems.

In 2003 the City of Porterville prepared and adopted its latest paratransit plan for the fixed route and demand-response services. The 2003 plan has determined that the City meets all six service criteria for providing paratransit service.

**TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

Transportation Management Plans, often called transportation demand management, transportation control measures, congestion management or trip reduction programs, are efforts which focus on the reduction in vehicle trips during the peak hours of travel through the shifting of trips to other times of the day or by eliminating the vehicle trip altogether. The motivating factors are either relief of traffic congestion or the reduction in vehicle air emissions.

The Porterville Transit service plays a critical role in Porterville’s transportation management. By providing accessible commuter services, the transit system helps to alleviate area traffic congestion and assist with downtown parking problems. The transit service also benefits local air quality by reducing the total number of vehicles on the roadways.

**DRUG TESTING PROGRAM**

The Omnibus Transportation Employee Testing Act of 1991 requires alcohol and drug testing of safety-sensitive employees in the aviation, motor carrier, railroad, and mass transit industries. Large transit employers, which are defined as those transit employers who operate in an area of 200,000 or more in population, are required to do random drug testing for all safety-sensitive transit employees. Small transit employers, operating in areas with less than 200,000 in population, are required to implement a random drug testing program.
The City of Porterville, in conjunction with the operations contractor, is responsible for implementing this drug testing program. This program includes pre-employment, reasonable suspicion, post-accident, random, return-to-duty, and follow-up drug testing. Employee tests are reviewed and interpreted by a physician before they are reported to the employer. Furthermore, employee drug test results are confidential. Transit employers are required to provide information on drug use and treatment resources to safety-sensitive employees, as well as provide one hour of training on the dangers of substance abuse. The employer is not required to provide rehabilitation, pay for treatment, or reinstate the employee in his/her safety-sensitive position.
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA: February 17, 2004

SUBJECT: C.O.L.T. FIXED ROUTE BUS STOP LOCATIONS

SOURCE: Administration

COMMENT: Since last October, flag stops have been eliminated from the Fixed Route bus operation and replaced by fixed stop locations, all in an effort to make the system more efficient and bring it more in line with the 30-minute route intervals established. City staff, the City’s Transportation Consultant, and the Manager of Sierra Management rode each of the routes a total of three times to establish the safest and best locations for the initial establishment of the fixed stops. Several factors were considered in the placement of the stops, the number one factor being safety. There is case law now established where municipalities can be held liable relating to unsafe stops, so this was foremost in the preparation of the bus stop locations. The availability of City right-of-way, ample travel areas of the streets involved, and the previous locations of flag stops were also all considered. Fixed stops, where possible, were located in the most heavily-used “flag stop” areas, in an effort to accommodate the high volume of ridership previously established in these areas. In most instances, flag stops were able to be combined without creating any undue hardship. Individual phone call requests were all taken into consideration, and bus stop locations have been adjusted where warranted. We fully expect throughout the next year to make further adjustments as traffic, safety, or other concerns need to be addressed. Formal bus shelters will not be installed at any location until such time as these fixed stops have been utilized for some period of time and staff is able to fully assess the ridership in these areas.

Since October, the locations of the fixed stops have been posted at the Transit Center, as well as the bus drivers working with the passengers on a daily basis to get them comfortable with the transition. City crews have been in the process of installing the C.O.L.T. bus stop signs, and will continue to do so until all bus stops have been formally signed and curbs painted – approximately 100 locations.

For Council’s information, a map will be available at the Council meeting showing all established fixed bus stop locations. Additionally, hard copies of the maps are attached, together with Transit Bus Stop Locations itemized by stop name and cross street for each of the six routes.

RECOMMENDATION: Informational item only – no action required.

DD M. Appropriated/Funded  

GM

Item No. 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Stop Name</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>Bus Stop Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>330 W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Jaye</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>568 W.</td>
<td>between driveways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>700 W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Dameron</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1035</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>La Sierra High School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>northwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055</td>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>226 N.</td>
<td>in front of admin building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Sherwood Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Mission Mobile Home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1080</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>south side/street @ 1087 W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1085</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1090</td>
<td>Villa</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1095</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>&quot;G&quot; Street</td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1110</td>
<td>&quot;D&quot; Street</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Stop Name</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>Bus Stop Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Hockett</td>
<td>Thurman</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>northeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>&quot;G&quot; Street</td>
<td>northeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Villa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Wendy's</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Monache High School</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>Mathew</td>
<td>952 N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>Mathew</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2055</td>
<td>Newcomb</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>northeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>Newcomb</td>
<td>Pioneer</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2065</td>
<td>North Grand</td>
<td>Boyles</td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2075</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>Cobb</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>Milo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2085</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>Monte Vista School</td>
<td>east end of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Danner</td>
<td>northwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2095</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Belleview</td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>&quot;D&quot; Street</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2105</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2003 Porterville Transit Bus Stop Locations

**ROUTE NO. 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Stop Name</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th>Bus Stop Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3005</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3010</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3015</td>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>Garden</td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3020</td>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>Andres</td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Rainbow Market</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3035</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Leggett</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3040</td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3045</td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>Conner</td>
<td>southside @ Texaco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3050</td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>Rup's Market</td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3055</td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>Success Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3060</td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>2259 E. (Foodland)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3065</td>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3070</td>
<td>Crabtree</td>
<td>Alta Vista School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3075</td>
<td>Crabtree</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>northeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080</td>
<td>Crabtree</td>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>northwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3085</td>
<td>Holcomb</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>mid-block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3090</td>
<td>Olive</td>
<td>Granite Hills H.S.</td>
<td>existing (to be reinstalled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3095</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>Leggett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3105</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3110</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Stop Name</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>Bus Stop Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4005</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>45 N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4015</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>&quot;B&quot; Street</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4020</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Locust</td>
<td>northwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4025</td>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>northwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4035</td>
<td>Developmental Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4036</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>1008 E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4045</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Vandalia School</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Porterville College</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4055</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Big Stump Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4060</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Food King</td>
<td>between driveways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4065</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Stop Name</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>Bus Stop Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5005</td>
<td>Downtown Transit Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5010</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>El Granito</td>
<td>northwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5015</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>554 W.</td>
<td>in front of empty lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5020</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Social Security Adm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5025</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5030</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Newcomb</td>
<td>northeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5035</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Mathew</td>
<td>northwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5040</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5045</td>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>Kanai</td>
<td>northeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5050</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5055</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Newcomb</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5060</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Big 5</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5065</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Jack in the Box</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5070</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>99cent Store</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5075</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>&quot;G&quot; Street</td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5080</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Division</td>
<td>south side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5085</td>
<td>Plano</td>
<td>671 N.</td>
<td>west side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5090</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Roche School</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5095</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5100</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>45 N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5105</td>
<td>Downtown Transit Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Stop Name</td>
<td>Cross Street</td>
<td>Bus Stop Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6005</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6010</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>&quot;G&quot; Street</td>
<td>northeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6015</td>
<td>Jaye</td>
<td>Sierra View Hospital</td>
<td>in front of hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6020</td>
<td>Jaye</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6025</td>
<td>Jaye</td>
<td>Springville</td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6030</td>
<td>Family HealthCare</td>
<td></td>
<td>southwest corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6035</td>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>Assembly Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6040</td>
<td>Jaye</td>
<td>Home Depot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6045</td>
<td>Jaye</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>southeast corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6050</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>&quot;G&quot; Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6051</td>
<td>&quot;D&quot; Street</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6055</td>
<td>DOWNTOWN TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT: AMENDMENTS TO EMPLOYEE PAY AND BENEFIT PLAN AND
EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN DOCUMENT

SOURCE: Administrative Services/Human Resources

COMMENT: City representatives have recently concluded Meet and Confer Sessions on
matters within the scope and purview of the Meyers-Millas-Brown Act
with the Porterville City Firefighters’ Association (P.C.F.A.), representing
the Fire Series Employees, and a written Memorandum of Understanding
(M.O.U.) has been executed with the P.C.F.A. covering matters pertaining
to wages, benefits and working conditions.

City Council acceptance and approval of an executed M.O.U. is most
commonly demonstrated by Council authorization to change or amend,
when applicable, those documents as are necessarily known to implement
the points of agreement contained in the M.O.U.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council adopt the attached resolution amending the
Employee Pay and Benefit Plan for Fiscal Years 2003-04 and
2004-05, and the Employee Health Plan Document, and authorize
the Mayor to execute these and other documents necessary to
implement the provisions thereof.

ATTACHMENT: Draft Resolution

DCM Appropriated/Funded CM Item No. 15
RESOLUTION NO. _____-2004

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE AMENDING THE EMPLOYEE PAY AND BENEFIT PLAN, AND THE EMPLOYEE HEALTH PLAN DOCUMENT

WHEREAS: The City Council has determined and reiterated that an Employee Pay and Benefit Plan, Classification Plan, Personnel System Rules and Regulations, Health Plan, and Retirement Plan are essential for the proper administration of the City’s affairs, including employee recruitment and retention, and for proper supervision of City Employees; and

WHEREAS: The City Council recognizes the necessity of amending and/or changing the contents of such plans and regulations from time to time, and of executing instruments to implement and to keep the provisions thereof current, and to maintain the relevancy of same; and,

WHEREAS: There has been concurrence on a Memorandum of Understanding with the Porterville City Firefighters’ Association for the period from January 1, 2004, until June 30, 2005, covering provisions to amend the Employee Pay and Benefit Plan, and the Employee Health Plan Document, as they relate to employees holding positions represented by such recognized employee organization.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Porterville that the Employee Pay and Benefit Plan and the Employee Health Plan Document for employees holding positions designated in the Fire Series is hereby amended as follows:

I. EMPLOYEE PAY AND BENEFIT PLAN.

A. WAGE INCREASE.

Effective 01-01-04, the Employee Pay and Benefit Plan, Section II, A., Position Pay Plan Schedule, shall be amended to increase the base pay for all Fire Series employees by 2%.
Effective 07-01-04, the Employee Pay and Benefit Plan, Section II, A., Position Pay Plan Schedule, shall be amended to increase the base pay for all Fire Series employees by 3%.

It is the direction and goal of the City to attain parity with other consistently used comparable agencies, with respect to salaries of employees within the Fire Series. The City shall begin the Request for Proposals process for a total Classification and Compensation Study. Said study’s targeted completion date is prior to 06-30-05, or as soon thereafter as feasibly possible.

B. **WAGE INCREASE–REOPEN CLAUSE.**

If the General Fund of the City of Porterville experiences a 25% loss in the aggregate of the major revenue sources, i.e., sales tax, property tax, utility users tax, as a result of actions of other agencies or the people, prior to 07-01-04, the 3% wage increase, effective 07-01-04, will be reopened for additional negotiations.

If, during the term of this agreement, any of the other City of Porterville represented employee groups secure a compensation or retirement enhancement that exceeds this Memorandum of Understand, the City agrees to reopen negotiations for the express purpose of modifying the Fire Series Employee’s pay and benefit package to be comparable with the other groups.

II. **EMPLOYEE PAY AND BENEFIT PLAN, AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT TRUST FUND (HEALTH PLAN DOCUMENT).**

A. **EMPLOYEE MEDICAL BENEFIT PLAN.**

1. **DEDUCTIBLE.**

Effective 01-01-04 the Employee Pay and Benefit Plan, Section III., A., 1., and the Employee Benefit Trust Fund Document Section 1.03, Part B - Major Medical Coverage, shall be amended as follows:

Deductible: $150 deductible per person per calendar year. Maximum $300 deductible per family per calendar year.

B. **DEDUCTIBLE AND CONTRIBUTION RATE ADJUSTMENTS–REOPEN CLAUSE.**

The City agrees to pay the full insurance premiums for medical, dental and vision plan coverages for all full-time regular employees only; and, all eligible Fire Series
Employees will, through 06-30-04, be held harmless for any additional increased deductibles and for any additional increase in insurance premium contribution rates for dependent coverage. Thereafter, the amount of increase in insurance premium contribution rates paid by employees for medical, dental and vision plan dependent coverage, and for increased deductibles for same, will, under this reopen clause, be a matter scheduled for discussion during the months of April, May and June of 2004.

III. DEPARTMENT TRAINING ALLOWANCE

Effective 01-01-04, the Department Training Budget will double to allow for each employee in the Fire Series to utilize $300 annually for fire related training approved by the Department Head. (No training expenses will be paid for classes taken to attain an A.A. or A.S. Degree to be eligible for educational incentive compensation.)

IV. OVERTIME/COMPENSATORY TIME

A. Effective 02-01-04, the Employee Pay and Benefit Plan, Section II, Position Pay Plan, shall be amended to include the positions of Fire Captain and Fire Lieutenant in the Overtime Designation “4”.

B. Effective 02-01-04, the Employee Pay and Benefit Plan, Section II. C. 3., shall be amended to wit:

3.a. Fire Series employees with the Designation “4” are to be compensated at the rate of 1 1/2 times the regular rate for hours worked in excess of 216 hours in a 27-day consecutive pay period, except that they shall be paid at 1 1/2 times the 40 hour per week rate for 12 hours or less in a shift and at 1 1/2 times the 56 hours per week rate for more than 12 hours in a shift. If required to work on a State Forest fire, the employee’s time will start from the time the employee is required to report for duty and end when he is returned to the City of Porterville. Any time on his regular work schedule will be at regular pay; all other time will be overtime, as outlined above.

3.b. Fire Series employees may receive compensatory time at time and one-half in lieu of overtime pay. Compensatory time shall be recorded on the employee’s time sheet and accounted for through the payroll system. Compensatory time accrual may be accumulated at not more than a maximum of 112 hours at any given time for employees assigned to a 56-hour per week shift, and a maximum of 80 hours at any given time for employees assigned to an administrative staff position (40-hour week).
V. ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE

Effective 01-01-04, the positions of Fire Captain and Fire Lieutenant shall no longer be eligible for Administrative Leave.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor of the City of Porterville is hereby authorized to execute those documents as are necessary to implement the provisions hereof.

________________________________________
Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor

Attest:

______________________________
Georgia Hawley, Deputy City Clerk
SUBJECT: ADDENDUM TO M.O.U. BETWEEN CITY/P.C.F.A., AND AMENDMENT TO CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 116-2002

SOURCE: Administrative Services/Human Resources

COMMENT: On August 6, 2002, the Porterville City Council was informed that representatives of the City and the Porterville City Firefighters’ Association (P.C.F.A.) had reached concurrences on matters within the scope and purview of the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act, and had executed an M.O.U. setting forth those matters of mutual agreement. The City Council thereupon accepted the M.O.U. and approved the implementation thereof by adoption of Resolution No. 116-2002.

The M.O.U. which was executed on August 6, 2002, contained a reopen clause pertaining to the deductible and contribution rate adjustments in the medical, dental and vision insurance premiums. Under the reopen clause, these adjustments were to be a matter scheduled for discussion during 2003. On February 3, 2004, representatives of the City of Porterville met with representatives of the P.C.F.A. and concurred regarding an addendum to the M.O.U., and amendments to the Resolution No. 116-2002, to increase the contribution rates in the employee medical premiums, effective 11-01-03.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council accept Addendum No. 2 to the M.O.U. with the P.C.F.A., dated August 6, 2002; and adopt the attached Draft Resolution amending Resolution No. 116-2002.

ATTACHMENT: Draft Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. ______-2004


WHEREAS: Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3500, et. seq., of the Government Code, representatives of the City of Porterville met and conferred with representatives of the Porterville City Firefighters' Association (P.C.F.A.) and reached concurrence on matters within the scope and purview of the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act, and thereupon executed a Memorandum of Understanding (M.O.U.), dated August 6, 2002, setting forth such matters of mutual agreement; and, thereafter, the Porterville City Council accepted the M.O.U. and approved the implementation thereof by adoption of Resolution No. 116-2002; and

WHEREAS: On February 3, 2004, representatives of the City of Porterville met with representatives of the P.C.F.A. and concurred to amend their above referenced M.O.U., by execution of Addendum No. 2, setting forth certain changes and additions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Porterville that City Council Resolution No. 116-2002, the Employee Pay and Benefit Plan and the Employee Health Plan Document for employees holding positions in the Fire Series are hereby amended as follows:

I. EMPLOYEE PAY AND BENEFIT PLAN, AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT TRUST FUND (HEALTH PLAN DOCUMENT).

A. EMPLOYEE MEDICAL BENEFIT.

1. CONTRIBUTION RATE ADJUSTMENTS.

The Employee Pay and Benefit Plan, Section III, A. 5., shall be amended to reflect a contribution rate adjustment to the Employee Health Plan Document, resulting in the City solely making the full employee premium
contribution of $294.50 only. No dependent premium shall be funded by
the City. Effective 11-01-03, the monthly contribution rate structure will
be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City Pays</th>
<th>Employee Pays</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee/Single Coverage</td>
<td>$294.50</td>
<td>$ -0-</td>
<td>$294.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + 1</td>
<td>$294.50</td>
<td>$105.50</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + 2</td>
<td>$294.50</td>
<td>$156.40</td>
<td>$450.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee + 3 or more</td>
<td>$294.50</td>
<td>$166.40</td>
<td>$460.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The payroll deductions for the increase in the employees' dependents premium rates shall begin
on the last pay period in February, 2004, and will include any unpaid balances.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor of the City of Porterville is hereby authorized to
execute those documents as are necessary to implement the provisions hereof.

ADOPTED this 17th day of February, 2004.

__________________________
Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor

Attest:

Georgia Hawley, Deputy City Clerk
PUBLIC HEARING

SUBJECT: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS (Zoning Ordinance Amendment 1-2004)

SOURCE: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT – PLANNING

COMMENT: On December 16, 2003 and January 20, 2004, the City Council considered the status of a number of committees that the Community Development Department is involved with. Through this consideration, a number of modifications were made. On December 16, 2003, the Council decided to eliminate the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC), which necessitated this Code Amendment. Attached is an Ordinance modifying the General Plan Amendment process reflecting the elimination of the LRPC. Prior to the establishment of the LRPC, the Code was relatively silent on the General Plan Amendment process, which necessitates maintaining much of what was previously approved.

The process outlined in the proposed Code Amendment defines the process undertaken by staff prior to the establishment of the LRPC.

On January 27, 2004 the Environmental Coordinator made the determination that the proposed Code Amendment is Categorically Exempt from CEQA pursuant to a General Rule Exemption.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Approve the proposed Ordinance; and

2. Give first reading to the Ordinance amending Article 27 of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the General Plan Amendment process.

ATTACHMENTS: Exhibit A, Outlining proposed changes
Draft Ordinance
Exhibit A

SECTION 1: Article 27 is hereby amended as follows:

SECTION 2704: Authority to Grant General Plan Amendments.

A. The City Council shall have authority to initiate General Plan Amendments and to grant General Plan Amendments pursuant to the provisions of this Article. Any General Plan Amendment shall not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties.

SECTION 2705: Application for and Initiation of General Plan Amendments

A. Hearings on General Plan Amendments shall be initiated in any of the following manners:

1. By verified application of any interested person or persons;

2. By resolution of the City Council.

B. Upon filing with or adoption by the City Council of any such application or resolution, the proposal shall be submitted to the Long Range Planning Committee for review and processing. The Long Range Planning Committee, in conjunction with the Project Review Committee, shall review the proposal and make a recommendation that staff will forward to the City Council regarding the appropriateness of the General Plan Amendment for the benefit of the City of Porterville and under the criteria contained within the body of the General Plan. The recommendation shall require an affirmative vote of the Long Range Planning Committee at a properly convened meeting of the Committee held in accordance with the procedures adopted by Resolution No. 80-2001 of the City Council (or as subsequently amended). Said review shall be completed within fifty (50) days following the filing of such application or resolution.

C. Following consideration of the proposed General Plan Amendment, by the Long Range Planning Committee of any such application or resolution, City Staff shall prepare the appropriate level of environmental review as determined by the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (as amended) (CEQA) and by adopted policy of the City of Porterville.

D. After the required environmental review documents are complete, the City Council shall hold a public hearing thereon, and such additional public hearings as the Council deems necessary. The Council or the City Clerk shall set the time and place for such hearing(s).
E. Procedures for such hearings shall be substantially as provided in the following named Zoning Ordinance sections. Said provisions are as follows: Section 2701 (Notice of Hearings), paragraphs A, B, and C; Section 2702 (Hearings, etc.), paragraphs A, B, F and G; Section 2703 (Decision, etc.), paragraphs A, B and C.

SECTION 2706: City Council Action is Final.

The decision of the Council shall be final. The City Clerk shall cause a copy of its resolution to be mailed to the applicant within ten (10) days from the date of adoption thereof.

Note:
Existing Language to remain appears in normal print.
Proposed language to be added appears in underlined print.
Existing language proposed to be removed is shown crossed out.
ORDINANCE NO.__________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF PORTERVILLE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 1198,
BEING THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE PORTERVILLE
MUNICIPAL CODE, PERTAINING TO CONSIDERATION
OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS

WHEREAS: On December 16, 2003, during the course of evaluating the Community
Development Department involvement with a variety of committees, the City Council voted to
eliminate the Long Range Planning Committee; and

WHEREAS: The City Council of the City of Porterville at its regularly scheduled meeting of
February 17, 2004, conducted a public hearing to consider General Amendment of the Zoning
Ordinance 1-2004, deleting provisions to Article 27 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of
Porterville; and

WHEREAS: The proposed General Amendment of the Zoning Ordinance will delete from
the General Plan Amendment process, references to the Long Range Planning Committee which was
eliminated by the City Council on February 17, 2004.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED: That the City Council of the City of Porterville
does hereby amend Ordinance No. 1198 as follows:

SECTION 1: Article 27 is hereby amended to read as follows:

SECTION 2704: Authority to Grant General Plan Amendments.

A. The City Council shall have authority to initiate General Plan Amendments and to
grant General Plan Amendments pursuant to the provisions of this Article. Any
General Plan Amendment shall not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent
with the limitations upon other properties.
SECTION 2705: Application for and Initiation of General Plan Amendments

A. Hearings on General Plan Amendments shall be initiated in any of the following manners:

1. By verified application of any interested person or persons;

2. By resolution of the City Council.

B. Upon filing with or adoption by the City Council of any such application or resolution, the proposal shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review and processing. The Department, in conjunction with the Project Review Committee, shall review the proposal and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the appropriateness of the General Plan Amendment for the benefit of the City of Porterville and under the criteria contained within the body of the General Plan.

C. Following consideration of the proposed General Plan Amendment, City Staff shall prepare the appropriate level of environmental review as determined by the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (as amended) (CEQA) and by adopted policy of the City of Porterville.

D. After the required environmental review documents are complete, the City Council shall hold a public hearing thereon, and such additional public hearings as the Council deems necessary. The Council or the City Clerk shall set the time and place for such hearing(s).

E. Procedures for such hearings shall be substantially as provided in the following named Zoning Ordinance sections. Said provisions are as follows: Section 2701 (Notice of Hearings), paragraphs A, B, and C; Section 2702 (Hearings, etc.), paragraphs A, B, F and G; Section 2703 (Decision, etc.), paragraphs A, B and C.

SECTION 2706: City Council Action is Final.

The decision of the Council shall be final. The City Clerk shall cause a copy of its resolution to be mailed to the applicant within ten (10) days from the date of adoption thereof.
SECTION 2: This ordinance shall be in full force and effect thirty (30) days from and after its publication and passage.

Richard M. Stadtherr, Mayor

ATTEST:

John Longley, City Clerk

Georgia Hawley, Deputy City Clerk
SUBJECT: SECOND READING - ORDINANCE NO. 1647, ZONE CHANGE NO. 6-2003 (SIERRA VIEW DISTRICT HOSPITAL)

SOURCE: Administrative Services Department/City Clerk Division

COMMENT: Ordinance No. 1647 approved Zone Change No. 6-2003. It was a change of zone from City R-1 (One Family Residential) to City P-O (Professional Office) for that 1.4± acre site located on the west side of Kessing Street, between Putnam Avenue and Oak Avenue. The ordinance was given a First Reading on February 3, 2004, and has been printed.

RECOMMENDATION: That Council give Second Reading to Ordinance No. 1647, waive further reading, and adopt said ordinance.

ATTACHMENT: Ordinance No. 1647
ORDINANCE NO. 1647

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF PORTERVILLE APPROVING ZONE CHANGE 6-2003,
BEING A CHANGE OF ZONE FROM R-1 (ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL)
TO PO (PROFESSIONAL OFFICE) FOR THAT 1.4± ACRE SITE
LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF KESSING STREET, BETWEEN
PUTNAM AVENUE AND OAK AVENUE

WHEREAS: The City Council of the City of Porterville at its regularly scheduled meeting
of February 3, 2004, conducted a public hearing to consider Zone Change 6-2003, being a change of zone
from R-1 (One Family Residential) to PO (Professional Office) for that 1.4± acre site located on the west
side of Kessing Street, between Putnam Avenue and Oak Avenue; and

WHEREAS: The City Council of the City of Porterville, after proceedings duly had and taken, and
after due and legal notice having been given, as prescribed by Ordinance 1198 of the City of Porterville, and
the laws of the State of California, has determined that the public interest would best be served by approval
of the proposed Zone Change 6-2003; and

WHEREAS: The City Council made the following findings in support of the approval of Zone
Change 6-2003:

1. The Land Use Element of the General Plan designates the subject site for
Professional Office Uses.

2. That the proposed zoning will conform with the land use designation of the
General Plan.

3. That a Negative Declaration was approved for this project in accordance with
the California Environmental Quality Act and mitigation measures
incorporated into the approval will be precedent to project implementation.

4. That this zoning designation will ensure that any future development of the
subject site will be in conformance with existing plans and policies and will
not adversely impact the surrounding area.

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 6-2003, is hereby re-zoned from R-1 (One Family
Residential) to PO (Professional Office) for that 1.4± acre site located on the west side of Kessing Street,
between Putnam Avenue and Oak Avenue, more particularly shown on the attached map, incorporated
herein by this reference as Exhibit “A”; 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 that all of the above described real
property is re-zoned from R-1 (One Family Residential) Zone to PO (Professional Office) for that 1.4± acre
site located on the west side of Kessing Street, between Putnam Avenue and Oak Avenue; and
Section 3: This ordinance shall be in full force and effect thirty (30) days from and after its publication and passage.

ATTEST:
John Longley, City Clerk

By
Georgia Hawley, Deputy

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
CITY OF PORTERVILLE  ) (SS)
COUNTY OF TULARE )

I, JOHN LONGLEY, the duly qualified City Clerk of the City of Porterville do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing ordinance is a true and correct copy of Ordinance No. 1647, passed and adopted by the Council of the City of Porterville at a regular meeting held on the 17th day of February, 2004, that said ordinance has been duly published pursuant to law, and that by the terms and provisions of the Charter of the City of Porterville, said ordinance to become effective on the 18th day of March, 2004, at which time said ordinance is deemed to be in full force and effect.

THAT said ordinance was introduced by Council and the same was duly passed and adopted by the following vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNCIL:</th>
<th>WEST</th>
<th>MARTINEZ</th>
<th>HAMILTON</th>
<th>IRISH</th>
<th>STADTHERR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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

Georgia Hawley Deputy City Clerk
SUBJECT: SECOND READING - ORDINANCE 1648, AMENDING CHAPTER 12, ARTICLE II, FIREWORKS

SOURCE: Administrative Services Department/City Clerk Division

COMMENT: Ordinance No. 1648, amending Chapter 12, Article II, Fireworks, of the Code of the City of Porterville, pertaining to granting a fireworks sales permit to the Exchange Club of Porterville, was given First Reading on February 3, 2004, and has been printed.

RECOMMENDATION: That Council give Second Reading to Ordinance No. 1648, waive further reading, and adopt said ordinance.

Attachment: Ordinance No. 1648
ORDINANCE NO. 1648

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE AMENDING CHAPTER 12, ARTICLE II, FIREWORKS, OF THE PORTERVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE

Whereas, on May 1, 2001, the City Council did adopt Ordinance No. 1601 revising Chapter 12, Article II, Fireworks, to allow for the sale of Safe and Sane Fireworks within the City of Porterville; and

Whereas, The City Council has determined that eligible non-profit organizations may be instrumental in presenting the public fireworks displays for the benefit of the community as a whole; and

Whereas, the City Council has determined that for Calendar Year 2004 the Exchange Club of Porterville shall be granted a permit without participation in the lottery;

THEREFORE THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTERVILLE DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. For Calendar Year 2004, the following eligible organization shall be granted a permit to sell safe and sane fireworks, in addition to those permits issued by the lottery pursuant to Section 12.2.5., within the City of Porterville:

The Exchange Club of Porterville

This organization must adhere to all other rules and requirements set forth in Chapter 12, Article II, in order to receive their permit.

Section 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect thirty (30) days from and after its publication and passage.

Richard Stadtherr, Mayor

ATTEST:

John Longley, City Clerk
SUBJECT: POLICY FOR NAMING OR DEDICATION OF CITY FACILITIES

SOURCE: Parks and Leisure Services Department

COMMENT: The City of Porterville does not have a uniform policy to assist the City Council and guide the Parks and Leisure Services Commission and/or staff in the naming of City facilities, including buildings, support facilities, park sites, athletic fields and recreation facilities.

With the current issue of the naming of the planned Community Center and Library, Parks and Leisure Services staff has been directed to review and analyze procedures adopted by other cities to guide the naming process.

Staff was able to collect policies and/or resolutions from agencies from throughout the state. A very good summary on the subject was found from the City of Palmdale. Based on this information, a report with a summary of policies and recommendations was presented to the Parks and Leisure Services Commission. The Parks and Leisure Services Commission has reviewed and discussed this information and recommends City Council’s adoption of the attached policy. The Commission desires City Council guidance or adoption of a policy for the naming of City facilities prior to concluding their efforts towards recommending a list of names for the new Community Center and Library.

The Commission’s recommendation includes Financial Contribution Naming Guidelines as a component of the fifth point in Section 1. The Financial Contribution Naming Guidelines are proposed for consideration of naming facilities after an individual when land or financial contributions have been provided.

Staff does not endorse the inclusion of the Financial Contribution Naming Guidelines and recommends that the fifth point in Section 1 read as follows:

Consideration may be given of naming facilities after an individual when the land or facility, or the necessary funding, have been donated by the individual, particularly if such naming is set forth as a condition of the donation. In general, 100% of the land, facility, or necessary funding would be expected for favorable consideration to the naming of the facility after an individual.

Staff believes that this language would make the policy simpler and still provide future Councils with flexibility to consider contributions with name recognition conditions.

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt the Policy for Naming or Dedication of City Facilities without the Financial Contribution Naming Guidelines and with the staff suggested revised language for the fifth point of Section 1.

ATTACHMENTS: 1) Policy for Naming or Dedication of City facilities
2) January 30, 2004 memo report to City Manager on policies and procedures used by other agencies relating to attached the naming of City owned parks and facilities.

ITEM NO.: 20
CITY OF PORTERVILLE
POLICY FOR NAMING OR DEDICATION OF CITY FACILITIES
FEBRUARY 17, 2004
PAGE 1

Naming City buildings, parks and facilities serves a public interest by recognizing important landmarks, locations, or persons. The development of policies and procedures to guide the naming and dedication of City facilities is intended to enable the process to be applied in a fair, objective and consistent manner.

In order to facilitate the manner in which public facilities may be named, the following guidelines are recommended:

1) Naming of City-owned Parks and Facilities

- Names must be pleasant sounding, tasteful, non-controversial and grammatically correct.

- City buildings, parks and facilities will be named in a manner that will provide an easy and recognizable reference. Such names should generally reflect the facility’s landmarks and geographical location (such as a major street, location, or neighborhood), and/or function.

- In certain circumstances, where names reflecting the geographical location are unworkable, names may reflect topography, notable flora, prominent tree(s), cultural characteristics, a natural or environmental feature, city identification, historical precedent or enhancement of civic values and heritage.

- Under extraordinary circumstances, consideration may be given to naming facilities after significant individuals or organizations that made prominent contributions to the City’s community. This is to promote civic pride as well as to honor or recognize individuals. Consideration may be given to criteria that said individual or organization must meet in order to be considered.

- Consideration may be given to naming the facility after an individual when the land or facility, or the necessary funding, have been donated by the individual, particularly if such naming is set forth as a condition of the donation. See attached Financial Contribution Naming Guidelines.

- Names shall not be considered for those individuals when they have been previously named, or overly recognized. If naming after a deceased individual, a waiting period of at least ten years after the death is required.
• The Parks and Leisure Services Commission will oversee this process. The Commission will solicit ideas and suggestions from the community, and accept nominations at least 180 days prior to opening of a new facility. The Parks and Leisure Services Commission will hold at least one public hearing. Nominations should be submitted in writing on an approved form with a statement of justification and/or background information. Any letters of support may also be included. Recommendations may also come from other City boards and commissions. All qualified recommendations will be given the same consideration without regard to the nomination source.

• The Parks and Leisure Services Commission will make recommendations to the City Council. All names are subject to the approval of the City Council, upon recommendation of the Parks and Leisure Services Commission.

• The City Council also reserves the right to rename or remove a name from a City building and facility.

2) Dedication of Buildings and Facilities

• City buildings and facilities including places within City-owned land or facilities, such as a room within a building, can be dedicated in memory of an individual or group, who has contributed to the facility or community. A donation or in-kind contribution may be accepted by the Council and recognized by a plaque affixed to the appropriate city building.

• The Parks and Leisure Services Commission will oversee this process in the same manner as the “Naming” process.

• Any individual, family, group sponsoring dedication or memorial must provide sufficient funds to purchase, install and maintain the plaque.

• The City will make reasonable efforts to preserve plaques but if necessary (due to constructions, or repairs), the plaque must be relocated. The City Council also reserves the right to remove the plaque.
Financial Contribution Naming Guidelines

The following are general guidelines for which a naming opportunity may be extended:

1. For a major, prominent facility that exceeds $500,000 in cost, a significant monetary contribution may be considered to be 10% in cash, property, securities or in-kind services, of the total value of the development.

2. For facilities that are planned and scheduled for construction that are projected to cost less than $500,000, a significant contribution may be based on the following scale. For a project costing:

   a. $500,000 - $250,000        20% of the total cost
   b. $249,000 - $100,000        25% of the total cost
   c. $99,999 - $50,000          30% of the total cost
   d. $49,999 - $40,000          40% of the total cost
   e. Less than $39,999          Listed in the gifts catalog

3. Projects not budgeted and for which other funding is not designated may require a 100% contribution in order to be implemented and a naming opportunity extended.

4. If a facility is named in recognition of a financial contribution, an agreement should be signed between the donor and the City that specifies conditions of the gift and the responsibilities of each party and must include minimum length of time the name will be used, signage and other appropriate provisions. The recommended minimum sunset should be no less than 15 years.

5. It is understood that a name given in recognition of a financial contribution may be changed at the discretion of the City Council. Such changes may be for, but are not limited to, the following reasons:

   a. The name reaches a stated sunset date.
   b. Changing community values necessitate a name change.
   c. There is a need to use a new naming opportunity to raise funds to enhance the facility.
   d. The facility use is changed, the facility is no longer in use, no longer under City control, or needs to be moved.
To: John Longley, City Manager
Through: Jim Perrine, Director of Parks and Leisure Services
From: Jeannie Greenwood, Supervisor
Date: January 30, 2004
Subject: Report of policies and procedures used by other agencies relating to the naming of City-owned Parks and Facilities.

SUMMARY

Issue
What criteria are other agencies using to name City owned parks and facilities?

Fiscal Impact
There is no fiscal impact associated with this issue.

BACKGROUND

The City of Porterville does not have a uniform policy to assist the City Council and guide the Parks and Leisure Services Commission and/or staff in the naming of City facilities, including buildings, support facilities, park sites, athletic fields and recreation facilities.

With the current issue of the naming of the planned Community Center and Library, Parks and Leisure Services staff has been directed to review and analyze procedures adopted by other cities to guide the naming process.

Staff was able to collect a similar study conducted by the City of Palmdale as well as policies and/or resolutions from agencies from throughout the state. Attached are copies of the City of Palmdale report, a survey summary conducted by the League of California Cities, and policies/information gathered from San Joaquin Valley cities. Information collected from these agencies is summarized below.

SUMMARY OF NAMING CRITERIA USED BY OTHER CITIES:

- Names must be pleasant sounding, tasteful, non-controversial and grammatically correct.
- Descriptive of the parkfacility geographical location and/or function.
- Consideration may be given to an event of historical or cultural significance.
- Name can be from a natural or environmental feature.
- Geographical landmark
- Named to enhance the values and heritage of the City an be compatible with community interest.
Can be named for a person or organization when certain criteria are met. Some of the criteria is as follows:

- Person or organization that have a definite connection to the city.
- Person or organization that has made a significant, positive difference in the community. This has been written in some situations to include people who may or may not currently live within the community and in some can include someone who has never resided in the community.
- Person or group who has made a significant contribution to the development and/or organization of parks and recreation programs which has meaning for the city as a whole.
- After an individual or organization when a significant percentage of the land and/or cost for development has been donated to the City by an individual, corporation or organization. In some agencies a percentage is defined.
- A person living or deceased with historical or cultural significance.
- A person (living or deceased) with feature particularly identified with the land or facility.
- Some require a person to be deceased for a specified number of years.
- At least one agency studied does not allow the naming of facilities after individuals.
- Facilities cannot be named for a person or organization that has been previously named.

**PROCESS OF NAME SELECTION**

Below is a brief summary of methods in the process of name selection:

- In most it is stated that the naming of the facility should be completed prior to the first phase of planning.
- Nominations should be solicited from the public. This is done in a variety of ways by different agencies, several hold a public hearing, some conduct contests and some approach community organizations to assist in this process. It is common that nominations be submitted in writing and include a justification as to how this name meets the criteria established.
- In some agencies, department staff screen and review nominations prior to the list reaching the commission or designated advisory board. In other agencies the commission or advisory board review all nominations.
- The commission or advisory board may work with other community organizations to identify individuals and events or historical and/or cultural significance.
- The commission or advisory board reviews nominations and forwards a recommendation to council.
- City Council had the final decision on the naming of facility.
- Some agencies maintain a master list of proposed names for future use.
DATE:       December 10, 2003

SUBJECT:   Consideration by the City Council to establish policies and procedures
related to the naming of City-owned Parks and Facilities.

ISSUING DEPARTMENT: Office of the City Manager

SUMMARY

Issue:
Shall the City Council establish guidelines to name City Parks and Facilities?

Fiscal Impact:
There is no fiscal impact associated with this issue.

BACKGROUND

The City of Palmdale does not have a uniform policy to assist the City Council and guide
staff in the naming of City facilities, including buildings, support facilities, park sites,
athletic fields, and recreational facilities. As a result, City facilities have been named in
honor of public officials, citizens, or in association with geographical locations, without the
benefit of a City Council approved policy to guide the naming process.

Staff has been requested by the City Council to review and analyze procedures adopted
by other cities and to make recommendations to guide the naming process. Staff was
able to collect information from the following California cities: Cupertino, Brentwood, El
Segundo, Turlock, Long Beach, Santa Barbara, Merced, Hollister, Chino, Belmont,
Campbell, Sunnyvale, South San Francisco, Palo Alto, San Mateo, San Francisco and
Burlingame. Information collected from these cities was summarized below.

Summary of Policies Adopted by Other Cities:

Honoring individuals can take place in a number of ways: 1) Naming the City facilities
after an individual; 2) Dedicating buildings, or a portion of the building after an individual;
and 3) Accepting and planting of trees in memory of an individual.
1. Naming of City-owned Parks and Facilities

Numerous cities, state agencies and the Federal Government have criteria and procedures for naming public facilities. Policies range from identifying the culture and history of a place, to city identification or recognition of individuals for exceptional or distinguished contributions.

Some cities have set higher priorities on naming based on location and/or function of a facility rather than naming after an individual; others limit public facility being used as memorials to the deceased. Most policies recommend a waiting period of at least one year after the death of an individual for recognition of that person. Some cities have established a restriction of naming several facilities after one individual or organization. In those cases, names shall not be considered for those individuals when they have previously been named, or overly recognized.

Most cities select names that provide easy and recognizable reference. Geographic locations such as neighborhood and major streets are commonly selected. Others that are eligible to be named include prominent topography, notable flora, a prominent plant, bush, or tree.

In certain unusual circumstances, where names reflecting the geographical location or others noted above are unworkable, 15 of 17 cities surveyed also allow facilities and buildings to be named to honor or recognize individuals or groups. Eligible individuals include retired elected officials or community volunteers, and individuals that have made extraordinary, prominent, distinguished, non-monetary and monetary contributions to the City, region, or to general public.

Of 15 cities that allow naming of facilities after individuals or groups, 11 cities allow the public facilities to be named after financial donors, long-term sponsors, land donors, or in-kind contributors. In all cases, contributions toward the cost of naming is encouraged, or required, but the City Council will have the final prerogative of accepting or rejecting any offers of donations associated with a nomination.

In most cases, each entity typically tailors the process of selecting a name or affiliation by using its existing commission or committee structure as a means of developing a final recommendation to the City Council. Established policy and criteria will guide the assigned commission in recommending names to the Council for approval.

2. Dedication of Buildings and Facilities

This process also offers recognition of an outstanding service, through dedication in memory of an individual who has contributed to the facility or community. This dedication process is generally implemented by placement of a plaque at the entryway of the facility.

In those cities that have implemented this policy, the process is very similar to the "naming" process. A donation or in-kind contribution may be accepted by the City Council and may be recognized by a plaque affixed to the appropriate City building.
As with the policy for naming of facilities, a formal, written request must be submitted. The same forms can be used for both processes. Biographical information is required and letters of local support are encouraged. Recommendations may also come from other City boards and commissions. All recommendations will be given the same consideration without regard to the nomination source.

3. Acceptance of Tree and Other Gifts

The City of Palmdale currently accepts donation of a tree and a plaque to memorialize individuals, but does not have established procedures.

Cities such as Cupertino and Brentwood also accept plant, bench, picnic table in addition to a tree. Although the cities provide regular landscape/maintenance care, they are not obligated to provide a replacement if the tree does not survive. The cities also reserve the right to remove the tree at the discretion of the Council.

RECOMMENDATION

Naming City buildings, parks and facilities serves a public interest by recognizing important landmarks, locations, or persons. The development of policies and procedures to guide the naming and dedication of City facilities is intended to enable the process to be applied in a fair, objective and consistent manner.

In order to facilitate the manner in which public facilities may be named, the following guidelines are recommended for the City of Palmdale:

1) Naming of City-owned Parks and Facilities

- City buildings, parks and facilities will be named in a manner that will provide an easy and recognizable reference. Such names should generally reflect the facility’s landmarks and geographical location (such as a major street, location, or neighborhood).

- In certain circumstances, where names reflecting the geographical location are unworkable, names may reflect topography, notable flora, prominent tree, cultural, city identification or historical precedent.

- Under extraordinary circumstances, consideration may be given to naming facilities after significant individuals or organizations that made prominent contributions to the City’s community. This is to promote civic pride as well as to honor or recognize individuals, who have made prominent, distinguished, extraordinary non-monetary contributions to the City, the region, or to general public.
Consideration may be given to naming the facility after an individual when the
land or facility, or the necessary funding, have been donated by the individual,
particularly if such naming is set forth as a condition of the donation.

Names shall not be considered for those individuals when they have been
previously named, or overly recognized. If naming after a deceased individual,
a waiting period of at least one year after the death is required.

The Planning Commission will oversee this process. The Planning
Commission will solicit ideas and suggestions from the community, and accept
nominations at least 180 days prior to opening of a new facility. The Planning
Commission will hold at least one public hearing. Nominations should be
submitted in writing on an approved form with required biographical
information. Any letters of support may also be included. Recommendations
may also come from other City boards and commissions. All qualified
recommendations will be given the same consideration without regard to the
nomination source.

The Planning Commission will make recommendations to the City Council. All
names are subject to the approval of the City Council, upon recommendation of
the Planning Commission after the conduct of at least one public hearing.

Contributions toward the cost of naming are encouraged, but the Council will
have the final prerogative of accepting or rejecting any offers of donations
associated with a nomination.

The City Council also reserves the right to rename or remove a name from a
City building and facility.

However, places within City-owned land or facilities, such as a room within a
building, which do not require formal dedication by the City Council, may be
named by the City Manager or his designee.

2) Dedication of Buildings and Facilities

City buildings and facilities can be dedicated in memory of an individual or
group, who has contributed to the facility or community. A donation or in-kind
contribution may be accepted by the Council and recognized by a plaque
affixed to the appropriate city building.

The Planning Commission will oversee this process in the same manner as the
“Naming” process.

Any individual, family, group sponsoring dedication or memorial must provide
sufficient funds to purchase, install and maintain the plaque.
- The City will make reasonable efforts to preserve plaques but if necessary (due to constructions, or repairs), the plaque must be relocated. The City Council also reserves the right to remove the plaque.

3) Acceptance of Tree and Other Gifts

- The City may accept a gift of a tree with a plaque in memory of an individual. The Director of Public Works will oversee this process.

- Type and size of both tree and plaque will be determined by the Director of Public Works. Trees will be planted in a manner established by the Director of Public Works.

- All trees will be planted only in a centralized, pre-determined location of McAdam Park.

- The City will provide its regular landscape and maintenance care. If the tree does not survive, the City is not obligated to provide a replacement.

- The tree may be removed at the discretion of the City Manager.

Submitted by:  
Saynne Redifer  
Senior Administrative Analyst

Reviewed by:  
Carol Seidl  
Assistant City Manager

Robert W. Toone, Jr.  
City Manager
NAMING PUBLIC FACILITIES

Numerous cities, state agencies and the Federal Government all have criteria and procedures for naming public facilities. Policies range from identifying the culture and history of a place, to city identification or recognition of individuals for exceptional or distinguished contributions. Some cities have set higher priorities on naming based on location and/or function of a public space rather than naming after an individual; others limit public space being used as memorials to the deceased. Most policies recommend a waiting period of at least one year after the death of an individual for recognition of that person. Honoring individuals can take place in a number of ways including naming a building, portion of a building or related garden or other space. By and large, each entity typically tailors the process of selecting a name or affiliation by using its existing commission or committee structure as a means of developing a final recommendation to an elected body. Here follows a summary of various entities’ naming policies as drawn from California cities, a web search and a Congressional Research Service inquiry.

RESPONSES FROM CALIFORNIA CITIES THROUGH PHONE INTERVIEWS AND THE LEAGUE LIST SERVE; WEB SEARCH AND A CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE INQUIRY

CITY OF LONG BEACH

Policy:
The City Council considers 1) appropriate names for City-owned land, buildings, and facilities; and 2) circumstances to name or rename as follows:

- Incorporation of Long Beach for City identification;
- Recognized geographic, topographic or historical significance as recommended by Planning Commission, Cultural Heritage Commission or Long Beach Historical Society;
- Recognition of individuals or families who have donated land or funds for capital projects;
- Recognition in honor of persons who have served the Nation, State or City in an exceptional or distinguished manner where the contribution is of major significance;
- Recognition in honor of deceased persons shall generally not take place until one year after their deaths;
- Names of such facilities shall not be named in honor of individuals when they have previously been named for other individuals, or overly recognized.
Procedure:
Requests for naming shall be filed with the City Clerk in writing with a justification. City Council refers requests to its Human Resources Committee, as well as concerned advisory bodies, for study and recommendation. Upon completion of deliberations and a public hearing, Human Resources Committee refers a recommendation to City Council for final decision.

Major donations of materials, equipment and facilities are recognized through the Parks & Recreation Commission to the City Council after City Attorney and City Manager Approval.

SANTA BARBARA

Policy:
- Names which commemorate the culture and history of Santa Barbara will be given first priority; California history will be second priority.
- A name of an individual shall be considered when the individual has made an outstanding contribution over a period of years to the City.
- Preference shall be given to names of long established usage, or that lend dignity to the facility.
- Proliferation of names for different parts of the same facility should be avoided.

Procedure:
Any person may initiate the naming by a request to the City Administrator. The department, commission or committee having jurisdiction shall hold a public hearing and prepare a recommendation for City Council.

CITY OF MERCED

Policy:
The City Council/Redevelopment Agency Commission will determine appropriate names for facilities based on 1) significant contributions by citizens; and 2) historical links throughout the development of the City.

Procedure:
Notice of interest in naming a public facility will be forwarded to the City Council/Redevelopment Agency Commission. If the decision is to name the facility, the Council/Commission will direct staff to issue a public notice inviting proposals to name said facility. If the decision is not to name the facility, the Council/Commission will direct staff to decline the request.

Facilities to be newly acquired, built, installed, or established should be named as soon as possible. A facility name may be changed by action of the City Council/Redevelopment Agency Commission.
Written proposals should clearly explain the basis for the nomination:

- The contribution of the honoree(s);
- The connection between the proposed name(s) and the facility purpose;
- The historical or geographical significance.

In addition, the proposals should suggest a format for displaying the name and any recommended ceremonial activities for the naming of the facility.

Selection:
In the case of parks or recreational facilities, the selection committee will be comprised of the Recreation and Parks Commission plus two City Councilmembers. For other facilities, a selection committee will be formed, composed of two members of the City Council, the City Manager, the City Attorney, the Department Head of the lead City department involved with the project, and any other member(s) the Council deems appropriate.

The selection committee will forward to the City Council/Redevelopment Agency Commission a recommendation regarding 1) name(s) to be associated with the new facility; and 2) the preferred means of presenting and displaying the selected name(s).

The Council/Commission will invite public comment on the recommendation at a public hearing. The Council/Commission will make the final selection and direct staff to design a plan, budget, and schedule to implement the naming.

Contributions toward the costs of the naming and dedication will be encouraged; however, the Council/Commission will have the final prerogative of accepting or rejecting any offers of donations associated with a nomination.

CITY OF HOLLISTER
Resolution # 200234

- Public parks, recreation and public facilities are typically named after geographical locations, historic events or persons who have made contributions to the City of Hollister.

- Criteria for naming and renaming public facilities:
  1) To identify the facility by geographical location of the site or immediate area.
  2) To identify the facility by historical features of the site or immediate area.
  3) To identify the facility after a person who has made distinct and significant community contributions.

- Process for naming and renaming public facilities:
1) City staff will develop a written application process that will allow the public to submit recommendations to the Parks and Recreation Commission.
2) The public will be notified of the need to name a public facility and will be encouraged to submit requests.
3) The Parks and Recreation Commission will then review any applications and forward recommendations to the City Council.
4) The Parks and Recreation Commission recommendation will then be reviewed and acted upon by the City Council.

CITY OF CHINO

Parks:
The name of the park should enhance the identity of the surrounding area or jurisdiction to be served. A theme can be explored to assist in getting the community involved with the naming of the facilities (i.e. contest). A theme can be taken from the park itself due to an identifiable aspect.

Buildings:
Naming of buildings should follow the same policy for naming of parks. The name should describe what the purpose of the building is (i.e., Senior Citizens Center, Chino Multi-purpose Recreation Center, etc.).

Naming Facilities After Individuals:
The recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Commission is to keep the naming of facilities after a theme and dedicate the facility in the name of an individual. A plaque would be placed on an outside wall with that person's accomplishments.

TOWN OF WINDSOR
Resolution # 361-94

Objectives:
• To enhance the values and heritage of the Town of Windsor and be compatible with community interest.
• To be descriptive of the park's geographical location and/or function so that it will be easily identified.
• To encourage the dedication of land or funds for public use by individuals/groups in recognition of their achievements or community contribution.

NATIONAL SEARCH

MUSKEGO, WISCONSIN  http://www.ci.muskego.wi.us/ordinances/ord.htm
has the following ordinance:
Citation: Ordinance #979, Section 26.03 Naming of Public Facilities

Begin text:

1) Requests for the naming or the renaming of public buildings, facilities, and parks shall be submitted in writing. Requests concerning parks shall be brought before the Parks and Recreation Board for recommendation to the Common Council by Resolution. The person(s) who submitted the request shall provide background information into the rationale behind the request, including biographical information and any letters of local support.

2) Once a public building, park, or facility is named after a person, the name of the public property cannot be changed for a period of one hundred years.

3) All costs associated with the naming shall be paid by the person(s) submitting the request. This cost may be waived by the Common Council.

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON (http://clerk.ci.seattle.wa.us/~public/code1.htm) speaks of the naming of parks in the following code:

Citation: Seattle Municipal Code 18.08.010 Authority to designate names—Naming Committee Created.

The Superintendent of Parks and Recreation with the advice of the Board of Park Commissioners is authorized to designate the names of parks, recreation areas or facilities from among names submitted by a Parks and Recreation Naming Committee (the Superintendent of Parks and Recreation, the Chairman of the Board of Park Commissioners, and the chairman of the committee of the City Council responsible for parks and public grounds, or their designated representatives, and the Naming Committee) is authorized to establish policies and procedures as contemplated in C.F. 268124 to be followed in selecting names to be submitted to the Superintendent.

STATE OF MARYLAND
DHMH POLICY NUMBER 02.03.01

Title:
Policy on the naming of sites, buildings, and other permanent type structures that will be or are under the control of the department of health and mental hygiene

Executive Summary:
The Secretary of the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH) recognizes the fact that there may be a desire by interested persons to give a site, building, or other permanent type structure an elegant name for euphonic and/or aesthetic value or the name of a specific person or persons in order to
honor and perpetuate the deeds of those who have given of their life and/or 
treasure to humanity and/or the State of Maryland.

The Board of Public Works (BPW) must approve all requests to name a site, 
building, or other permanent type structure.

Policy:
All requests shall be handled through the following channels - head of the 
requesting unit or his designee to the applicable Director of Program 
Administration; to the Director, OPCF; to the Office of the Secretary; and, then to 
the BPW. The requests must state the reason or reasons for the choice of name. 
If the name to be used is the name of a person, a vita in quadruplicate must 
accompany the request.

All requests to name a site, building, and/or other permanent type structure for a 
person or persons, approval to use the name must be received from the person 
or persons, if living, or the heirs if the person or persons are deceased, after 
receiving BPW's approval.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE REQUESTING PERSON, PERSONS, OR UNIT

Procedure:
  • Provide a tentative name for the site, building, or permanent structure.
  • Develop vita type information and reasons for request to honor 
    individual(s), if the name of the site, building, or permanent structure is to 
    honor an individual(s).
  • Provide explanation, if naming the site, building, or permanent structure 
    for euphonic and/or aesthetic value.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

“Naming Federal Buildings” Guidelines

The naming of Federal Buildings is done through Congressional action through:

   Subcommittee of the House, and the Senate Environment and Public Works 
   Committee.

2) The House Committee may approve bills to name Federal buildings in honor 
   of former or retiring Members of Congress, Judges or others who have 
   distinguished themselves in their communities where the building is located. 
   The building must be located within the Congressional District of the bill’s 
   sponsor or have the support of that member.
In addition, the Senate Committee rules state that “the committee may not name a building, structure or facility for any living person, except for Presidents or former Vice Presidents of the United States, former Members of Congress over 70 years of age, & US Supreme Court Justices over 70 years of age.”
To: Darrel Pyle  
Deputy City Manager  
City of Porterville  

Phone: (559) 782-7466  
Fax phone: (661) 362-4008  
CC:  

From: Diane E. Lewis  
Director of Parks &  
Community Services  
City of Madera  

Phone: (559) 661-5495  
Fax phone: (559) 675-3827  

Date: 1/23/04  
Number of pages including cover sheet: 4  

REMARKS: □ Urgent □ For your review □ Reply ASAP □ Please comment  

Attached is the Naming of Park and Recreation Facilities resolution.  
If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at the number above.  

Thanks 😊  

Diane
RESOLUTION NO: 00-08

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF MADERA, CALIFORNIA
ESTABLISHING A POLICY FOR THE NAMING OF
PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES

WHEREAS, the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board has recommended a
policy describing the manner in which municipal park and recreation facilities are
to be named,

And by definition as used herein, the term (Parks), includes “Park”, “Recreation
Facility”, and “Fields and portions thereof,

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Madera does hereby adopt
the following policy governing the naming of municipal Parks:

A. Objectives. The name shall address one or more of these objectives:

A1. To enhance the values and heritage of the City of Madera and be
    compatible with community interest.

A2. To be descriptive of the park’s geographical location and/or function
    so that it will be easily identified.

A3. To encourage the dedication of land or funds for public use by
    individuals/groups in recognition of their achievements or community
    contribution.

B. If the park is to be named for a person in recognition of the public
    service the person has provided, the following criteria in addition to those
    in “A” must apply:

B1. The person shall have made a major contribution to the community,
    the County, the State, or the field of recreation and parks.

B2. Consideration of a person shall occur not less than 3 years
    following the date of the service for which the recognition is being made.

B3. The service the person made shall have occurred over a period not
    less than 2 years.

B4. Typically, the service shall have been rendered in a volunteer, non-
    paid status.

B5. The person may be living or deceased.
C. If the park is to be named in recognition of a gift of resources for the acquisition or building of the park, the following criteria in addition to those in “A” apply.

C1. The gift of resources for the park from the donor shall exceed fifty percent (50%) of the capital cost of the park.

C2. If being named for a person, the person must have a record of outstanding citizenship; that is, the person is of exemplary character and integrity.

C3. A donor may stipulate the name of the park if (a) the stipulated name is part of a written agreement approved by the City Council at the time the donation of resources is offered; and (b) the stipulated name is consistent with paragraphs C.1 and C.2 and Section A of this policy.

D. Procedures for naming Parks:

D1. The Park and Recreation Advisory Board shall recommend to the City Council the names for Park and Recreation facilities.

D2. The criteria used by the Park and Recreation Advisory Board, and subsequently the City Council, for considering a park name shall be the criteria set forth in this policy.

D3. Typically, parks shall be named immediately after acquisition of the site in order to be identified from the onset.

D4. The Park and Recreation Advisory Board shall provide ample public notice of its intent to select a park name, providing sufficient time for other individuals/groups to propose other names prior to the Park and Recreation Advisory Board making a decision.

E. Change of Name. A park name may be changed if any of the following conditions are met:

E1. When the current name appears to be inappropriate.

E2. When the current name is inconsistent with the objectives of the park naming policy.

E3. If a serious oversight would result because a particularly deserving person could not be appropriately recognized unless an existing PARK was renamed.
E5. Selecting a new name for a facility already named shall be subject to the same objectives, criteria, and procedures described in this policy.

F. Definitions:

F1. The term "person" includes the plural, people; it also includes informal groups or formally established organizations.

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Madera this ___ day of January, 2000, by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Armientrout, Wells, Perez, Nabors, Skeals.
NOES: None.
ABSENT: None.

[Signature]
MAYOR

ATTEST:

[Signature]
CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

[Signature]
CITY ATTORNEY

TOTAL P. 04
DRAFT A-20

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SUBJECT: PROCEDURES FOR NAMING CITY AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY FACILITIES

EFFECTIVE: Policy for Naming Parks 2/96

Purpose:
The purpose of this policy is to provide uniform general guidelines for the determination of names for public facilities acquired, built, established, or installed by the City of Merced and/or the Merced Redevelopment Agency.

Objectives:
1. Ensure that parks, recreational areas and facilities are easily identified and located.
2. Ensure that given names to parks, recreational areas and facilities are consistent with the values and character of the area or neighborhood served.
3. Encourage public participation in the naming, renaming and dedication of parks, recreation areas and facilities.
4. Encourages the dedication of lands, facilities, or donations by individuals and/or groups.

Definition:
Parks, recreation areas and facilities includes all property assets under the City’s ownership and control; including buildings, structures, open spaces, public parks, natural areas, wetlands, environmental habitat and land.

Criteria:
The policy of the City of Merced is to name parks, recreation areas and facilities through an adopted process utilizing established criteria emphasizing community values and character, local history, geography, environment, civics and service unique to the community of Merced. The following criteria shall be used in determining the appropriateness of the naming designation:

a. Geographic location (neighborhood, significant areas, etc.).
b. Natural features.
c. A person (living or deceased) with historical or cultural significance.
d. A person/group (living or deceased), with feature particularly identified with the land or facility.

1. The process to name parks, recreation areas and facilities shall not begin until after the City has acquired title to the land and/or formally accepted the dedication.

2. Conditions of property donation as agreed upon by the donor and the City shall be honored regarding the naming of the parks, recreation areas and facilities subject to these adopted policies.
3. Names that are similar to existing parks, properties or facilities in the City system (or other systems in the metro area) should not be considered in order to minimize confusion.

4. The City reserves the right to change the name of any City/Redevelopment Agency facility to maintain consistency with these policies.

Procedure:

Naming of City and Redevelopment Agency Facilities.

1. A request for naming of a park, recreational area or facility shall be submitted in writing. Voice mail and emails will not be accepted.

2. Those submitting a naming request should show how the proposed name is consistent with the criteria stated in this policy.

3. When naming after a person or persons, the application will describe the contributions to the City of Merced. Written documentation of approval by next of kin of person to be honored (if available/possible) is required as part of the proposal.

4. A request for naming of parks, recreation areas and facility shall be submitted in writing to the Director of Parks and Community Services. The Recreation and Park Commission and two appointed City Council members shall review all written requests for naming of parks, recreation areas or facilities as the Selection Committee.

5. A request for naming other City/Redevelopment Agency Facilities shall be submitted to Department Head of the lead City department involved with the project. Two City Council members, the City Manager, and a maximum of three (3) other members shall form the Selection Committee to review all requests for naming all other City/Redevelopment Agency facilities.

6. City staff shall review the written proposal for adherence to the stated criteria and authentication of statements relative to contributions in the case of an individual before forwarding the request to the Recreation and Parks Commission and/or the Selection Committee of City Council members, City Manager, City Attorney and other members. If the request is incomplete, staff will contact the applicant, in writing, and provide them with the opportunity to resubmit a revised request.

7. The Recreation and Parks Commission/Selection Committee(s) will offer the opportunity for public input on the proposed naming at a published public hearing.

8. The Recreation and Parks Commission/Selection Committee(s) shall forward their recommendation(s) to the City Council for the final decision.

9. The Recreation and Parks Commission/Selection Committee can initiate the naming process whenever deemed necessary and/or in the best interest of the City of Merced.

10. In the absence of any naming request, the Recreation and Parks Commission/Selection Committee(s) shall adhere to criteria stated in this policy in any/all recommendations of name(s).
Renaming of City Parks, Recreation Areas/Redevelopment Agency Facilities

1. Renaming of parks, recreation areas and facilities carries with it a much greater burden of process compared to the initial naming. Tradition and continuity of name and community identification are important community values. Each application must meet the criteria in this policy, but meeting all criteria does not ensure renaming.

2. A request for renaming of a park, recreational area or Redevelopment Agency facility shall be submitted in writing to the Parks and Community Services Department or the specific Department Head of the lead City department involved with the project.

3. The request shall include the proposed name change, the purpose of the change, and how the proposed name change is consistent with the criteria established. When renaming after a person or persons, the application will describe the contributions to the City. A written documentation approval by the next of kin of the person to be honored (if available/possible) is required as part of the proposal.

4. City staff will review the proposal for adherence to the stated criteria and authentication of statements relative to contributions in the case of an individual before forwarding to the Recreation and Parks Commission/Selection Committee(s). If the request is incomplete, staff will contact the applicant, in writing, and provide them with the opportunity to resubmit a revised request.

5. The recognized Neighborhood Association will be notified of the proposal when the Recreation and Parks Department and other City Departments receive a complete application.

6. The Recreation and Parks Commission/Selection Committee(s) will offer the opportunity for public input on the proposed naming at a published public hearing.

7. The Recreation and Parks Commission/Selection Committee(s) shall forward their recommendation(s) to City Council for final decision.

8. Upon adoption of this policy, all naming proposals previously submitted and recommended for reconsideration by the City Council, shall be resubmitted on the new approved form. City staff will contact the applicant, in writing, and provide them with the opportunity to resubmit a revised request.

Reviewed and Approved:

James G. Marshall, City Manager

APPLICATION FOR FACILITY NAMING

As a general policy, parks, recreation areas and Redevelopment Agency facilities shall be named in
accordance with geographical, historical or ecological features indigenous to the park site or to the immediate vicinity of the site. Parks, recreation areas and Redevelopment Agency facilities may be named for an individual(s) under the following conditions:

1. Where the individual has made a significant gift of land to the City of Merced and/or the Redevelopment Agency, or

2. In memoriam for an individual who has made a significant contribution to the City of Merced/Redevelopment Agency.

Recreational facilities or resource management areas within a park may be named for a corporation or an individual, living or deceased, who:

1. Has made a significant contribution to the protection of natural, cultural, or horticultural resources of the City of Merced, or

2. Has made substantial contributions to the advancement of commensurate types of recreational opportunities within the City of Merced, or

3. Has made significant contributions to the betterment of a specific park, consistent with the established criteria and standards for the designated facility.

In support of this policy, nominations for naming parks, recreational facilities/Redevelopment Agency facilities, shall be evaluated on the basis of the above criteria and upon appropriate documentation.

Person making nomination: (required)

Address: (required)

Contact Phone Number: (required)

E-mail: (not required)

Suggested Name: (required)

Biographical Information: (Explain)

Civic Involvement: (Explain)

Connection to Facility: (Explain)

Reason for Nomination: (Required)
Parks Naming Policy

Additional Comments: (required)

Date received By City staff: ____________________________

Reviewed by: ______________________________________

Approved by: (Department Head) ______________________

Date scheduled for review by Selection Committee: ________

Date person submitting nomination notified: ______________

EVALUATION SHEET

name of City Facility: ________________________________

suggested Name: __________________________________

Department/Selection Committee: ____________________

2 of Review: ______________________________________

1. Rate significant gift of land to the City (✓)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ificant</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Minor ( )</th>
<th>No Gift ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

( )
1. Rate significant contribution to the City (\$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>No Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Rate significant contribution to protect natural cultural, or horticultural resources of the City of Merced (\$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>No Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Rate substantial contribution to the advancement of appropriate types of recreational opportunities within the City of Merced (\$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>No Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Rate significant contribution to the betterment of a specific park or City facility consistent with the established criteria and standards for the designated facility classification (\$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>No Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>(</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In support of this policy, nominations for naming City and Redevelopment Facilities or resource management areas shall be evaluated on the basis of the above criteria and upon appropriate documentation.
Subject: Naming of a Park
From: "Sarah Reid" <sarah.reid@reedley.com>
Date: Wed, 21 Jan 2004 09:31:58 -0800
To: <jgreenwood@ci.porterville.ca.us>

Within the last couple of years the City of Reedley named their newest park. The process starts with the Park and Recreation Commission. A contest was designed for the students in our School District for naming this park. All grades were included from K-12. The winner was a 4th grade with the title Citizens Park. All recommendations for naming a building or park goes to the P&R Commission and then to City Council.

Hope this helps.

Sarah
RESOLUTION NO. 2003 - 39

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KINGSBURG
ESTABLISHING POLICIES AND GUIDELINES FOR NAMING PUBLIC PARKS,
RECREATION FACILITIES, AND SPECIFIC FACILITIES ON PARKS

WHEREAS, there is a need to establish guidelines and principles for naming public parks,
recreation facilities and for specific facilities in parks.

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the Community Services Commission to recommend
names for parks and recreation facilities to the City Council for approval.

WHEREAS, the naming of parks and recreation facilities shall involve the community and have
meaning for the area or the community at-large.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council that the following policy
objectives and principles relating to the naming of public parks, recreation facilities and for
specific facilities in parks hereby are adopted as guidelines,

Policy

The City of Kingsburg’s Community Services Commission by authority of the City Council shall
have the discretionary responsibility for the naming of all public parks and recreation facilities
and specific facilities on parks within the corporate limits of the City of Kingsburg. They will
review all recommended park names and make their recommendations to the City Council for
their review and final approval.

Objective

1. To establish guidelines and principles for the naming of existing and future parks and
recreation facilities.
2. To name parks and facilities so they will be easily identified and compatible to the area in
which they are located.
3. To encourage community participation in the selection of park names.
4. To encourage the dedication of land or funds for public use by individuals or groups.
5. To name parks during the first phase of construction and establish name identification.

Principles

1. Names must be pleasant sounding and grammatically correct.
2. Consideration may be given to naming the City owned property or facility after a
geographical landmark, an individual, or event of local or regional historical or cultural
significance, a natural or environmental feature, or a person who has made a significant
contribution to the development and/or organization of parks and recreation programs
which has meaning for the City as a whole or for the area in which the land or facility is
located.
3. Consideration may be given to naming the City-owned land or facility after an individual when a significant percentage of the land or cost of development has been donated to the City by the individual, corporation, or organization.

**Selection Process**

The Commission may name parks when the first phase of development begins to increase awareness and identify the park.

The Community Services Commission may work with community organizations to identify individuals and events of historical and/or cultural significance.

The Community Services Department may maintain a master list of proposed names for parks and facilities, and all individuals and agencies should be encouraged to forward proposed names to the Commission for possible inclusion on the master list.

In the case of neighborhood parks, a notice may be distributed to residents within one half mile requesting suggestions for a name.

A part of the selection process for park and recreation facilities names may include, where desirable, a contest or competition in order to obtain suggestions for names to stimulate public interest.

The final selection of a park name shall rest with the City Council.

* * * * *

I Sue Bauch, City Clerk of the City of Kingsburg do hereby certify the foregoing resolution was duly passed and adopted at the regular meeting of the Kingsburg City Council held on the 18th day of June, 2003, by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember(s): Blayney, Kruper, Karstetter, Smith and Mayor Bergstrom

Noes: Councilmember(s):

Absent: Councilmember(s):

Abstain: Councilmember(s):

______________________________
Susan Bauch, City Clerk
City of Kingsburg
CITY OF VISALIA
POLICY, OBJECTIVES AND PRINCIPLES, AS A GUIDE FOR THE
NAMING OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, FACILITIES AND PARKS

Policy

The Visalia City Council has the discretion to name all City-owned or controlled public buildings, facilities and parks within the incorporated limits of the City of Visalia. It is the intent of this policy to provide guiding principles for proposing names, and a process for soliciting, processing and selecting names. This policy may be applied to any City-controlled facility, excluding streets. It may be applied to entire facilities, or to portions of a facility, such as fields at a park, or rooms in a building.

Objectives

1. To establish guiding principles for the naming of existing and future public buildings, facilities and parks.
2. To name public buildings, facilities and parks so they will be easily identified and compatible to the area in which they are located.
3. To encourage community participation in the selection of names.
4. To encourage the dedication of land or funds by individuals or groups for public use.
5. To name public buildings, facilities and parks during the first phase of planning to establish name identification.

General Naming Guidelines

1. Names must be pleasant sounding, tasteful, non-controversial and grammatically correct. The name should be no more than three words, not including articles or prepositions, preceding the designation. (ie: park, hall, recreation center, transit center, ponding basin, etc.)

2. The City Council shall have the discretion to designate the type of facility. (ie: park, hall, recreation center, stadium, transit center, ponding basin, etc.).

1. It is recognized that other communities may choose to recognize state and national leaders and heroes. However, in establishing naming criteria for Visalia facilities, the emphasis should be placed on people, organizations, places, events, etc., that have a definite connection with Visalia. Consideration may be given to naming the city owned property or facility for a:
   a. A local or regional geographical landmark
   b. A local event of regional historical or cultural significance
   c. A local natural or environmental feature
   d. A person currently or previously from Visalia that has made a significant, positive difference in the community
   e. A person or organization currently or previously from Visalia that has made a significant, positive difference on a state or national level.
   f. A person or organization that does not and has not lived in Visalia, but who has done something extraordinary for Visalia
   g. A living person, or a deceased person, if the person has been deceased for at least 5 years, providing he/she meet at least one of the qualifications listed here
   h. Consideration may be given to naming the City owned land or facility after an individual when a significant percentage of the land or cost for development has been donated to the City by an individual, corporation, or organization.
Financial Contribution Naming Guidelines

The following are general guidelines for which a naming opportunity may be extended:

1. For a major, prominent facility that exceeds $500,000 in cost, a significant monetary contribution may be considered to be 10%, in cash, property, securities or in-kind services, of the total value of the development.

2. For facilities that are planned and scheduled for construction that are projected to cost less than $500,000, a significant contribution may be based on the following scale. For a project costing:
   a. $500,000 - $250,000
   b. $249,000 - $100,000
   c. $99,000 - $50,000
   d. $49,999 - $40,000
   e. Less than $39,000

   20% of the total cost
   25% of the total cost
   30% of the total cost
   40% of the total cost
   Listed in the gifts catalog

3. Projects not budgeted and for which other funding is not designated may require a 100% contribution in order to be implemented and a naming opportunity extended.

4. If a facility is named in recognition of a financial contribution, an agreement should be signed between the donor and the City that specifies conditions of the gift and the responsibilities of each party and must include minimum length of time the name will be used, signage and other appropriate provisions. The recommended minimum Sunset should be no less than 15 years.

5. It is understood that whether a name is given in recognition of a financial or community, the name may be changed at the discretion of the City Council. Such changes may be for, but are not limited to, the following reasons:
   a. The name reaches a stated sunset date.
   b. Changing community values necessitate a name change.
   c. There is a need to use a new naming opportunity to raise funds to enhance the facility.
   d. The facility use is changed, the facility is no longer in use, no longer under City control, or needs to be moved.

Selection Process

1. The City Council will name public buildings, facilities and parks when the first phase of planning begins to increase awareness and promote the identity.

Nominations should be solicited from the public. Such solicitations may include, but not be limited to, requests for nominations through:
   a. Notices or ads in newspapers
   b. City Commissions and Committees
   c. The surrounding neighborhood
   d. Local organizations
   e. User groups
   f. Appropriate web pages
2. The City staff will screen and review all nominations and submit all appropriate nominations to the Park and Recreation Commission for any park or recreation facility, and to the Citizens Advisory Committee for all other city buildings and facilities. These bodies will review the nominations and make a recommendation to the City Council.

The final selection of all public facilities, buildings and parks shall rest with the City Council.

Generated: 5/03
Hi Darrel. In Clovis the policy is that we don't name buildings or parks after people. In the history of Clovis I know of only one exception. The Council has taken the prerogative to name such facilities.

Mike Prandini

-----Original Message-----
From: bounce-members-1422@csfmo.org [mailto:bounce-members-1422@csfmo.org] On Behalf Of Darrel Pyle
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2004 9:09 AM
To: Mike Prandini
Subject: [members] Question on Building Naming Policies.

Good morning Gang!

This question is outside finance in most cases, but if the answer is handy, I would appreciate it. If the answer is not handy, please disregard.

The City of Porterville will be awarding a contract to build a new Community Center. Of course, everybody in town has a great idea for the name of the Center. Does your agency have a policy on naming buildings and/or parks?

Darrel Pyle
Deputy City Manager

---

You are currently subscribed to members as: mikep@ci.clovis.ca.us
To unsubscribe send a blank email to leave-members-1422@csfmo.org
A PLAN FOR NELSON BUILDING DEMOLITION, FIRST PHASE DEVELOPMENT OF CENTENNIAL PLAZA, AS WELL AS TRAILHEAD PARK TREE INSTALLATION

Parks and Leisure Services

Building Demolition

Discussions have been in process for several months with a prospective developer for the commercial building and park located on Main Street across from the civic center. In late January, 2004 the discussions concluded with the developer indicating he could not proceed at this time.

The Council has previously requested staff to provide a plan for demolition of the existing building in the event of the closure of discussions with the developer. Consistent with that direction this report outlines an approach to fund the demolition, and develop the initial phase of the plaza park. A preliminary budget estimate and project schedule for this scenario are also included as attachments to this report.

Staff have contacted two demolition contractors to inquire about budgetary estimates for the demolition work. The contractor cost estimates range between $52,000 and $128,000. The higher figure is viewed by staff as a more realistic cost for dealing with work area security, capping of utilities, pedestrian safety, street closures, dust control and staging of the work. Staff suggest that obtaining an outside engineering evaluation of demolition cost be done prior to bidding the demolition work. This would allow for any necessary budget and funding adjustments or modifications to the project at the earliest opportunity.

In addition, for building demolition to proceed there would be cost associated with removal of hazardous substances. The City has not obtained asbestos and lead materials assessments to determine abatement costs necessary prior to commencing demolition. Staff has estimated the cost at 25% of demolition cost.

Staff estimate that it will take six weeks for the development of the demolition and hazardous substance abatement plans once the Council directs the preparation as a priority project. A CEQA process negative declaration would need to be prepared simultaneously. The CEQA process would become the critical path to the bidding of the demolition work. Staff estimates that demolition of the building could be accomplished no later than September, 2004.

ITEM NO.:  21   

[Signature]
[Initials]
With demolition of the building the commercial site is potentially more marketable as it would be a clear site that it is ready to build upon. The remaining area would also be ready for the initial phase of development of the plaza park.

**Centennial Plaza Park**

Staff have discussed the plaza park project with two civic clubs, the Breakfast Rotary Club and the Noon Rotary Club. Each have embraced the downtown plaza park as a Rotary Centennial Project, committed $15,000 each from current budgets, and offered to assist with additional fundraising. The two Rotary Clubs are particularly interested in funding support for the covered performance stage. As their fundraising efforts advance the Rotary Clubs could assist with expanding the initial phase of the plaza park development. The discussions with the Rotary clubs has included the concept of naming the downtown plaza park the ‘Centennial Plaza’. This naming relates to both the City of Porterville’s centennial year acquisition of the land for the plaza park, and Rotary International centennial year of 2005 when the park would become available.

In making their commitment to the downtown plaza park the Noon Rotary Club has asked to also shift to this project their previous $17,000 commitment for funding development of ‘Rotary Park’, located at Highways 65 and 190. This contribution has been offered for the purpose of funding the installation of an irrigation system for a new turfed park area. The Noon Rotary Club understands the city’s current reluctance to immediately develop a new five acre park in light of budget limitations for maintenance of such facilities. City staff have discussed with the Noon Rotary Club the transfer of this funding towards accomplishing an irrigation system and turf at the ‘Centennial Plaza’.

With the transfer of park commitments for the Noon Rotary Club, and the initiation of Nelson Building demolition planning, staff would suggest that the downtown plaza park design work be initiated. A community outreach effort is envisioned as a component of the park master plan design, with the Rotary Clubs each having particular involvement on the covered performance stage placement and design. A Request for Qualifications and Proposals for design services would be conducted and once architecture services are obtained the design work could be conducted simultaneously with the CEQA process and demolition activities. It is preliminarily anticipated that the construction bidding or volunteer construction of ‘Centennial Plaza’ could begin by October, 2004 following the completion of building demolition.

**Trailhead Park**

The concept discussed with the Rotary Clubs envisions the city funding the cost for design and acquisition of irrigation equipment for tree planting at what was to be ‘Rotary Park’. The installation of the irrigation system would be performed by the California Conservation Corps. Working with City staff, the Sequoia Conservation Corps office has obtained a State Park Bond Grant for the cost of their labor to install an irrigation system. The City would need to fund the equipment purchase to allow the Conservation Corps to utilize their grant and provide the labor to install the limited irrigation system for trees.
City staff have also worked with the Tule River Parkway Association towards their application for a tree grant to acquire the 145 trees proposed to be planted. They anticipate that a grant award could occur by March 23, 2004 for the trees and planting supplies. The Parkay Association would then take the lead on a volunteer effort to plant the trees. To be successful with the tree grant they need to be able to demonstrate that an irrigation system will be in place. This adds importance for facilitating the Conservation Corps installation of the irrigation system.

With the proposed Noon Rotary Club change in funding commitment it has been suggested that the tree park located at Highways 65 and 190, and the entrance to the Tule River Parkway, be designated as ’Trailhead Park’. The concept with this name is to bring attention to the Tule River Parkway and recognition to the California Conservation Corps involvement. Installation of the irrigation system and trees at ‘Trailhead Park’ could be accomplished no later than June, 2004 if the Conservation Corps and Tule River Parkway grants are utilized and the City funds the $8,500 cost for the irrigation equipment. The total cost to the City for design, and capital expense for ‘Trailhead Park’ is estimated to be $11,000. The current project budget contains $8,000, leaving a deficiency of $3,000 needing to be supplemented to accomplish the irrigation system and tree planting.

**Funding**

The proposed funding source for the building demolition, ‘Trailhead Park’ cost, and initial design work for the plaza park is a loan from the City’s Equipment Replacement Fund. The loan could be repaid through an allocation of a portion of park development funds over a five year period. At least $70,000 of community and grant funding is anticipated.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff believe that this combination of projects would be an enhancement to both an entrance to the City and the downtown area. Staff is cautious that should this project be designated as a Council priority the parks administrative and engineering resource commitments to other projects would need to be adjusted. It is recommended that the City Council:

1) Direct the designation of the demolition of the Nelson Building, the design of the plaza park, and the tree planting at ‘Trailhead Park’ to be a priority project, and

2) Authorize the use of a $180,000 loan from the Equipment Replacement Fund for the preparation of a building demolition estimate, construction plans, and necessary project manuals, for the anticipated City expenditure line items as shown on the Preliminary Estimate.
# Preliminary Estimate

## Nelson Building Demolition, Centennial Plaza Initial Construction, and Trailhead Park Tree Installation  
February 17, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>City Funds</th>
<th>Community Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building demolition &amp; site clearing</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate confirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous material abatement</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abatement contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material testing surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Centennial Plaza’ design services</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Centennial Plaza’ irrigation &amp; turf</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered performance stage</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public address system</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Trailhead Park’ irrigation &amp; trees</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, &amp; irrigation supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$258,000</td>
<td>$188,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>(- 8,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equipment Replacement Fund Loan** $180,000

---

1. If the Rotary Clubs are able to secure additional Rotary organization funding the performance stage could be enhanced in size and quality. Funding from the San Francisco Rotary Club or other Rotary organizations is expected to be contingent on dedicating the performance stage in honor of Homer Wood.

2. Loan repayment proposed to commence in FY 05-06. Source of funding would include an estimated $70,000 from land sale of commercial building site plus $110,000 from Park Development Funds repaid over seven years. An Amendment to the Parks and Recreation Element would be processed to accomplish this.
Project: NELSON BUILDING DEMOLITION, CENTENNIAL PLAZA AND TRAILHEAD PARK CONSTRUCTION
Date: Wed 2/11/04
Feb 11, 2004

Jim Perrine  
Director of Parks and Leisure Services  
City of Porterville

Dear Jim,

In regard to our recent conversations about a downtown park project, Porterville Breakfast Rotary is very interested in participating.

The property being mentioned is across the street from City Hall and we think this would be an ideal site.

Our organization has been in contact with the Porterville Rotary (noon) club as well and we have discussed jointly funding part of the facilities.

To date our club has $15,000 that could be used toward this project.

Please keep us informed on the status.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Brett A. Schroeder  
President 2003-2004  
Porterville Breakfast Rotary
Jim Perrine  
Porterville Parks and Leisure Services  

RE: City Main Street Park Project  

Dear Mr. Perrine:  

Porterville Rotary Club appreciates the opportunity to serve Porterville’s community. We would like to donate to the covered bandstand and sod in the Main Street Park Project.  

Financially we have set aside $17,000 from prior years and $15,000 from our present years budget, totaling $32,000. Once we get further commitment from the city on the desire and schedule to complete this project, we will contact the San Francisco Rotary Club for additional funds. The additional funding would be contingent upon the city agreeing to dedicate the stage as the “Homer Wood Rotary Stage.” This would be to honor Homer Wood who was a prominent Porterville Rotarian as well as being instrumental in extending Rotary throughout the United States.  

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to serve our city.  

Sincerely,  

Robert Gillett  
President  
Porterville Rotary
SUBJECT: NORTH MAIN STREET TRAFFIC STUDY AND ANALYSIS

FROM: PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - ENGINEERING

COMMENT: On November 18, 2003, Engineering presented an item to Council regarding traffic and safety concerns along North Main Street in the vicinity of Charlie’s Engine House No. 5. Staff recommended placing “No Parking” signs along the east side of Main Street to eliminate the unsafe practice of parking and walking across Main Street to access the tavern.

After consideration, the Council directed the Traffic Engineer to perform a traffic engineering study along the North Main Street corridor and directed staff to meet with the tavern property owner to discuss other parking options. The traffic study resulted in the following action:

1. Posted speed change from 50 mph to 35 mph.
2. Re-painting of double yellow center line.
3. Trimming of trees and removal of bushes along the shoulder to enhance visibility.

As of this report, parking and more specifically, pedestrian crossing of Main Street continues to be a concern. Staff undertook a second traffic study and the results are as follows:

A. 85% speed is 52 mph. Prior to posting of 35 mph signs, 85% speed was 52 mph.
B. 24 hour traffic count on an average day (Tuesday) is 4,164 vehicles. Traffic volume on an average day between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 2:00 a.m. is 126 vehicles. Staff feels that vehicle traffic on Friday evening and Saturday morning is significantly higher.

At one of the Project Review Committee (PRC) meetings between staff and principals of Charlie’s Engine House No. 5, it was suggested that the City install a crosswalk in the vicinity of Charlie’s Engine House No. 5. This is an extremely bad idea and the Traffic Engineer cannot support this recommendation.

Recommendation: That City Council:

1. Direct staff (Police, Public Works, Community Development) to meet once more with the tavern principals and interested members of the public with the hope that parking and pedestrian issues can be resolved; and
2. Have the council designate two Council members as an ad hoc subcommittee to participate in resolving the parking and pedestrian concerns.

cc: Traffic Counts
    Radar Speed Survey
    Summary of PRC Meetings

Item No. 22
DATE: Feb 10, 2004  
24 hr. Count

LOCATION:  
Main St  AT  Reid Ave.

NORTH

Main St.

Reid Ave.

1500
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Mon 9 Feb 04</th>
<th>Tue 10 Feb 04</th>
<th>Wed 11 Feb 04</th>
<th>Thu 12 Feb 04</th>
<th>Fri 13 Feb 04</th>
<th>Average Day</th>
<th>Sat 14 Feb 04</th>
<th>Sun 15 Feb 04</th>
<th>Week Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:00</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:00</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Day Total: 1068 2600 1653 0 0 2557 0 0 2557

% Avg. WkDay 41.8% 101.7% 64.6% 0.0% 0.0%

% Avg. Week 41.8% 101.7% 64.6% 0.0% 0.0% 100.0% 0.0% 0.0%

AM Peak 08:00 08:00 216 214 08:00 06:00
PM Peak 16:00 16:00 15:00 16:00 248 250 250 16:00

Grand Total 1068 2600 1653 0 0 2557 0 0 2557

ADT Not Calculated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Mon 09-Feb-04</th>
<th>Tue 10-Feb-04</th>
<th>Wed 11-Feb-04</th>
<th>Thu 12-Feb-04</th>
<th>Fri 13-Feb-04</th>
<th>Average Day</th>
<th>Sat 14-Feb-04</th>
<th>Sun 15-Feb-04</th>
<th>Week Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 AM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>170</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Total</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>09:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Avg.</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>101.0%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADT Not Calculated
# RADAR SPEED SURVEY

**Jurisdiction:** Porterville  
**Date:** 02/11/04  
**Location:** Main Street between Reid & Westfield  
**Direction:** N/S  
**Begin:** 1545  
**End:** 1645  
**Weather:** Clear  
**Day/Night:** Light  
**Recorder:** Clements  
**Speed Limit:** 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPH</th>
<th>Number of Vehicles Observed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Critical Speed (85 Percentile):** 52  
**Median Speed (50 Percentile):** 47  

**10 MPH Page:** 43  
**Thru 52:** 64.5% in Pace
December 10, 2003: The property owner and business operator were unable to appear. A neighboring property owner spoke in favor of the reduced speed limit and requested its extension farther north.

December 18, 2003: The Police Department presented a video tape demonstrating the nature of the safety concerns. The Engineering Division concurred that the current situation poses a significant safety risk. The property owner and business operator testified that the greatest hazard along North Main Street was poorly maintained street trees and other plantings. Staff and the property owner carried out a substantial discussion regarding the potential to increase parking on the subject site. The item was continued with the agreement that the Parks and Leisure Services Director would study the maintenance of trees and shrubs along North Main Street and the property owner and business operator would study the potential to provide increased on-site parking.

January 21, 2004: The Parks and Leisure Services Director presented his report to the Project Review Committee. The report found that there were some areas that might benefit from some attention but that the North Main Street area was not a high priority for tree trimming as compared to other areas of the City. The property owner had nothing to report and the business operator was not present at that meeting. With no evidence that additional parking could or would be provided, the Project Review Committee discussed alternative solutions to the safety hazard. The Project Review Committee continued the item to January 28, 2004 to allow additional time to review City Council’s original direction to the Committee and to allow further consideration of the appropriate response to the safety concerns.

January 28, 2004: The property owner informed the Project Review Committee that the business operator had secured permission from the neighboring property owner to the south to allow overflow parking. Some trees had been removed and an area had been graded for this purpose. As the property in question was within the City limits, Staff expressed concern that the proposed parking area would be required to be constructed to full City standards or the neighboring property owner may risk violating the Zoning Ordinance. The Project Review Committee considered recommending a policy requiring review and consideration of No Parking areas along all streets in the City which carried large volumes of traffic and did not offer safe, developed shoulders. The City Engineer agreed to study this issue, determine where such circumstances may occur and report back to the Project Review Committee on February 25, 2004. Following the meeting, the item was rescheduled for the PRC meeting of February 18, 2004.
SUBJECT: GRANT MANAGEMENT

SOURCE: Administrative Services Department

COMMENT: As previously discussed with the City Council, staff has prepared a centralized Grant Management Matrix to track the status of grant activity in each department. This matrix was constructed by the Accountant II in the Finance Department and is updated on a monthly basis. The updates are disseminated to each department and reviewed by the Department Head Group as part of a weekly staff meeting.

In a continuing effort to provide the Council with pertinent and timely financial information, staff is recommending that this matrix be supplied to the Council as part of the Quarterly Financial and Portfolio Update process. This will allow for a quarterly review of the grant activity and the budget impact of that activity.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council authorize the inclusion of the Grant Matrix to be included as part of the Quarterly Financial and Portfolio Updates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Description</th>
<th>City/Point-of-Contact</th>
<th>Granting Agency</th>
<th>Grant Number</th>
<th>Amount of Grant Award</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Last Drawdown Request Date</th>
<th>Drawdown Rejected Date</th>
<th>Final Grant Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 CDBG neighborhood beautification</td>
<td>B. Dunlap</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td></td>
<td>756,995.00</td>
<td>12/23/03</td>
<td>12/19/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 CDBG neighborhood beautification</td>
<td>B. Dunlap</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td></td>
<td>751,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 CDBG neighborhood beautification</td>
<td>B. Dunlap</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td></td>
<td>899,995.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 HOME grant for historic mixed use rehabilitation</td>
<td>D. Dunlap</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>1998-HOME-032</td>
<td>1,030,000.00</td>
<td>2/18/04</td>
<td>1/1/2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 HOME grant for FTHI (first time homebuyer program)</td>
<td>D. Dunlap</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>2000-HOME-040</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/04</td>
<td>12/1/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 HOME grant for FTHI</td>
<td>B. Dunlap</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>2002-HOME-068</td>
<td>600,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/04</td>
<td>12/1/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 HOME grant for housing rehabilitation</td>
<td>B. Dunlap</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>2006-HOME-096</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/04</td>
<td>12/1/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 U.S.C. HOME grant for FTHI</td>
<td>D. Dunlap</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>U.S.C. HOME-096</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>07/1/04</td>
<td>07/1/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley Infrastructure grant</td>
<td>B. Dunlap</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>01-0203-09015</td>
<td>400,000.00</td>
<td>01/01/04</td>
<td>01/01/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EED DEPARTMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Preparedness Grant</td>
<td>F. Goyton</td>
<td>OES</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency operations plan</td>
<td>F. Goyton</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Preparedness Grant</td>
<td>F. Goyton</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td>1/1/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to Firefighting Grant</td>
<td>F. Goyton</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>SCE-2003-F-054</td>
<td>136,170.00</td>
<td>02/19/04</td>
<td>02/19/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention and Safety Grant</td>
<td>F. Goyton</td>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINS AND LEISURE SERVICES DEPARTMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River-to-Trails</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA Trans Comm (CMAC)</td>
<td>CM/G 5122(029)</td>
<td>242,421.00</td>
<td>12/20/03</td>
<td>12/20/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded (Received $42,020.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Safety Program</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA Trans Comm (Pedestrian Safety Program)</td>
<td>PSPL-5122(029)</td>
<td>132,220.00</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert T. Frye, Grant (competitive)</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA Dept of Parks &amp; Rec (2003 Park Bond Act)</td>
<td>RN-54-006</td>
<td>346,600.00</td>
<td>70.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert T. Frye, Grant (local)</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA Dept of Parks &amp; Rec (2003 Resources Bond Act)</td>
<td>CM/G 52070</td>
<td>132,000.00</td>
<td>60.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Cheka</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA Dept of Parks &amp; Rec (2002 Resources Bond Act)</td>
<td>CM/G 52070</td>
<td>220,000.00</td>
<td>60.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubac River Parkway, Ph III</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA Resources Agency (Envr Enforcement/Mitigation)</td>
<td>EEM-0509(007)</td>
<td>222,000.00</td>
<td>60.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubac River Parkway, Ph III</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA Resources Agency (Envr Enforcement/Mitigation)</td>
<td>EEM-0509(017)</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>60.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubac River Parkway, Ph III</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA Resources Agency (Envr Enforcement/Mitigation)</td>
<td>CM/G 52070</td>
<td>220,000.00</td>
<td>60.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postparkle Creek Trail O&amp;M</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA Dept of Parks &amp; Rec (2004 Heavy Motor Veh Rec)</td>
<td>CM/G 52070</td>
<td>44,000.00</td>
<td>60.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postparkle Creek Trail O&amp;M</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA Dept of Parks &amp; Rec (2004 Heavy Motor Veh Rec)</td>
<td>CM/G 52070</td>
<td>44,000.00</td>
<td>60.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postparkle Trail O&amp;M</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA Dept of Parks &amp; Rec (2004 Heavy Motor Veh Rec)</td>
<td>CM/G 52070</td>
<td>44,000.00</td>
<td>60.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Munity Literacy services</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA State Library (Adult Literacy)</td>
<td>CM/G 52070</td>
<td>72,870.00</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Munity Literacy services</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA State Library (English language learner instruction)</td>
<td>CM/G 52070</td>
<td>130,000.00</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Experiential Success (YES)</td>
<td>J. Perino</td>
<td>CA Department of Education</td>
<td>CM/G 52070</td>
<td>1,185,792.00</td>
<td>60.00 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Description</td>
<td>City/Contact</td>
<td>Granting Agency</td>
<td>Grant Number</td>
<td>Amount of Grant Award</td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>Last Grant Award Request Date</td>
<td>Downtown Request Date</td>
<td>Final Grant Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>CA Dept. of Traffic Safety</td>
<td>89-0233</td>
<td>174,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/15/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Received) $27,486.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalM. Law Enforcement Equipment Program Grant (CLEEP)</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>State of CA, Dept. of Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td>177,317.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Traffic Safety Program Grant</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>State of CA, Dept. of Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/31/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Path Grant</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>US, Dept. of Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,928.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California KIDS Plus Grant</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>San Diego University, CIPP</td>
<td></td>
<td>594.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Motor Vehicle Special Trust Funds</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>State of CA, DMV</td>
<td></td>
<td>53,065.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/15/04</td>
<td>01/16/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>OR, Office of Justice Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,731.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/03</td>
<td>01/20/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New St @ Tera River bridge widening project</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>CALTRANS, WPR</td>
<td>89-0281</td>
<td>300,000.00</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>05/20/03</td>
<td>06/27/03</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Design authorized by Caltrans (Received $260,841)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New St @ Tera River bridge widening project</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>CALTRANS, HBRR</td>
<td>89-0185</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Preliminary design authorized by Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal at Tera St @ Piazza Av (La Mesa)</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>CALTRANS, CPAQ</td>
<td>89-0283</td>
<td>51,120.00</td>
<td>50.50%</td>
<td>05/27/03</td>
<td>02/11/03</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Design complete (Received $33,047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal at Hiley St @ Mulberry Ave (project)</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>CALTRANS, CPAQ</td>
<td>89-9188</td>
<td>213,000.00</td>
<td>50.50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Design and construction authorized by Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Path-project</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>CALTRANS, RBSTP</td>
<td>89-9187</td>
<td>2,437,100.00</td>
<td>50.50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Construction authorized by Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olander Ave (Upper St to San Joaquin Valley Railroads)</td>
<td>B. Rodriguez</td>
<td>CALTRANS, RBSTP</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,437,100.00</td>
<td>50.50%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Environmental awarded, design not authorized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>