REGULAR MEETING OF THE SOLVANG CITY COUNCIL

COUNCIL CHAMBERS
1644 OAK STREET

August 14, 2017
6:30 p.m.

Please be advised that, pursuant to State Law, any member of the public may address the Council concerning any item on the Agenda. Please be aware that Items on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and are normally enacted by one vote of the Council.

If you wish to speak on Items 3, 4, 5, or 6 please do so during Public Communications.

Regular City Council meetings are broadcast live on Channel 23 in the Santa Ynez Valley, and stream live on the City’s website at www.cityofsolvang.com/City Council

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PRESENTATION

Devon Hartman of the Community Home Energy Retrofit Project (CHERP) and Marisa Hanson of emPower Santa Barbara County will present the 50 Home Challenge, a joint initiative between CHERP and emPower Santa Barbara County to retrofit 50 homes to make them more energy efficient. (15 minutes)

CITY MANAGERS REPORT

1. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – WRITTEN OR VERBAL

At this time, please direct comments to the City Council regarding Consent Calendar Items or matters NOT on the agenda but within the jurisdiction of the Council. (Speakers are limited to five [5] minutes).

2. COUNCIL COMMENTS AND REQUESTS

Comments and requests from City Council Members. No action will be taken at this meeting.

3. CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED BY CITY COUNCIL

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AS PRESENTED
5. **CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF JULY 24, 2017 MEETING**

   Approval of Draft Minutes.

6. **CONSENT AGENDA**
   a. Approval of Warrant Register
   b. Resolution for Transit Security Grant – Certification & Assurances
      
      Adopt Resolution No. 17-____, a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Solvang, agreeing to comply with the conditions and requirements of the Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant Program, and authorize the City Manager and/or Public Works Director to execute all associated required grant documents.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

7. **EXTENSION OF CANNABIS/MARIJUANA REGULATIONS**
   
   Adopt Resolution No. 17-____, a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Solvang, extending the previously adopted Urgency Ordinance banning recreational marijuana activities.

8. **STORMWATER PROGRAM FUNDING**
   a. Direct staff to update the development related Drainage Impact Fee; and
   b. Provide staff with direction on next steps toward adequately funding the City’s Stormwater Management Program, NPDES compliance, and Storm Drain Capital Improvement Program.

9. **LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES – DESIGNATION OF VOTING DELEGATE AND DIRECTION ON SOLVANG’S POSITION ON PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS**
   
   Appoint Voting Delegate and discuss and provide City Council’s voting delegate direction on Solvang’s position on the Resolutions proposed by the League of California Cities.

10. **COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS** (Oral reports: Each Council Member will give oral reports on their activities in relation to the following committee or agencies. In addition, each member may report on items that will be included on the agenda for such committee or agency and seek guidance from the Council as a whole on such items, including on what position to take on behalf of the City)

   - Santa Barbara County Association of Governments
   - Air Pollution Control Board
   - Joint Wastewater Committee
   - Chumash Tribe
   - Library Ad Hoc Committee
   - Indian Gaming Benefit Committee

11. **ADVANCE CALENDAR**

    Informational Calendar – No Action.
12. **CLOSED SESSION**

   Government Code §54957.6 – Conference with Labor Negotiators – Agency Representatives
   Brad Vidro, City Manager, and Sandra Featherson, Administrative Services Director –
   Employee Organization Teamsters Local 986

   Government Code Subdivision (a) of §54956.9 Existing Litigation – Amendment to Permit
   15878 in front of the State Water Resources Control Board

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

Copies of staff reports and supporting documentation pertaining to each item on this agenda are available for public viewing and inspection at City Hall, 1644 Oak Street, Solvang, during regular business hours and on the City’s website [www.cityofsolvang.com](http://www.cityofsolvang.com), in addition, any writings relating to an open session agenda item provided to a majority of the Council that is distributed within 72 hours of the meeting, after the posting of the agenda, will be identified and available separately at City Hall and may be posted to the website.

**In Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, you should contact the office of Administrative Services at 688-5575 or the California Relay Service. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting would enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.**
50 HOME CHALLENGE
SOLVANG

What is the 50 Home Challenge?
The 50 Home Challenge is a joint initiative between the CHERP (Community Home Energy Retrofit Project) and the empower program to engage an entire community and retrofit 50 single family homes to make them more energy efficient.

Homeowner Benefits

- Improved comfort, health & safety
- A cleaner, quieter home
- Reduced energy usage
- Utility rebates of up to $5,000 or more
- Access to low interest - financing starting at 3.9%
- Reduced project costs due to economies of scale achieved by doing a large number of retrofits at once

Community Benefits

- Marketing opportunities and media attention for being a "green" community
- Bragging rights for improving your community
- Job creation in the local construction industry and a positive economic impact
- Possibility of increased property values
- Greater resiliency, health, and safety of local homes
- Thousands of dollars in marketing, education, incentives, and other resources directed towards your community
Why Solvang?
The warmer summers and colder winters in comparison to other parts of Santa Barbara County make Solvang an ideal location for the 50 Home Challenge. The sense of community in this area also makes it a great fit.

Goals

- Educate an entire community on the benefits and opportunities around energy efficiency
- Provide trusted information and inspire 50 single-family homeowners to take action and retrofit their homes
- Provide a reliable stream of energy efficiency retrofit projects for local contractors
- Create true market transformation!

What is emPower?
The emPower program offers incentives, financing and to help single-family homeowners make home energy upgrades easier and more affordable. emPower was established by the County of Santa Barbara to help the community preserve the environment and stimulate the economy by creating jobs.

What is CHERP?
CHERP is a 501(c) 3 non-profit organization that was created to eliminate barriers to the success of our critical, national energy efficiency goals. CHERP is engaged in a comprehensive, replicable, community-wide program to help achieve aggressive goals for improved energy efficiency in buildings through education about the impact of buildings on greenhouse gas emissions and the many benefits that accrue to building owners and cities from retrofitting.

The emPower program is funded by California utility ratepayers and administered by Southern California Gas Company, Southern California Edison and Pacific Gas and Electric Company under the auspices of the California Public Utilities Commission.
July 20, 2017

Mayor Jim Richardson  
City of Solvang  
P.O. Box 107  
Solvang, CA 93464

Dear Mayor Richardson and Council members,

On behalf of the board of directors of Elverhøj Museum, I would like to thank you for approving and funding our request for a $30,000 grant for program support.

The gift enables us to present relevant exhibitions, offer educational activities, conduct research, and produce publications for an increasingly diverse and multi-generational museum audience. For nearly 30 years Elverhøj has been a key cultural institution in Solvang, serving our community and a growing global visitorship.

We are truly grateful for this gift and appreciate your continued confidence in the Museum and our mission.

With appreciation,

Esther Jacobsen Bates  
Executive Director

cc: Councilmembers Duus, Jamieson, Toussaint, Zimmerman
August 7, 2017

Mayor Richardson
City Council Members
City of Solvang
1644 Oak Street
Solvang, CA 93463

RE: Letter of Request for Consideration: Additional Bus Parking in Lot #4

Dear Honorable Mayor Richardson and Solvang City Council,

On behalf of the Solvang Conference & Visitors Bureau Board of Directors, please accept this Letter of Request for Consideration for additional designated tour bus parking spaces in Solvang Parking Lot #4. It has come to our attention through concerns and complaints by both business owners and residents that additional bus parking (currently designated behind the Alisa Windmill/Tower Pizza/Post Office) would be welcomed.

Our board member and staff met with Public Works Director Matt van der Linden to identify potential overflow options for tour buses. He noted the feasibility of Parking Lot #4 due to lack of overhead foliage, easy access/egress and turn-around plus minimal re-structuring. Lot #4 could provide tour groups with an alternate landing/pick-up location that could bring foot traffic to the west end of the city as well as alleviating Post Office parking issues over time. The Solvang CVB would offer marketing services to post new signage, educate and re-direct bus services, as well as assist in residential notifications.

It is our mission to bring the visitors to Solvang and encourage overnight stays as well as retail sales. We believe this solution could provide additional economic stimulus as well as avert negative visitor impact. We welcome discussing all options.

With Regards,

Kim Jensen, President
Solvang CVB Board of Directors

Cc: Angie Horn, Susan Williams, Laura Hanberg, Matt Raab, Dr. Ken Harwood, Tracy Farhad
August 1, 2017

Jim Richardson, Mayor Solvang
Ryan Toussaint, Mayor Pro Temp
Hans Duus, Joan Jamieson, Neil Zimmerman – City Council Members

The Honorable Jim Richardson and Solvang City Council Members:

We are writing to ask you to review the feasibility of having the tour busses that come into Solvang park in a different location.

Currently the tour busses unload their passengers and park in the lot behind Tower Pizza. Since this lot is located on the East end of the village, many of our retail businesses, restaurants and museums on the West end of the village are never visited by these tourists.

If the tour busses were to unload and park in Lot 4, behind Fresco Café and Rita’s Flowers, our tourists would disembark in a more central location in the village. This would afford more retail businesses, restaurants and museums the opportunity to showcase their establishments.

Thank you for considering this proposal.

Charles Werner
Vice President

CW#:sh
CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Richardson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Mayor Richardson, Council Members Duus, Jamieson, Toussaint and Zimmerman

STAFF: Brad Vidro, City Manager; Roy Hanley, City Attorney; Matt van der Linden, Public Works Director; Sandra Featherson, Administrative Services Director; Holly Owen, Planning & Economic Development Director; Lt. Shawn O’Grady; and Lisa S. Martin, City Clerk

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Council Member Zimmerman

PRESENTATION

Tracy Farhad, Executive Director of the Solvang Conference and Visitor’s Bureau, gave their biennial report, along with Brenda Ball, and Lauren Schau of Lauren Schau Consulting.

CITY MANAGERS REPORT

Informational report only.

1. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – WRITTEN OR VERBAL

Brian Chaney, Planning Commissioner & Solvang Resident

➢ Mentioned our loss of water from the San Luis Reservoir
➢ Commented on the cost of city projects, opposes the amount of money the city is spending

Ellen Albertoni, Director of the Solvang Senior Center

➢ Described the planned expansion of the senior center building and the possible addition of a conference or meeting room, and asked for the city’s support

Fred Kovol, Solvang Resident

➢ Updated the Council on the last ID#1 meeting where the likelihood of runoff causing high sedimentation levels in Lake Cachuma due to the wildfire was discussed, as well as how much Cachuma water may be reserved in the future for fish
2. **COUNCIL REQUESTS**

Council Member Duus commented on forest management and requested that the public voice their concern and contact Salud Carbajal regarding the lack of controlled burns by the Forest Service. Wildfires shouldn’t have so much fuel.

3. **CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED BY COUNCIL**

No discussion – informational only.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA AS PRESENTED**

No changes to the agenda.

5. **CITY COUNCIL MINUTES OF JULY 10, 2017**

*Motion made by Council Member Duus to approve the minutes as written, seconded by Council Member Jamieson, and carried with a verbal response of 5 ayes.*

6. **CONSENT AGENDA**

   a. Receive and file Fire Department quarterly report for April – June 2017
   b. Receive and file Sheriff’s Department report for June 2017

*Motion to approve the Consent Agenda made by Council Member Duus, seconded by Mayor Richardson, and carried with a verbal response of 5 ayes.*

**REGULAR AGENDA**

7. **REQUEST FOR CHANGE TO SOLVANG TROLLEY LICENSE IN REGARDS TO PICK-UP LOCATION**

Staff report by Brad Vidro, City Manager.

Presentation by operator, Sal Orona. Instead of the current shaded parking area on Copenhagen, he suggested that they be allowed to use the west side of parking lot 2, and indicated that approximately 5 parking spots would be lost during those hot days when they need to move the pick-up location so that the horses can be rested in the shade.

The Council discussed the location within parking lot 2 and the curb removal required, and agreed that a loss of up to 7 parking spots would be acceptable.

Mayor Richardson opened the item to public comment at 7:34 p.m.

Dutch Haling, Solvang Trolley Employee

➢ The treatment of the animals is excellent, would invite anyone at any time to visit and spend time viewing their operation
➢ Hopes there is an equitable solution to the parking location issue
Claudia Orona, Solvang Trolley Company
- Discussed their operations and their role in advertising businesses within the city
- Summer is their critical time as they operate at a loss most of the rest of the year

Sam Tanksley, Solvang Trolley Tour Guide
- Loves the tourists, their customers need a shady spot to wait in for the trolley
- This is a very special service that is done right

Jillian Lopez, works at Solvang Knives
- The Oronas treat these horses like family members
- Appreciates that the tour guides mention their business, they get many customers after the trolley goes by

Dianne Wittenbrock, owner of Solvang Knives and Solvang Resident
- Asks that the Council help Solvang Trolley thrive, because the Trolley Co. helps the community thrive

Sue Moualim, owner of Artistic Pony
- The horses love their job and they are very happy to work, she can tell by the way they prance by in the mornings
- When the trolley isn't running she sees a decline in business
- Would love to have a shady spot in front of her store so that they could park there on hot days

Ben Bramson, Veterinarian who cares for the Solvang Trolley horses
- The horses are very well cared for

The item was closed to public comment at 7:51 p.m.

Mayor Richardson asked Dr. Bramson if the horses could work during temperatures of 90 degrees and above. Dr. Bramson replied that they could with access to fresh water and rest periods.

Council Member Duus commented that the Council had a hard time finding a shady pick-up location. Solvang has a lot of competition in California for tourism, the trolley helps make Solvang unique. Suggested the shaded pick-up location be left where it is.

Council Member Jamieson suggested the pick-up location be in parking lot 2, right behind the Visitor Center on the left hand side and they should exit through the alley to First Street.

Council Member Toussaint agreed that the parking lot is probably the best spot, although on First Street right at Solvang Park might also be a good location and it would only be 4 spots lost.

Council Member Zimmerman stated that the parking lot is a good idea and suggested that the City build a covered area for the horses and patrons to wait.

Public Works Director Matt van der Linden indicated that a consultant is already working on a drainage issue and improvements at the western side of parking lot 2 so he could bring back options, including possibly a cover for the existing Copenhagen Drive street location.

City Manager Vidro clarified that he understands the Council’s position to be to use parking lot 2 in the interim and bring back an agenda item for a possible permanent shade structure.

*Staff has adequate direction from Council on the item.*
8. **REQUEST OF BELLA VISTA SYV, LLC TO AMEND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL OF TRACT MAP 30.070 – APNS: 137-540-057 TO -064 (COTTAGES ON OLD MISSION)**

Staff report by Holly Owen, Planning Director. The owner is proposing changes to conditions relating to aesthetics, traffic circulation, biological resources, hydrology and stormwater, and noise. Staff is recommending the elimination of a condition requiring the painting of a yellow line at the centerline of Old Mission Drive and a condition requiring one guest parking space, and noted a conflict between the proposed conditions and the Initial Study (IS) mitigation measure regarding tree replacement. Staff would rather use the IS recommendation of having an arborist determine appropriate mitigation instead of requiring replacement at a 10:1 ratio.

Presentation by owners, Gary Blake and Brian Nelson. They would rather be allowed to install plastic orange fencing around the oak trees instead of chain link. The architecture of the project is eclectic traditional. Removing the garages from the front creates a more pedestrian friendly street. They have a Facebook page to notify the neighbors of project activity. The dotted line on the elevations is meant to depict what the height of a Northern European roofline would have been.

Council Member Toussaint appreciates how much they have worked with the neighborhood.

Council Member Jamieson inquired as to whether there would be a Homeowners Association to maintain the private driveway and the infiltration basins. Gary Blake responded affirmatively.

There was discussion relating to the grading and retaining wall. Brian Nelson replied that the retaining wall will go from 1.0’ to 4.0’ and will not be seen from the street.

Council Member Duus stated that the existing oaks provide a buffer for their development. He is concerned though, that the width of the driveway is not wide enough. Brian Nelson answered that it has a 2.0’ shoulder on each side, making the total width 16 feet. It was mentioned that the Fire Department will most likely fight a fire from the street.

Mayor Richardson commented on the noise conditions. He would not only like the window condition to remain, but the houses should also be air conditioned to help with noise from the highway as well as dust and other pollution.

**Mayor Richardson opened the item to public comment at 9:15 p.m.**

Allen Jones, Santa Ynez Realty
- Was the agent for both the seller and the buyer
- Hopes to see houses finally built on this problematic site, would like to see the project approved

Fred Kovol, Solvang Resident
- Mitigation Measure #7 discusses the hydro-load, but he doesn’t see a study that proves the adequacy of their proposal
- He visited the site with his noise meter and the highway noise registered both above and below 60 decibels

**The item was closed to public comment at 9:25 p.m.**

Discussion ensued regarding site stormwater and drainage. Post-construction requirements require that there cannot be increased runoff from the site. The infiltration basins and other improvements will need to be approved by Public Works once the project is approved.
Council Member Duus indicated that the exterior night lighting condition needs work.

**Motion** made by Council Member Duus to adopt Resolution No. 17-____, accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration as adequate environmental review, and approve the amendments to the Conditions of Approval of Tract Map 30,070 with revisions to remove the requirement for chain link fencing of the oaks, elimination of the conditions requiring the painting of a yellow centerline and the guest parking space, and use of the Initial Study recommendation relating to Tree Replacement, seconded by Council Member Toussaint, and **carried** with a roll call vote of 5-0.

9. **SOLVANG ANNEX OF THE LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN**

Staff report by Lisa Martin, City Clerk.

Mayor Richardson opened the item to public comment at 9:46 p.m.

Fred Koval, Solvang Resident

➢ Hope that Solvang has earthquake insurance since it is one of the hazards affecting our city

The item was closed to public comment at 9:47 p.m.

Motion to approve staff’s recommendation made by Council Member Duus, seconded by Council Member Zimmerman, and carried with a roll call vote of 5-0.

10. **COUNCIL MEMBER REPORTS**  **(Oral reports: Each Council Member will give oral reports on their activities in relation to the following committee or agencies. In addition, each member may report on items that will be included on the agenda for such committee or agency and seek guidance from the Council as a whole on such items, including on what position to take on behalf of the City)**

- Santa Barbara County Association of Governments
- Air Pollution Control Board
- Library Ad Hoc Committee
- Joint Wastewater Committee
- Indian Gaming Benefit Committee
- California Joint Powers Authority

None.

11. **ADVANCE CALENDAR**

Information only, no action.

12. **CLOSED SESSION**

Mayor Richardson opened the item to public comment at 9:48 p.m.

Fred Koval, Solvang Resident

- Discussed Social Security

The item was closed to public comment at 9:50 p.m.
Council adjourned to closed session at 9:50 p.m.

Council returned to Council Chambers and Mayor Richardson announced *No Reportable Action* from closed session.

13. **ADJOURNMENT:** Mayor Richardson adjourned the City Council meeting at 11:08 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Payment Date</th>
<th>Vendor Number</th>
<th>Vendor Name</th>
<th>Payment Type</th>
<th>Payable Description</th>
<th>Payable Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10613</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>Advantage Group, The</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11257</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>Aramark Uniform Service</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10009</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>California Code Check, Inc.</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10853</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>California JPIA</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11108</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>Carrs Boots &amp; Western Wear</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10195</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>City of Lompoc Finance Dept.</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10467</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>DellaValle Embroidery</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10611</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>Farm Supply Co</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11210</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>Hach Company</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10028</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>Hanley &amp; Fleishman, LLP</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10706</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>Jean-Paul Demeure</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10224</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>Christophe Millner</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10034</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>ReadyRefresh by Nestle</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10975</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>O'Reilly Automotive Stores, Inc. dba O'Reilly Auto</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10790</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>Polydyne, Inc</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bank Code: APBNK-AP Bank Code**

**Number**

**Payment Date**

**Vendor Name**

**Payment Type**

**Payment Amount**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Payable #</th>
<th>Payable Type</th>
<th>Payable Date</th>
<th>Payable Description</th>
<th>Payment Type</th>
<th>Payment Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10723</td>
<td>10723</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,562.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110631</td>
<td>110631</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/28/2017</td>
<td>Streets Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>287.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110632</td>
<td>110632</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/28/2017</td>
<td>Restroom #3 Janitorial Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>273.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110634</td>
<td>110634</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/28/2017</td>
<td>Restroom #1 Janitorial Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>478.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110716</td>
<td>110716</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Vets Hall Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110731</td>
<td>110731</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Restroom #2 Janitorial Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>127.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110733</td>
<td>110733</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Restroom #2 Janitorial Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>327.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110818</td>
<td>110818</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/05/2017</td>
<td>Restroom #1 Janitorial Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>274.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110819</td>
<td>110819</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/05/2017</td>
<td>Annex Janitorial Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>604.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11320</td>
<td>11320</td>
<td>Rafael Ruiz Janitor Service</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,018.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694-July</td>
<td>694-July</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>July 1 &amp; 2 Cleaning</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>524.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694-June</td>
<td>694-June</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Add to PO to cover rest of fiscal year</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,494.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91257</td>
<td>91257</td>
<td>Richardson, Jim</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>775.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11381</td>
<td>11381</td>
<td>Roadrunner Management Services, Inc.</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33,240.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5547</td>
<td>5547</td>
<td>SYVT Operations Contract</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33,240.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10281</td>
<td>10281</td>
<td>Satcom Global FZE</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>42.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62474</td>
<td>62474</td>
<td>SP Maintenance Services, Inc</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10902</td>
<td>10902</td>
<td>Staples Advantage</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>274.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3344097950</td>
<td>3344097950</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/15/2017</td>
<td>Finance Office Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3344097951</td>
<td>3344097951</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/24/2017</td>
<td>Planning Office Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>258.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11179</td>
<td>11179</td>
<td>Todd Pipe &amp; Supply</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342054</td>
<td>342054</td>
<td>Restroom #1 Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11182</td>
<td>11182</td>
<td>Underground Service Alert of Southern California</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620170981</td>
<td>620170981</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>13 New Tickets</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10686</td>
<td>10686</td>
<td>ZWorld GIS</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>832.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-0140</td>
<td>2017-0140</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>GIS Maint. &amp; Updates</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>832.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10875</td>
<td>10875</td>
<td>Alliant Insurance</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10797</td>
<td>10797</td>
<td>Engel &amp; Gray</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>541.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000019430</td>
<td>0000019430</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/21/2017</td>
<td>Annual po for sludge disposal</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>541.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10611</td>
<td>10611</td>
<td>Farm Supply Co</td>
<td>07/07/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25685</td>
<td>25685</td>
<td>Sunnyfields Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>07/07/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10057</td>
<td>10057</td>
<td>FGL Environmental, Inc.</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,984.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703804A</td>
<td>703804A</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>05/01/2017</td>
<td>Inorganic &amp; Organic Analysis</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>310.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704981A</td>
<td>704981A</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>05/11/2017</td>
<td>Inorganic Analysis Wet Chemistry</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704982A</td>
<td>704982A</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>05/18/2017</td>
<td>Bacti Analysis Colilert</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704983A</td>
<td>704983A</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>05/18/2017</td>
<td>Bacti Analysis Quanti Tray Colilert</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704984A</td>
<td>704984A</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>05/20/2017</td>
<td>Radio Analysis</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>118.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705275A</td>
<td>705275A</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>05/23/2017</td>
<td>Bacti Analysis Coliform Colilert</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Payment Date</td>
<td>Vendor Number</td>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Payable Description</td>
<td>Payment Type</td>
<td>Payment Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705327A</td>
<td>05/04/2017</td>
<td>Inorganic &amp; Support Analysis</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>861.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705616A</td>
<td>05/10/2017</td>
<td>Bacti Analysis Coliform</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705888A</td>
<td>04/01/2017</td>
<td>Bacti Analysis Coliform</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705899A</td>
<td>06/01/2017</td>
<td>Bacti Analysis Coliform</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706294A</td>
<td>05/24/2017</td>
<td>Bacti Analysis Coliform</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706533A</td>
<td>06/08/2017</td>
<td>Bacti Analysis Coliform</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706813A</td>
<td>06/19/2017</td>
<td>Bacti Analysis Coliform</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707137A</td>
<td>06/14/2017</td>
<td>Bacti Analysis Coliform</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707141A</td>
<td>06/22/2017</td>
<td>Bacti Analysis Coliform</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707439A</td>
<td>06/28/2017</td>
<td>Bacti Analysis Coliform</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10706</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,281.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11068</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,663.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10885</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,043.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5548</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,265.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10902</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>283.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10258</td>
<td>06/25/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>460.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10337</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>39,124.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11281</td>
<td>07/13/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>107.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10076</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,526.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10166</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,738.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11278</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10530</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,113.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10723</td>
<td>07/12/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,298.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11068</td>
<td>07/12/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11089</td>
<td>07/12/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>179.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11090</td>
<td>07/12/2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>480.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Payable #</td>
<td>Payment Type</td>
<td>Payable Date</td>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Payable Description</td>
<td>Payment Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110990-1</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/14/2017</td>
<td>Rafael Ruiz Janitor Service</td>
<td>Restroom #1 Janitorial Supplies</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110991</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/12/2017</td>
<td>USA Blue Book</td>
<td>Restroom #3 Janitorial Supplies</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/14/2017</td>
<td>USA Blue Book</td>
<td>Restroom #3 Janitorial Supplies</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11320</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Western Exterminator Company</td>
<td>Janitorial for RR 1,2,3</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10042</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Western Exterminator Company</td>
<td>Vets Hall June</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>Western Exterminator Company</td>
<td>Jul &amp; Aug portion of Jun-Aug Vets Hall Ma</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Western Exterminator Company</td>
<td>June portion of Jun-Aug Vets Hall Mainten</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11257</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Aramark Uniform Service</td>
<td>Mats and towels</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10076</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Cannon Associates</td>
<td>Troubleshoot &amp; Rep VFD's not responding</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11279</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Carollo Engineers, Inc</td>
<td>Engineering -- Well 22 Upgrade Project</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11008</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/14/2017</td>
<td>Carrs Boots &amp; Western Wear</td>
<td>Jorge Boots</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>City of Lompoc Finance Dept.</td>
<td>Wine Country Express August 2017</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98209</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>City of Lompoc Finance Dept.</td>
<td>Thomas Pokotylo Live Scan</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98210</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/05/2017</td>
<td>Engel &amp; Gray</td>
<td>Blanket PO for Sludge Disposal</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/14/2017</td>
<td>Engel &amp; Gray</td>
<td>Blanket PO for Sludge Disposal</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10611</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/20/2017</td>
<td>Farm Supply Co</td>
<td>Sunnyfield Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10276</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Infosend, Inc</td>
<td>Utility Bill Printing and Distribution</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122599</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Infosend, Inc</td>
<td>Utility Bill Printing and Distribution</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122672</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>More Office Solutions</td>
<td>Contract usage 4/19/17-6/30/17</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>More Office Solutions</td>
<td>Contract Usage 7/1-7/18/17</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Void</strong></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/18/2017</td>
<td>Polydyne, Inc</td>
<td>Blanket PO for Polymer</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10790</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/05/2017</td>
<td>Procare Janitorial Supply, Inc</td>
<td>Sunnyfield Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110929</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/09/2017</td>
<td>Procare Janitorial Supply, Inc</td>
<td>Sunnyfield Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111111</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Procare Janitorial Supply, Inc</td>
<td>Sunnyfield Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111132</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/09/2017</td>
<td>Procare Janitorial Supply, Inc</td>
<td>Sunnyfield Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111133</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Procare Janitorial Supply, Inc</td>
<td>Sunnyfield Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111134</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/09/2017</td>
<td>Procare Janitorial Supply, Inc</td>
<td>Sunnyfield Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111136</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/09/2017</td>
<td>Procare Janitorial Supply, Inc</td>
<td>Sunnyfield Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111244</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/09/2017</td>
<td>Procare Janitorial Supply, Inc</td>
<td>Sunnyfield Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111245</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/09/2017</td>
<td>Procare Janitorial Supply, Inc</td>
<td>Sunnyfield Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111246</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/09/2017</td>
<td>Procare Janitorial Supply, Inc</td>
<td>Sunnyfield Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91262</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Ryan Toussaint</td>
<td>Travel &amp; Equip Fee/Svc Reimb</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10214</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/19/2017</td>
<td>USA Blue Book</td>
<td>Water Dept Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>316319</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/19/2017</td>
<td>USA Blue Book</td>
<td>Water Dept Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>EFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Payable #</td>
<td>Payment Date</td>
<td>Vendor Number</td>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Payable Type</td>
<td>Payable Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319568</td>
<td>10148</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>5003517652</td>
<td>Gemplers</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>New Valve to discharge washwater basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10148</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>5003511243</td>
<td>Gemplers</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Shipping Saver Subscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10280</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>HV0004763</td>
<td>James Enderle</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>City Sign Rent 7/1-12/31/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10294</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>N6576886</td>
<td>MailFinance</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Lease Payments 7/10/17-05/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10697</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>SI03517652</td>
<td>Menveg Properties LLC</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>July Transit Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11173</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>SI03531243</td>
<td>Solvang Conference &amp; Visitors Bureau</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>1st QTR Payment 17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10992</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>025-193587</td>
<td>Tyler Technologies, Inc</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>July Utility Billing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10266</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>79743</td>
<td>Western Aeronomedical Consortium</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Yearly Renewal Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10991</td>
<td>06/29/2017</td>
<td>278940</td>
<td>A-O-K Power Equipment</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Solvang Park Rep &amp; Maint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10073</td>
<td>06/26/2017</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Buellflatt Rock Co, Inc</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>June Fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10095</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>94163</td>
<td>City of Buellton</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Water Dept Rep &amp; Maint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10095</td>
<td>06/26/2017</td>
<td>2017-0626</td>
<td>City of Buellton</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>SWMP-Education &amp; Outreach Reimb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10655</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>5898 6/18/17</td>
<td>Comcast</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Acc# 8155 70 005 0125898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10197</td>
<td>06/13/2017</td>
<td>PCW352</td>
<td>County of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Pollutant Load Monitoring/Laboratory An</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11160</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>4599359A</td>
<td>DLT Solutions</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>17-18 Autodesk AutoCAD Civil Maint. Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11022</td>
<td>06/29/2017</td>
<td>HV0005264</td>
<td>Doug Lazer</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>June-Softball Umpire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11365</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>7459 6/25/17</td>
<td>Frontier Communications</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>805-688-7459-060995-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11365</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>7900 6/28/17</td>
<td>Frontier Communications</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>805-688-2900-110481-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10148</td>
<td>06/26/2017</td>
<td>5103528074</td>
<td>Gemplers</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Water Safety Gear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10716</td>
<td>06/25/2017</td>
<td>28321879</td>
<td>Geosyntec Consultants, Inc.</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>LPR Modeling - BMP Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11262</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>28322135</td>
<td>Graphic Systems</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>LPR Modeling - BMP Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11262</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>69950</td>
<td>Graphic Systems</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Street Light Banners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11262</td>
<td>06/29/2017</td>
<td>70314</td>
<td>Graphic Systems</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Vets Hall Rep &amp; Maint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11081</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>3800054</td>
<td>Harrison Hardware</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Transit Rep &amp; Maint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11081</td>
<td>07/01/2017</td>
<td>380040</td>
<td>Harrison Hardware</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Transit Rep &amp; Maint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Payable #</td>
<td>Date Range: 07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Payment Date</td>
<td>Vendor Number</td>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Payable Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380712</td>
<td>380712</td>
<td>06/12/2017</td>
<td>Cookie Camp Supplies</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383575</td>
<td>383575</td>
<td>06/22/2017</td>
<td>Roads Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10083</td>
<td>Inner Nature</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11571</td>
<td>11571</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Directional Signs Planting</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11572</td>
<td>11572</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>City planters</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10180</td>
<td>Jim's Service Center</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>890.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10721</td>
<td>John H. Salter</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>128.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10903</td>
<td>Lachaine &amp; Associates, Inc</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,470.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90350</td>
<td>Lisa Martin</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>204.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10027</td>
<td>Lompoc Excel Personnel Svs Inc</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,145.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11128</td>
<td>Nielsen Building Material</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>262.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11133</td>
<td>Nielsen's Market</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>430.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001 6/30/17</td>
<td>0001 6/30/17</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Cookie Camp Supplies</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>144.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 6/30/17</td>
<td>5001 6/30/17</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>JPIA-Environmental Safety Meeting</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7501 6/30/17</td>
<td>7501 6/30/17</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>WWTP Kitchen Supplies</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11294</td>
<td>Scott Reardon's Locksmith Service</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>116.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11174</td>
<td>Solvang Bakery Inc.</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10110</td>
<td>Solvang Heritage Associates dba Elverhoj Museum</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11152</td>
<td>Sterling Codifiers</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,802.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10146</td>
<td>Terry Clark</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11377</td>
<td>Tractor Supply Credit Plan</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>211.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11167</td>
<td>Santa Ynez Valley Hardware</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,179.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Payable #</td>
<td>Payable Type</td>
<td>Payable Date</td>
<td>Payable Description</td>
<td>Payment Type</td>
<td>Payment Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51588</td>
<td>HV0005271</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>HCA Rent Refund</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10437</td>
<td>HV0005290</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Woodworking Class 6/26-30</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10070</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Roads Supplies</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>216.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10655</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comcast</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>8155 70 005 028185</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>86.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11233</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>June Fingerprints</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>319.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11365</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frontier Communications</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Acc# 805-686-1998-110309-5</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>102.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51154</td>
<td>HV0005292</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Super Hero Camp Refund</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10027</td>
<td>2284734</td>
<td>Lompoc Excel Personnel Svs Inc</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Jenny Branson PE 6/23</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>1,074.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10653</td>
<td>5146</td>
<td>Mainline Utility Company</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>TV Trk Inspection @ Willow &amp; Mtn View</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11128</td>
<td>583614</td>
<td>Nielsen Building Material</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Water Hand Trowel &amp; Rake</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>27.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11146</td>
<td>583633</td>
<td>Solvang Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>City Hall Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>12.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11239</td>
<td>1/17-6/30/17</td>
<td>S.Y. River Water Conservation</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Semi-Annual Groundwater Production</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>1,597.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10004</td>
<td>17-304</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Co Sheriff Dept</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>June Contract Services</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>178,264.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-335</td>
<td>583615</td>
<td>SYV Therapeutic Riding Program</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Hoof N Boots Camp 6/26,28,30</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>2,025.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11048</td>
<td>HV0005294</td>
<td>Tom De Marcus</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>HCA Irrigation Repair</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>1,594.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10992</td>
<td>2017-2018 Grant</td>
<td>Tyler Technologies, Inc</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Utility Billing Notification 4/1/17-6/30/17</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>12.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10793</td>
<td>2017-2018 Grant</td>
<td>Valley Wind Ensemble</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>2017-2018 Grant</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10497</td>
<td>127251</td>
<td>West Coast Arborists, Inc</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>tree trimming</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>2,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11136</td>
<td>HV0005301</td>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>07/13/2017</td>
<td>Admin Petty Cash Request</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>66.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10553</td>
<td>172400</td>
<td>BrightView Landscape Services</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>7,171.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Warrant Register Date</td>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Payable Type</td>
<td>Payable Date</td>
<td>Payable Description</td>
<td>Payable Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3016927</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>LLMD Landscape Maintenance</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/23/2017</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,880.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5348968</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>LLMD Landscape Maintenance</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,291.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10639</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Brush Goats 4 Hire</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/18/2017</td>
<td>weed abatement by goats 2018</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10070</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Cal-Coast Irrigation</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/14/2017</td>
<td>Roads Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10261</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>California Building Standards</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>4/1/17-6/30/17 Bldg Standard Administra</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11225</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Clean Machine Laundromat</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/03/2017</td>
<td>Vets Hall 12 lbs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203727</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Vets Hall</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Solvang Park 8 lbs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203742</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Vets Hall</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Vets Hall 10 lbs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283724</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Sunnyfields 10 lbs</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/05/2017</td>
<td>Sunnyfield 15 lbs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594546</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Sunnyfields 15 lbs</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/26/2017</td>
<td>Sunnyfield 15 lbs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594547</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Sunnyfield 15 lbs</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/03/2017</td>
<td>Sunnyfield 15 lbs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10197</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>County of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/06/2017</td>
<td>Green Business Program of SB County</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11296</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Department of Conservation</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Apr-Jun Strong Motion Instrument/Seismi</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10886</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Division of the State Architect</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Apr-Jun Disability Access &amp; Education Fee</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11365</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Frontier Communications</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/13/2017</td>
<td>Acc# 805-688-5575-062171-5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10376</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Gauld Drafting &amp; Design LLC</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>drafting revisions for HCA ADA restroom r</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10148</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Gemplers</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/12/2017</td>
<td>Water-Chemical Wash Apron</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500577709</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Gemplers</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/18/2017</td>
<td>Nathan Uniforms</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11023</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Gromatici Land Surveying, Inc.</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/19/2017</td>
<td>Survey of Northeast City Limit Line</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Gromatici Land Surveying, Inc.</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Mission &amp; Fifth UUD survey-base map</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Gromatici Land Surveying, Inc.</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Mission &amp; Fifth UUD survey-base map</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10027</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Lompoc Excel Personnel Svs Inc</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/06/2017</td>
<td>Jenny Branson PE 6/28/17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2289973</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Lompoc Excel Personnel Svs Inc</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/06/2017</td>
<td>Jenny Branson PE 6/28/17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10046</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Lunde's Solvang Auto Repair</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>truck #623, 2 tires, A/C repairs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008414</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Lunde's Solvang Auto Repair</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/11/2017</td>
<td>truck #623, 2 tires, A/C repairs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10697</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Menvog Properties LLC</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/20/2017</td>
<td>August Transit Rent</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11187</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Nu-Tech Pest Management</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/10/2017</td>
<td>Annex Ants &amp; Roaches</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9128130</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Company</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Acc# 3982645526-1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11137</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Company</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>Acc# 3982645526-1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11137</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Company</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/14/2017</td>
<td>4922450769-6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10004</td>
<td>07/01/2017 - 07/31/2017</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Co Sheriff Dept</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/03/2017</td>
<td>Late Report &amp; Vets Hall Security</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Payable #</td>
<td>Payable Type</td>
<td>Payable Date</td>
<td>Payable Description</td>
<td>Payment Type</td>
<td>Payment Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1048</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>2017-2018 Grant</td>
<td>Santa Ynez Valley Foundation</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11174</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Cookie Camp Supplies</td>
<td>Solvang Bakery Inc.</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10128</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>2017-2018 Grant</td>
<td>Solvang Senior Center</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11176</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>2017-2018 Grant</td>
<td>Southern California Gas Company</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11178</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Tires and alignment truck 624</td>
<td>Steve's Wheel &amp; Tire</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10100</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>2017-2018 Grant</td>
<td>SYV People Helping People</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50918</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Jr Chef Class Refund-Had to Cancel due to</td>
<td>Kathleen Valazquez</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10999</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>6/11/17-6/30/17 Charges</td>
<td>Platinum Plus for Business dba Business Card</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51168</td>
<td>07/25/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Rain Barrel Rebate x 2</td>
<td>Beth Tinsley</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10691</td>
<td>07/25/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Construction of Fire Station Addition</td>
<td>Jeff Ploutz Construction, Inc. dba J &amp; P Contract</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11136</td>
<td>07/26/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>MMASC Network Mixer-Change Box</td>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10991</td>
<td>07/31/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Recreation/HCA &amp; Solvang Parks Cutter/Al</td>
<td>A-OK Power Equipment</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11155</td>
<td>07/31/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>General Water Matters</td>
<td>Baker, Manock &amp; Jensen</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10112</td>
<td>07/31/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>John deere riding mower x750 capital repl</td>
<td>Cal-Coast Machinery Inc.</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10655</td>
<td>07/31/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>8155 70 005 009241</td>
<td>Comcast</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10159</td>
<td>07/31/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Street Light Association Membership</td>
<td>County of Marin / CAL-SLA</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10197</td>
<td>07/31/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Dist of LAFCO Budget for FY 17/18</td>
<td>County of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10197</td>
<td>07/31/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Water Conservation - RWEP</td>
<td>County of Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11365</td>
<td>07/31/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>805-668-6997-072877-5</td>
<td>Frontier Communications</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10725</td>
<td>07/31/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>T1 Sheet Blueprints</td>
<td>Hankering Corporation, The</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10520</td>
<td>07/31/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Water Dept Circular Saw &amp; Misc Small Too</td>
<td>Harbor Freight</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51170</td>
<td>07/31/2017</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heather Fletcher</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable #</td>
<td>Payable Type</td>
<td>Payable Date</td>
<td>Payable Description</td>
<td>Payment Type</td>
<td>Payment Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R00077005</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Rocket Camp Refund-Cancelled-Low Enroll</td>
<td></td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50531</td>
<td>Lindsey Hinnrichs</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Cartoon Camp Refund due to low enrollm</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10027</td>
<td>Lompoc Excel Personnel Svs Inc</td>
<td>07/13/2017</td>
<td>Jenny Branson PE 7/7</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>916.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/20/2017</td>
<td>Jenny Branson PE 7/14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,145.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10949</td>
<td>Municipal Maintenance Equipment Inc.</td>
<td>07/19/2017</td>
<td>Boom Lock Latch</td>
<td></td>
<td>91.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/18/2017</td>
<td>Fujitsu fi-7160 Scanner</td>
<td></td>
<td>943.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11128</td>
<td>Nielsen Building Material</td>
<td>07/20/2017</td>
<td>WWTP Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11137</td>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Company</td>
<td>07/19/2017</td>
<td>Acc# 0408007582-5</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>39,722.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/17/2017</td>
<td>WWTP Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>129.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11169</td>
<td>Presidio Winery</td>
<td>07/20/2017</td>
<td>WWTP Rep &amp; Maint</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Refund for Utility Box Art Prgm Contributi</td>
<td></td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10221</td>
<td>R &amp; M Diesel Service &amp; Towing</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Recharge #965 AC System</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Recharge #965 AC System</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>65.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10004</td>
<td>Santa Barbara Co Sheriff Dept</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Independence Day Parade &amp; Late Arrest</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>551.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Independence Day Parade &amp; Late Arrest</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>551.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10206</td>
<td>Santa Barbara News Press</td>
<td>06/30/2017</td>
<td>Classified Ad 6/25/17-7/2/17</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Classified Ad 6/25/17-7/2/17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>127.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11356</td>
<td>Santa Ynez Valley Star LLC</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Santa Ynez Valley Star advertising</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/24/2017</td>
<td>Santa Ynez Valley Star advertising</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,872.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11176</td>
<td>Southern California Gas Company</td>
<td>07/27/2017</td>
<td>Acc# 098 214 9500 0</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>35.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/27/2017</td>
<td>Acc# 098 214 9500 0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11176</td>
<td>Southern California Gas Company</td>
<td>07/20/2017</td>
<td>194 215 2500 7</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>69.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/20/2017</td>
<td>194 215 2500 7</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>69.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10872</td>
<td>Verizon Wireless Services, LLC</td>
<td>07/19/2017</td>
<td>Wireless Billing June 20 - July 19</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>07/19/2017</td>
<td>Wireless Billing June 20 - July 19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>196.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10682</td>
<td>Regional Government Services Authority</td>
<td>07/27/2017</td>
<td>Compensation Study</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>03/31/2017</td>
<td>Compensation Study</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,330.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7006</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>04/30/2017</td>
<td>Compensation Study</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,258.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Number</td>
<td>Vendor Name</td>
<td>Payment Date</td>
<td>Payable Description</td>
<td>Payment Type</td>
<td>Payable Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7115</td>
<td>05/31/2017</td>
<td>Compensation Study</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>1,275.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bank Code APBNK Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment Type</th>
<th>Payable Count</th>
<th>Payment Count</th>
<th>Discount</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Checks</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>787,725.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Checks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voided Checks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Drafts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFT's</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>605,440.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,393,165.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fund Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>998</td>
<td>POOLED CASH</td>
<td>7/2017</td>
<td>1,393,165.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I. RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt Resolution No. 17-____, a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Solvang, agreeing to comply with the conditions and requirements of the Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant Program, and authorize the City Manager and/or Public Works Director to execute all associated required grant documents.

II. BACKGROUND:

Proposition 1B is the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act passed by California voters in 2006. One of the programs under Prop 1B is the California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP). Funding under this Program is distributed by the California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (CalOES).

On April 24, 2017 at its Regular Meeting, the City Council adopted Resolution 17-1010 authorizing staff to submit grant applications under the CTSGP. Applications were submitted for two proposed projects: Bus Shelter LED Solar Lighting Replacement, and SIMME-seat LED Solar Light Retrofit. The grant application amounts for the two proposed projects are $12,347 and $14,208 respectively, for a total of $26,555. We have received notification that the SIMME-seat LED Solar Light Retrofit application has been approved. However,
State funds to support these proposed projects will not be available until an unknown future date when the State conducts the necessary bond sales.

III. DISCUSSION:

Execution by the Authorized Agent of the attached CTSGP Certifications & Assurances document must be authorized by resolution of the City Council. The Resolution identifies and approves an Authorized Agent(s) to act on the City’s behalf with respect to the CTSGP. The City of Solvang must adopt the attached Resolution or be ineligible for Prop 1B funding under the California Transit Security Grant Program. Therefore, staff recommends City Council adopt the attached Resolution, and authorize the City Manager and/or Public Works Director to execute all associated required grant documents.

IV. ALTERNATIVES:

The City Council could choose to not adopt the attached Resolution thereby declining Prop 1B CTSGP funding to the City of Solvang. However, bus stop lighting improvements are planned to be implemented using these funds. Therefore, these proposed projects would have to be cancelled, or alternative funding identified in order to proceed with these projects.

V. FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no immediate fiscal impact to adopting the recommended Resolution. The City of Solvang must adopt the attached Resolution, or be ineligible for Prop 1B CTSGP funding. Approximately 98% of the funding to complete the Bus Shelter LED Solar Lighting Replacement, and SIMME-seat LED Solar Light Retrofit projects will be provided by Transit Security Grants. After the State sells bonds and funds these Projects, staff will include these Projects in the next fiscal year’s budget for City Council further approval.

VI. ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution 17-
2. CTSGP Certifications & Assurances Form
3. CTSGP Authorized Agent Form
RESOLUTION NO. 17-____

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLVANG, CALIFORNIA, IDENTIFYING AGENT AUTHORIZED TO ACT ON BEHALF OF CITY OF SOLVANG TO EXECUTE ACTIONS NECESSARY TO OBTAIN CALIFORNIA TRANSIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM (CTSGP) FUNDS FROM CAL OES AND ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH CAL OES CTSGP ASSURANCE AND STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS

WHEREAS, the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 authorizes the issuance of general obligation bonds for specified purposes, including, but not limited to, funding made available for capital projects that provide increased protection against security and safety threats, and for capital expenditures to increase the capacity of transit operators to develop disaster response transportation systems; and

WHEREAS, the California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) administers such funds deposited in the Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account under the California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP); and

WHEREAS, the City of Solvang (Santa Ynez Valley Transit) is eligible to receive CTSGP funds; and

WHEREAS, the City of Solvang (Santa Ynez Valley Transit) will apply for FY 2016-17 CTSGP funds in an amount up to $26,555 for Bus Shelter LED Solar Lighting Replacement, and SIMME-seat LED Solar Light Retrofit. These LED lighting Projects improve bus stop amenities and safety by providing well lit bus stops at night and early morning hours, thereby promoting increased transit ridership resulting in traffic reduction and improved air quality; and

WHEREAS, the City of Solvang (Santa Ynez Valley Transit) recognizes that it is responsible for compliance with all Cal OES CTSGP grant assurances, and state and federal laws, including, but not limited to, laws governing the use of bond funds; and

WHEREAS, Cal OES requires City of Solvang (Santa Ynez Valley Transit) to complete and submit a Governing Body Resolution for the purposes of identifying agent(s) authorized to act on behalf of City of Solvang (Santa Ynez Valley Transit) to execute actions necessary to obtain CTSGP funds from Cal OES and ensure continued compliance with Cal OES CTSGP assurances, and state and federal laws.

THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLVANG THAT Brad Vidro, City Manager, or Matt van der Linden, Public Works Director, is hereby authorized to execute for and on behalf of City of Solvang (Santa Ynez Valley Transit), a public entity established under the laws of the State of California, any actions necessary for the purpose of obtaining financial assistance provided by the California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services under the CTSGP.
RESOLUTION NO. 17-____

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Solvang on the 14th day of August, 2017, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

________________________
Jim Richardson, Mayor

ATTEST:

________________________
Lisa S. Martin, City Clerk

Certification

I, _________________________ Lisa S. Martin ________________________________, duly appointed and ___________________________, City Clerk/Executive Assistant of the ___________________________, City of Solvang ___________________________ do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a resolution passed and approved by the ___________________________, City Council of the ___________________________, City of Solvang ___________________________ on the ___________________________ day of ___________________________ August, 2017.

___________________________________________
(Official Position)

___________________________________________
(Signature)
California Transit Security Grant Program
California Transit Assistance Fund

Name of Applicant: City of Solvang

Grant Cycle: FY 2016/17  Grant Number: 6961-0002

Address: 1644 Oak Street

City: Solvang  State: CA  Zip Code: 93463

Telephone Number: (805) 688-5575

E-Mail Address: bradv@cityofsolvang.com

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant named above:

1. Has the legal authority to apply for Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account funds, and has the institutional, managerial and financial capability to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the grant provided by the State of California and administered by the California Governor’s Office Emergency Services (Cal OES).

2. Will assure that grant funds are only used for allowable, fair, and reasonable costs.

3. Will give the State of California generally and Cal OES in particular, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all paper or electronic records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or Cal OES directives.

4. Will provide progress reports and other information as may be required by Cal OES.

5. Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable timeframe after receipt of Cal OES approval.

6. Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain for themselves or others, particularly those with whom they have family, business or other ties.

7. Will comply with all California and federal statues relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to:
a. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352), as amended, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin;
b. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. §§ 1681-1683 and 1685-1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex;
c. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. §§ 794) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps;
d. The Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 6101-6107) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age;
e. The Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92-255) as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse;
f. The Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-616), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism;
g. Sections 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. §§ 290dd-2), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records;
h. Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. §§ 3601 et seq.), as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing;
i. Any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for federal assistance is being made; and
j. The requirements on any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

8. Will comply, if applicable, with the flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is $10,000 or more.

9. Will comply with applicable environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to California or federal law. These may include, but are not limited to, the following:

   b. Institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190) and Executive Order (EO)11514;
   c. Notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738;
   d. Protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990;
   e. Evaluation of flood hazards in floodplains in accordance with EO 11988;
   f. Assurance of project consistency with the approved state management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §§ 1451 et seq.);
   g. Conformity of federal actions to State (Clean Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 7401 et seq.);
   h. Protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, (P.L. 93-523); and

10. Will comply, if applicable, with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (16 U.S.C. §§ 1271 et. seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.


12. Will comply with Standardized Emergency Management System requirements as stated in the California Emergency Services Act, Gov Code §§ 8607 et seq. and CCR Title 19, Sections 2445, 2446, 2447 and 2448.

13. Will:
   a. Promptly return to the State of California all the funds received which exceed the approved, actual expenditures as accepted by Cal OES;
   b. In the event the approved amount of the grant is reduced, the reimbursement applicable to the amount of the reduction will be promptly refunded to the State of California; and
   c. CTSGP-CTAF funds must be kept in a separate interest bearing account. Any interest that is accrued must be accounted for and used towards the approved Prop1B project approved by Cal OES.

14. Will comply, if applicable, with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. §§ 4728-4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the nineteen statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM’s Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 C.F.R. 900, Subpart F).

15. Agrees that equipment acquired or obtained with grant funds:
   a. Will be made available under the California Disaster and Civil Defense Master Mutual Aid Agreement in consultation with representatives of the various fire, emergency medical, hazardous materials response services, and law enforcement agencies within the jurisdiction of the applicant;
   b. Will be made available pursuant to applicable terms of the California Disaster and Civil Defense Master Mutual Aid Agreement and deployed with personnel trained in the use of such equipment in a manner consistent with the California Law Enforcement Mutual Aid Plan or the California Fire Services and Rescue Mutual Aid Plan.

16. Will comply, if applicable, with Subtitle A, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) 1990.
17. Will comply with all applicable requirements, and all other California and federal laws, executive orders, regulations, program and administrative requirements, policies and any other requirements governing this program.

18. Understands that failure to comply with any of the above assurances may result in suspension, termination or reduction of grant funds.

   a. The applicant certifies that it and its principals:

      1. Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, sentenced to a denial of federal benefits by a state or federal court, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any federal department or agency;

      2. Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (federal, state, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of federal or state antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

      3. Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (federal, state, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and (d) have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transactions (federal, state, or local) terminated for cause or default; and where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

19. Will retain records for thirty-five years after notification of grant closeout by the State.

20. Will comply with the audit requirements set forth in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133, “Audit of States, Local Governments and Non-Profit Organizations.”

21. Grantees and subgrantees will use their own procurement procedures which reflect applicable state and local laws and regulations.

22. Grantees and subgrantees will comply with their own contracting procedures or with the California Public Contract Code, whichever is more restrictive.

23. Grantees and subgrantees will maintain procedures to minimize the time elapsing between the award of funds and the disbursement of funds.
As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

The undersigned represents that he/she is authorized by the above named applicant to enter into this agreement for and on behalf of the said applicant.

Signature of Authorized Agent: 

Printed Name of Authorized Agent: Brad Vidro

Title: City Manager Date: 
Authorized Agent Signature Authority

AS THE ____________________________ Mayor
(Chief Executive Officer / Director / President / Secretary)

OF THE ____________________________ City of Solvang
(Name of State Organization)

I hereby authorize the following individual(s) to execute for and on behalf of the named state organization, any actions necessary for the purpose of obtaining state financial assistance provided by the California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services.

__________________________________
(Name or Title of Authorized Agent)

City Manager, City of Solvang, OR

__________________________________
(Name or Title of Authorized Agent)

Public Works Director, City of Solvang, OR

__________________________________
(Name or Title of Authorized Agent)

(none)

Signed and approved this ____________________________ day of ____________________________, 20________

________________________________________________________
(Signature)
TO: SOLVANG CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: Roy A. Hanley, City Attorney

MEETING DATE: August 14, 2017

DATE PREPARED: July 18, 2017

SUBJECT: RESOLUTION EXTENDING INTERIM URGENCY ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SOLVANG PROHIBITING MANUFACTURING, PROCESSING, LABORATORY TESTING, LABELING, STORING AND WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DISTRIBUTION OF CANNABIS

I. RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt Resolution No. 17-____, a Resolution of the City Council of the City of Solvang, extending the previously adopted Urgency Ordinance banning recreational marijuana activities, on a 4/5 vote.

II. DISCUSSION:

The Solvang Municipal code presently prohibits medical marijuana dispensaries and cultivation, whether personal or commercial, within every zone in the City. Although dispensaries are prohibited, the code allows for the delivery of medical marijuana to qualified patients under the Compassionate Use Act.

The Code is silent regarding manufacturing, processing, laboratory testing, labeling, storing and wholesale and retail distribution of cannabis. Over the past few months neighboring cities have received multiple inquiries from individuals seeking instruction on how to obtain permits to open manufacturing and distribution centers. There are likely many persons interested in such operations to begin in other cities and in Solvang.
Proposition 64 was passed by a majority of California voters. The measure legalized marijuana use for those 21 years of age and over, and established the Bureau of Marijuana Control within the Department of Consumer Affairs to regulate and license the marijuana industry, in conflict with the authority granted to the Bureau of Medical Marijuana Regulation established when Governor Jerry Brown signed the Medical Marijuana Regulation and Safety Act into law in October 2015. Not all of those conflicts have been fully resolved by legislation.

The urgency ordinance prohibits the manufacturing, processing, laboratory testing, labeling, storing and wholesale and retail distribution of cannabis in the City and is intended to preserve the status quo. The urgency ordinance was adopted in September of 2016. Its initial life was 45 days and it was properly extended to last a full year. One more twelve month extension is allowed. This will allow the staff and Planning Commission to study the issues surrounding medical and recreational cannabis use, and give recommendations to the City Council toward the development of a comprehensive regulatory scheme.

There are many aspects of State regulation that are still being worked out. The taxing scheme set forth in Prop 64 is not advantageous to local revenue schemes so there are no distinct advantages to the City as such, in moving too fast to regulate and locate. Some cities that did move fast are encountering problems with the locations selected for retail activities and the City can learn much in the next year from other people’s experiences.

Please note that this urgency ordinance relates to recreational cannabis and does not supplant the rules in regards to medical marijuana.

III. ALTERNATIVES:

The City is not legally required to take action, may choose to not enact a ban, and may even choose to regulate and tax.

IV. FISCAL IMPACT:

No specific fiscal impacts are identified as part of this report.

V. ATTACHMENTS:

- Draft Resolution
- Adopted urgency ordinance
- Resolution extending ordinance
RESOLUTION NO. 17-___

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLVANG, CALIFORNIA, EXTENDING INTERIM ORDINANCE NO. 16-319 PROHIBITING MANUFACTURING, PROCESSING, LABORATORY TESTING, LABELING, STORING AND WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DISTRIBUTION OF CANNABIS

WHEREAS, on September 26, 2016 the City Council enacted Ordinance No. 16-319, finding there to be a current and immediate threat to the health, safety, and welfare of City residents arising from the risks associated with the manufacture, processing, laboratory testing, labeling, storing and wholesale and retail distribution of cannabis, whether medical or for adult use; and

WHEREAS, the City Council thereby ordained the Citywide prohibition of all cannabis activities, from cultivation to point of sale, to avoid the risks of criminal activity, degradation of the natural environment, malodorous smells and indoor electrical fire hazards that may result from such activities; and

WHEREAS, the City Council directed preparation of a report on describing the measures taken to alleviate the condition which lead to the adoption of the ordinance, in accordance with Government Code § 65858(d), which action was completed and the urgency ordinance was extended by resolution until September 11, 2017; and

WHEREAS, without action by the City Council, Ordinance No. 16-319 will expire on September 11, 2017; and

WHEREAS, without an extension of Ordinance No. 16-319, it will expire before a permanent ordinance can be adopted; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that there continues to be a current and immediate threat to the health, safety, and welfare of City residents arising from the risks associated with the manufacture, processing, laboratory testing, labeling, storing and wholesale distribution of cannabis, whether for medical or adult use, and the retail distribution of cannabis for adult use, requiring further research and investigation.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Solvang, California as follows:

Section 1. Ordinance No. 16-319 is extended pursuant to Government Code § 65858(a) for a period of one additional year, to then expire September 26, 2018 unless further extended.

Section 2. In accordance with Ordinance No. 16-319, any commercial or industrial use involving cannabis is prohibited in every zoning district in the City, including but not limited to manufacture, processing, laboratory testing, labeling,
storing and wholesale distribution of cannabis, whether for medical or adult use, and retail distribution of cannabis for adult use.

Section 3. This resolution is not a project subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15306 (Information Collection) because it does not have the potential to create a physical environmental effect.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Solvang held this 14th day of August, 2017, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAINS:

ABSENTS:

______________________________
Jim Richardson, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Lisa S. Martin, City Clerk
ORDINANCE NO. 16-319

AN INTERIM ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLVANG, CALIFORNIA, PROHIBITING MANUFACTURING, PROCESSING, LABORATORY TESTING, LABELING, STORING AND WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DISTRIBUTION OF CANNABIS AND DECLARING SAME TO BE AN URGENCY MEASURE TO TAKE EFFECT IMMEDIATELY

The People of the Chartered City of Solvang, California, do hereby ordain as follows:

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The City Council finds and declares as follows:

WHEREAS, in 1996, the voters of the State of California approved Proposition 215 (codified as California Health and Safety Code § 11362.5 and entitled “The Compassionate Use Act of 1996” or “CUA”); and

WHEREAS, the intent of Proposition 215 was to enable critically ill Californians who are in need of marijuana for medical purposes to use it without fear of criminal prosecution under limited circumstances. The proposition further provides that “nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede legislation prohibiting persons from engaging in conduct that endangers others, or to condone the diversion of marijuana for non-medical purposes.” The ballot arguments supporting Proposition 215 expressly acknowledged that “Proposition 215 does not allow unlimited quantities of marijuana to be grown anywhere;” and

WHEREAS, in 2004, the Legislature enacted Senate Bill 420 (codified as California Health & Safety Code § 11362.7 et seq. and referred to as the “Medical Marijuana Program” or “MMP”) to clarify the scope of Proposition 215 and to provide qualifying patients and primary caregivers who collectively or cooperatively cultivate marijuana for medical purposes with a limited defense to certain specified State criminal statutes. Assembly Bill 2650 (2010) and Assembly Bill 1300 (2011) amended the MMP to expressly recognize the authority of cities to “[a]dopt local ordinances that regulate the location, operation, or establishment of a medical marijuana cooperative or collective” and to civilly and criminally enforce such ordinances; and

WHEREAS, in City of Riverside v. Inland Empire Patients Health and Wellness Center, Inc. (2013) 56 Cal.4th 729, the California Supreme Court held that “[n]othing in the CUA or the MMP expressly or impliedly limits the inherent authority of a local jurisdiction, by its own ordinances, to regulate the use of its land...;” and

WHEREAS, the Federal Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq., classifies marijuana as a Schedule 1 Drug, defined as a drug or other substance that has a high potential for abuse, that has no currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United State, and has not been accepted as safe for use under medical supervision. The Federal Controlled Substances Act makes it unlawful under federal law for any person to cultivate, manufacture, distribute or dispense, or possess with intent to manufacture, distribute or dispense, marijuana. The Federal Controlled Substances Act contains no exemption for medical purposes, although there is recent
case law that raises a question as to whether the Federal Government may enforce the Act where medical marijuana is allowed; and

WHEREAS, on October 9, 2015, Governor Jerry Brown signed three bills into law (AB 266, AB 243, and SB 643) which collectively are known as the Medical Marijuana Regulation and Safety Act (hereinafter, the “MMRSA”). The MMRSA established a State licensing scheme for commercial medical marijuana uses while protecting local control by requiring that all such businesses must have a local license or permit to operate in addition to a State license. The MMRSA allows the City to completely prohibit commercial and private medical marijuana activities; and

WHEREAS, the Control, Regulate, and Tax Adult Use of Marijuana Initiative (Proposition 64) has qualified for the November 8, 2016, California ballot. If passed by a majority of California voters, the measure would legalize marijuana use for those 21 years of age and over, and would establish the Bureau of Marijuana Control within the Department of Consumer Affairs to regulate and license the marijuana industry, in conflict with the authority granted to the Bureau of Medical Marijuana Regulation established by MMRSA. Portions of Proposition 64 could take effect as soon as the day after Election Day; specifically, recreational use by adults and cultivation in private residences; and

WHEREAS, if passed, Proposition 64 as drafted will allow local governments to ban recreational marijuana businesses entirely. With respect to cultivation, Proposition 64 will allow local governments to reasonably regulate cultivation through zoning and other local laws, and to ban outdoor cultivation outright. Proposition 64 will, however, require local governments to allow limited indoor cultivation in private residences; and

WHEREAS, if the City fails to pass ordinances surrounding these issues, the City could face issues of preemption and grandfathering in the days, weeks and months after Proposition 64 passes; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds there is a current and immediate threat to the health, safety, and welfare of City residents arising from the risks associated with the manufacture, processing, laboratory testing, labeling, storing and wholesale and retail distribution of cannabis, whether medical or recreational. Citywide prohibition of all activities, from cultivation to point of sale, is proper and necessary to avoid the risks of criminal activity, degradation of the natural environment, malodorous smells and indoor electrical fire hazards that may result from such activities; and

WHEREAS, as recognized by the Attorney General’s August 2008 Guidelines for the Security and Non-Diversion of Marijuana Grown for Medical Use, marijuana cultivation or other concentrations of marijuana in any location or premises without adequate security increases the risk that surrounding homes or businesses may be negatively impacted by nuisance activity such as loitering or crime; and

WHEREAS, several California cities have reported negative impacts of marijuana processing and distribution uses, including offensive odors, illegal sales and distribution of marijuana, trespassing, theft, violent robberies and attempted robbery, and fire hazards; and
WHEREAS, until and unless the Department of Food and Agriculture establishes a track and trace program for reporting the movement of marijuana items through the distribution chain as mandated by Business & Professions Code § 19335, the risk of crime from theft and burglary attendant to manufacturing and distribution facilities is significant. Until traceable, stolen product will have street value for sale to minors; and

WHEREAS, manufacturing of cannabis products can involve use of chemicals and solvents, and as a result, the manufacture of hash oil concentrate, often added to edibles, drinks and liquids, carries a significant risk of explosion due to the distillation process utilized to extract tetrahydrocannabinol. Major burn treatment centers at two hospitals in Northern California reported in 2015 that nearly 10 percent of severe burn cases were attributed to butane hash oil explosions, which was more than burn cases from car accidents and house fires combined; and

WHEREAS, the limited immunity from specified state marijuana laws provided by the Compassionate Use Act, Medical Marijuana Program and Proposition 64 do not confer a land use right or the right to create or maintain a public nuisance; and

WHEREAS, cultivation of cannabis and medical marijuana dispensaries are currently prohibited under the City’s permissive zoning regulations. The City Council desires to enact this interim urgency ordinance to expressly clarify that manufacture, processing, laboratory testing, labeling, storing and wholesale and retail distribution of cannabis, whether medical or recreational, are also prohibited in all zones throughout the City; and

WHEREAS, the immediate ban of all commercial or industrial cannabis activities will maintain the status quo while allowing the City to investigate and research the safety and options of regulation and taxation; and

WHEREAS, the immediate ban of all commercial or industrial cannabis activities will enable the City to develop a comprehensive approach to cannabis, including analysis of the provisions of Proposition 64’s proposed Health & Safety Code § 11362.2, if passed, as well as regulation of presently unregulated delivery services operating within the City’s jurisdiction. At least 2 dispensaries advertise online delivery services to Solvang; and

WHEREAS, this ordinance is not a project subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15306 (Information Collection) because it does not have the potential to create a physical environmental effect.

SECTION 2. REGULATION.

The following regulation is hereby imposed. This regulation shall prevail over any conflicting provisions of the Solvang Municipal Code or the other ordinances, resolutions, policies and regulations of the City of Solvang:

1. Any commercial or industrial use involving cannabis is prohibited in every zoning district in the City, including but not limited to manufacture, processing, laboratory testing, labeling, storing and wholesale and retail distribution.
SECTION 3. INTERIM URGENCY ORDINANCE.

Based upon the findings set forth in Section 1, above, this is an interim urgency ordinance adopted pursuant to Government Code § 65858, and pursuant to the authority granted to the City of Solvang in Article 11, Section 7 of the California Constitution. This ordinance shall therefore take effect immediately upon adoption. This ordinance shall remain in effect for forty-five (45) days from the date of adoption; that is, September 26, 2016. This ordinance will terminate upon a determination by the City Council supported by substantial evidence that the threat to public health, safety and welfare described in Section 1 of this ordinance has been ameliorated, or by the adoption of ordinances or amendments extending or superseding this ordinance.

SECTION 4. SEVERANCE CLAUSE.

The City Council declares that each section, subsection, paragraph, subparagraph, sentence, clause and phrase of this ordinance is severable and independent of every other section, subsection, paragraph, subparagraph, sentence, clause and phrase of this ordinance. If any section, subsection, paragraph, subparagraph, sentence, clause or phrase of this ordinance is held invalid, the City Council declares it would have adopted the remaining provisions of this ordinance irrespective of the portion held invalid, and further declares its express intent that the remaining portions of this ordinance should remain in effect after the invalid portion has been eliminated.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council held on the 26th day of September, 2016, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Mayor Richardson, Council Members Duus, Jamieson, Skytt, and Zimmerman
NOES: 
ABSENT: 
ABSTAINED: 

Jim Richardson, Mayor

ATTEST: Lisa S. Martin, City Clerk
RESOLUTION NO. 16-999

A RESOLUTION EXTENDING INTERIM ORDINANCE NO. 16-319 OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SOLVANG, CALIFORNIA PROHIBITING MANUFACTURING, PROCESSING, LABORATORY TESTING, LABELING, STORING AND WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DISTRIBUTION OF CANNABIS

WHEREAS, on September 26, 2016, the City Council enacted Ordinance No. 16-319, finding there to be a current and immediate threat to the health, safety, and welfare of City residents arising from the risks associated with the manufacture, processing, laboratory testing, labeling, storing and wholesale and retail distribution of cannabis for adult use; and

WHEREAS, the City Council thereby ordained the Citywide prohibition of all cannabis activities, from cultivation to point of sale, to avoid the risks of criminal activity, degradation of the natural environment, malodorous smells and indoor electrical fire hazards that may result from such activities; and

WHEREAS, the City Council directed preparation of a report on describing the measures taken to alleviate the condition which lead to the adoption of the ordinance, in accordance with Government Code §65858(d); and

WHEREAS, without action by the City Council, Ordinance No. 16-319 will expire forty-five (45) days following its adoption; and

WHEREAS, without an extension of Ordinance No. 16-319, it will expire before a permanent ordinance can be adopted; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds there continues to be a current and immediate threat to the health, safety, and welfare of City residents arising from the risks associated with the manufacture, processing, laboratory testing, labeling, storing and wholesale and retail distribution of cannabis for adult use, requiring further research and investigation.

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

Section 1. Ordinance No. 16-319 is extended pursuant to Government Code § 65858(a) for a period of ten (10) months and fifteen (15) days, to then expire September 12, 2017, unless further extended.

Section 2. In accordance with Ordinance No. 16-319, any commercial or industrial use involving cannabis is prohibited in every zoning district in the City, including but not limited to manufacture, processing, laboratory testing, labeling, storing and wholesale and retail distribution.
Section 3. This resolution is not a project subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15306 (Information Collection) because it does not have the potential to create a physical environmental effect.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED at the regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Solvang held this 24th day of October, 2016 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Mayor Richardson, Council Members Duus, Jamieson, Skytt, and Zimmerman
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

Jim Richardson, Mayor

ATTEST:

Lisa S. Martin, City Clerk
CITY COUNCIL
STAFF REPORT

TO:          SOLVANG CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM:        Bridget Elliott, Associate Engineer, and
             Matt van der Linden, Public Works Director/City Engineer

MEETING DATE:  August 14, 2017

DATE PREPARED:  August 4, 2017

SUBJECT:      STORMWATER PROGRAM FUNDING

I.  RECOMMENDATION:

   1. Direct staff to update our development related Drainage Impact Fee; and
   2. Provide staff with direction on next steps toward adequately funding the City’s
      Stormwater Management Program, NPDES compliance, and Storm Drain Capital
      Improvement Program.

II.  BACKGROUND:

The Federal Clean Water Act requires the City of Solvang to operate under a National
Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Stormwater Permit for the
discharge of stormwater from the City’s storm drain system to surface waters such as our
local creeks and the Santa Ynez River.

On April 30, 2003 the State Water Resources Control Board adopted Water Quality
Order No. 2003-0005-DWQ, NPDES General Permit CAS000004 WDRs for Storm
Water Discharges from Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) (General
Permit) to comply with Clean Water Act section 402(p)(6). Under this Order the City of
Solvang is required to comply with the provisions of the General Permit. On February 5,
2013, an updated and significantly expanded General Permit (Order No. 2013-001 DWQ)
was adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board. The 5-year Stormwater Permit
became effective July 1, 2013, and remains in effect until the next Stormwater Permit
becomes effective, which is currently expected to be delayed, and occur sometime in
2020. Federal and State law gives the Regional Water Quality Control Board authority to
regulate and issue NPDES stormwater permits and requirements.
The City’s Stormwater Permit specifies actions necessary to reduce the discharge of pollutants in stormwater to the maximum extent practicable and effectively prohibit non-stormwater discharges into the municipal storm drain system to protect local creeks and the Santa Ynez River. Given that sections of our storm drain system lead directly to local creeks and the Santa Ynez River without any treatment, Permit compliance by the City is dependent on preventing pollutants from entering the system in the first place.

The City’s Stormwater Permit has over 71 permit requirements, and is organized into 11 sections with requirements that can be summarized as follows:

1. Reduce the discharge of pollutants to storm drains from routine municipal operations;
2. Ensure appropriate site design and treatment measures to manage stormwater runoff quality and quantity from new and redevelopment project sites;
3. Inspect construction sites, and industrial and commercial facilities that could potentially contribute to stormwater pollution;
4. Prohibit and ensure that illicit discharges are detected, controlled and eliminated;
5. Implement control methods for pollutants of concern such as total suspended solids (TSS), nutrients, hardness and pesticides; and
6. Conduct monitoring to track water quality status and trends.

These requirements dictate enforcement of the stormwater ordinance, drainage design standards, upkeep of maps and the storm drain facility inventory, as well as the implementation and annual assessment of various Best Management Practices (BMPs) used to prevent or remove pollutants (i.e. sediment, bacteria, trash and nutrients) from entering the local creeks and Santa Ynez River. A very significant management requirement, added last year to the City’s Stormwater Management Program, was the Program Effectiveness Assessment and Improvement Plan (PEAIP). The intent of the PEAIP is to document compliance with Stormwater Permit conditions and to allow staff to adaptively manage the Stormwater Management Program. The PEAIP requires significant documentation and tracking annually and long term of all the City’s Stormwater Program elements.

In addition, the State has recently added what is known as the Trash Amendment to our Stormwater Permit. The Trash Amendment requires that storm drain piping systems in commercial, industrial and multi-family areas of the City be retrofit with major trash capturing structures to remove nearly all solids within the stormwater flow during small and modest sized storms. These structures will be very costly to construct, and will require semi-annual maintenance and cleaning. Therefore, compliance with the Trash Amendment will require substantial capital improvements over the next ten years, and result in perpetual maintenance and cleaning costs.

Also, the City has a modest 10-Year Storm Drain Capital Improvement Plan to address flooding problems and provide for maintenance of our City-wide storm drain system.
III. DISCUSSION:

As described above, State stormwater regulations and requirements continue to expand for local agencies such as the City of Solvang resulting in high costs that are expected to increase further in the years ahead. Over the next 5 years, the City’s stormwater system faces an average of over $800,000 per year in costs associated with our ongoing Stormwater Management Program, Capital Improvement Plan, and NPDES Permit Requirements. The City is currently funding its stormwater costs through the General Fund, since it does not charge its users a regular fee and its Drainage Impact Fee does not cover needed revenues. With costs continuing to increase and the General Fund burdened with this, staff believes it is now appropriate to begin considering alternative means to fund the City’s Stormwater Program. Therefore, staff engaged the services of Bartle Wells Associates (BWA) to evaluate the City’s Stormwater Program, explore effective alternative funding mechanisms, and present the City with a recommended Stormwater Utility Funding Plan.

The City of Solvang currently has a population of approximately 5,400 on 1,550 acres of land with approximately 2,589 dwelling units. The City Limits encompass about 2% of the Santa Ynez River Uplands Watershed. The City’s stormwater system includes several separate sections of storm drain pipelines, as well as open drainage courses, and portions of Alisal, Adobe Canyon and Alamo Pintado creek, which are managed by Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

As mentioned, funding for the stormwater system has historically been provided by the General Fund, as the only charge associated with this system is Solvang’s one-time development related Drainage Impact Fee of $100 per lot for residential lots, $500 per acre for commercial, industrial, church and shopping center lots, and $100 per acre for parks, golf courses, greenbelts, and agricultural lots. This fee is inadequate and was never intended to cover the Stormwater Program costs that have increased dramatically in the last few years. It is recommended that this fee be updated. However, since the City expects slow growth in the future, an updated Drainage Impact Fee can only be expected to cover a small percentage of the Stormwater Program cost.

The City’s adopted Fiscal Year 2017-18 Budget for the Stormwater Management Program is over $550,000. This includes items such as personnel services, regular projects and their maintenance, Stormwater Permit activities, annual reporting, PEAIP tracking, and capital improvements. Over the next 10-years the Storm Drain Capital Improvement Plan costs total approximately $4.2 Million, an average of $420,000 per year.

Faced with these high costs, staff recommends the City Council consider alternative funding mechanisms. The following funding options were identified by BWA. Details of each option are included in the attached Stormwater Program Funding Technical Memo.

1. Proposition 218 – Special Taxes;
2. Proposition 218 – Property Related Fees;
3. Buy-In + Expansion Cost Approach;
4. Average Cost Approach;
5. Buy-In Only Approach;
6. Expansion or Marginal Cost Approach; and
7. Funding Stormwater from Water and Sewer Enterprises.

BWA recommends that the City implement a balloted property-related assessment/fee through a majority vote, and re-allocate funds from the water and sewer enterprises as the most viable approaches for consistent recovery of operation and capital costs. Full funding of the City’s Stormwater Program would require a property-related fee of about $558 per acre per year. A property-related fee is a “fee or charge imposed upon a parcel as an incident of property ownership”, and must reflect the cost of service on the affected property owners, supported by an engineer’s report or rate study. Prop 218 property-related fees require voter approval in the form of a hearing followed by a ballot. Each property owner in the affected area must be given a 45-day notice of the public hearing on the proposed rates. If a majority of property owners reject the proposed fee at the hearing, the fee may not continue to ballot. If there is no majority protest, the City may choose to submit the fee to a ballot for either all property owners or the residing electorate. The property owner vote requires a simple majority (50%) approval, which is the most viable source of regular cost-recovery from stormwater users.

However, as one can imagine, this would be very difficult to achieve and would require significant public outreach and education. Should the City not wish to continue to fund the Stormwater Management Program out of the General Fund, then financial, legal, and political realities necessitate that the City outline additional funding mechanisms, including other fee options and non-ballotted funding mechanisms. One other such option is to utilize tourist generated funds to offset the General Fund expenditure. Most likely, a combination of these approaches will need to be adopted to fully and reliably fund Solvang’s stormwater enterprise costs.

Currently, identifying a nexus and re-allocating Stormwater Program costs to the water and sewer enterprises within the framework of the Prop 218 process would also be very challenging, and only apply to a portion of the Stormwater Program costs. However, attempts such as proposed SB 231 are underway to broaden the scope of Prop 218 to cover stormwater, and help enable local agencies to fund compliance with their stormwater permits. SB 231 would add stormwater to the definition of “sewer” in Prop 218. Staff is monitoring the progress of this and any other proposed bills, and will update the City Council when applicable.

Only limited Measure A and Local Transportation funds are available to offset our Stormwater Management Program costs since these funds are needed for roadway maintenance and improvements. Also, as Solvang is not a disadvantaged community, future grant funding will be hard to come by. Therefore, the City’s cost to implement its Stormwater Program may soon be greater than the level desired to be continually funded out of the General Fund. As such, staff has brought this concern to the attention of the City Council for direction.
IV. **ALTERNATIVES:**

The City Council could choose to continue funding the City’s Stormwater Program primarily through the General Fund, and not provide staff with further direction at this time.

V. **FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no direct financial impact associated with the Stormwater Program Funding Technical Memo, or receiving and filing this Report. However, in Fiscal Year 2017-18 the cost of the City’s Stormwater Program is expected to be over $550,000 and the cost of compliance with our Stormwater Permit is projected to increase by approximately 10% annually for the next several years.

VI. **ATTACHMENTS:**

- Solvang Stormwater Program Funding Technical Memo, June 2017
- Solvang Storm Drain System Map
City of Solvang

Stormwater Program Funding
Technical Memo
June 2017

BARTLE WELLS ASSOCIATES
Independent Public Finance Consultants
1889 Alcatraz Avenue
Berkeley, California 94703
www.bartlewells.com
Tel: 510/653-3399
TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: Report Summary ........................................................................................................ 1
SECTION 2: History & General Description of District Services .................................................. 2
SECTION 3: Summary of Costs ................................................................................................... 3
SECTION 4: Options for Alternative Funding ............................................................................ 4
SECTION 5: Stormwater Utility Funding Plan ........................................................................... 6
SECTION 6: Conclusion .............................................................................................................. 7
SECTION 7: Appendix ............................................................................................................... 8

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 – City of Solvang ........................................................................................................ 2
Figure 2 – City of Solvang Stormwater Expenses 2016/17 ......................................................... 3
SECTION 1: Report Summary

The City of Solvang has retained Bartle Wells Associates to evaluate its current stormwater system and make recommendations on funding the system’s ongoing expenses. Over the next 5 years, the City’s stormwater system faces an average of $860,000 per year in costs associated with the City’s ongoing annual expenses, Stormwater Management Program, Capital Improvement Plan, and NPDES Permit Requirements. The City is currently funding its stormwater costs through the General Fund, since it does not charge its users a regular fee and its Drainage Impact Fee does not cover needed revenues.

The object of this Stormwater Technical Memo is to review the current costs associated with the City’s stormwater system, explore effective alternative funding mechanisms for stormwater systems, and present the City with a recommended Stormwater Utility Funding Plan. Bartle Wells Associates finds that balloted property-related assessments/fees and the re-allocation of funds from water and sewer enterprises are the most viable approaches to long-term comprehensive funding. Full funding of the City’s stormwater program would require a fee of $557.63 per acre per year. This charge would be higher than the average annual single family stormwater charge in California and may be difficult to implement, as Proposition 218 requires such fees to be passed by ballot approval.

Financial, legal, and political realities necessitate that the City outline additional funding mechanisms, including other fee options and non-balloted funding mechanisms. Most likely, a combination of these approaches will need to be adopted to fully and reliably fund Solvang’s stormwater enterprise costs.
SECTION 2: History & General Description of District Services

The City of Solvang is located in Santa Barbara County, 3 miles east of US Highway 101. Solvang currently has an estimated population of 5,400 on 1,550 acres of land with approximately 2,589 dwelling units. Yearly precipitation averages 12 inches in its wettest months between November and March. The City’s stormwater system includes the Santa Ynez River Uplands Watershed. It consists of open and closed storm drains and portions of Alisal, Adobe Canyon and Alamo Pintado creeks, which are managed by Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District.

Funding for this system has historically been provided by the General Fund, as the only charge associated with this system is Solvang’s one-time Drainage Impact Fee of $100 per lot for residential lots, $500 per acre for commercial, industrial, church and shopping center lots, and $100 per acre for parks, golf courses, greenbelts, and agricultural lots (See Appendix Table 1). Since the City expects slow growth in the future, it cannot depend on this revenue for general operations and maintenance costs or capital improvements.

Figure 1. City of Solvang
SECTION 3: Summary of Costs

The City of Solvang is currently required to uphold the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s). The NPDES Permit requires that MS4s eliminate the discharge of pollutants as effectively as possible, protect water quality, and implement Best Management Practices that address six Minimum Control Measures. These are:

1) Public Education and Outreach on Stormwater Impacts
2) Public Involvement and Participation
3) Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination
4) Construction Site Runoff Control
5) Post Construction Stormwater Management in New Development and Redevelopment
6) Pollution Prevention/Good Housekeeping for Municipal Operations

The requirements outlined by the NPDES Permit and its Best Management Practices include inherent costs incurred by the City. According to the City’s Annual Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17, the Stormwater Management Fund faces annual fixed costs of approximately $350,000, including items such as personnel services, regular projects and maintenance, and an annual stormwater report (See Appendix Table 2). The City has also adopted a Capital Improvement Program to meet permit requirements and perform system upkeep, valued at $4,412,000 for the next 10 years, or approximately $440,000 per year for the next ten years (See Appendix Tables 2 and 3).

Figure 2. City of Solvang Stormwater Expenses 2016/17
SECTION 4: Options for Alternative Funding

The City’s Stormwater Fund expenses are largely covered by the General Fund and Measure A revenues, but could also benefit from alternative revenue streams. General Fund money often faces competition from other necessary services such as police and fire protection, while Measure A funding is the City’s primary road maintenance funding source and should not be relied on as a stormwater funding source. This report covers several alternate options for funding stormwater, including balloted and non-balloted approaches.

4.1 Charging for Stormwater – Proposition 218

Charging stormwater users for the benefits they receive is the most reliable way to recover stormwater costs of service. Local government’s ability to implement these taxes, assessments and fees are regulated by Proposition 218, which has an overarching goal of restricting the methods by which taxpayers are subjected to these costs without voter approval. Water, sewer and garbage rates are exempted from voter approval under Proposition 218, but all other government fees must be put to a formal vote. Despite some agency efforts to classify stormwater charges as a type of water or sewer charge to exempt them from voting requirements, it is not currently possible to recover stormwater costs from users on a regular basis without undergoing a balloted approval process. Any agency planning to impose stormwater fees must prepare for a significant public outreach effort to achieve majority voter approval. The exact voting process varies by the type of Proposition 218 fee imposed on the user. The two most viable balloted options are outlined below.

4.1.1 Proposition 218 – Special Taxes

One option for funding the City’s stormwater enterprise is through taxation. Proposition 218 defines “general taxes” and “special taxes”, of which “special tax” is most applicable and means “any tax imposed for specific purposes”. One benefit of these fees is that they do not require a detailed cost basis, but they must be submitted to the City’s electorate via ballot and approved by a two-thirds majority vote. Since the electorate may be reluctant to impose new taxes on themselves, special taxes for stormwater have a higher chance of being rejected than other funding options. Agencies may also wish to fund stormwater through existing taxation such as gas tax, sales tax, and transient occupancy tax funding, though many of these fund revenues may be difficult to re-allocate to stormwater. (See Proposition 218, Article XIII D, Section 3)

4.1.2 Proposition 218 – Property Related Fees

A property-related fee is a “fee or charge imposed upon a parcel as an incident of property ownership”, and must reflect the cost of service on the affected property owners, supported by an engineer’s report or rate study. Property-related fees require voter approval in the form of a hearing followed by a ballot. Each property owner in the affected area must be given a 45-day notice of a public hearing on the proposed rates. If a majority of property owners reject the proposed fee at the hearing, the fee may not continue to ballot. If there is no majority protest, the City may choose to submit the fee to a ballot for either all property owners or the residing electorate (as seen in Section 4.1.1 - Special Taxes). The ballot for property owners must contain the proposed fee, the cost basis for the fee, the reason for the fee,
and the procedure for voting on the fee. The property owner vote requires a simple majority (50%) approval, which is more politically viable than the electoral ballot requirement of two-thirds. Provided that fees are cost-justified and implemented in a way that carefully follows Proposition 218 requirements, a property-related fee approved by a majority of property owners is the most viable source of regular cost-recovery from stormwater users. (See Proposition 218, Article XIII D, Section 6)

4.1.2.1 Zones of Benefit
A zone of benefit may also be established to levy property-related stormwater fees, where the zone is a geographic area in which property owners receive the special benefit of stormwater services. Fees levied on zones of benefit must comply with the same Proposition 218 procedures as general property-related fees, but choosing to levy them on a zone of benefit may narrow the population of property owners who are receiving stormwater services, thereby narrowing the amount of public outreach and expense necessary to receive majority approval.

4.2 Charging for Stormwater – Impact Fees
While ongoing annual costs are more reliably funded through user fees and other sources of revenue, a drainage impact fee (also called a capacity fee or connection fee) that reflects the cost of current assets and capital improvement has the potential to recover costs associated with any new stormwater development. The key requirements of impact fees are that they must be proportionate to benefits received by new development, and must not fund operating and maintenance expenses. BWA recognizes four ways of calculating impact fees, outlined below:

4.2.1 Buy-In + Expansion Cost Approach
Under this approach, the impact fee includes two components: a) a buy-in component to recover an equitable share of costs for existing facilities available to serve new development (in current dollars), plus b) an expansion component to recover the cost of capacity in future facilities needed to serve projected new development through 2027.

4.2.2 Average Cost Approach
Under this approach, the impact fee is calculated based on the total costs of existing and future stormwater facilities benefiting new development through buildout (in current dollars), divided by the total anticipated capacity of the stormwater system through buildout. The resulting fee represents the average cost of stormwater facilities benefiting growth through buildout.

4.2.3 Buy-In Only Approach
Under this approach, the fee is based on the cost of existing facilities and assets (in current dollars) divided by the capacity of the existing stormwater system. The buy-in approach is more commonly used by agencies that are mostly built out with stormwater systems that require minimal future facility improvements. This approach excludes cost recovery for capital improvement projects.
4.2.4 Expansion or Marginal Cost Approach
Under this approach, the fee is based on the cost of future expansion-related improvements (in current dollars) divided by the increase in system capacity associated with those improvements. Fees calculated under this approach represent the marginal cost of adding a unit of expansion. This approach excludes cost recovery for existing facilities and assets that provide benefit to new development.

Regardless of methodology chosen, impact fees can be easily adopted and updated by City Council through an ordinance process because they do not fall under the scrutiny of Proposition 218. However, impact fees can only be charged on new development, so revenues can only be driven by growth.

4.3 Funding Stormwater from Water and Sewer Enterprises
Another viable funding mechanism for Solvang’s stormwater costs is to allocate as many funds as possible from water and sewer enterprises. Securing this funding is viable to the extent that stormwater enterprises can be shown to provide benefit to water and sewer. Some examples of expense justification from water and sewer are:

- Quantifying the benefit to sewer of avoided capital expense from expanding the sewer system to accommodate stormwater
- Reimbursing stormwater for any shared assets between stormwater and water/wastewater
- Developing the stormwater system as a source of supply for the water system

Allocating expenses from these funds has the potential to remove some burden from stormwater rate and tax payers, but presents several challenges. First, some effort must be put into quantifying the exact benefit of stormwater to water and sewer. Second, declaring these expenses may incur increases to water and/or sewer rates, which are already facing public pressure to keep rates as low as possible.

4.4 Funding Stormwater through Grants and Loans
The City may also consider various grants and loans to supplement expenses. The State Water Resources Control Board has undertaken a Stormwater Project which outlines several funding sources for stormwater enterprises. Among these sources are Integrated Regional Water Management Grants, Clean Water State Revolving Fund Grants, Infrastructure State Revolving Fund Loans (I-Bank), and Bond Funds from transportation, climate change, SB985, and Proposition 1. Unfortunately, grants for stormwater are difficult to secure and many have already been claimed. They are awarded through a highly competitive process, have a narrow focus, and often require matching local funds. Similarly, any bond funds acquired must be secured by a reliable source of revenue, so they may only be appropriate for capital projects once a fee has been implemented.

SECTION 5: Stormwater Utility Funding Plan

Bartle Wells Associates recommends that the City implement balloted property-related fees through a majority vote and re-allocate funds from water and sewer enterprises, as they are the
most viable methods for consistent recovery of operation and capital costs. Property-related fees are a common and legally-defensible method of funding stormwater enterprises, and can be passed without the electorate through a mailed ballot to property owners that requires a simple majority to favor the fee. The City’s water and wastewater funds should also cover stormwater expenses to the extent that stormwater benefits those enterprises and can be quantified (avoided treatment costs, capital expansion expenses), without over-burdening rate payers. Should these two methods not sufficiently cover stormwater expenses, the City can turn to grants and loans for capital projects after they have adopted a steady revenue stream, or continue to receive support from the General Fund and/or Transient Occupancy Tax.

BWA calculates that full funding of the City’s stormwater plan would result in an annual rate of $557.63 per acre. It may not be possible to collect revenue on every acre in the City, so some contingencies may need to be built into this calculation. A typical rural single-family residence of 0.2 acres (approx. 8,700 square feet) would pay $111.53 per year, which is above the average annual stormwater rate in California of $86.92 per year, though there are very few recurring stormwater fees in the area (See Appendix Tables 4-6).

BWA also recommends that the City update their drainage impact fee, which may provide additional funds from new connections. Impact fees should be based on the City’s current assets, capital improvement plan, and projected growth. The average impact fee for a single-family residence in California is approximately $2,641, though there are very few stormwater impact fees in the surrounding area (See Appendix Tables 7-8).

SECTION 6: Conclusion

This report presents an analysis of current storm drain expenses and various funding mechanisms to satisfy the City of Solvang’s ongoing expenses given strict fee regulation under Proposition 218 and limited outside funding. The City can develop a comprehensive revenue strategy using the above funding categories. It is recommended that the City pursue a combination of available funding options in order to create the most politically and financially stable stream of revenue.
### Appendix Table 1
City of Solvang
Stormdrain (Drainage) Impact Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Class</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Per</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix Table 2
City of Solvang
Stormwater Cash Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In from Local Transportation</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A Funding</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$79,978</td>
<td>$704,916</td>
<td>$905,563</td>
<td>$936,530</td>
<td>$852,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Contribution</td>
<td>601,542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$686,542</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,099,578</td>
<td>$704,916</td>
<td>$905,563</td>
<td>$936,530</td>
<td>$852,826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries</strong></td>
<td>$58,224</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>$59,971</td>
<td>$61,770</td>
<td>$63,623</td>
<td>$65,532</td>
<td>$67,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FICA</strong></td>
<td>4,446</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4,579</td>
<td>4,717</td>
<td>4,858</td>
<td>5,004</td>
<td>5,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retirement</strong></td>
<td>6,460</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6,654</td>
<td>6,835</td>
<td>7,059</td>
<td>7,271</td>
<td>7,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cafeteria Plan</strong></td>
<td>7,287</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7,506</td>
<td>7,731</td>
<td>7,963</td>
<td>8,202</td>
<td>8,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worker’s Comp. Ins.</strong></td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>2,257</td>
<td>2,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>13,802</td>
<td>14,216</td>
<td>14,643</td>
<td>15,082</td>
<td>15,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Term Disability</strong></td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies</strong></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postage</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Equipment</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance</strong></td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2,762</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>2,931</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>3,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printing and Publishing</strong></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>1,311</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>1,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Services - SWMP</strong></td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>135,960</td>
<td>140,039</td>
<td>144,240</td>
<td>148,567</td>
<td>153,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storm Water Permit</strong></td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>40,170</td>
<td>41,375</td>
<td>42,616</td>
<td>43,895</td>
<td>45,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Sweeping</strong></td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6,386</td>
<td>6,578</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>6,978</td>
<td>7,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects</strong></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>21,218</td>
<td>21,855</td>
<td>22,510</td>
<td>23,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storm Drain Improvements</strong></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>30,900</td>
<td>31,827</td>
<td>32,782</td>
<td>33,765</td>
<td>34,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Stormwater Report</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>10,609</td>
<td>10,927</td>
<td>11,255</td>
<td>11,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Improvement</strong></td>
<td>352,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>755,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$686,542</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,099,578</td>
<td>$704,916</td>
<td>$905,563</td>
<td>$936,530</td>
<td>$852,826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Table 3
City of Solvang
Stormwater Capital Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stormwater Management Program</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$1,627,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Second Street Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure A</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stormwater Resources Plan</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stormwater Management Program Funding &amp; Rate Study</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stormwater Quality Modeling</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Storm Drain Trash Capture Improvements</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$820,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Storm Drain System Atlas Map Enhancement</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Drainage Improvements at Various Locations</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Drainage Master Plan</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Storm Drain Outfall/Manhole Improvements</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Adobe Creek Culvert Replacement Project</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Misc Capital Improvement</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$352,000</td>
<td>$755,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$465,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$535,000</td>
<td>$4,412,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Solvang FY 2016/17

## Appendix Table 4
City of Solvang
Stormwater Rate Calculation

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Cost 2016/17 – 2021/22</td>
<td>$864,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Acre per Year</td>
<td>$557.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Acre per Month</td>
<td>$46.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - Includes projected budget expenses and capital plan from Table 2
## Appendix Table 5

### City of Solvang

**Storm Drain Rate Survey: Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Rate Description</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Rate Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Alameda</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Los Angeles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Single Family Residential Parcel</td>
<td>$56.15 per year</td>
<td>Stormwater Pollution Abatement Charge</td>
<td>$23.00 per EDU per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium</td>
<td>$16.85 per unit per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of El Cerrito</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Elk Grove</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>$58.00 per year</td>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>$5.34 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family Residential (2 - 20 Units)</td>
<td>$43.50 per unit per year</td>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>$16.85 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Industrial</td>
<td>$870.00 per acre per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>$406.00 per acre per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>$11.60 per acre per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Elk Grove</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Burlingame</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of San Jose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Palo Alto</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>$94.44 per year</td>
<td>All Users</td>
<td>$13.89 per equivalent residential unit per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Multi-Family Residence (5+)</td>
<td>$51.60 per unit per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Multi-Family Residence (3-4)</td>
<td>$179.40 per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Condo</td>
<td>$51.60 per unit per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>$47.28 per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of San Diego</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Monrovia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residence 1-3 rooms</td>
<td>$7.53 per month</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>$1.68 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 rooms</td>
<td>$9.58 per month</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>$1.25 each additional unit per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7 rooms</td>
<td>$11.31 per month</td>
<td>Trailer</td>
<td>$2.55 1st space per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9 rooms</td>
<td>$13.38 per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 rooms</td>
<td>$15.25 per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 15</td>
<td>$1.19 per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>$0.001928 per month per sq. ft of gross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surface area per per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries, Parks and Airports</td>
<td>$0.001928 per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Non-Residential Rate</td>
<td>$8.39 per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Regina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Davis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Industrial</td>
<td>$1.90 per account bimonthly</td>
<td>Churchs</td>
<td>$0.000464 per sq ft per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Users</td>
<td></td>
<td>Private Day Care</td>
<td>$0.000232 per sq ft per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up to 1000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group Living</td>
<td>$0.000232 per sq ft per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 - 3000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$0.000464 per sq ft per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001 - 5,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$0.000928 per sq ft per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 7,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>All Other Users</td>
<td>$0.000232 per sq ft per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001 - 9,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001 - 11,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,001 - 13,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,001 - 15,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 17,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,001 - 19,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,001 - 21,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,001 - 23,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,001 - 25,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 - 27,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27,001 - 29,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29,001 - 31,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 31,000 m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Table 6
City of Solvang
Storm Drain Rate Survey: Chart

Single Family Residence Annual Stormwater Rates, FY 2016/17

Assumes 0.2 acres, 2,500 square feet impervious surface area
All rates converted to annual
# Appendix Table 7

City of Solvang

Storm Drain Capacity Fee Survey: Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Burlingame</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Escondido</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$781.00 per dwelling unit</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$1,092.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>$391.00 per dwelling unit</td>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>$437.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$442.00 per 1,000 sqft of building</td>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>$0.71 per sq ft of roof area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$717.00 per 1,000 sqft of building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$628.00 per 1,000 sqft of building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Upland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$186.00 per residence</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>$2,856.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus</td>
<td>$28.00 for each 100 sq ft of roof area in excess of 750 sqft</td>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>$2,315.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>$466.00 per space</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$4,029.00 per 1,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>$186.00</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$3,570.00 per 1,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus</td>
<td>$28.00 for each 100 sq ft of roof area 750 - 3,000 sqft</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$2,968.00 per 1,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus</td>
<td>$0.06 for each sq ft of roof area in excess of 3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus</td>
<td>$0.02 per sq ft of site area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St Helena</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Redlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$0.73 per sq ft</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>$700.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>$0.69 per sq ft</td>
<td>Multi Family Residential</td>
<td>$343.00 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$1.65 per sq ft</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$0.17 per sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$1.65 per sq ft</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$0.17 per sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$1.65 per sq ft</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$0.15 per sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>$1.28 per sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Norco</td>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Moraga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$0.404 per sq ft</td>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>$9,055.00 per dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$0.277 per sq ft</td>
<td>Multi Family / Duplex</td>
<td>$4,528.00 per dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$2,545.00 per unit</td>
<td>Senior Housing</td>
<td>$1,080.00 per dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>$210.00 per unit</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$46,419.00 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Livermore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/Duplex</td>
<td>$2.42 per sq ft impervious surface area</td>
<td>Residential - Low Density</td>
<td>$564.00 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>$2.42 per sq ft impervious surface area</td>
<td>Residential - High Density</td>
<td>$868.00 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$3.42 per sq ft impervious surface area</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$1,528.00 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial - Assembly Hall</td>
<td>$564.00 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$1,128.00 per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Low Density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - High Density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$1,658.00 per 1000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$1,481.00 per 1000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$987.00 per 1000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Soledad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>$3,526.00 per unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Family</td>
<td>$2,328.00 per unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$1,680.00 per 1000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$1,481.00 per 1000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$987.00 per 1000 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix Table 8
City of Solvang
Storm Drain Impact Fee Survey: Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Annual Rate, $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solvang</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>1,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Valley</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>2,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norco</td>
<td>2,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>2,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>3,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>6,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helena</td>
<td>6,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraga</td>
<td>9,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: $2,641

Assumes 8,712 square feet, 0.2 acres
Appendix: Proposition 218 – The Right to Vote on Taxes Act

This initiative measure adds Articles XIII C and D to the California Constitution.

RIGHT TO VOTE ON TAXES ACT

SECTION 1. TITLE.
This act shall be known and may be cited as the "Right to Vote on Taxes Act."

SECTION 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.
The people of the State of California hereby find and declare that Proposition 13 was intended to provide effective tax relief and to require voter approval of tax increases. However, local governments have subjected taxpayers to excessive tax, assessment, fee and charge increases that not only frustrate the purposes of voter approval for tax increases, but also threaten the economic security of all Californians and the California economy itself. This measure protects taxpayers by limiting the methods by which local governments exact revenue from taxpayers without their consent.

SECTION 3. VOTER APPROVAL FOR LOCAL TAX LEVIES.
Article XIII C is added to the California Constitution to read:

ARTICLE XIII C
SECTION 1. Definitions. As used in this article:

(a) "General tax" means any tax imposed for general governmental purposes.

(b) "Local government" means any county, city, city and county, including a charter city or county, any special district, or any other local or regional governmental entity.

(c) "Special district" means an agency of the state, formed pursuant to general law or a special act, for the local performance of governmental or proprietary functions with limited geographic boundaries including, but not limited to, school districts and redevelopment agencies.

(d) "Special tax" means any tax imposed for specific purposes, including a tax imposed for specific purposes, which is placed into a general fund.

SEC. 2. Local Government Tax Limitation. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution:

(a) All taxes imposed by any local government shall be deemed to be either general taxes or special taxes. Special purpose districts or agencies, including school districts, shall have no power to levy general taxes.
(b) No local government may impose, extend, or increase any general tax unless and until that tax is submitted to the electorate and approved by a majority vote. A general tax shall not be deemed to have been increased if it is imposed at a rate not higher than the maximum rate so approved. The election required by this subdivision shall be consolidated with a regularly scheduled general election for members of the governing body of the local government, except in cases of emergency declared by a unanimous vote of the governing body.

(c) Any general tax imposed, extended, or increased, without voter approval, by any local government on or after January 1, 1995, and prior to the effective date of this article, shall continue to be imposed only if approved by a majority vote of the voters voting in an election on the issue of the imposition, which election shall be held within two years of the effective date of this article and in compliance with subdivision (b).

(d) No local government may impose, extend, or increase any special tax unless and until that tax is submitted to the electorate and approved by a two-thirds vote. A special tax shall not be deemed to have been increased if it is imposed at a rate not higher than the maximum rate so approved.

SEC. 3. Initiative Power for Local Taxes, Assessments, Fees and Charges
Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, including, but not limited to, Sections 8 and 9 of Article II, the initiative power shall not be prohibited or otherwise limited in matters of reducing or repealing any local tax, assessment, fee or charge. The power of initiative to affect local taxes, assessments, fees and charges shall be applicable to all local governments and neither the Legislature nor any local government charter shall impose a signature requirement higher than that applicable to statewide statutory initiatives.

SECTION 4. ASSESSMENT AND PROPERTY RELATED FEE REFORM.
Article XIII D is added to the California Constitution to read:

ARTICLE XIII D

SECTION 1. Application
Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this article shall apply to all assessments, fees and charges, whether imposed pursuant to state statute or local government charter authority. Nothing in this article or Article XIII C shall be construed to:

(a) Provide any new authority to any agency to impose a tax, assessment, fee, or charge.

(b) Affect existing laws relating to the imposition of fees or charges as a condition of property development.

(c) Affect existing laws relating to the imposition of timber yield taxes.
SEC. 2. Definitions.
As used in this article:
(a) "Agency" means any local government as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1 of Article XIII C.

(b) "Assessment" means any levy or charge upon real property by an agency for a special benefit conferred upon the real property. "Assessment" includes, but is not limited to, "special assessment," "benefit assessment," "maintenance assessment" and "special assessment tax."

(c) "Capital cost" means the cost of acquisition, installation, construction, reconstruction, or replacement of a permanent public improvement by an agency.

(d) "District" means an area determined by an agency to contain all parcels which will receive a special benefit from a proposed public improvement or property-related service.

(e) "Fee" or "charge" means any levy other than an ad valorem tax, a special tax, or an assessment, imposed by an agency upon a parcel or upon a person as an incident of property ownership, including a user fee or charge for a property related service.

(f) "Maintenance and operation expenses" means the cost of rent, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, fuel, power, electrical current, care, and supervision necessary to properly operate and maintain a permanent public improvement.

(g) "Property ownership" shall be deemed to include tenancies of real property where tenants are directly liable to pay the assessment, fee, or charge in question.

(h) "Property-related service" means a public service having a direct relationship to property ownership.

(i) "Special benefit" means a particular and distinct benefit over and above general benefits conferred on real property located in the district or to the public at large. General enhancement of property value does not constitute "special benefit."

SEC. 3. Property Taxes, Assessments, Fees and Charges Limited
(a) No tax, assessment, fee, or charge shall be assessed by any agency upon any parcel of property or upon any person as an incident of property ownership except:

(1) The ad valorem property tax imposed pursuant to Article XIII and Article XIII A.

(2) Any special tax receiving a two-thirds vote pursuant to Section 4 of Article XIII A.

(3) Assessments as provided by this article.
(4) Fees or charges for property related services as provided by this article.

(b) For purposes of this article, fees for the provision of electrical or gas service shall not be deemed charges or fees imposed as an incident of property ownership.

SEC. 4. Procedures and Requirements for All Assessments

(a) An agency which proposes to levy an assessment shall identify all parcels which will have a special benefit conferred upon them and upon which an assessment will be imposed. The proportionate special benefit derived by each identified parcel shall be determined in relationship to the entirety of the capital cost of a public improvement, the maintenance and operation expenses of a public improvement, or the cost of the property related service being provided. No assessment shall be imposed on any parcel which exceeds the reasonable cost of the proportional special benefit conferred on that parcel. Only special benefits are assessable, and an agency shall separate the general benefits from the special benefits conferred on a parcel. Parcels within a district that are owned or used by any agency, the State of California or the United States shall not be exempt from assessment unless the agency can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that those publicly owned parcels in fact receive no special benefit.

(b) All assessments shall be supported by a detailed engineer's report prepared by a registered professional engineer certified by the State of California.

(c) The amount of the proposed assessment for each identified parcel shall be calculated and the record owner of each parcel shall be given written notice by mail of the proposed assessment, the total amount thereof chargeable to the entire district, the amount chargeable to the owner's particular parcel, the duration of the payments, the reason for the assessment and the basis upon which the amount of the proposed assessment was calculated, together with the date, time, and location of a public hearing on the proposed assessment. Each notice shall also include, in a conspicuous place thereon, a summary of the procedures applicable to the completion, return, and tabulation of the ballots required pursuant to subdivision (d), including a disclosure statement that the existence of a majority protest, as defined in subdivision (e), will result in the assessment not being imposed.

(d) Each notice mailed to owners of identified parcels within the district pursuant to subdivision (c) shall contain a ballot which includes the agency's address for receipt of the ballot once completed by any owner receiving the notice whereby the owner may indicate his or her name, reasonable identification of the parcel, and his or her support or opposition to the proposed assessment.

(e) The agency shall conduct a public hearing upon the proposed assessment not less than 45 days after mailing the notice of the proposed assessment to record owners of each identified parcel. At the public hearing, the agency shall consider all protests against the proposed assessment and tabulate the ballots. The agency shall not impose an assessment if there is a majority protest. A majority protest exists if,
upon the conclusion of the hearing, ballots submitted in opposition to the assessment exceed the ballots submitted in favor of the assessment. In tabulating the ballots, the ballots shall be weighted according to the proportional financial obligation of the affected property.

(f) In any legal action contesting the validity of any assessment, the burden shall be on the agency to demonstrate that the property or properties in question receive a special benefit over and above the benefits conferred on the public at large and that the amount of any contested assessment is proportional to, and no greater than, the benefits conferred on the property or properties in question.

(g) Because only special benefits are assessable, electors residing within the district who do not own property within the district shall not be deemed under this Constitution to have been deprived of the right to vote for any assessment. If a court determines that the Constitution of the United States or other federal law requires otherwise, the assessment shall not be imposed unless approved by a two-thirds vote of the electorate in the district in addition to being approved by the property owners as required by subdivision (e).

SEC. 5. Effective Date
Pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 10 of Article II, the provisions of this article shall become effective the day after the election unless otherwise provided. Beginning July 1, 1997, all existing, new, or increased assessments shall comply with this article. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the following assessments existing on the effective date of this article shall be exempt from the procedures and approval process set forth in Section 4:

(a) Any assessment imposed exclusively to finance the capital costs or maintenance and operation expenses for sidewalks, streets, sewers, water, flood control, drainage systems or vector control. Subsequent increases in such assessments shall be subject to the procedures and approval process set forth in Section 4.

(b) Any assessment imposed pursuant to a petition signed by the persons owning all of the parcels subject to the assessment at the time the assessment is initially imposed. Subsequent increases in such assessments shall be subject to the procedures and approval process set forth in Section 4.

(c) Any assessment the proceeds of which are exclusively used to repay bonded indebtedness of which the failure to pay would violate the Contract Impairment Clause of the Constitution of the United States.

(d) Any assessment which previously received majority voter approval from the voters voting in an election on the issue of the assessment. Subsequent increases in those assessments shall be subject to the procedures and approval process set forth in Section 4.
SEC. 6. Property Related Fees and Charges

(a) Procedures for New or Increased Fees and Charges. An agency shall follow the procedures pursuant to this section in imposing or increasing any fee or charge as defined pursuant to this article, including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) The parcels upon which a fee or charge is proposed for imposition shall be identified. The amount of the fee or charge proposed to be imposed upon each parcel shall be calculated. The agency shall provide written notice by mail of the proposed fee or charge to the record owner of each identified parcel upon which the fee or charge is proposed for imposition, the amount of the fee or charge proposed to be imposed upon each, the basis upon which the amount of the proposed fee or charge was calculated, the reason for the fee or charge, together with the date, time, and location of a public hearing on the proposed fee or charge.

(2) The agency shall conduct a public hearing upon the proposed fee or charge not less than 45 days after mailing the notice of the proposed fee or charge to the record owners of each identified parcel upon which the fee or charge is proposed for imposition. At the public hearing, the agency shall consider all protests against the proposed fee or charge. If written protests against the proposed fee or charge are presented by a majority of owners of the identified parcels, the agency shall not impose the fee or charge.

(b) Requirements for Existing, New or Increased Fees and Charges. A fee or charge shall not be extended, imposed, or increased by any agency unless it meets all of the following requirements:

(1) Revenues derived from the fee or charge shall not exceed the funds required to provide the property related service.

(2) Revenues derived from the fee or charge shall not be used for any purpose other than that for which the fee or charge was imposed.

(3) The amount of a fee or charge imposed upon any parcel or person as an incident of property ownership shall not exceed the proportional cost of the service attributable to the parcel.

(4) No fee or charge may be imposed for a service unless that service is actually used by, or immediately available to, the owner of the property in question. Fees or charges based on potential or future use of a service are not permitted. Standby charges, whether characterized as charges or assessments, shall be classified as assessments and shall not be imposed without compliance with Section 4.

(5) No fee or charge may be imposed for general governmental services including, but not limited to, police, fire, ambulance or library services, where the service is available to the public at large in substantially the same manner as it is to property owners. Reliance by an agency on any parcel map,
including, but not limited to, an assessor's parcel map, may be considered a significant factor in determining whether a fee or charge is imposed as an incident of property ownership for purposes of this article. In any legal action contesting the validity of a fee or charge, the burden shall be on the agency to demonstrate compliance with this article.

(c) Voter Approval for New or Increased Fees and Charges. Except for fees or charges for sewer, water, and refuse collection services, no property related fee or charge shall be imposed or increased unless and until that fee or charge is submitted and approved by a majority vote of the property owners of the property subject to the fee or charge or, at the option of the agency, by a two-thirds vote of the electorate residing in the affected area. The election shall be conducted not less than 45 days after the public hearing. An agency may adopt procedures similar to those for increases in assessments in the conduct of elections under this subdivision.

(d) Beginning July 1, 1997, all fees or charges shall comply with this section.

SECTION 5. LIBERAL CONSTRUCTION

The provisions of this act shall be liberally construed to effectuate its purposes of limiting local government revenue and enhancing taxpayer consent.

SECTION 6. SEVERABILITY

If any provision of this act, or part thereof, is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional, the remaining sections shall not be affected, but shall remain in full force and effect, and to this end the provisions of this act are severable.
I. RECOMMENDATION:

Appoint Council Member Toussaint as the Voting Delegate for the annual conference in Sacramento, September 13-15, 2017, and discuss and provide City Council direction to the Voting Delegate on the position Solvang should take on the League of California Cities’ (LOCC) annual Resolutions.

II. DISCUSSION:

The League’s 2017 Annual Conference is scheduled for September 13-17 in Sacramento. The Annual Business Meeting (at the General Assembly) is scheduled for 12:30 p.m. on Friday, September 15th.

In order for the City of Solvang to vote at the Annual Business Meeting the City Council must designate a voting delegate. Per the League’s bylaws the designation of a voting delegate must be done by City Council action.

At this time, only Council Member Toussaint has scheduled to attend the annual conference.
This year, two Resolutions have been submitted for consideration at the Annual Luncheon Business Meeting on September 15 and referred to the League policy committee. The League bylaws provide that resolutions shall be referred by the President to an appropriate policy committee for review and recommendation. Resolutions with committee recommendations are then referred to the General Resolutions Committee at the Annual Conference. The League encourages each city council to consider the resolutions and to determine a position so that the city’s voting delegate can represent the city’s position on each.

The resolutions are described as follows and are included as an attachment with all of the associated support material as submitted by the LOCC.

1. A Resolution calling upon the Governor and legislature to enter into discussion with League and other public safety stakeholders to identify and implement strategies that will reduce the unintended negative impacts of existing criminal law

2. A Resolution supporting legislation amending Government Code Section 38611 to clarify the definition of local control providing broad statutory authority for local officials to determine emergency service levels and direct emergency medical response within their jurisdictions

III. ALTERNATIVES:

The City Council could designate up to two alternate voting delegates; and could choose to support one, or both, or neither of the resolutions.

IV. FISCAL IMPACT:

None with this action.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Correspondence from the League with Voting Delegate Form
- LOCC Resolution Packet
May 3, 2017

TO: Mayors, City Managers and City Clerks

RE: DESIGNATION OF VOTING DELEGATES AND ALTERNATES
League of California Cities Annual Conference – September 13 – 15, Sacramento

The League’s 2017 Annual Conference is scheduled for September 13 – 15 in Sacramento. An important part of the Annual Conference is the Annual Business Meeting (during General Assembly), scheduled for 12:30 p.m. on Friday, September 15, at the Sacramento Convention Center. At this meeting, the League membership considers and takes action on resolutions that establish League policy.

In order to vote at the Annual Business Meeting, your city council must designate a voting delegate. Your city may also appoint up to two alternate voting delegates, one of whom may vote in the event that the designated voting delegate is unable to serve in that capacity.

Please complete the attached Voting Delegate form and return it to the League’s office no later than Friday, September 1, 2017. This will allow us time to establish voting delegate/alternate records prior to the conference.

Please note the following procedures that are intended to ensure the integrity of the voting process at the Annual Business Meeting.

- **Action by Council Required.** Consistent with League bylaws, a city’s voting delegate and up to two alternates must be designated by the city council. When completing the attached Voting Delegate form, please attach either a copy of the council resolution that reflects the council action taken, or have your city clerk or mayor sign the form affirming that the names provided are those selected by the city council. Please note that designating the voting delegate and alternates must be done by city council action and cannot be accomplished by individual action of the mayor or city manager alone.

- **Conference Registration Required.** The voting delegate and alternates must be registered to attend the conference. They need not register for the entire conference; they may register for Friday only. To register for the conference, please go to our website: www.cacities.org. In order to cast a vote, at least one voter must be present at the
Business Meeting and in possession of the voting delegate card. Voting delegates and alternates need to pick up their conference badges before signing in and picking up the voting delegate card at the Voting Delegate Desk. This will enable them to receive the special sticker on their name badges that will admit them into the voting area during the Business Meeting.

- **Transferring Voting Card to Non-Designated Individuals Not Allowed.** The voting delegate card may be transferred freely between the voting delegate and alternates, but only between the voting delegate and alternates. If the voting delegate and alternates find themselves unable to attend the Business Meeting, they may *not* transfer the voting card to another city official.

- **Seating Protocol during General Assembly.** At the Business Meeting, individuals with the voting card will sit in a separate area. Admission to this area will be limited to those individuals with a special sticker on their name badge identifying them as a voting delegate or alternate. If the voting delegate and alternates wish to sit together, they must sign in at the Voting Delegate Desk and obtain the special sticker on their badges.

The Voting Delegate Desk, located in the conference registration area of the Sacramento Convention Center, will be open at the following times: Wednesday, September 13, 8:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.; Thursday, September 14, 7:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.; and Friday, September 15, 7:30 a.m.–Noon. The Voting Delegate Desk will also be open at the Business Meeting on Friday, but will be closed during roll calls and voting.

The voting procedures that will be used at the conference are attached to this memo. Please share these procedures and this memo with your council and especially with the individuals that your council designates as your city’s voting delegate and alternates.

Once again, thank you for completing the voting delegate and alternate form and returning it to the League office by Friday, September 1. If you have questions, please call Carly Shelby at (916) 658-8279.

**Attachments:**

- Annual Conference Voting Procedures
- Voting Delegate/Alternate Form
Annual Conference Voting Procedures

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. **Resolving Disputes.** In case of dispute, the Credentials Committee will determine the validity of signatures on petitioned resolutions and the right of a city official to vote at the Business Meeting.
2017 ANNUAL CONFERENCE
VOTING DELEGATE/ALTERNATE FORM

Please complete this form and return it to the League office by Friday, September 1, 2017. Forms not sent by this deadline may be submitted to the Voting Delegate Desk located in the Annual Conference Registration Area. Your city council may designate one voting delegate and up to two alternates.

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

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

1. VOTING DELEGATE

Name: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________

2. VOTING DELEGATE - ALTERNATE

Name: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________

3. VOTING DELEGATE - ALTERNATE

Name: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________

PLEASE ATTACH COUNCIL RESOLUTION DESIGNATING VOTING DELEGATE AND ALTERNATES.

OR

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

Name: ____________________________ E-mail ____________________________

Mayor or City Clerk ______________ Phone: ____________________________
(circle one) (signature)

Date: ____________________________

Please complete and return by Friday, September 1, 2017

League of California Cities
ATTN: Carly Shelby
1400 K Street, 4th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

FAX: (916) 658-8240
E-mail: cshelby@cacities.org
(916) 658-8279
Annual Conference
Resolutions Packet

2017 Annual Conference Resolutions

Sacramento, California
September 13 – 15, 2017
INFORMATION AND PROCEDURES

RESOLUTIONS CONTAINED IN THIS PACKET: The League bylaws provide that resolutions shall be referred by the president to an appropriate policy committee for review and recommendation. Resolutions with committee recommendations shall then be considered by the General Resolutions Committee at the Annual Conference.

This year, two resolutions have been introduced for consideration by the Annual Conference and referred to the League policy committees.

POLICY COMMITTEES: One policy committee will meet at the Annual Conference to consider and take action on the resolutions referred to it. The committee is Public Safety. The committee will meet from 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, September 13, at the Hyatt Regency. The sponsors of the resolutions have been notified of the time and location of the meeting.

GENERAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE: This committee will meet at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 14, at the Hyatt Regency in Sacramento, to consider the report of the policy committee regarding the resolutions. This committee includes one representative from each of the League’s regional divisions, functional departments and standing policy committees, as well as other individuals appointed by the League president. Please check in at the registration desk for room location.

ANNUAL LUNCHEON/BUSINESS MEETING/GENERAL ASSEMBLY: This meeting will be held at 12:30 p.m. on Friday, September 15, at the Sacramento Convention Center.

PETITIONED RESOLUTIONS: For those issues that develop after the normal 60-day deadline, a resolution may be introduced at the Annual Conference with a petition signed by designated voting delegates of 10 percent of all member cities (48 valid signatures required) and presented to the Voting Delegates Desk at least 24 hours prior to the time set for convening the Annual Business Meeting of the General Assembly. This year, that deadline is 12:30 p.m., Thursday, September 14. Resolutions can be viewed on the League's Web site: www.cacities.org/resolutions.

Any questions concerning the resolutions procedures may be directed to Meg Desmond at the League office: mdesmond@cacities.org or (916) 658-8224.
GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS

Policy development is a vital and ongoing process within the League. The principal means for deciding policy on the important issues facing cities is through the League’s seven standing policy committees and the board of directors. The process allows for timely consideration of issues in a changing environment and assures city officials the opportunity to both initiate and influence policy decisions.

Annual conference resolutions constitute an additional way to develop League policy. Resolutions should adhere to the following criteria.

Guidelines for Annual Conference Resolutions

1. Only issues that have a direct bearing on municipal affairs should be considered or adopted at the Annual Conference.

2. The issue is not of a purely local or regional concern.

3. The recommended policy should not simply restate existing League policy.

4. The resolution should be directed at achieving one of the following objectives:

   (a) Focus public or media attention on an issue of major importance to cities.

   (b) Establish a new direction for League policy by establishing general principles around which more detailed policies may be developed by policy committees and the board of directors.

   (c) Consider important issues not adequately addressed by the policy committees and board of directors.

   (d) Amend the League bylaws (requires 2/3 vote at General Assembly).
LOCATION OF MEETINGS

**Policy Committee Meetings**
Wednesday, September 13
Hyatt Regency Sacramento
1209 L Street, Sacramento
9:00 – 11:00 a.m.: Public Safety

**General Resolutions Committee**
Thursday, September 14, 1:00 p.m.
Hyatt Regency Sacramento
1209 L Street, Sacramento

**Annual Business Meeting and General Assembly Luncheon**
Friday, September 15, 12:30 p.m.
Sacramento Convention Center
1400 J Street, Sacramento
KEY TO ACTIONS TAKEN ON RESOLUTIONS

Resolutions have been grouped by policy committees to which they have been assigned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Key Word Index</th>
<th>Reviewing Body Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Policy Committee Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - General Resolutions Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - General Assembly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE

| 1 | Implement Strategies to Reduce Negative Impacts of Recent Changes to Criminal Laws |
| 2 | Local Control for Emergency Medical Response |

Information pertaining to the Annual Conference Resolutions will also be posted on each committee’s page on the League website: www.cacities.org. The entire Resolutions Packet will be posted at: www.cacities.org/resolutions.
KEY TO ACTIONS TAKEN ON RESOLUTIONS (Continued)

Resolutions have been grouped by policy committees to which they have been assigned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY TO REVIEWING BODIES</th>
<th>KEY TO ACTIONS TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Policy Committee</td>
<td>A Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. General Resolutions Committee</td>
<td>D Disapprove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General Assembly</td>
<td>N No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R Refer to appropriate policy committee for study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION FOOTNOTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footnote</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Amend+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Approve as amended+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Approve with additional amendment(s)+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>Refer as amended to appropriate policy committee for study+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raa</td>
<td>Additional amendments and refer+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da</td>
<td>Amend (for clarity or brevity) and Disapprove+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Amend (for clarity or brevity) and take No Action+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Withdrawn by Sponsor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedural Note:**
The League of California Cities resolution process at the Annual Conference is guided by the League Bylaws. A helpful explanation of this process can be found on the League’s website by clicking on this link: [Resolution Process](#).
2017 ANNUAL CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION REFERRED TO PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE

1. A RESOLUTION OF THE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES CALLING UPON THE GOVERNOR AND LEGISLATURE TO ENTER INTO DISCUSSION WITH LEAGUE AND OTHER PUBLIC SAFETY STAKEHOLDERS TO IDENTIFY AND IMPLEMENT STRATEGIES THAT WILL REDUCE THE UNINTENDED NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF EXISTING CRIMINAL LAW

Source: City of Whittier
Concurrence of five or more cities/city officials: Cities: La Mirada; Lakewood; Monrovia; Pico Rivera; Rolling Hills; Santa Fe Springs; and South Gate
Referred to: Public Safety Policy Committee
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:

WHEREAS, during the past several years, State legislative changes have made fundamental alterations to the fabric of California’s criminal justice system. Many of those changes have been needed and necessary, as not all crimes should be punished with jail sentences; and

WHEREAS, California cities, counties, and the State, however, are facing increased crime which endangers the health and safety of police officers, residents, business owners, and property due to some of these legislative changes which created a situation where violent and career criminals are serving little to no prison time; and

WHEREAS, negative impacts from State legislative changes have been far reaching and crime rates and the number of victims are skyrocketing throughout California. The negative impacts of these laws were unintended when voters and legislators approved the laws, which were instead intended to help lower the prison population in California prisons and appropriately rehabilitate non-violent offenders; and

WHEREAS, incentives for offenders to voluntarily enroll in substance abuse programs have diminished, which has had the effect of eroding the safety of our communities; and

WHEREAS, AB 109 transferred nearly 45,000 felons from the State prison system to local jail facilities, which were not designed to house criminals on a long-term basis and were unprepared for such an increase in incarcerations, resulting in lower-level criminals being released early, directly impacting rising property crime rates throughout the State; and

WHEREAS, many probationers who have severe mental illness are released into communities where they continue to commit crimes that adversely impact the safety of community members and drain the resources of probation departments and police departments throughout the state; and
WHEREAS, Proposition 47, The Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act, downgraded a number of serious crimes from felonies to misdemeanors—drug possession, repeated shoplifting, forging checks, gun theft, and possession of date-rape drugs; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 57 categorizes rape by intoxication, rape of an unconscious person, human trafficking involving sex with minors, drive-by shooting, assault with a deadly weapon, domestic violence, hate crime causing physical injury, and corporal injury to a child as “non-violent” felonies and offenders convicted of violating such laws are able to avoid appropriate prison sentences; and

WHEREAS, under Proposition 57, criminals who commit multiple crimes against multiple victims will be eligible for release at the same time as offenders who only committed a single crime against a single victim and allows repeat criminals to be eligible for release after the same period of incarceration as first time offenders; and

WHEREAS, cities must join together to voice their concerns for these legislative changes that have created an adverse impact on the safety of residents and businesses in local communities.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the General Assembly of the League of California Cities, assembled in Sacramento on September 15, 2017, to:

1. Direct League staff to consider creating a task force with other organizations and jointly commission a report on the unintended negative impacts of recent and future criminal law based on appropriate documentation by local agencies to identify necessary changes, working with key stakeholders to promote support for resulting advocacy efforts.

2. Promote an amendment of appropriate sections of AB 109 to change the criteria justifying the release of non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender inmates to include their total criminal and mental health history instead of only their last criminal conviction.

3. Continue to advocate to place into law that for the purposes of Section 32 of Article I of the California Constitution, a violent offense includes any of the following:

   - Murder or voluntary manslaughter.
   - Mayhem.
   - Rape.
   - Sodomy by force, violence, duress, menace, or threat of great bodily harm.
   - Oral copulation by force, violence, duress, menace, or threat of great bodily harm.
   - Lewd acts on a child under the age of 14 years.
   - Any felony punishable by death or imprisonment in the state prison for life.
   - Any other felony in which the defendant inflicts great or serious bodily injury on any person, other than an accomplice, that has been charged and proven, or any felony in which the defendant uses a firearm which use has been charged and proven.
   - Attempted murder.
   - Assault with intent to commit rape or robbery.
- Assault with a deadly weapon or instrument on a peace officer.
- Assault by a life prisoner on a non-inmate.
- Assault with a deadly weapon by an inmate.
- Arson.
- Exploding a destructive device or any explosive with intent to injure.
- Exploding a destructive device or any explosive causing great bodily injury.
- Exploding a destructive device or any explosive with intent to murder.
- Robbery.
- Kidnapping.
- Taking of a hostage by an inmate of a state prison.
- Attempt to commit a felony punishable by death or imprisonment in the state prison for life.
- Any felony in which the defendant personally used a dangerous or deadly weapon.
- Escape from a state prison by use of force or violence.
- Assault with a deadly weapon.
- Extortion as defined in Penal Code section 518, or threats to victims or witnesses as defined in Penal Code section 136.1, which would constitute a felony violation of Penal Code section 186.22.
- Carjacking.
- Discharge of a firearm at an inhabited dwelling, vehicle, or aircraft.
- Throwing acid or flammable substances with intent to injure.
- Continuous sexual abuse of a child.

4. Request the State to improve the Smart Justice platform to provide an effective statewide data sharing to allow state and local law enforcement agencies to rapidly and efficiently share offender information to assist in tracking and monitoring the activities of AB 109 and other offenders.

5. Encourage the collection and organization of real world data from cities and counties on the universe of post-release community supervision (PRCS) offenders.

6. Encourage cities throughout California to join in these advocacy efforts to mitigate the unintended negative impacts of recent policy changes to the criminal justice system.

7. Call for the Governor and the Legislature to work with the League and others stakeholders to consider and implement such criminal justice system reforms.

///////////
Background Information on Resolution No. 1

Source: City of Whittier

Background:
During the past several years, State legislative changes have made fundamental alterations to the fabric of California’s criminal justice system. Some changes have been needed, as not all crimes should be punished with jail sentences. These changes included AB 109 as well as Propositions 47 and 57.

Approved in 2011, AB 109 was approved, transferring nearly 45,000 felons from the State prison system to local jail systems, resulting in lower-level criminals being released early. Then, Proposition 47, so called The Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act, was approved by California voters in 2014. It reclassified and downgraded a number of serious crimes from felonies to misdemeanors. Similarly, Proposition 57, called The Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act, was approved by voters in 2016 and allows the State to provide for the release of up to 30,000 criminals convicted of “non-violent” felonies, including rape by intoxication, driveby shooting, human trafficking involving sex act with minors, assault with a deadly weapon, to name a few. Additionally, under Prop 57 repeat criminals are eligible for release after the same period of incarceration as first time offenders.

Now, California cities and counties are facing increasing crime rates which are being connected to these legislative actions which created a situation where violent and career criminals are serving little to no prison time while low-level offenders commit multiple crimes with limited consequences. This increasing level of crime endangers the health and safety of our residents, police officers, and property. Negative impacts from these State legislative changes have been far reaching, and crime rates and the number of victims are increasing throughout California. The negative impacts of these laws were unintended when voters and legislators approved the laws, which were instead intended to help lower the prison population in California prisons and appropriately rehabilitate non-violent offenders.

As an example, the Public Policy Institute of California reports since 2015:

- California has experienced an uptick in overall crime
- Property crime is up 145%, violent crime up 54%
- One in four Californians view violence and street crime in their community as a substantial problem
- Arrests dropped 31% for property crimes and 68% for drug offenses (due to Prop. 47)
- The report concludes auto theft increase is a direct result of AB109

To make matters even worse, during the past two years we’ve seen officers shot, wounded and killed in communities throughout California including Whittier, Downey, Lancaster, Palm Springs, San Diego, Stanislaus County, and Modoc County. Further, the number of U.S. police officers killed in the line of duty hit a five-year high in 2016. The National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund’s preliminary report shows that this year's 135 fatalities were a 10% increase over the 123 officers who died in the line of duty last year.
When taken together the increases in crime in our communities and reductions in arrests for many crimes plus violent attacks against police officers underscores the need for a call to action amongst California’s state and local leaders. This conference resolution is an important first step and seeks to initiate both a dialogue as well as actions to begin reforming California’s criminal justice system by requesting that League staff analyze the negative impacts of recent criminal law, identify necessary changes, and work with stakeholders to promote support for such advocacy efforts. The resolution also calls on the Governor, Legislature, cities, and other stakeholders to work together toward reforms.

The resolution contains three specific reforms:

1. **Address Issues with AB 109**

   The conference resolution promotes the amendment of appropriate sections of AB 109 to change the criteria justifying the release of non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender inmates to include their total criminal and mental health history instead of only their last criminal conviction.

2. **Revise the Definition of Violent Crime**

   The resolution calls for the League to advocate to place into law for the purposes of Section 32 of Article I of the California Constitution, a violent offense includes any of the following crimes:

   - Murder or voluntary manslaughter
   - Mayhem
   - Rape
   - Sodomy by force, violence, duress, menace, or threat of great bodily harm
   - Oral copulation by force, violence, duress, menace, or threat of great bodily harm
   - Lewd acts on a child under the age of 14 years
   - Any felony punishable by death or imprisonment in the state prison for life
   - Any other felony in which the defendant inflicts great or serious bodily injury on any person, other than an accomplice, that has been charged and proven, or any felony in which the defendant uses a firearm which use has been charged and proven
   - Attempted murder
   - Assault with intent to commit rape or robbery
   - Assault with a deadly weapon or instrument on a peace officer
   - Assault by a life prisoner on a non-inmate
   - Assault with a deadly weapon by an inmate
   - Arson
   - Exploding a destructive device or any explosive with intent to injure
   - Exploding a destructive device or any explosive causing great bodily injury
   - Exploding a destructive device or any explosive with intent to murder
   - Robbery
   - Kidnapping
   - Taking of a hostage by an inmate of a state prison
• Attempt to commit a felony punishable by death or imprisonment in the state prison for life
• Any felony in which the defendant personally used a dangerous or deadly weapon
• Escape from a state prison by use of force or violence
• Assault with a deadly weapon
• Extortion as defined in Penal Code section 518, or threats to victims or witnesses as defined in Penal Code section 136.1, which would constitute a felony violation of Penal Code section 186.22
• Carjacking
• Discharge of a firearm at an inhabited dwelling, vehicle, or aircraft.
• Throwing acid or flammable substances with intent to injure.
• Continuous sexual abuse of a child.

3. **Data Sharing**

   The resolution requests the State to improve the Smart Justice platform to provide an effective statewide data sharing to allow state and local law enforcement agencies to rapidly and efficiently share offender information to assist in tracking and monitoring the activities of AB 109 and other offenders.

---

**League of California Cities Staff Analysis on Resolution No. 1**

Staff: Tim Cromartie  
Committee: Public Safety

**Summary:**

This Resolution seeks to address increases in crime in the wake of AB 109 (2011), Proposition 47 (2014), which reclassified a host of felony offenses as misdemeanors, and Proposition 57 (2016), which revised the rules of parole for what are designated “non-violent” offenders under the California Penal Code, but in fact comprise a number of criminal acts that are violent in nature, or may be committed to facilitate a violent outcome (for example, discharging a firearm from a motor vehicle).

This Resolution would direct staff to seek legislation expanding the term “violent felony” as defined in the California Penal Code; to tighten the criteria for the release of non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender inmates; to mandate consideration of an inmate’s entire criminal history as part of the deliberations involving whether to grant in individual parole; and to consider creation of a task force that would be charged with issuing a report recommending further changes in law, and supported by documentation collected by local agencies and other key stakeholders.
**Background:**  
Since 2011, changes in state law, starting with AB 109, altered the fabric of California’s criminal justice system. In 2011, AB 109 began to shift nearly 45,000 felons from the state prison system to local county jails. Prior to AB 109, many of California’s more heavily populated counties already had jail systems that were operating under court-ordered or self-imposed population caps. As a result, AB 109 implementation triggered changes in that county jails experienced over time an influx of a rougher class of offender, and many lower level petty criminals committing new offenses were simply booked and released, serving no jail time at all.

Proposition 47 followed in 2014, reclassifying a host of felony offenses as misdemeanors and increasing the threshold amount for a felony charge of grand theft from $450.00 to $900.00. The effect of this change was to significantly stimulate the volume of petty theft, shoplifting, auto theft, and organized retail theft (shoplifting involving multiple persons with cell phones, designated getaway drivers, and a pre-determined escape route often involving a short trip to a major highway). Proposition 57, approved by voters in 2016, facilitates the potential early release of a large number of “non-violent” offenders by providing that inmates are eligible for parole once they have served 100% of their base sentence, without regard to any time served as a result of any sentencing enhancements. The universe of “non-violent” offenders could include individuals who have committed the following offenses: rape by intoxication, attempted drive-by shooting, assault with a deadly weapon, throwing acid with the intent to disfigure, to name but a few offenses. Since current law defines a “non-violent offender” based on the individual’s most recent commitment offense, even if the individual is a repeat offender, the State Parole Board must still consider that person’s parole application.

This state of affairs includes factors such as a higher proportion of offenders at large on our city streets, many of whom have had little in the way of rehabilitation programming while incarcerated, some with drug habits, who are more violent now that when initially incarcerated. Unless they engage in major illegal activity (murder, rape, arson, armed robbery), the available sanctions for any violations they commit, such as flash incarceration, i.e. temporary incarceration for 48-72 hours in a city or county jail, scarcely provide a meaningful deterrent to further criminal activity.

Communities in California are now facing increasing crime rates which can be linked to these recent legislative changes, which probation officers and local law enforcement are struggling to monitor and contain a situation in which a dramatically increase universe of offenders are at large in our communities.

The Public Policy Institute of California reports that since 2015:

- California has experienced an increase in overall crime  
- Property crime is up 145%  
- Violent crime is up 54%  
- One in four Californians view violence and street crime in their community as a substantial problem  
- Arrests dropped 31% for property crimes and 68% for drug offenses (due to Prop. 47)  
- The report concludes auto theft increase is a direct result of AB 109
Support:
Cities of La Mirada, Lakewood, Monrovia, Pico Rivera, Rolling Hills, Santa Fe Springs, and South Gate

Opposition:
None received.

Fiscal Impact:
The collective and cumulative effect of the current criminal justice policies has led to increased pressure on county general funds for increased resources for probation supervision and incarceration in county jails, as well as identical pressure on municipal general funds related to increased law enforcement activity and in some areas, increased emergency medical services calls. Should the objectives outlined by the resolution be achieved, those pressures will be alleviated to a significant but undetermined amount.

Comment:
This measure is a response to a trend of rapidly mounting frustration among cities beset by calls for more law enforcement resources as a result of ongoing, sustained criminal activity. There is a growing sense among law enforcement professionals and local elected officials that current policies which have reduced criminal penalties, reclassified felonies as misdemeanors and facilitated what amounts to early release of many offenders who are not truly non-violent, will in time result in a high-profile tragedy involving significant loss of life.

Existing League Policy:
In regard to incarceration policy, the League supports stiffer penalties for violent offenders. In 2014, the League joined the California Police Chiefs in opposing Proposition 47, which reduces sentencing penalties for specified non-serious and non-violent drug and property crimes. It directed that the following offenses would be treated as misdemeanors, in most instances irrespective of the circumstances:

- Commercial Burglary
- Forged
- Passing Bad Checks
- Grand Theft
- Receipt of Stolen Property
- Petty Theft with a Prior Offense
- Drug Possession

In 2013, the League Board of Directors approved a resolution pertaining to AB 109 (2011), which implemented Public Safety Realignment and brought significant changes to the state’s incarceration policy. Specifically, it provided that specified categories of felony offenders previously sentenced to state prison, would prospectively be sentenced to terms in county jails.

The League’s Resolution had two significant components relevant to this resolution:

1) It urged the Governor’s office to adjust the implementation of Public Safety Realignment so that the criteria examined to evaluate the appropriateness of release of non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender inmates would include their total criminal and mental
history, instead of merely the most recent criminal conviction for which they are currently committed; and

2) It urged the Governor’s office to expedite the development of an effective statewide data sharing mechanism allowing state and local law enforcement agencies too rapidly and efficiently share offender information to assist in tracking and monitoring the activities of AB 109 and other offenders.

Finally, the League in 2016 opposed Proposition 57, which altered rules for parole eligibility for non-violent felons, potentially facilitating parole before an individual has served any time toward a sentencing enhancement, and ushered in new rules for good time behavior seeking to incentivize inmates to undergo rehabilitation programming of an educational/vocational nature.

RESOLUTION REFERRED TO PUBLIC SAFETY POLICY COMMITTEE

2. A RESOLUTION OF THE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES SUPPORTING LEGISLATION AMENDING GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 38611 TO CLARIFY THE DEFINITION OF LOCAL CONTROL PROVIDING BROAD STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR LOCAL OFFICIALS TO DETERMINE EMERGENCY SERVICE LEVELS AND DIRECT EMERGENCY MEDICAL RESPONSE WITHIN THEIR JURISDICTIONS

Source: City of Tracy
Concurrence of five or more cities/city officials: Cities: Lathrop, Lodi, Manteca, Stockton, and Consumnes Fire Department (Cities of Elk Grove and Galt)
Referred to: Public Safety Policy Committee
Recommendation to General Resolutions Committee:

WHEREAS, Government Code Section 38611 was last amended in 1957 and does not contain language clarifying the broad scope of emergency services as provided by present day fire departments; and

WHEREAS, Government Code Section 38611 requires further definition for general law and charter cities in determining service levels for the delivery of emergency services commensurate with the resources provided by the local government body; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 7 of Article XI of the California Constitution, municipal governments are vested with police power which imposes on the responsibility to protect public safety and public health and municipal governments must provide or contract for fire and/or emergency medical services; and

WHEREAS, the local provision of fire protection services, rescue services, emergency medical services, hazardous material emergency response services, ambulance services, and other services relating to the protection of lives and property is critical to the public peace, health, and safety of the state; and
WHEREAS, local fire and/or emergency medical services are financed by local taxpayers and the availability and use of such services is determined by the local governing body of the jurisdiction to which services are directly provided; and

WHEREAS, amending Government Code Section 38611 would provide the chief of a fire department specific authority to protect public safety and public health within the jurisdictional boundaries of the fire department.

RESOLVED, that the League of California Cities General Assembly, assembled at the League Annual Conference on September 15, 2017 in Sacramento, calls for the Governor and the Legislature to work with the League and other stakeholders to amend Government Code Section 38611 clarifying the definition of local control, providing broad statutory authority for local officials to determine emergency service levels and direct emergency medical response within their jurisdictions.

//////////////

**Background Information on Resolution No. 2**

**Source:** City of Tracy

**Background:**

In 1980, the State Legislature enacted the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Act in response to the development of paramedic services and a concern that there was a lack of medical oversight and coordination of emergency medical services. The EMS Act contains 100 different provisions in nine separate chapters of the California Health and Safety Code. The EMS Act created a two-tiered system that established a State EMS Agency to coordinate state-wide EMS activities and to develop state-wide minimum EMS policies and a local tier (Local EMS Agency) to plan, implement and evaluate an EMS System. The statute also includes language that establishes “The medical direction and management of an emergency medical services system shall be under the medical control of the medical director of the local EMS Agency.” In each county, the local EMS Agency sets local EMS policy, administers and provides medical oversight for cities and special fire districts to deliver EMS services within the county.

In the late 1970’s, as the EMS Act was being developed, the League of California Cities weighed heavily concerning the impact of the proposed EMS Act on cities. The League of California Cities argued against depriving a city of local control over EMS service levels. The League of California Cities wrote, “We believe (local control) is important because city taxpayers financially support (EMS) programs and city management is responsible for their efficient utilization. The city council is responsible for the level of service and the cost of the program, wholly unrelated to the medical questions.” Based on that argument, additional language was included in the EMS policy that allowed local agencies that were providing EMS service to continue (and even obligated) them to continue to provide EMS services at the same levels as prior to 1980. This addition to the EMS Act (Section 1797.201 – became known as “201
Rights”) has been very controversial and has led to several lawsuits between cities/special districts and local EMS Agencies.

The City of Tracy in San Joaquin County has become the epicenter on the issue of local control as it relates to who has the authority to determine which resources will respond to medical emergencies. Several incidents have been noted where poor patient outcomes were the result of a failed county policy (SJCEMS Agency Policy 3202) that restricts local fire departments from responding to “low-level” emergencies. The EMS policy decisions within San Joaquin County have potential implications on every local community within the state of California and increasingly threaten local control.

Proposed Amendment
The proposed amendment to Government Code Section 38611 would clarify local control and allow the local governing bodies to determine which services are directly provided within their respective jurisdictions. The existing law is extremely limited in scope having been last amended in 1957, at a time when fire departments did not routinely provide many of the specialized services of today. Changes in services provided include but are not limited to hazardous materials response, specialized rescue, and emergency medical services. The amendment aims to support the long-standing tradition in California of local control over the types, levels, and availability of these services.

League of California Cities Staff Analysis on Resolution No. 2
Staff: Tim Cromartie
Committee: Public Safety

Summary:
This resolution calls for the Governor and the Legislature to work with the League and other stakeholders to amend Government Code Section 38611 clarifying the definition of local control, providing broad statutory authority for local officials to determine emergency service levels and direct emergency medical response within their jurisdictions.

Background:
In 1980, the State Legislature enacted the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Act in response to the development of paramedic services and a concern that there was a lack of medical oversight and coordination of emergency medical services. The EMS Act contains 100 different provisions in nine separate chapters of the California Health and Safety Code. The EMS Act created a two-tiered system that established a State EMS Agency to coordinate state-wide EMS activities and to develop state-wide minimum EMS policies and a local tier (Local EMS Agency) to plan, implement and evaluate an EMS System.

The statute also includes language that establishes “The medical direction and management of an emergency medical services system shall be under the medical control of the medical director
In each county, the local EMS Agency sets local EMS policy, administers and provides medical oversight for cities and special fire districts to deliver EMS services within the county.

In the late 1970’s, as the EMS Act was being developed, the League of California Cities weighed heavily concerning the impact of the proposed EMS Act on cities. The League argued against depriving a city of local control over EMS service levels. The League wrote, “We believe (local control) is important because city taxpayers financially support (EMS) programs and city management is responsible for their efficient utilization. The city council is responsible for the level of service and the cost of the program, wholly unrelated to the medical questions.” Based on that argument, additional language was included in the EMS policy that allowed local agencies that were providing EMS service to continue (and even obligated) them to continue to provide EMS services at the same levels as prior to 1980. This addition to the EMS Act (Section 1797.201 – became known as “201 Rights”) has been very controversial and has led to several lawsuits between cities/special districts and local EMS Agencies.

The City of Tracy in San Joaquin County has become one of the epicenters on the issue of local control as it relates to who has the authority to determine which resources will respond to medical emergencies. Several incidents have been noted where poor patient outcomes have been attributed by some observers to a county policy (SJCEMS Agency Policy 3202) that restricts local fire departments from responding to “low-level” emergencies. The EMS policy decisions within San Joaquin County have potential implications on every local community within the state of California and increasingly threaten local control.

**Support:**
Cities of Lathrop, Lodi, Manteca, City of Stockton, and Consumnes Fire Department (Cities of Elk Grove and Galt)

**Opposition:**
None received.

**Fiscal Impact:**
This resolution, if its directive can be achieved, will have no direct fiscal impact on cities. It will however, provide an atmosphere in which cities that have invested significant resources in building up and maintaining an independent EMS capability can have confidence that it will be deployed as intended.

**Comment:**
While this resolution calls for very specific action to clarify the rules governing emergency medical services, ideally it would be more generally worded to allow greater flexibility in pursuing legislative and other solutions to a problem that has existed for decades, spawning both legislation and multiple incidents of litigation.

However, it accurately expresses the legitimate frustration of cities in their efforts to provide emergency medical services (EMS) while abiding by the directives of their local emergency medical services authorities (LEMSA’s), which are county entities. Counties have broad
discretion under existing case law in how they administer EMS under the doctrine of medical control. To the degree there is dissatisfaction on the part of cities within a given county or counties, the following should be noted:

1) A task force convened by the California Emergency Medical Services Authority, the state entity with jurisdiction over this subject matter, made significant headway in crafting regulations governing the provision of ground emergency medical transport -- until disputes over local control and the criteria under which a local (municipal) agency could lay claim to the exclusive right to provide EMS in a specific operating area led to a lawsuit being filed by the California Fire Chiefs Association. That suit effectively suspended the work of the Task Force.

2) Over the past two decades, multiple attempts at legislation to resolve this issue have been tried, most without success. It was in part the multiple attempts at legislation that triggered the formation of the above-referenced task force.

**Existing League Policy:**
The League supports the fire service mission of saving lives and protecting property through fire prevention, disaster preparedness, hazardous-materials mitigation, specialized rescue, etc. as well as cities’ authority and discretion to provide all emergency services to their communities.

The League supports and strives to ensure local control of emergency medical services by authorizing cities and fire districts to prescribe and monitor the manner and scope of pre-hospital emergency medical services, including transport through ambulance services, all provided within local boundaries for the purpose of improving the level of pre-hospital emergency medical service.

The League supports legislation to provide the framework for a solution to longstanding conflict between cities, counties, the fire service and LEMSA’s particularly by local advisory committees to review and approve the EMS plan and to serve as an appeals body. Conflicts over EMS governance may be resolved if stakeholders are able to participate in EMS system design and evaluation and if complainants are given a fair and open hearing.

The League opposes legislation, regulations and standards that impose minimum staffing and response time standards for city fire and EMS services since such determinations should reflect the conditions and priorities of individual cities.

The League supports Emergency 911 systems to ensure cities and counties are represented on decisions affecting emergency response.
LETTERS OF CONCURRENCE
Resolution No. 1

Implement Strategies to Reduce Negative Impacts of Recent Changes to Criminal Laws
July 11, 2017

General Resolutions Committee
League of California Cities
1400 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: 2017 CONFERENCE RESOLUTION STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF CRIMINAL LAW

Dear Committee:

The City of La Mirada supports the League of California Cities Annual Conference Resolution proposed by the City of Whittier calling on the Governor and Legislature to enter into discussion with the League and other public safety stakeholders to identify and implement strategies that will improve the unintended negative impacts of existing criminal law.

The City of La Mirada has seen increases in property crime that may have resulted from a combination of legislative actions and voter-approved initiatives. Specifically, since 2014 the City of La Mirada has seen property crime increase by 41 percent. The proposed resolution seeks to correct these negative impacts from existing criminal law and considers proactive measures that could reduce such impacts.

The resolution directs League staff to consider creating a task force with other organizations and jointly commission a report on the unintended negative impacts of recent criminal law to identify necessary changes.

The resolution also promotes an amendment of appropriate sections of AB 109 to change the criteria justifying the release of non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender inmates to include one’s total criminal and mental health history instead of only the most recent criminal conviction. It encourages continued advocacy to make “violent offenses” include crimes that meet the plain language definition of “violent”.

The resolution further asks the State to improve the Smart Justice platform to allow state and local law enforcement agencies to rapidly share information to track offenders, and encourages data collection on post-release community supervision offenders.

The passage of this resolution would provide a range of important reforms to enhance public safety in our community. For these reasons, the City of La Mirada strongly supports this resolution to strategically address criminal justice reforms.

Sincerely,

CITY OF LA MIRADA

[Signature]
Ed Eng
Mayor

Ed Eng
Mayor

Lawrence P. Mowles
Mayor Pro Tem

Steve De Ruse, D. M.D.
Councilmember

John Lewis
Councilmember

Andrew Sarega
Councilmember

Jeff Boynton
City Manager
July 10, 2017

General Resolutions Committee
League of California Cities
1400 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: 2017 Conference Resolution – Notice of Support
Strategies to Improve Negative Impacts of Criminal Law

Dear Committee:

The City of Lakewood supports the League of California Cities Annual Conference Resolution calling on the Governor and Legislature to enter into discussion with the League and other public safety stakeholders to identify and implement strategies that will improve the unintended negative impacts of existing criminal law.

Like other cities, Lakewood has seen increases in property crime that may have resulted from a combination of legislative actions and voter-approved initiatives. The proposed annual conference resolution seeks to turn around these negative impacts from existing criminal law and considers proactive measures that could reduce such impacts. These include:

- Request League staff to consider creating a task force with other organizations and jointly commission a report on the unintended negative impacts of recent criminal law to identify necessary changes and work with key stakeholders to promote support for resulting advocacy efforts.

- Promote an amendment of appropriate sections of AB 109 to change the criteria justifying the release of non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender inmates to include their total criminal and mental health history instead of only their last criminal conviction. It encourages continued advocacy to make “violent offenses” include crimes that meet the plain language definition of “violent.”

- Request that the State improve the “Smart Justice” platform to allow state and local law enforcement agencies to rapidly share information to track offenders and encourage data collection on post-release community supervision offenders.

The passage of this resolution would provide a range of important reforms that would enhance public safety in our community. For these reasons, the City of Lakewood strongly supports this resolution to strategically address criminal justice reforms.

Sincerely,

Diane DuBois
Mayor

Lakewood
5050 Clark Avenue, Lakewood, CA 90712 • (562) 866-9771 • Fax (562) 866-0505 • www.lakewoodcity.org • Email: service1@lakewoodcity.org
July 11, 2017

President JoAnne Mounce
The League of California Cities
1400 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Letter of Support for the Resolution Brought Forward by the City of Whittier Regarding the Unintended Negative Consequences of Recent Legislative Changes to California’s Criminal Justice System

Dear Ms. Mounce:

The City of Monrovia strongly supports the Resolution brought forth by the City of Whittier, which asks the League of California Cities (League) to initiate and facilitate further discussion between the Governor, the State Legislature, and other key public safety stakeholders regarding the legislative changes that have been made to California’s criminal justice system during the past few years.

Taken together, Assembly Bill 109, Proposition 47, and Proposition 57 have reshaped how we approach public safety issues in our State. And certainly, the identified measures have resulted in measurable and positive impacts to California’s criminal justice system, such as a decrease in the State prison system population. However, the cumulative effect of these legislative actions have had several significant unintended consequences, which have resulted in California cities now needing to address increasingly complex public safety challenges.

For example, in the City of Monrovia, violent and property crimes increased by 19% when comparing 2016 crime levels against 2015 rates. On-the-street information being provided by our Police Officers seems to correlate that the increasing levels of crime are connected with the legislative changes that have been enacted in California during the past several years. Additionally, the public safety issues we are experiencing in Monrovia are not occurring in a vacuum, as other neighboring jurisdictions are reporting similar concerns that impact our region as a whole.

Given these factors, we believe that California’s overall criminal justice system needs to be carefully reexamined for potential methods to mitigate these emerging public safety issues. The City of Whittier’s Resolution represents a positive first step, which includes the formation of a task force to examine possible criminal justice system modifications in greater detail. We believe that such a step would be a move in the right direction for California.

For these reasons, the City of Monrovia strongly supports the Resolution brought forth by the City of Whittier. Of course, please feel free to contact me if I can provide any additional information. I can be reached at (626) 932-5501, or via email at ochi@ci.monrovia.ca.us.

Best regards,

Oliver Chi
City Manager
July 12, 2017

General Resolutions Committee
League of California Cities
1400 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: 2017 Conference Resolution
Strategies to Improve Negative Impacts of Criminal Law
Notice of Support

Dear Committee:

The City of Pico Rivera supports the League of California Cities Annual Conference Resolution calling on the Governor and Legislature to enter into discussion with the League and other public safety stakeholders to identify and implement strategies that will improve the unintended negative impacts of existing criminal law.

The City of Pico Rivera has seen increases in property crime that may have resulted from a combination of legislative actions and voter-approved initiatives. Following are some specific impacts provided by the Pico Rivera Sheriff’s Department:

**Part I crimes**
Robbery is up 10.26% in 2017 compared to 2016
Larceny Theft is up 4.09% in 2017 compared to 2016

**Part II crimes**
Weapon Law is up 9.68% in 2017 compared to 2016
Felony Transport & or Sales of controlled substance (except Marijuana) is up 44.44% compared to 2016
Misdemeanor Possession of a Controlled Substance (excluding Marijuana) is up 56.06% compared to 2016
Under the influence of Narcotic is up 28.57% in 2017 compared to 2016

The proposed annual conference resolution seeks to turn around these negative impacts from existing criminal law and considers proactive measures that could reduce such impacts.
General Resolutions Committee

2017 Conference Resolution – Strategies to Improve Negative Impacts of Criminal Law
Notice of Support
July 12, 2017
Page 2

The resolution directs League staff to consider creating a task force with other organizations and jointly commission a report on the unintended negative impacts of recent criminal law to identify necessary changes, working with key stakeholders to promote support for resulting advocacy efforts.

The resolution also promotes an amendment of appropriate sections of AB 109 to change the criteria justifying the release of non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender inmates to include their total criminal and mental health history instead of only their last criminal conviction. It encourages continued advocacy to make “violent offenses” include crimes that meet the plain language definition of “violent”.

The resolution further asks the State to improve the Smart Justice platform to allow state and local law enforcement agencies to rapidly share information to track offenders, and encourages data collection on post-release community supervision offenders.

The passage of this resolution would provide a range of important reforms that would enhance public safety in our community. For these reasons, the City of Pico Rivera strongly supports this resolution to strategically address criminal justice reforms.

Best regards,

[Signature]

René Bobadilla, P.E.
City Manager
City of Pico Rivera
July 12, 2017

General Resolutions Committee
League of California Cities
1400 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: 2017 Conference Resolution
Strategies to Improve Negative Impacts of Criminal Law
Notice of Support

Dear Members of the General Resolutions Committee:

As a member of the Rolling Hills City Council, I support the League of California Cities Annual Conference Resolution calling on the Governor and Legislature to enter into discussion with the League and with other public safety stakeholders to identify and implement strategies that will relieve the unintended negative impacts of existing criminal law.

The City of Rolling Hills has seen increases in burglaries, mail/package theft and other property related crime that may have resulted from a combination of legislative actions and voter-approved initiatives. The City has also seen a significant jump in identity theft. The proposed annual conference resolution seeks to turn around these negative impacts from existing criminal law and considers proactive measures that could reduce such impacts.

The resolution directs League staff to consider creating a task force with other organizations and jointly commission a report on the unintended negative impacts of recent criminal law to identify necessary changes, working with key stakeholders to promote support for resulting advocacy efforts.

The resolution also promotes an amendment of appropriate sections of AB 109 to change the criteria justifying the release of non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender inmates to include their total criminal and mental health history instead of only their last criminal conviction. It encourages continued advocacy to make “violent offenses” include crimes that meet the plain language definition of “violent”.

112
The resolution further asks the State to improve the Smart Justice platform to allow state and local law enforcement agencies to rapidly share information to track offenders, and encourages data collection on post-release community supervision offenders.

The passage of this resolution would provide a range of important reforms that would enhance public safety in our community. For these reasons, I strongly support this resolution to strategically address criminal justice reforms.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Bea Dieringer
Councilmember
City of Rolling Hills

RC:BD:hl

07-12-17League Resolution Support.docx
Dear Committee:

The City of Santa Fe Springs supports the League of California Cities Annual Conference Resolution calling on the Governor and Legislature to enter into discussion with the League and other public safety stakeholders to identify and implement strategies that will improve the unintended negative impacts of existing criminal law.

The City of Santa Fe Springs has seen increases in property crime that may have resulted from a combination of legislative actions and voter-approved initiatives. In addition, the City of Santa Fe Springs contracts with the Whittier Police Department for Law Enforcement Services. In February, Whittier Police Department Officer Keith Boyer was gunned down by an AB 109 offender in a heinous act of indiscriminate violence. We feel strongly that AB 109 and the loosening of oversight and control over recidivist offenders was at least partially responsible in Officer Boyer’s death. We believe that the proposed annual conference resolution seeks to turn around these negative impacts from existing criminal law and considers proactive measures that could reduce such impacts.

The resolution directs League staff to consider creating a task force with other organizations and jointly commission a report on the unintended negative impacts of recent criminal law to identify necessary changes, working with key stakeholders to promote support for resulting advocacy efforts.

The resolution also promotes an amendment of appropriate sections of AB 109 to change the criteria justifying the release of non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender inmates to include their total criminal and mental health history instead of only their last criminal conviction. It encourages continued advocacy to make “violent offenses” include crimes that meet the plain language definition of “violent”.

The resolution further asks the State to improve the Smart Justice platform to allow state and local law enforcement agencies to rapidly share information to track offenders, and encourages data collection on post-release community supervision offenders.

July 11, 2017
2017 Conference Resolution

The passage of this resolution would provide a range of important reforms that would enhance public safety in our community. For these reasons, the City of Santa Fe Springs strongly supports this resolution to strategically address criminal justice reforms.

Sincerely,

William K. Rounds, Mayor
City of Santa Fe Springs
July 11, 2017

General Resolutions Committee
League of California Cities
1400 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: 2017 ANNUAL CONFERENCE RESOLUTION: STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF CRIMINAL LAW- NOTICE OF SUPPORT

Dear Committee:

As a Council Member of the City of South Gate, and a Member of the League’s Public Safety Policy Committee, I am writing to express my support of the City of Whittier’s 2017 Annual Conference Resolution (Resolution.) The proposed Resolution calls on the Governor and Legislature to enter into discussion with the League and other public safety stakeholders, to identify and implement strategies that will improve the unintended negative impacts of existing criminal law.

Cities in Los Angeles County have experienced increases in property crimes that may have resulted from a combination of legislative actions and voter-approved initiatives. The proposed Resolution seeks to remedy many of the negative impacts from existing criminal law and considers proactive measures that could reduce such impacts.

The passage of this Resolution would provide a range of important League directives to address the growing public safety concerns in these communities. For these reasons, I strongly support this Resolution to strategically address criminal justice reforms.

Sincerely,

Jorge Morales
Council Member
LETTERS OF CONCURRENCE
Resolution No. 2

Local Control for Emergency Medical Response
July 13, 2017

The Honorable JoAnne Mounce, President
League of California Cities
1400 K Street
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: RESOLUTION THAT SUPPORTS LEGISLATION TO AMEND GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 38611 TO CLARIFY THE DEFINITION OF LOCAL CONTROL

Dear President Mounce,

The Cosumnes CSD Fire Department, which encompasses the Cities of Elk Grove and Galt supports the proposed resolution that would support legislation to amend Government Code Section 38611 to clarify the definition of local control as it pertains to emergency services.

A core function of local government is the ability to determine and provide the appropriated level of emergency response resources. Allowing Local Emergency Medical Services Agencies (LEMSAs) to determine when and how local fire agencies respond to emergencies circumvents the role of Fire Chiefs and municipal and special fire district legislative bodies. It should be the role of the Fire Chief to determine the required service levels and the role of the local legislative bodies to support the Fire Chief’s recommendations based on community expectations, community risk reduction strategies and available resources.

Therefore, the Cosumnes CSD Fire Department supports the proposed resolution and future legislation that would serve to ensure local government determines their emergency response service levels. If further clarification is required, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Michael W. McLaughlin
Fire Chief
July 14, 2017

The Honorable JoAnne Mounce, President
League of California Cities
1400 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Sent to Via Email to: Meg Desmond mdesmond@cacities.org

Re: RESOLUTION THAT SUPPORTS LEGISLATION TO AMEND GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 38611 TO CLARIFY THE DEFINITION OF LOCAL CONTROL

Dear President Mounce,

The City of Lathrop supports the proposed resolution that would support legislation to amend Government Code Section 38611 to clarify the definition of local control as it pertains to emergency services.

A core function of local government is the ability to determine and provide the appropriated level of emergency response resources. Allowing Local Emergency Medical Services Agencies (LEMSAs) to determine when and how local fire agencies respond to emergencies circumvents the role of Fire Chiefs and municipal and special fire district legislative bodies. It should be the role of the Fire Chief to determine the required service levels and the role of the local legislative bodies to support the Fire Chief’s recommendations based on community expectations, community risk reduction strategies and available resources.

Therefore, the City of Lathrop supports the proposed resolution and future legislation that would serve to ensure local government determines their emergency response service levels. If further clarification is required, please let me know.

Thank you,

Stephen J. Salvatore
City Manager

Cc: Members of the City of Lathrop City Council
Lathrop Manteca Fire Chief, Gene Neely
Tracy City Manager, Troy Brown
Tracy Fire Chief, Randall Bradley
Central Valley Regional Public Affairs Manager LOCC, Stephen Qualls
The Honorable JoAnne Mounce, President
League of California Cities
1400 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: RESOLUTION OF THE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES SUPPORTING LEGISLATION AMENDING GC §38611 TO CLARIFY DEFINITION OF LOCAL CONTROL PROVIDING BROAD STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR LOCAL OFFICIALS TO DETERMINE EMERGENCY SERVICE LEVELS AND DIRECT EMERGENCY MEDICAL RESPONSE WITHIN THEIR JURISDICTIONS

The City of Lodi supports the proposed resolution to support legislation amending Government Code §38611 to clarify the definition of local control providing broad statutory authority for local officials to determine emergency service levels and direct emergency medical response within their jurisdictions.

Accordingly, we concur in the submission of the resolution for consideration by the League of California Cities General Assembly at its annual meeting on September 15, 2017.

Government Code Section 38611 does not contain language clarifying the broad scope of emergency services as provided by present day fire departments. The code requires further definition for general law and charter cities in determining service levels for the delivery of emergency services commensurate with the resources provided by the local government body. Amending Government Code Section 38611 would provide the chief of a fire department specific authority to protect public safety and public health within the jurisdictional boundaries of the fire department.

The City of Lodi is in strong support of providing statutory authority for local officials to determine emergency service levels and direct emergency medical response within their jurisdictions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Doug Kuehne
Mayor, City of Lodi

CC: Larry Rooney, Fire Chief, City of Lodi
    Randall Bradley, City of Tracy, randall.brady@ci.tracy.ca.us
    Stephen Qualls, League of California Cities, sqall@calcities.org
July 13, 2017

League of California Cities
1400 K Street, Suite 400
Sacramento CA 95814

RE: A RESOLUTION OF THE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES SUPPORTING LEGISLATION AMENDING GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 38611 TO CLARIFY THE DEFINITION OF LOCAL CONTROL PROVIDING BROAD STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR LOCAL OFFICIALS TO DETERMINE EMERGENCY SERVICE LEVELS AND DIRECT EMERGENCY MEDICAL RESPONSE WITHIN THEIR JURISDICTIONS

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter confirms that the City of Manteca supports the resolution on Emergency Medical Services submitted to the League of California cities by the City of Tracy. The City of Manteca believes that local control of Emergency Services is critical to ensure that the best possible service and protection of our citizens/taxpayers is provided.

We appreciate the City of Tracy’s willingness to bring this crucial issue to the forefront.

Respectfully,

[Signature]
Greg Showerman, Acting City Manager

Date: 13 July 2017

[Signature]
Kyle Shipherd, Fire Chief

Date: 13 July 2017
July 13, 2017

The Honorable JoAnne Mounce, President
League of California Cities
1400 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: Resolution of the League of California Cities Supporting Legislation Providing Broad Statutory Authority for Local Officials to Determine Emergency Service Levels - SUPPORT

Dear President Mounce,

On behalf of the City of Stockton, I wish to voice our support of the City of Tracy proposed resolution for consideration by League membership. Stockton supports this resolution for the following reasons:

1) The City of Stockton Legislative Program seeks the broadest authority for the City Council to make decisions locally, particularly related to the local exercise of police powers;
2) The City of Stockton Legislative Program advocates for efforts that impact the City’s ability to enhance the well-being, quality of life, health, and safety of residents;
3) The City of Stockton has experienced challenges and frustrations in delivering the highest quality of emergency medical services to our residents due to provision of the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Act.
4) Amendments to the EMS Act would clarify local control and allow governing bodies to determine which services are directly provided within their respective jurisdictions.

For these reasons, the City of Stockton concurs with and supports the City of Tracy proposed resolution for consideration by League membership.

MICHAEL TUBBS
MAYOR

MT:cc

cc: Stockton City Council members
    Kurt Wilson, Stockton City Manager
Below is an Advance Calendar of anticipated agenda items. The dates are tentative but reflect an overview of items to come. Items on this advance calendar are subject to change. Final agendas will be available on-line and at City Hall at least 72 hours prior to the meeting date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DATE</th>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST 28, 2017</td>
<td>Solid Waste Services Contract – discuss and provide direction</td>
<td>Discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utility Box Art Program</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER 11, 2017</td>
<td>SYVT-SRTP Update</td>
<td>Receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER 25, 2017</td>
<td>10-Year Capital Improvement Program</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Fee revisions, California Code Check Agreement</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SYCSD Recycled Water Planning Study Findings &amp; Los Olivos Request</td>
<td>Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPDES Permit Trash Amendment Summary</td>
<td>Adopt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict of Interest Code Review (June 2018)</td>
<td>Discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic Device Public Records Act Training</td>
<td>Receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOI/Economic Development Funding</td>
<td>Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Funding and Contract</td>
<td>Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment to Library Advisory Committee (July 2019)</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance Amendment</td>
<td>Adopt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warrant Register (1st meeting of each month)</td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheriff’s Department Report (2nd meeting of each month)</td>
<td>Receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCVB Report (2nd meeting of each month &amp; biennial report)</td>
<td>Receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Department Report (Quarterly)</td>
<td>Receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VisitSYV Report (Quarterly)</td>
<td>Receive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>